REFINING THE PARADIGM:
Holistic Evaluation of Faculty to Support Faculty and Student Learning

**Richard Alan Gillman,
Nancy H. Hensel,
David A. Salomon
and Stephen C. Wilhite**

Refining the Paradigm: Faculty Models to Support Student Learning

Cover Photo: Pexels
Cover Design: James Fields

Refining the Paradigm: Holistic Evaluation of Faculty to Support Faculty and Student Learning

Richard Alan Gillman, Nancy H. Hensel, David A. Salomon and Stephen C. Wilhite

In Context: The New American Colleges & Universities

A 1992 speech by Frank Wong, titled "The Ugly Duckling of Higher Education," argued that "comprehensive" was not an adequate label for institutions such as the University of the Pacific, where Wong was speaking, and the University of Redlands, where Wong served as vice president for academic affairs. The institutions were devoted to the ideals of a liberal arts education but also offered professional programs and adult programs. The speech prompted another meeting with a small group of academic vice presidents representing similar institutions at which Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and author of the ground-breaking *Scholarship Reconsidered,* argued the need for alternative models in higher education and called for a new American college for the 21st century.

Boyer argued for more integrated institutions that would, for example, better connect academic departments in a truly integrated core curriculum and better connect general and specialized education. He also wanted colleges to more effectively tie formal learning in the classroom to the continuing education that follows in students' adult lives as workers, citizens, and family members. Boyer and representatives of 15 comprehensive liberal arts colleges reached two conclusions at a Wingspread Conference on the New American College, held August 15-17, 1994 (Berberet and Wong, 1995). These conclusions were that: "(1) the essence of the New American College model of liberal learning is a blending of knowledge and experience in ways particularly suited to society's needs in the 1990s; and (2) organizationally,

these institutions are attuned to the restructuring movement currently affecting all sectors of society" (Berberet & Wong, 1995, p. 49).

NAC&U, originally the Associated New American Colleges, was founded in 1995 and took its name from Boyer's call for a new American model for higher education. In a 1994 *Chronicle of Higher Education* article, Boyer asked, "How can American higher education successfully contribute to national renewal? Is it possible for the work of the academy to relate more effectively to our most pressing social, economic, and civic problems?" The founders of NAC&U asked similar questions, which they explored in a 1994 publication of *Perspectives,* the Journal of the Association for General and Liberal Studies. Jerry Berberet, in his contribution to the journal, identified key characteristics for a new model for higher education (pp. 44-47):

- ability to respond to change;
- integrative governance mechanisms;
- multiple faculty and staff roles;
- cost-effective administrative structure;
- new roles for students; and
- campus-community partnerships.

As any new educational model depends on faculty work and commitment, in 2002 NAC&U, with support from the Pew Charitable Trusts, published the *New Academic Compact: Revisioning the Relationship between Faculty and Their Institutions*, which described a year-long study of faculty work. The study looked at faculty workload, professional development, differentiated roles, and evaluation. NAC&U continued the study of faculty roles in 2013 with a grant from The Teagle Foundation that had three goals:

(1) individualize and improve faculty evaluation;

(2) develop a holistic department model; and

(3) articulate and expand the NAC&U focus on integrating professional studies and liberal arts. An integrated new approach to faculty evaluation, resulting from The Teagle Foundation project, is the topic of this paper. A review of the current literature helped to inform our view of evaluation, and we also surveyed NAC&U faculty regarding their views on how faculty work has changed in the last twenty years and their concerns about current evaluation practices.

In Context: Evaluating Faculty Work

In 1915 the American Association of University Professors outlined in its founding documents the three core areas of the university (Wilson, 2016):

- to promote inquiry and advance the sum of human knowledge;

- to provide general instruction to students; and

- to develop experts for various branches of public service.

The specifics of the three core areas have changed and expanded since 1915, but they still form the basis for faculty work and a focus for evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service. While the emphasis may differ depending on the type of institution, nearly every college and university focuses on these three areas when considering faculty retention, promotion, and tenure. Research universities may expect more in the area of scholarship than liberal arts colleges, and liberal arts colleges and community colleges probably place more emphasis on teaching. It was long thought that teaching, scholarship, and service accounted for the whole or nearly the whole faculty workload. We have seen, however, a significant expansion of faculty work in the last two or three decades that both blurs and exceeds the boundaries of teaching, scholarship, and service. Today's faculty may be involved in recruiting students, writing accreditation reports, mentoring students outside the classroom, writing proposals for external funding, and participating in

professional development activities to keep up with rapid technological changes and new pedagogical expectations. The work of faculty in 2018 is significantly different from the work of faculty in the latter part of the twentieth century. In addition, evaluating faculty work has always been somewhat problematic.

What is good teaching and how should we document it? Should we rely heavily on student evaluations? Peer observation? An examination of the course syllabus? Alumni reports? The current emphasis on experiential learning and student engagement has added further complications to the evaluation of teaching. The evaluation of scholarship also presents its own challenges. What are appropriate expectations for faculty productivity? What should count as a publication? Must all publications be peer-reviewed? Should online publications receive the same value as print publications? The opportunities for sharing research, discoveries, and professional opinions have significantly expanded because of the Internet.

