

## **FACULTY & PEDAGOGY**

Chism, N.V.N. (2006). Teaching awards: What do they award? *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(4), 589-617.

*Seeking to understand the criteria, evidence, and standards of postsecondary teaching awards programs, as well as the extent to which they align, this study performed a content analysis of program descriptions for 144 teaching awards associated with 85 institutions located in 33 states. Initial examination of data revealed that no program articulated specific standards, so subsequent analysis focused on criteria, evidence, and their alignment. Results indicated that over half of the award descriptions examined offered overly vague criteria or no criteria at all. Additional results showed that nomination letters and student evaluations of teaching were the most common pieces of evidence requested, rather than primary measures of effective teaching such as syllabi, video tapes, samples of student work, etc. To move beyond the current symbolic nature of teaching awards, the author recommends elucidating award criteria, linking the types of evidence required to the award criteria, and developing explicit standards that distinguish outstanding teaching from the ordinary.*

Frost, S.H., & Teodorescu, D. (2001). Teaching excellence: How faculty guided change at a research university. *Review of Higher Education*, 24(4), 397-415.

*This study details the case of one Emory University's attempt to achieve teaching excellence as a top research institution by soliciting and then using faculty opinion to shape institutional action. Analysis of qualitative data from 24 separate faculty group discussions (10 faculty members present for 90 minutes each) revealed 11 major themes regarding how the institution should approach teaching improvement. These 11 themes clustered into one of three types of change: 1) Behavioral change (the institution should: support faculty development; provide effective rewards for teaching; and improve teaching evaluation;) 2) Cultural change (the institution should: clarify institutional mission and educational goals; make teaching a priority; support intellectual community; recognize teaching as a multifaceted activity; and understand the responsibility of students) 3) Structural change (the institution should: promote interdisciplinary teaching; implement change at multiple levels; and improve the physical infrastructure). Two key implications emerge from this specific case, namely that different academic constituencies (e.g., faculty, administrators, etc.) will have differing views regarding the balance of teaching and research and a focus on teaching across disciplines can foster greater academic community.*

Kim, Y.K & Sax, L.J (2009). Student–faculty interaction in research universities: Differences by student gender, race, social class, and first-generation status. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(5), 437-459.

*Applying Astin’s involvement theory (1984) and I-E-O framework (1991) to a sample of 58,281 students from 9 campuses who completed the 2006 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), this study attempted to understand if the effects of student-faculty interaction varied according to a number of student characteristics. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) yielded 2 composite measures of faculty-student interaction (the independent variable) containing 3 items each, research-related interaction (alpha = .60) and course-related interaction (alpha = .83), as well as composite measures of 4 student outcomes (the dependent variable): integration (alpha = .83), self-reported gains in critical thinking (alpha = .91), self-reported gains in social awareness (alpha = .87), and satisfaction with overall college experience (alpha = .85). Two additional student outcomes, college GPA and degree aspiration, were also analyzed and a number of control variables were included: student demographics, first-year experiences, institutional characteristics, major, major field climate, and college experiences. Use of cross-tabulations, chi-square statistics, and blocked regression analyses revealed conditional effects of student-faculty interaction on student outcomes according to race, social class, gender, and first-generation status.*

Lindholm, J.A., & Astin, H.S. (2008). Spirituality and pedagogy: Faculty’s spirituality and use of student-centered approaches to undergraduate teaching. *Review of Higher Education*, 31(2), 185-207.

*Using a sample of 40,670 full time faculty from 414 institutions who completed the HERI Faculty Survey, this study attempted to assess the impact faculty spirituality has on classroom pedagogy. Through factor analysis, authors derived two constructs for examination: student-centered pedagogy (dependent variable, 8 items, alpha = .81) and spirituality (independent variable, 3 items, alpha = .88). After controlling for 41 variables previously shown to be correlates of student-centered pedagogy (i.e., demographic characteristics, educational experiences and practices, institutional type, etc.) and 15 variables relating to the personal views, behaviors, goals, and experiences of faculty, stepwise multiple regression analysis revealed that higher levels of faculty spirituality significantly predicted for use of student-centered classroom pedagogy.*

Marsh, H.W., & Hattie, J. (2002). The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness: Complimentary, antagonistic, or independent constructs? *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(5), 603-641.

