Teaching Awards: What Do They Award?

Coveted at many liberal arts institutions yet sometimes termed “the kiss of death” at research institutions, teaching awards have become a standard feature of the reward system at most colleges and universities. Although their effects have not been rigorously assessed, teaching awards are initiated for three main reasons: Institutions hope to symbolically acknowledge their support for teaching, to recognize the accomplishments of excellent teachers, and to encourage other faculty to achieve similar levels of performance in teaching (Chism & Szabo, 1997; McNaught & Anwyl, 1993; Menges, 1996; Warren & Plumb, 1999).

What is it that teaching awards recognize? How do those judging them decide whether candidates have the appropriate characteristics or record of performance? The literature on teaching awards has largely ignored these questions. Of the awards program studies that exist, most consist of descriptions of programs or recommendations for implementing them. A small body of literature explores the impact of teaching awards, concluding that affirmation of the winners, rather than inspiration to others, is the main effect (Chism & Szabo, 1997; Francis, 1976; McNaught & Anwyl, 1993).

Very few empirical studies examine the criteria used in making teaching awards and the evidence used in making decisions on award winners. A small number of studies enumerate common criteria used by awards programs in state or national systems (Adams, 1977; Francis,
In general, the studies find some areas of agreement among criteria, but these studies do not provide detailed information, especially in the area of evidence to be submitted by candidates or their supporters. Two studies (Donaldson, 1988; Goldsmid, Gruber, & Wilson, 1977) analyzed the content of letters of nominations for an awards program to understand the implicit criteria that were being used by nominators. Lowman (1994) did the same for 500 nomination letters from another awards program to arrive at a list of perceptions of qualities of exemplary teachers. These studies of implicit criteria find sets of common characteristics within the categories of teaching strategies, concern for students, and mastery of subject matter. There do not seem to be studies that look at the actual program language to determine the qualities that are sought in teaching award winners, the indicators that are used in selecting candidates who demonstrate these qualities, and the standards that are used in ranking candidates.

Since teaching awards are estimated to be in place at most major universities and many colleges, it is important to articulate the assumptions on which they are based. Doing so may lead to improvements in the way in which such programs are conceived and administered. A further benefit is that studying teaching awards programs inevitably explores taken-for-granted notions about teaching excellence and how it is demonstrated in higher education, an exploration that has implications for other aspects of the teaching reward system, such as promotion and tenure, merit raises, and post-tenure review. The present study was undertaken with these uses in mind.

Methods

This study of teaching awards sought to answer four main questions:

1. On what criteria are teaching awards programs based?
2. In order to make judgments, what kinds of evidence do teaching awards programs collect?
3. What standards do awards programs use to judge the evidence?
4. Is there a match between the criteria and the evidence sought?

To examine the range of criteria used in teaching awards, the evidence that is required, and standards used in judging candidates, the study analyzed the content of teaching awards program descriptions from
institutions of higher education in the United States. The initial sample was restricted to programs that were detailed on the World Wide Web sites of a list of institutions with teaching centers. Only programs with complete documentation on the Web (34%) were used for the study. When this initial method yielded a sample that was not representative of baccalaureate and community colleges, an additional attempt to gather information on teaching awards programs was made by mailing letters to the chief academic officer of a stratified random sample of 100 of these institutions. Letters were followed by emailed requests. The response rate to this method was 29%. Details of the sampling methods are in Appendix A.

The final sample of 144 teaching awards was associated with 85 institutions located in 33 states of the United States. According to the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, (2000), 45 were classified as Doctoral/Research Universities-Extensive; 10 as Doctoral/Research Universities-Intensive; 11 as Master's Colleges and Universities I or II; 14 as Baccalaureate Colleges-General; and 5 as Community Colleges.

Coding was done by entering two kinds of information into a database, in addition to state, name of institution, and name of award. The information focused on the stated criteria for the award and the evidence that was required of candidates. Since no program articulated standards, there was no information to code on this dimension. The coding taxonomy was then applied by two coders working independently with a small sample of the awards program descriptions; modifications were made by consensus and applied retroactively to the whole data set as coding continued. The coding taxonomy is included as Appendix B. Reconciliation of final coding was conducted in a joint session of the coders. In addition to the codes describing the criteria and evidence for each award, excerpts from the text of the program description for each category were entered in another field. The resulting database enabled sorting by any one of the fields and easy reference to the full text of the award language, which was on the print copy of the award description, contained in notebooks organized by state. During the analysis, codes that contained a small number of entries were combined with others and renamed.