Service was traditionally defined by one's college and university committee work and participation in a professional organization, but expectations have expanded as universities seek to be more engaged in communities outside the university. But how do you assess service? Is being present at a committee meeting sufficient? Would being inadequate at student recruitment simply get you out of that service?

Institutional policies for faculty evaluation have been periodically revised and updated, but they have not, for the most part, changed in major ways, even though narrow definitions of teaching, scholarship, and service do not represent the full workload of faculty, especially the time spent on continuing professional development. It is the position of the authors that evaluation of faculty members should encompass the full spectrum and interconnectedness of their work.

Current Models for Faculty Evaluation

Today every campus recognizes the need for evaluating faculty performance. Buller (2012) offers a survey of contemporary evaluation models and relevant faculty evaluation concerns, addressing both quantitative and qualitative methods of evaluation, including post-tenure review. Currently, most institutions follow one of two major models for faculty evaluation or a combination of the two common approaches.

The most prevalent models currently in use are those of Arreola (2007) and Seldin (2007). Arreola (2007) argues for a quantitative approach for developing a fair and consistent faculty evaluation system that responds to the unique values, needs, missions, traditions, and overall culture of the institution. He is particularly keen on the need for continual faculty development to support the ever-changing nature of faculty work, and essentially offers an eight-step process whereby institutions can craft instruments and processes that reflect their campus cultures. The model's eight steps emphasize identifying key characteristics of evaluation such as faculty work assignments, sources of information, and weights assigning priorities for those characteristics. Most significantly, Arreola's 2007 edition adds a new section in which he defines the professoriate as "a meta-profession," by which he asserts that faculty work involves much more than content expertise and requires more than 20 skill sets specific to teaching. This "meta-profession model greatly facilitates both the specification of what aspects of faculty performance should be measured and provides a ready and meaningful link to professional growth (faculty development) activities" (xiii).

The Seldin model is, in Buller's (2012) words, Arreola's "qualitative equivalent" (p. 215). Seldin suggests that the evaluation process should encourage reflection and pathways to improvement. Essentially a portfolio-based model, Seldin argues in several places that numbers

often lack context. Overall, it would seem that Seldin's is a more malleable approach than

Arreola's; however, it is easy to see why many believe that what is needed is a hybrid Arreola-

Seldin model that is quantitative (needed for institutional assessment and accreditation

processes) while retaining the qualitative characteristics that permit adaptation to institution,

discipline, and teaching modality. Researchers have studied various aspects of the evaluation of

teaching; indeed, the literature on faculty evaluation is more robust in the area of teaching than in

the areas of scholarship and service. Marzano, Frontier, and Livingston (2011), for example,

provide guidance for the role of classroom observation and suggest strategies for improving

observation protocols; although several of their ideas (improving collegiality and its link to

student learning, for example) can be extrapolated for higher education, their principal focus is

K-12 education. Cain and Hutchings (2015) focus on the use of faculty evaluation to assess and

improve student-learning outcomes, arguing that the best evaluation is internally driven and not

reliant on external assessment.

   Of course, the type of faculty evaluations that appear to be the most prevalent now are those

done by students. Student evaluations can certainly be helpful as they are often a way for

professors to understand what is working for their students and to determine how they might

improve their teaching. Yet as Guthrie noted many years ago (1954), student evaluations of

teaching may be inconsistent and, in effect, call on an "amateur" to review the results of

someone's professional work. Current studies in education and social science have, not

surprisingly, proven various biases (gender, racial, sexual orientation, and others) may be

inherent in students' evaluations of individual instructors. Marsh (1984) was another early

researcher to acknowledge that student evaluations of teaching may have validity questions that

expose potential biases. Harlow (2003) astutely looks at racial bias in the college classroom,

including the power dynamics in student evaluations of faculty teaching. Tatro (1985) was an early investigator of the gender bias in student evaluations, and MacNell, Driscoll, and Hunt (2015) advocate hiding instructors' gender in online courses. Laube, Massoni, Sprague, and Ferber (2007) argue that quantitative measures can mask underlying gender bias in teaching evaluations. Sidanius and Crane (1989) look at gender bias in teaching effectiveness and note how gender bias can extend to tenure and promotion cases. More recently, Hornstein (2017) argued that student evaluations of teaching are not only biased and ineffective but are by nature inadequate. As institutions recognize the possibility of bias in student evaluations, they are developing documents and plans (many in coordination with Title IX administrators) to address bias in evaluation of faculty, but there is still work to be done, as we discuss below.