*Examining student evaluations for 182 faculty members from 20 academic departments at a large urban university in Australia, this study attempted to ascertain the interaction between research productivity and teaching effectiveness. Four student ratings were used to operationalize teaching effectiveness: overall teacher rating, overall course value, course materials rating, and rating of teacher presentations. Research productivity was quantified by a simple unweighted sum of the total number of faculty publications as reported on annual departmental reports. To control for potential mediating variables, a separate survey querying a number of faculty characteristics (time spent in a typical week, personal motivation, self-rating of ability as a teacher and researcher, etc.) was completed by 80 participants. A number of quantitative analyses – bivariate correlation, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), multilevel analysis, structural equation modeling (SEM) – demonstrated that no statistically significant relationship exists between research productivity and teaching effectiveness, suggesting that these two constructs are independent, rather than complimentary or antagonistic.*

Umbach, P.D. & Wawrzynski, M.R. (2005) Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(2), 153-184.

*This study used two national datasets – a sample of 20,226 seniors and 22,033 freshmen from 137 institutions who completed the NSSE and a sample of 14,336 faculty at the same 137 institutions who completed a related survey – to determine faculty behaviors and attitudes that are related to student engagement, positive perceptions of the college environment, and self-reported gains in learning. After controlling for a number of variables (students: age, race, gender, transfer status, on-campus residence, student athlete, Greek affiliation, major, full-time status, parents' education; institutions: Carnegie Classification, sector, urbanicity, selectivity, size; faculty: gender, race/ethnicity, age, years teaching, rank, part-time, discipline of academic appointment), results from hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) demonstrated a relationship between student engagement, satisfaction, and perceived gains in learning and faculty use of educational practices such as collaborative learning, increased academic challenge, and high levels of course-related interactions.*

Welsh, J.F., & Metcalf, J. (2003). Faculty and administrative support for institutional effectiveness activities: A bridge across the chasm? *Journal of Higher Education*, 74(4), 445-468.

*Using a sample of 386 faculty and 294 administrators who completed a mailed survey sent to 1,232 individuals at 168 institutions that were reviewed by evaluation teams from the*

*Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) for either initial accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation, this study sought to understand how faculty and administrators differ in their attitudes toward institutional effectiveness. Survey results indicated that, when compared to faculty responses, administrators perceived institutional effectiveness to be more important overall. Moreover, administrators were more likely to view institutional effectiveness as internally motivated and more deeply implemented, to feel more personally involved in the task of institutional effectiveness, and to define institutional quality in terms of student outcomes. Hierarchical regression analysis revealed that perceptions of institutional motivation (i.e., internal or external) and personal level of involvement predicted for both faculty and administrators' perception of the importance of institutional effectiveness. In other words, faculty and administrators are more likely to embrace the concept of institutional effectiveness when they have a sense of self determination and personal agency.*

Wright, M. (2005). Always at odds?: Congruence in faculty beliefs about teaching at a research university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(3), 331-353.

*Using survey data obtained from 2,624 faculty at a large research university as well as follow-up qualitative data, this study sought to understand what factors lead to cultures of congruence, or agreement regarding the value of teaching, within academic departments. The author first administered a faculty survey to gauge the congruence of 12 academic departments and then select 4 cases for additional qualitative analysis. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 80% of the junior faculty from the 4 selected departments. Subsequent social network analysis involved contacting persons mentioned in the previous interviews with junior faculty to determine the shape of instructional networks. Findings demonstrated that congruent departments evidence larger and more extensive instructional networks than their incongruent counterparts. Moreover, congruent departments placed greater emphasis on team teaching, peer review, and discussions of instructional practices (both formal and informal).*