Findings

Analysis of the data produced patterns to address the research questions on awards criteria, evidence, and the match between the two.
Criteria

Table 1 lists the criteria codes by frequency and percentage of sample. It is somewhat startling to observe that for a little more than half of the awards in the sample, no criteria or only a global statement associating the award with the term “teaching excellence” is stated. Occasionally, eligibility requirements, such as the number of years candidates have taught at the institution, their tenure status, or time elapsed since receipt of another award are listed under the label “criteria,” but these are not descriptions of what is meant by teaching excellence. One institution lists under the header “Criteria” four paragraphs that speak to eligibility (rank and length of time since last nomination) and the evidence that should be collected, but includes no mention of what characteristics are desirable. Several others confuse “criteria” and “evidence,” such as the program that listed the following as “Criteria for Selection”:

1. Evaluations by students
2. A concise two-page essay describing teaching philosophy and methods
3. Letters of support from five individuals of the nominee’s choosing
4. Observation of the final list to be determined by the committee (ID#24)

Many awards programs seem to assume that it is not important to specify particular characteristics or to define teaching excellence for purposes of identifying and discriminating among candidates. By contrast, they list very specific requirements for such things as whether the nomination materials are to be bound or unbound, how many copies are needed, and what font and margin sizes are to be employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Criteria Category Name</th>
<th>Sample size: n = 144</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Global (excellent teacher) as the only criterion, or no criteria specified at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Specific characteristics of teaching performance listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Impact on student learning, promotion of learning outside classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Student-centered approach, shows concern for growth and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Content knowledge, mastery of subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Leadership in promoting teaching on campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Range of teaching activities undertaken during career or current practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Curriculum development efforts, innovation in teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Scholarship of teaching activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Professional development efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A look at the language of the programs is revealing. Some show that there is a belief that excellence in teaching is ephemeral, or incapable of being defined. For example, one program states, "Teaching excellence is difficult to define and document. . . . The nominee may undertake primary responsibility for identifying documentation to support the nomination" (ID#19).

Others maintain that teaching varies so much from one context to the other that it is impossible to name a set of characteristics that would be universally applicable. Examples of this language include "The intent is to interpret distinguished teaching broadly. . . . For this reason, no detailed format or set of criteria for nominations will be specified" (ID#23) and "The Selection Committee shall consider all relevant indicia of excellent teaching" (none were mentioned) (ID#96).

Some programs imply that the components of excellent teaching are so obvious that it is unnecessary to name these and elaborate upon them. In the same category are those programs that do name criteria but make apologetic statements about this. A few indicate that judges may use different sets of criteria and do list some examples, but they caution applicants about these. One program typifies this approach, stating:

In the past, the committees that have judged the candidates for this award have stressed the following characteristics. While there is no guarantee that future committees will look at the packets in the same way, these are some of the basic properties and activities that are considered. [A list follows.] (ID#21)

In a few instances, statements about the difficulty of defining excellence in teaching are followed by broad sets of criteria, such as the programs that state:

Because of the diversity of students, teachers, subject matters, teaching methods, and settings in which instruction occurs, teaching excellence has no single, simple definition. It may be demonstrated, however, in the manner in which faculty members fulfill the University's teaching mission. This includes the ways they foster the "development of the individual's intellect and personality" and in the ways they help students acquire "knowledge, competencies, and values essential to personal and professional achievement." Distinguished teaching implies overall excellence, sustained commitment, and effectiveness in helping students achieve meaningful goals. (ID#88)