Redefining the Terms

Centra (1993) was an early proponent of improving evaluation of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service in explicit reaction to Ernest Boyer's redefinition of those areas. Centra writes, "The definition of a scholar … has been too narrow" (147); nonetheless, he does little to break down the three silos and instead encourages the type of "bucketed" evaluation process we propose moving away from. Hensel, Hunnicutt, and Salomon (2015) suggest breaking down the silos and appreciating that teaching, scholarship, and service, particularly as described in the Boyer model, often bleed into one another—that faculty work is a hybrid activity. Holistic evaluation of faculty work acknowledges the often-blended nature of teaching, scholarship, service, and professional development. We call this approach the "learning centered paradigm." This new model places learning, by both faculty and students, at the center of the evaluation process. This paradigm suggests an active approach to student learning and looks at students and the professor as a team committed to accomplishing the expected learning outcomes identified

by each campus and department. We view this new paradigm as an expansion of Boyer's ideas (1992) when he called for a new American college. Specifically, we want to address his call to close the gap between teacher, student, and community by creating *cooperative and democratic learning and scholarship* in the college classroom and external community. A first and necessary step in developing a learning-centered evaluation process is to review how departments manage faculty work.

The Holistic Department

In an earlier publication (Hensel, Hunnicutt & Salomon, 2015), NAC&U proposed an approach to departmental organization and function that we call the holistic department. The holistic department model for academic organization challenges traditional conceptualizations of faculty and their work by positing that faculty members are neither interchangeable parts nor independent operators. Rather, it proposes that faculty members should be treated as members of a team, each bringing particular talents to the department's collective work. These talents are then combined and re-combined in transparent ways that advance the mission of the department in alignment with the institution's goals. The model further suggests that these talents need to be developed, learned, and shared over the course of a faculty member's career.

The motivation for this holistic perspective is the complex nature of the work of a modern faculty member. The pedagogies that faculty are expected to master and utilize are increasingly diverse and sophisticated, as are the associated delivery modes for a class. Formalizing assessment practices and focusing on student outcomes have increased the pressure on departments and institutions to develop and document quality teaching. Similarly, on most campuses, expectations for the quantity and quality of faculty scholarship have continued to creep higher. Increasing pressure to support broader institutional objectives such as student

recruitment, fund-raising, and community engagement further complicate the faculty member's ability to accomplish the core activities of teaching and research. A further complication is increasing bureaucracy, especially that associated with accountability and accreditation. Finally, as the majority of professors spend their careers at a single institution, the institution needs to be responsive to changing personal circumstances of faculty, and to support faculty efforts to grow both personally and professionally.

While this approach was developed in the context of institutions that clearly have student learning at the center of their missions, the holistic department paradigm also could potentially be applied even in departments in research-intensive universities where student learning may not be the major focus, but only one of several objectives, all of which may be secondary to producing cutting-edge research.

In summary, the holistic department model requires that faculty be treated – in their work and in their evaluation – in an equitable manner rather than simply in an identical manner.

The holistic department is based on two key concepts: (1) viewing the department as a team rather than a collection of independent contractors and (2) ensuring transparency in all decisions regarding faculty workload and performance. To facilitate the holistic department, faculty members are expected to construct meaningful work plans that span a year or more. These work plans, reviewed and agreed upon in a transparent way by the chair and departmental colleagues, reflect attainable goals that do more than simply achieve personal goals. Specifically, work plans will also include goals that advance the collective work of the department. This combination of personal and team-oriented objectives typically requires periods of several years for development and implementation. Implementation of the holistic department will likely require concerted professional development on the part of department members.

This model of faculty work therefore requires a holistic view of faculty evaluation that spans periods longer than a year. Necessarily, it requires that the evaluation process shift toward qualitative forms of assessment rather than quantitative, while still being evidence-based. It also requires that an evaluation value the four areas of faculty work – teaching, scholarship, professional development, and service – that reflect the shifting relationships among these areas in a faculty member's workload. A key feature of the holistic department is that it recognizes differentiation in faculty skills, expects continued professional development, and supports opportunities for such development. Valparaiso University, for example, as part of its commitment to creating holistic departments, describes professional development in the following way: "This newest category in organizing faculty work asks faculty to identify the activities that demonstrate their professional engagement with local, regional, and national organizations; currency in their field of study or area of practice; attention to pedagogical advances and new methods of teaching; and appropriate service or leadership in professional societies" (Carlson, Quigley, Richardson, Saloman & Schneller, 2015).

This qualitative, integrated perspective on evaluation suggests that faculty portfolios, similar to those prepared for tenure and promotion, should be part of the regular evaluation process. But that is too burdensome to do on an annual basis, both in terms of the time invested and the return (in an era of few or no salary increases). Therefore, we argue that portfolio reviews of faculty work, and significant associated raises for high performance, be conducted on a multi-year schedule that aligns with tenure and promotion. Specifically, we suggest reviews at the third year in the pre-tenure period, at the point of tenure and promotion to associate professor, three to four years after tenure, at time of application for promotion to the rank of professor, and again three to four years following promotion to professor. This approach also suggests that a new rank of

distinguished professor be created to motivate faculty to continue to excel in the fifteen to twenty years of their careers after promotion to professor. Between these multi-year portfolio reviews, annual brief formative reviews can be undertaken to address any particular concerns that become apparent to department chairs and supervising deans.