We recognize, of course, that outstanding teaching neither is fixed in form and venue nor easily assessed. Yet irrespective of whether instruction takes place in lecture courses, seminars, or laboratories (or whether it is pitched at introductory or advanced levels), exceptional pedagogy is marked by the active, critical role of the instructor whose demanding presence fosters critical thinking and inspires students to engage the quest for knowledge as a value and a craft. (ID#77)
Among those programs that do list specific criteria, some offer quite full depictions of those characteristics that they associate with teaching effectiveness. One institution drew upon the work of a committee convened to study and make recommendations on ways to document teaching effectiveness on that campus. A few others referred candidates, through links on the Web page or reference to internal documents that could be obtained on campus, to a definition of teaching excellence that had been agreed to at that institution. Examples of such practices include the following statements:

As general guidelines of the definitions of excellence in teaching that have won acceptance on the [name] campus, the Committee [on Teaching] cites University Bulletin [citation given], the Handbook for Faculty Members [citation given], and its own policy on the Evaluation of Teaching for Advancement and Promotion. [A full list of criteria follows.] (ID#10)

For the first time this year, a list of criteria for good teaching has been developed by the University Teaching Committee (UTC) based on extensive research literature on teaching effectiveness. (ID#27)

Levels of detail vary across the specified criteria. Some are stated briefly in terms similar to those listed in Table 1. Other programs provide more information about the criteria. For example, one program's criteria are all presented with short rationales and explanations. The definition for the diversity criterion reads, “Demonstrates Sensitivity to Issues of Diversity: Gender and cultural diversity are part of the college environment. The instructor makes attempts to present material and to run class or laboratory sessions in ways that take such differences into account” (ID#80).

Among those awards programs that name criteria, the most frequently cited criteria are specific characteristics of teaching performance. Some programs enumerate substantial lists of these characteristics and others cite only a few. These were coded and compiled into a list. The most commonly cited characteristics include (a) communication skills, (b) organization, (c) high standards, (d) clear goals, (e) enthusiasm, (f) strategies for student engagement, and (g) focus on higher order thinking skills. Characteristics mentioned less frequently are respect for diversity and use of technology.

The next two most frequently employed criteria focus on student learning. In this category are statements that allude to having a student-centered attitude as well as those that call for demonstration of impact on learning and promotion of learning beyond the classroom. Typical phrases in this category include “capacity to animate students and engage them in pursuit of knowledge and understanding, ability to motivate students”
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(ID#106) and “concern for students’ intellectual growth and personal and intellectual development” (ID#52). As indicated in Table 1, 35 of the awards programs named content knowledge as an important characteristic of teaching excellence. Statements associated with this category are “possess exceptional mastery of discipline and remain current in their field” (ID#52) and “competence and command of the subject matter” (ID#2).

Next in order of frequency, 22% of the programs express concern for campus leadership for teaching and breadth of teaching responsibilities. Leadership is associated with curriculum development, advocacy and involvement in undergraduate education, and mentoring of colleagues, while breadth of teaching experience includes the listing of teaching load, but for some programs, focuses on advising, the fostering of undergraduate research, or other activities in addition to classroom teaching. Innovation, chiefly associated with course revision and use of new teaching methods, is the next most often mentioned criterion. One program described this criterion as “An enthusiasm for assessing, revising, and updating instructional methods, materials and technologies; a willingness to attempt and revise innovative instructional activities through varied approaches” (ID#71).

The most frequently mentioned criterion in the “Other” category is appreciation for diversity, listed by six programs (only 4% of the sample). Citizenship, openness to new ideas, resourcefulness, and interdisciplinary teaching are mentioned by two programs, while record of obtaining grants for teaching, participation in recruiting efforts, visibility outside campus, and respect for others are mentioned by only one program each. Twelve programs stress the scholarship of teaching, and 10 list professional development activities as criteria for excellent teaching. The relative absence of emphasis on teaching activities other than classroom performance pervades the awards programs.

Evidence

The kinds of evidence sought by the programs and their frequency within the sample are displayed in Table 2.

Only 12 of the awards programs in the sample do not specify at all the type of evidence that should be sent to support the award. Seven more asked for additional documentation to be provided along with specified evidence, but did not indicate what this documentation should include.

Letters

The most popular source of evidence is the letter, required by 133 or 92% of the programs. A substantial number (47, or 33%) rely on
nomination letters or letters of support alone; of these, most specify a nomination letter from an administrator or letters of support from students. Fifty-nine programs (41%) call for multiple letters of support. The most popular source for these required letters is current or former students (44%), followed by faculty colleagues (41%). Although administrators are favored as nominators, letters of support from deans or chairs are less popular on the whole (20%).

In 74% of the cases calling for letters of nomination or support, those writing letters are not given specific instructions about the content of the letter. Instructions from programs that do provide details on the content of the letters range from very general statements such as “state why you think the candidate is deserving” to very specific instructions, such as the following example:

Students [writing letters] should be asked to comment, among other things, on the following questions:

* How accessible and supportive was the nominee?
* How well organized were the individual class sessions of the nominee?
* What types of learning activities and teaching strategies did the nominee use particularly effectively?
* Does the nominee respect diverse talents and ways of learning and thus create an atmosphere where all students feel comfortable and equal?” (ID#86)

A few programs provide a form that lists specific questions, with spaces for written comments. The total number of letters needed is stated by about 7% of the programs. These range from one to 12 and average five across the programs specifying letters. Length is specified by only two of the programs, with one calling for one- to two-page letters and the other a limit of four single-spaced pages. Only seven programs ask for a list of references in lieu of or in addition to letters of nomination or support.

Only one program specifies the type of evidence that should be given to those writing letters for their use in making judgments on the teaching of the candidate. In this case, the program specifies that letter writers review the candidate’s portfolio before composing their letter. Four programs explicitly state that letters should be written by those knowledgeable about the teaching of the candidate: One specifies that this knowledge should be based on more than casual content or observation and should include having team taught or been part of a teaching circle or curriculum development project with the candidate (ID#104).

**Student Evaluation of Teaching**

By far, the next most prevalent type of evidence requested by teaching awards programs is student rating of instruction, required by 61% in the
TABLE 2
Evidence Required by Awards Programs in the Study
Percentages reflect the use of multiple types of evidence and do not total 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Evidence Category Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Nomination letters (29%; 38% = with letters of support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Letters of support (63%; 62% = more than one kind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* from current or former students (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* from peers/other faculty (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* from administrators (deans, chairs) (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* from unspecified writers (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Student ratings of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Curriculum vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Philosophy of teaching statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>List of teaching responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Syllabi or other course materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Peer review summary or summary of classroom observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teaching portfolio (3% = specific contents; 11% = unspecified contents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>List of professional contributions in teaching (papers, presentations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>List of contributions to promotion of teaching on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>List of previous rewards or recognitions for teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Documentation of involvement with students outside classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No evidence specified at all (send &quot;documentation&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Description of growth in teaching and self-learning over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>List of professional development activities in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Descriptions of innovations in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unspecified “additional documentation,” coupled with other evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sample. Within this category of evidence, about one quarter of the programs are quite specific, with some warning that they want only global summary scores rather than raw student comments; others specifying the survey items and/or kinds of courses from which these ratings summaries are to come; some specifying that scores are to come from use of the standard local instrument used by the students on that campus rather than from other forms; and some actually providing tables for entering the scores.

Documents from Candidates

Documentation that is to be submitted by the nominee accounts for much of the evidence requested. Curriculum vitae are required by 49% of the programs. Only a few programs give instructions for the format of the c.v. Of those that do, the instructions specify limits on length or time period covered. Fifteen programs ask candidates to document previous awards or recognitions for teaching.
A little more than one third of the programs ask for a philosophy of teaching statement to be included among the evidence. No further explanation on the format for this statement is supplied by most of the awards programs. Some programs ask candidates to provide descriptions of teaching innovations, involvement with students, and professional growth over time, which are often considered components of a philosophy of teaching. A few give specific instructions on the core documentation they want the candidate to provide:

A document from the nominee describing his or her view of the four core tasks of teaching: course planning and preparation, actual teaching, evaluating student learning and providing feedback, and keeping up with the professional field in areas related to teaching. (ID#15)

A substantial percentage of the programs (28%) ask for a list of teaching responsibilities. Several programs give specific directions, including the years for which they want this information, the kind of responsibilities to be documented, and the additional information to be listed, such as numbers of students.

Only 20% of the awards programs call explicitly for peer review of teaching, although some may have assumed this is gained through letters of nomination and support. Classroom observation is most frequently specified as the method of peer review; in five cases, the awards programs indicate that their committee would observe the classroom performance of the finalists for the award directly.