Supporting Holistic Evaluations through Effective Faculty Development

The successful implementation of the holistic department and a holistic approach to faculty evaluation require support for faculty development. If faculty development is conceptualized as the acquisition of new knowledge and skills by faculty members that can contribute to their roles as teachers, scholars, and academic citizens, institutional support for faculty development can make important contributions to a system of faculty evaluation focused on promoting positive change.

In fact, the focus of faculty development should move from assessment and evaluation—daunting tasks for chairs and the faculty they oversee—to growth and exploration that lead to innovation. Our holistic model embraces the multi-dimensional nature of today's faculty work and is easily adapted to reflect institutional values and goals.

The first element in a successful faculty-development program should be establishing a mentoring program. Such a program not only benefits junior faculty but also senior faculty who serve as mentors, because in their mentoring roles they can seize the opportunity to learn new techniques and strategies for their own teaching, scholarship, and service. A good faculty mentor is someone who has institutional memory but little institutional baggage. The mentor guides the junior faculty member as he or she navigates early years in the field, assisting with managing administrative obstacles and seizing academic opportunities. In addition to drastically improving

faculty retention, mentoring can improve faculty evaluation in both quantitative and qualitative ways. The mentor provides valuable insight and experience to assist the new faculty member in becoming a reflective practitioner who is committed to ongoing improvement and innovation.

A mentoring program can help faculty to continuously engage in positive improvement, but it is essential to have a non-punitive system of remediation for faculty whose evaluation is less than exemplary. Such a system must be formative and supportive. The system should be formalized, should include input from both academic affairs and human resources, and should become part of the faculty handbook with an eye toward supporting the faculty member while he or she develops and grows as an academician. Clear deadlines, resources, and a support system are integral to success.

In the same vein, Brown and Dinkel (2017) recently noted that faculty evaluation needs to be viewed as formative, not punitive: "The key to bringing college professors out of their shells is to remove the perception of harm" (p. 5). A supportive faculty-development structure can only improve faculty evaluation—and achieve positive results in students' learning.

There are many models for mentoring programs, with some more adaptable at small schools and others specifically geared for professional programs such as those found in medical schools. Although it does not focus on faculty evaluation, a 2014 Hanover Research study looks at five different models for mentoring: reverse mentorship, mutual mentoring, peer mentoring, team/collective mentoring, and e-mentoring.

One approach to mentoring that may be particularly helpful in this regard is peer mentoring. *Peer observations of teaching* can be a source of important information to faculty who are endeavoring to become reflective practitioners (Golparian, Chan, & Cassidy, 2015). However, we would argue that including peer observations of teaching as a required part of the

evaluation of faculty members seriously compromises the potential usefulness of such observations. As typically administered, these observations occur on a limited number of occasions and thus provide few opportunities for meaningful dialogue with colleagues about the structuring and delivery of courses.

Furthermore, in cases in which there are requirements that the peer observations be included in the faculty member's performance review file, critical analysis and detailed recommendations for changes and alternative approaches are often lacking (Weller, 2009). Even when faculty colleagues have been trained to conduct useful peer observations and are highly motivated to provide helpful feedback and specific suggestions, the knowledge that the observations will be viewed by the committee reviewing the faculty member tends to inhibit the depth of the dialogue between the observer and the faculty member being observed (Christie, 2014).

For these reasons, we propose peer mentoring as opposed to a peer-observation approach. As we envision it, in peer mentoring the faculty member would have a team of at least two peer mentors who would engage in an extended period (perhaps two years) of consultation with the faculty member—consultation that would include in-depth examination of all aspects of the faculty member's approach to a specific course, including course assignments, assessments, instructional materials, and instructional practices.

The information provided to the faculty member by the mentors would be available to the faculty member to use as he or she saw fit. That is, the extent to which faculty members included information from the peer mentors in their review files could be left to the judgment of the faculty members being evaluated. However, including such information in the faculty member's self-narrative on teaching effectiveness would be a potentially powerful way to demonstrate how the mentoring experience contributed to faculty members making specific changes to their

teaching that resulted in improved student-learning outcomes. An additional potential benefit of this peer-mentoring approach is that it represents a significant opportunity for mutual professional development for the mentors and those receiving mentoring (Smith, Calderwood, Storms, Lopez & Colwell, 2016). The benefit of such mentoring is likely to be reciprocal – the mentors may gain new insights into their own teaching that they could not easily achieve through other means of professional development.