Actual samples of syllabi and course materials prepared by the candidate are requested by 20% of the programs. Only one program asks for examples of Web-based teaching materials, and 4% ask for samples of student work. The latter category is closest to primary evidence of student learning, yet it is not frequently requested.

Candidates, or in some cases, their nominators, are asked to document a variety of activities. These include promoting teaching on campus, contributing to the scholarship of teaching through publication or conference presentation, and engaging in professional development activities. This documentation is requested by few programs, possibly because it is assumed that the c.v. or letters of nomination or support would provide it. Five programs ask for documentation of contributions to scholarly literature in the disciplinary area rather than to the teaching literature in that discipline.

Only 14% of the programs ask for accumulated documentation and reflection from the nominee to be presented through a teaching portfolio. Two of the 20 programs in this category specify the contents of the portfolio, such as the program that indicated that candidates are to provide descriptions of work in several areas, answering specific questions
in these descriptions. The example below is from the course goals section, where candidates are to describe learning goals, course content, and selection of materials and activities, answering the following:

- Is the material appropriate to the students?
- Is the material appropriate to the course?
- Is the material appropriate to the curriculum?
- How do course activities fit with the goals? (ID#67)

In the “Other” category were those programs that called for the following kinds of evidence: grade distribution charts, votes of students, a list of favorite Web sites, a record of outreach teaching to local high schools, videotapes, and telephone interviews with the committee.

**Match between Criteria and Evidence**

In looking at the evidence required by teaching awards programs, the most startling observation is its disconnectedness with the criteria. Only two programs that list explicit criteria for the award specifically match these with evidence that would be considered suitable indicators of the criteria. One provides a grid with the criteria arrayed in one column and the required evidence for demonstrating each criterion listed in the adjacent column. Another suggests appropriate evidence for each criterion, as in this example:

How well does the nominee engage and stimulate students? . . . Documentation might come, for example, in the form of carefully designed surveys of students, in-depth review with representative students, solicitation of testimony from successful formal students and/or faculty evaluation of syllabi or other indicators of content organization and course objectives. (ID#23)

An example of a program that fails to match criteria and evidence is one that has a very well-articulated set of criteria (such as “Organizational: Has well-organized, well-designed courses, including clear goals and objectives, relevant assignments, appropriate textbooks, and well-designed examinations . . . .”, ID#103) yet fails to ask for syllabi or copies of course assignments or exams that might be used to demonstrate these accomplishments and does not ask letter writers to review this evidence in writing their recommendations.

**Standards and Other Findings**

The search for standards used by awards programs to rate or rank evidence according to criteria produced no data. If standards are in use, they are not published. They may be tacit or contained in ratings forms that awards programs judges use but do not share publicly.
Two additional findings about the general approach of awards programs are worth mentioning. First, several programs, approximately one fifth of the sample, are organized around a two-stage process, requiring letters of nomination for the first round, then more extensive evidence for the second round. In most cases, the evidence for the first round, which determines advancement to the final round, is limited to what the letter writer brings to the committee. In one program, a popular vote of students determines the names of those from whom more evidence will be solicited. Only one program asks that the candidate not know about the nomination. Supporters in this program are asked to obtain the information supporting the nomination without the help of the candidate. These practices directly influence the amount of information brought to bear on the selection process.

Secondly, although the findings were, for the most part, consistent across those schools sampled, there were some differences in the awards programs based on institutional type. Baccalaureate and community college programs in this sample were noticeably more informal, requiring much less evidence. Although proportionately more awards programs in baccalaureate and community colleges than in other types of institutions requested letters of support, these schools were far less likely than the research, doctoral, masters, and comprehensive schools to ask for curriculum vitae, student evaluation of teaching evidence, teaching materials, statements of teaching philosophy, or other specific evidence. They also emphasized content knowledge, student-centeredness, campus leadership, and record of professional development more in their list of criteria and did not list work in the scholarship of teaching and learning as frequently as did other institutions. A table comparing the results from the two samples is in Appendix C. Given the small size and low response rate of the liberal arts-community college sample, however, these differences may be overstated.

Discussion

Centra (1993) distinguishes between criteria and standards: “Put simply, criteria define what aspects of a performance will be evaluated; standards define the desired level of performance” (p. 6). Angelo (1996) elaborates:

In order to identify, assess, evaluate, and honor exemplary teaching, we need to know what to look for and where to look. Then we need guidelines on how to look at and assess it. In the jargon of assessment and evaluation, the criteria of exemplary teaching will tell us what to look for; the indicators where; and the standards how. (p. 58)
In the programs under study, there seemed to be some confusion about the use of these terms. Occasionally, as mentioned earlier, criteria took the shape of eligibility requirements rather than characteristics of excellence. At other times, they were associated with indicators, such as “student evaluations.” Nowhere in the entire sample were standards mentioned. Within each of these three categories of criteria, evidence/indicators, and standards, the findings illustrate several dilemmas about the ways in which teaching is conceptualized and evaluated in higher education.

**Criteria**

The absence of any specified criteria in over half of the awards programs may be attributed to several possible reasons: the primacy of the symbolic—rather than individual reward function—of many programs; the belief that excellent teaching is impossible to define because it is ineffable, situation-specific, or individual; the belief that everyone knows good teaching when he or she sees it; or the lack of knowledge of the research literature on teaching (or lack of trust of these findings) on the part of those who frame the awards.

Menges (1996) suggests that the symbolic value of awards programs is primary: “Programs of awards to individuals may be seen as an inexpensive way to satisfy an institution’s commitment to honor teaching.” Referring to the absence of studies that show gains in overall institutional teaching effectiveness due to awards, he continues, “Although public relations benefits of programs can be sizable, it is difficult to document other positive consequences” (p. 6). If he is correct, there is little to motivate those who frame and judge teaching awards programs to invest considerable energy in making fine distinctions among candidates through elaborating on the procedures. A counterargument to this reasoning, however, is that even the symbolic value of the award may be jeopardized when procedures are vague. One teaching award winner commented:

It has brought a tinge of sadness because the nomination procedure seemed so haphazard. I know of colleagues who have not been recognized and who are more worthy of recognition than I am. Alternatively, I know of individuals who have actively campaigned for the award, whose credibility is suspect, and yet who have been honored. This has led to a “devaluation of the currency” in the eyes of some. As a result, whether through jealousy or genuine knowledge, colleagues have suggested the winning of the award is of no great significance. (Middleton, 1987, pp. 3-4)

Knapper (2001) agrees, “Even in the case of prestigious teaching awards offered by national bodies and individual institutions, the basis
for judgment may be obscure, which can lead to controversy and skepticism” (p. 4). Teaching awards program administrators, however, may not be swayed by this reasoning. They may see that obscurity and vagueness give them degrees of freedom in the selection process that they would not have if their policies were more specific, and that this freedom is worth more than credibility.

Another possibility is that instead of deliberate intention to keep procedures vague and to emphasize the symbolic, teaching award administrators make the choices that they do about criteria because of uncertainties or mixed feelings about the evaluation of teaching. Several scholars (Eble, 1982; Mauksch, 1987; Svinicki, 1995; Weimer, 1997) have long attributed the belief that there is no way to assess teaching to what they call the “myths” of college teaching, beliefs such as “teachers are born, not made” or that “teaching is an art, not a science.” Svinicki and Menges (1996) counter these claims:

Because teaching is difficult to study, some have argued that it cannot be studied. Critics who refuse to study it feel free to fall back on hearsay, personal anecdotes, and questionable survey research. Fortunately, research about teaching has now attained a level of sophistication that supports stable conclusions and generalizations about what makes for excellence. (p. 110)

**Specification of Characteristics of Excellent Teaching Performance.** When one looks at how excellence in teaching has been studied, several methods are listed: observation or interviews of teachers generally thought to be excellent or whose teaching evaluations by students or peers is high (Lowman, 1996); factor analysis of student ratings of instruction (Cashin, 1990; Feldman, 1996); content analysis of letters of nomination for awards (Donaldson, 1988; Lowman, 1994); review of the literature or expert opinion (Chickering & Gamson, 1989; Elton, 1998; McAlpine & Harris, 2001; Ramsden Margetson, Martin, & Clarke, 1995); student or faculty opinion surveys (Lowman, 1994); or multiple methods (Lowman, 1996; Pritchard, Watson, Kelly, & Paquin, 1998).