Holistic Faculty Evaluation in the Learning-Centered Paradigm

In developing the concept of the *learning centered paradigm,* we reviewed a revised version (Anderson et. al. 2000), of Benjamin Bloom's "taxonomy of educational objectives," Donald Schon's *The Reflective Practitioner,* and Robert Barr and John Tagg's transformative 1995 article in *Change, "*From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education." As we thought about a new approach to evaluating faculty, as noted above, we determined that the traditional categories of teaching, scholarship, and service have converged, so the totality of a professor's work should be evaluated. We suggest the following considerations in developing a learning-centered evaluation (Carlson, Quigley, Richardson, Salomon, & Schneller, 2015):

- While excellence is expected of every professor, excellence may be demonstrated through different activities and in different ways for individual faculty members, with the specific expectations for areas of special focus for each faculty member reflected in the annual work plan developed for each faculty member and in the benchmarks that will be used in the ultimate summative assessments of the faculty member. Therefore, in the same holistic department, two faculty members might end up being granted tenure and promotion whose profiles in the three traditional categories of evaluation and in the proposed new category of professional development might differ significantly.

- Further, the primary focus of evaluation may change from year to year depending on the focus of the professor's work for that year.

- Definitions of what constitutes teaching, scholarship, and service must be expanded to reflect new pedagogies, new ways of communicating scholarship, and engagement in service beyond the campus.

- Faculty members continue their own learning process through professional development activities that may be focused in one particular category of evaluation (e.g., teaching) or that may involve multiple categories of evaluation (especially as the distinctions between categories of evaluation become blurred – for example a focus on service learning could impact the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service).

- Students and faculty have a new relationship that includes collaborative work in learning, scholarship, and community engagement.

- The pedagogical move toward experiential learning requires more active student involvement in the learning process and thus argues that students' contributions toward their own learning should be part of the process of faculty evaluation.

In particular, the expectations for faculty to engage students in experiential learning suggests that faculty may face two challenges: (1) developing new pedagogical strategies is likely to require faculty to seek out professional development opportunities; and (2) professors may have concerns that they may not be initially successful with experiential learning. Professional development should be made available for departments that wish to implement experiential learning across the departmental curriculum. In a study of faculty who were implementing course-based undergraduate research for the first time, Lopatto and colleagues (2012) found that curricular change became more feasible when professional development created a community of practice. Such networks can provide troubleshooting support, sharing of pedagogy and new resources, and access to expertise of others in the network. The holistic department, when members are working as a team toward departmental and individual goals, can serve as a community of practice and support new learning for faculty.

Professors need reassurance that they will not be penalized if they develop innovative learning/teaching strategies in their courses. Individual curricular change should not isolate an individual faculty member but rather be part of the department's work plan in addressing

departmental and institutional strategic objectives. Encouraging faculty to take appropriate risks is part of both individual and institutional growth. When professors feel supported in their efforts to implement innovative learning strategies, they are more likely to encourage students to also take risks and be innovative.

How Faculty Evaluation Can Support a Learning-Centered Approach to Teaching

In our more holistic approach to faculty evaluation, we propose that faculty members' development as teachers be focused on helping them to become *reflective practitioners.* Therefore, we suggest that sources of evidence traditionally used to evaluate teaching effectiveness be regularly used for formative (developmental) rather than summative assessment. For example, student course evaluations, if structured appropriately, can provide useful information to faculty members who want to adjust their pedagogy to promote student learning (Carlson, Quigley, Richardson, Salomon, & Schneller, 2015). However, rather than using summaries of those evaluations (whether quantitative or qualitative) to judge whether faculty members are meeting the department's criterion for excellence in teaching, we suggest that faculty members be given the opportunity to demonstrate how they are using the feedback from students to become more effective instructors. In this approach, therefore, the personal narrative that faculty members write as part of their summative assessment becomes critically important. In this narrative, faculty members will need to present convincing evidence of how they have modified and changed their approaches to instruction based on feedback received and show how these changes in teaching practices appear to have improved student learning. In such an approach having thoughtful, constructive feedback from students becomes very important.

The University of California Merced (http://www.ucmerced.edu) has an innovative program known as Students Assessing Teaching and Learning which trains students in classroom

observation, including assessment of student participation, teaching behavior, and learning. They can also interview students to seek feedback that might lead to teaching improvements. If asked, they can film a class for the professor to view at a later date. Students in the program provide feedback to the professor who may use the information at his or her discretion. The students can provide valuable feedback from their perspectives as students, and because they are trained in observation and what to look for in an effective classroom, students in the program are also gaining valuable experience that could be helpful in a future career.

We would advocate that departments, schools, and universities adopting a holistic and learning-centered faculty evaluation model devote serious consideration to how students can be encouraged to develop skills in writing helpful critiques of faculty that are focused on the design of the course and the instructional practices used by the instructor. In addition to developing skills in providing meaningful, detailed, and targeted feedback, students will need to be motivated to see this opportunity to reflect on the course as an important part of their student role. For example, students will need to be provided with ample time to reflect on the course, including their own course-related activities and efforts, and to write substantive commentaries. One possibility would be to treat completion of course evaluations as a course assignment, with students required to complete the evaluation in order to receive a final grade in the course, but with instructors receiving the course evaluations only after grades have been recorded and released.

However, such restructuring of course evaluations would require that consideration be given to not having every course evaluated in this way every semester, with the objective being to make it unlikely that a student would be completing this type of reflective evaluation in every course taken in a given semester. Establishing this type of periodic course evaluation, as opposed to

evaluating every course every semester, would have the added benefit of giving the faculty member more time to focus on the information provided in the evaluation and a longer interval over which to plan and implement changes to the course.