The list of characteristics of excellent teaching that emerges from these various studies does show a high degree of consistency. A comparison of the lists derived from studies using surveys, summaries of the literature, theoretical arguments about learning, and statistically-identified factors identified three qualities—organization, communication, and fairness in grades and exams—as common to all studies in the sample. Results from at least three of the four approaches named an additional five factors as commonly associated with excellent teaching: rapport, clarity, enthusiasm, flexibility, and assigned workload (Pritchard et al,
1998). Some others that are frequently listed, such as preparation and motivational qualities, may be included indirectly in Pritchard’s list through such qualities as organization, rapport, enthusiasm, and flexibility. One other reoccurring factor listed by many studies is mastery of subject matter (Cashin, 1990; Centra, Froh, Gray, & Lambert, 1987; Feldman, 1988), which was coded separately for this study and was present in 24% of the teaching award program descriptions.

The age of most of the studies of characteristics of teaching excellence and the implied emphasis on didactic teaching for many of the qualities may be opening the door to the articulation of new characteristics of excellence. For example, the Wingspread document on the “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education” (Chickering & Gamson, 1989) was one of the first to reflect the relatively recent critique of transmission theories of teaching in focusing on some additional teacher characteristics: use of active learning strategies, frequent contact with students, provision of prompt feedback, high expectations, and respect for diverse talents and ways of knowing. Similarly, the lists of characteristics of excellent teaching in Ramsden (1992) and Ramsden et al. (1995) draw upon the literature on deep and surface learning and situate excellent teaching in the cultivation of deep learning through active engagement of students.

By comparing these lists from the literature with the list of most commonly listed criteria by the 38% of programs in the study that specified characteristics of teaching excellence, one can see that several generic qualities such as organization, communication, clarity, and enthusiasm are in accord. Two qualities listed by some of the awards programs—high standards and strategies for student engagement—are more in line with the Wingspread principles. The remaining quality—focus on higher order thinking skills—seems to reflect the conversations on deep and surface learning. One emphasis in the Wingspread principles that is not captured directly in the lists of awards programs criteria is student-faculty contact, a dimension that may have been intended by the occasional mention of “faculty accessibility” in the awards programs.

But what of the 62% of the programs that did not list any characteristics of teaching performance? One possible reason for reluctance that has not yet been considered is concern that these lists would be too situation-specific. As Menges (1996) warns:

Attaining clear selection criteria and ensuring inclusiveness is made more difficult by the diversity of academic disciplines and programs, the variety of settings in which faculty teach, and the varied instructional styles they employ. Comparing the work of, say, teachers in the humanities with those in the performing arts, in languages, in the sciences, and in other fields is indeed complex, but it cannot be avoided. (p. 4)
Centra (1993) points out additional complicating factors that limit the applicability of general lists of exemplary qualities, including different orientations to teaching (such as behaviorist or emancipatory), level of student taught, and size of class.

A more fundamental objection to specification of qualities of excellent teaching is raised by Cranton (2001):

> When a person builds a shed, we can assess whether the construction is straight and stable. Teaching, however, is a specialized form of communication taking place in a social context, with a goal of change in individuals’ ways of thinking and knowing. There are no invariant principles. There are no clear, best ways of teaching. Our judgments of the quality of teaching are, by definition, subjective and interpretive.

In the evaluation of teaching, we need to base our strategies on the communicative and emancipatory nature of knowledge about teaching. Our procedures need to be open-ended, qualitative, and flexible. We need to shift our way of thinking about the evaluation of teaching away from attempts to objectify and quantify this complex process of human and social interaction. (pp. 17–18)

Cranton’s objections might be indicative of an additional factor operating in the general area of peer review of teaching. Traditional normative values associated with teaching reinforce privacy and lack of inspection. Teaching is thought to be a personal act and judging the quality of others’ teaching or being judged is to be avoided (Chism, 1999; Lortie, 1975). When judgments must be made, a holistic, connoisseurship approach (Eisner, 1979) is likely to have more appeal than an explicit set of criteria.