Alternative ways of gathering reflective feedback from students include journals or diaries required of students enrolled in a course (Gelmiz & Bagli, 2015) and email prompts to students throughout the course asking for responses to specific questions focused on design and delivery of the course (Peterson, 2016). Some professors use the technique of "transparent teaching" to solicit student feedback. In this approach a professor informs students about a new learning strategy he/she will be trying out and what he/she hopes to accomplish, and then later requests a class discussion about the strategy once the lesson has been completed. This strategy has the benefit of both encouraging more engagement in the learning process and suggesting to students that the professor seeks continual improvement just as students should focus on in their own continued learning.

Requiring students to collect artifacts of their learning (e.g., revised group assignments based on instructor feedback, individual written assignments with feedback, etc.) could also encourage them to be more reflective about their active participation in a course (Eynon, Gambino, & Török, 2014). Faculty members could also use these artifacts as evidence of the impact and effectiveness of their teaching. They could also share the artifacts with peer mentors as evidence of how students are learning in the course and as examples of the types of learning experiences being employed, with the aim of obtaining feedback and suggestions on how to improve instructional effectiveness. Such suggestions are, of course, compatible with the move to encourage students to compile e-portfolios as evidence of their learning outcomes, portfolios that also would be of interest to potential employers (Alanson & Robles, 2016).

An additional advantage of the intermittent evaluation of courses is that it would likely encourage more risk-taking on the part of faculty members. If faculty have some courses each semester for which formal course evaluations are not being conducted, they may be more inclined to try new instructional approaches, such as high-impact practices, knowing that they will have the opportunity to refine their structuring of those courses prior to being formally evaluated. For example, if a faculty member wants to flip his classroom in order to free in-class instructional time for collaborative group projects based on the information presented online outside of class, he might want to "pilot" the approach in a course that will not be formally evaluated the first time the new pedagogical approach is employed. Instead, the faculty member could collect feedback from students, examine student performance, seek advice and feedback from peer mentors, and then refine the altered approach to the course prior to the formal evaluation of the course in succeeding semesters.

Another strategy to support faculty is an "innovation agreement," supported as an option for faculty professional development by the chief academic officer, in which professors describe the innovation they will be implementing in a course and submit it to the immediate academic supervisor and the personnel review committee. The innovation agreement is an alert to those reviewing the professor's performance that he or she is developing new approaches to the learning/teaching process and that student evaluations may be impacted, possibly negatively. Professors who make use of the innovation agreement would be expected to report changes they would make to improve the new learning/teaching approach after its first implementation and evaluation. It is imperative that faculty feel comfortable with risk if universities are to fulfill their goals for the creation of new knowledge.

For the formative or developmental approach to teaching effectiveness to work, faculty members need assistance in learning to write reflective self-narratives that effectively document their development as teachers, including the use of information and insights from student course evaluations and peer mentoring to demonstrate how their teaching evolved in ways that contributed to improved student learning. We would argue that faculty development sessions (or peer mentoring sessions) devoted to constructing effective self-narratives would do more than promote engaging and persuasive descriptions of the evolution of faculty members as teachers. Such sessions also would help facilitate focused reflection by faculty members on their teaching because such reflections would be the basis for beginning to write about their development as teachers.

This formative approach to evaluating teaching is compatible with the notion of individual work plans for faculty discussed above, in which differential expectations for teaching, scholarship, service, and professional development can be implemented. For faculty members for whom teaching is going to be a major component of their roles, the work plan would need to provide for significant time and effort devoted to formative evaluation of teaching. With less effort allocated to scholarship and service, the associated goals and objectives for those areas of evaluation would need to be adjusted accordingly. In this approach, the relative emphasis on the different areas of evaluation could change over time. Faculty members whose departments early on expect them to heavily focus on research might need to later focus more on teaching, as their professional interests evolve and as the needs of the department and the school change.

Conclusion: The Holistic Faculty Evaluation Model

A holistic approach to evaluating faculty work recognizes that teaching, scholarship, service, and professional development are no longer mutually exclusive activities. Teaching, for example, may involve engaging students in undergraduate research and that research may lead to new discoveries and also may be community-based. A professor's scholarship may also be considered service, if, for example, the scholarship is identifying more effective ways of teaching children to read or developing an early warning system for detecting a serious disease. The traditional approach of evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service as independent variables presents a dilemma for professors: to which activity do they attribute particular facets of their work? An integrated, holistic evaluation process allows professors to more fully describe and accurately characterize their work.

A guiding focus for a holistic evaluation of faculty should be the questions of how effectively does the professor's teaching contribute to student learning, how does the professor's research engage students in the process of developing new knowledge, and how does his or her participation in service, particularly service in the external community, ground the professor's teaching and scholarship in the practice of the discipline? Holistic evaluation, within the context of the *learning-centered paradigm,* suggests that as professors develop their self-narratives, their performance portfolios should address how their teaching, scholarship, service, and professional development contribute to students' learning as well as to their own learning.

Holistic evaluation also recognizes that the emphasis of a faculty member's work may shift from year to year. A professor who recently received a grant that could lead to cutting-edge research or a professor who is writing a book may not put as much energy into service while working on the grant or book but would be expected ultimately to incorporate the research or book manuscript into teaching. This approach is consistent with our view that professors should

be considered as members of a team rather than as independent contractors and that the ultimate goal is that their work should contribute to the mission of the institution to educate students and prepare them for their future.

What would a holistic evaluation look like? First, a holistic evaluation would start with a self-narrative constructed by the faculty member. The narrative might include a series prompts that would ask the professor to describe how his or her work supports student learning and how one area of professional work relates to the other areas. For example, how do the faculty member's professional development activities lead to more effective teaching, more productive scholarship, and more engaged service, and how do each of these areas contribute to student learning? The narrative could draw on student evaluations that include questions about how and what the student learned, the faculty member's responses to student evaluations and peer observations, and indications of students' success such as publications, conference presentations, acceptance to graduate school, or other indicators of student accomplishment.

A primary purpose of the self-narrative as the basis of the evaluation would be to provide faculty members with a vehicle for describing how they have developed as faculty in addressing departmental and institutional goals and other objectives such as advancing knowledge in their discipline or profession. In this regard, holistic evaluation is focused on encouraging faculty to become reflective practitioners not just in the area of teaching but rather in all aspects of their roles. For example, faculty members in research-focused institutions could use the self-narratives to describe how their research agendas have contributed to the advancement of knowledge, innovative research techniques, procurement of funding to support new scholars and graduate students, and/or the prestige of their departments and their university. In support of their self-narratives, faculty members could cite a variety of sources of evidence to support the claims in

their narratives, including information related to their scholarship and community service, as well as information showing that their activities in one of the traditional areas of evaluation (e.g., teaching) have also contributed to accomplishments in service, professional development, and scholarship. Ultimately, the effectiveness of the self-narrative will depend not simply on how well-written it is but also on the extent to which it effectively cites evidence to support the claims made. Therefore, any department moving to establish a holistic model of faculty evaluation should address the need to provide faculty with training and support in crafting effective self-narratives.

Ultimately, the holistic approach we envision bears many similarities to Seldin's (2007) qualitative approach to faculty evaluation, but with one major difference: the weighting of factors in the evaluation of faculty can differ from faculty member to faculty member within a department, and those weights may even vary for a given faculty member from one formal evaluation to the next. This difference is not trivial. It is fundamental to the notion of the holistic department.

Most significantly perhaps, holistic evaluation would encourage an approach to faculty evaluation that encourages departments and institutions to assemble a collection of faculty members whose complementary skills, interests, and openness to risk-taking maximize the potential for achieving strategic goals and objectives of the department and the university. Key here is that the individualized expectations for faculty members are transparently established with the input and agreement of colleagues, including a willingness to revisit expectations over the course of a faculty member's career since both departmental needs and individual priorities are likely to shift significantly over the span of faculty members' careers.

References

Alanson, E. R. & Robles, R. A. (2016). Using electronic portfolios to explore essential student learning outcomes in a professional development course. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, *17*, 387-397.

Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P. W., Cruickhank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, P. R., Raths, J., & Wittrock, M.C. (2000). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.

Aries, E. (2008). *Race and class matters at an elite college*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Arreola, R. A. (2007). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: A guide to designing, building, and operating large-scale evaluation systems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Anker.

Barr, R. B. & Tagg, B. J. (1995, November/December). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change, 27*, (6), 13-25.

Basow, S. A. (1995). Student evaluations of college professors: When gender matters. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *87*, 656–665.

Berberet, W. G. (1994). The New American College: Managing for a new era. *Perspectives,* Spring and Fall, 36-49.

Berberet, W. G. & Wong, F. (1995). The New American College: A model for liberal learning. *Liberal Education,* Winter, 49-51.

Boatright-Horowitz, S. & Soeung, S. (2009). Teaching white privilege to white students can mean saying good-bye to positive student evaluations. *American Psychologist, 64,* 574–575.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brown, R. D. & Dinkel, L. M. (2017). Department Chairs and Old Turtles. *Academic Leader Today: Special Report: Leading with Intention: Faculty development and evaluation*. Madison, WI: Magna Publications, 4-5.

Buller, J.L. (2012). *Best practices in faculty evaluation: A practical guide for academic leaders.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cain, T.R. & Hutchings, P. (2015). Faculty and students: Assessment at the intersection of teaching and learning in *Using evidence of student learning to improve higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 95-116.

Carlson, J., Quigley, L., Richardson, N., Salomon, D. A., & Schneller, B. (2015). Changing faculty evaluation. In N. H. Hensel, L. Hunnicutt, & D.A. Salomon (Eds.), *Redefining the paradigm:*

Faculty models to support student learning (pp.40-58). Los Angeles, CA: New American Colleges and Universities.

Centra, J.A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Channing, J. (2017). Faculty evaluations: Contentious bothers or important tools for faculty growth? *Community College Journal of Research and* Practice. *41.11*, 757-760.

Christie, H. (2014). Peer mentoring in higher education: Issues of power and control. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *19*, 955-965.

Ellis, A. K., Cogan, J. J. & Howey. K. R. *Introduction to the foundations of education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1981.

Eynon, B., Gambino, L. M., & Török, J. (2014). What difference can eportfolio make? A field report from the Connect to Learning Project. *International Journal of ePortfolio*, *4,* 95-114.

Fink, L.D. (2008). Evaluating teaching: A new approach to an old problem. AACU. *To Improve the Academy, 26.1,* 3-21.

Gelmiz, K., & Bagli, H. (2015). Learning from students: Reflections from personal magazines in basic design course. *Design and Technology Education: An International Journal*, *20*, 29-37.

Golparian, S., Chan, J., & Cassidy, A. (2015). Peer review of teaching: Sharing best practices. *Collected Essays in Learning and Teaching*, *8*, 211-218.

Guthrie, E.R. (1954). *The evaluation of teaching: A progress report*. University of Washington.

Hanover Research, (2014, January). *Faculty Mentoring Models and Effective Practices*. Arlington, VA: Hanover Research.

Harlow, R. (2003). "Race doesn't matter, but. . . ": The effect of race on professors' experiences and emotion management in the undergraduate college classroom. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *66*, 348–363.

Hensel, N. H., Hunnicutt, L., & Salomon, D., Eds. (2015). *Redefining the paradigm: Faculty models to support student learning*. http://nacu.wpengine.com/wpcontent/uploads/2015/06/redef1n1_issue_low.pdf

Hornstein, H.A. & Law, H.F.E. (2017). Student evaluations of teaching are an inadequate assessment tool for evaluating faculty performance. *Cogent Education* 4.1.

Kuh, G.D., Ikenberry, S.O., Jankowski, N.A., Cain, T.R., Ewell, P.T., Hutchings, P., & Kinzie, J. (2015). *Using evidence of student learning to improve higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Laube, H., Massoni, K., Sprague, J., & Ferber, A. L. (2007). The impact of gender on the evaluation of teaching: What we know and what we can do. *NWSA Journal, 19(3)*, 87-104.

Lopatto D., Hauser, C, Jones, C.J. Paetkau, D, Chandrasekaran, V., Dunbar, D., …Elgin, S.C.R. (2012) A Central Support System Can Facilitate Implementation and Sustainability of a Classroom-Based Undergraduate Research Experience (CURE) in Genomics. *CBE Life Sci Educ*, *13*, 771-723.

McMillin, L. A. & Berberet W. G, Eds. (2002). New Academic Compact: Revisioning the relationship between faculty and their institutions. Boston: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

MacNell, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. (2015). What's in a name: Exposing gender bias in student ratings of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 1-13.

Marsh, H.W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *76*, 707-754.

Marzano, R.J., Frontier, T., & Livingston, D. (2011). *Effective supervision: supporting the art and science of teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Miller, J.E., & Seldin, P. (2014). Changing practices in faculty evaluation. *Academe, 100.3*, 35-38.

Moore, V. A. (1996). Inappropriate challenges to professorial authority. *Teaching Sociology*, *24*, 202-6.

Ornstein, A. C. & Levine, D. U. (1981). *An introduction to the foundations of education* (2nd ed.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Peterson, J. L. (2016). Formative evaluations in online classes. *The Journal of Educators Online*, *13*, 1-24.

Reid, L. D. (2010). The Role of perceived race and gender in the evaluation of college teaching on RateMyProfessors.com. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3.3*, 137-152.

Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* Boston: Basic Books.

Sidanius, J. & Crane, M. (1989). Job evaluation and gender: The case of university faculty. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19(2)*, 174-97.

Smith, E. R., Calderwood, P. E., Storms, S. B., Lopez, P. G., & Colwell, R. P. (2016). Institutionalizing faculty mentoring within a community of practice model. *To Improve the Academy*, *35*, 35-71.

Steiner, S., Holley, L.C., Gerdes, K., & Campbell, H.E. (2006). Evaluating teaching: Listening to students while acknowledging bias. *Journal of Social Work Education, 42.2*, 355-376.

Summary of comments by Ernest Boyer, (February 7, 1992). Meeting at the University of Redlands. Unpublished formal and informal comments.

Tatro, C. N. (1995). Gender effects on student evaluations of faculty. *Journal of Research & Development in Education*, *28*, 169–173.

Weller, S. (2009). What does "peer" mean in teaching observation for the professional development of higher education lecturers? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 21, (1), 25-35.*

Wilson, J. K. (2016). *Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *21*, 25-35. The AAUP's 1915 *Declaration of Principles*: Conservative and Radical, Visionary and Myopic . *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom, 7.* https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Wilson_1.pdf