Without knowing the thinking behind the awards programs process, it is impossible to gauge whether the lack of specification of criteria results from neglect or belief that such lists of characteristics of excellent teachers cannot or should not be used. When looking at additional categories listed, however, one can speculate that at least for some programs, relying on teaching characteristics alone might be judged too narrow an approach.

The Emphasis on Student Learning. Student learning, although generally believed to be the ultimate indicator of teaching excellence, is deemed by most writers to be difficult to tie to teacher impact (Fenwick, 2001). Although some disagree and advocate its feasibility (such as Angelo, 1996), published studies identifying characteristics of effective teaching through analysis of student learning are not widely available. The exceptions are those that correlate student grades with student ratings of instruction, which usually find positive associations. (The interpretation of such findings, however, is mixed, with some believing that
grade pandering is the reason for the correlation and others arguing that grades and effective teaching are linked. A discussion of this issue is in Greenwald & Gilmore, 1997; Marsh & Roche, 2000; McKeachie, 1997.) It is interesting, therefore, that 29% of the programs in this study list criteria relating teaching excellence to production of student learning. Unfortunately, as mentioned above, only 4% of the programs ask for actual evidence of student learning, unless one allows for potential self-report evidence contained in student letters or on evaluations of teaching.

Breadth of Teaching Criteria. The remaining criteria listed by the awards programs refer to range of teaching experience, teaching leadership, curriculum development, scholarship of teaching, and professional development. Many in the literature emphasize this broader conception: A particularly broad list is provided by Elton and Partington (1993), who add the factor of teaching within the community context (perhaps an early link to service learning). Looking at these dimensions of teaching permits awards programs to go beyond the act of working with students and to capture the ways in which faculty study and share their teaching. The emphasis in Elton’s more recent list (1998) is on the reflective practitioner, innovative teacher, curriculum designer, course organizer, pedagogic researcher, and leading member of a team. “Excellence,” he states, “has many more dimensions than competence” (p. 35).

Evidence and Match to Criteria

It is interesting to note that although criteria are frequently not identified, awards programs are more inclined to list requirements for evidence. A second observation that quickly follows is that the primary source of evidence is letters of nomination or support and that there is widespread lack of any direction to those supporting the nomination on what qualities they are to address in their letters. For the 52% of the programs that specified no criteria for their awards, this lack of direction is consistent with their reluctance to list characteristics of excellent teaching. For others, the procedures give no assurance that letter writers will speak to their announced criteria. Given that letters of support are the most frequently required type of evidence, the lack of topical commonality across the letters is indeed problematic. More serious perhaps is the failure of all but a few of the awards programs to identify what sort of evidence from or about the nominee that letter writers should have before they write their letters—should they have access to the person’s teaching materials, have observed their classroom teaching, have looked at student ratings? Without guidelines in this area, it is hard to know whether the letters are based on anecdotes, hearsay, or friendship, rather than on good information.
Given the potential noncomparability of student ratings information and frequent problems with validity and reliability of untested student evaluation of instruction instruments, the special instructions listed by the teaching awards programs with respect to this form of evidence seem warranted. Their priority in the evidence requirements indicates a great reliance on student ratings, either because they are easily obtained or because they are respected as important.

The lack of similar specificity on peer review of teaching and its relatively low emphasis within the evidence requirements of awards programs except through letters of support testifies to the low use of standardized processes of peer review on most campuses. Similarly, the failure of all but 15% of the programs to request evidence of teaching scholarship through documentation of presentation or scholarly writing on teaching demonstrates the low value placed on this dimension of teaching.

The lack of emphasis on primary materials, such as syllabi, videotapes, and samples of student work, or their compilation with reflective statements in a teaching portfolio, indicates the reluctance of most committees to deal with first-order evidence. This preference may reflect a practical interest in saving reviewers time by keeping to evidence of a summary nature, or it might reflect the respect of those framing the teaching award requirements for the judgment of peers and students on the candidates’ credentials. However, since there are no recommendations for the evidence that peers and students must use in making their judgments, it appears that the value on the use of primary materials in judging teaching performance is generally low.

A further consideration that might account for vagueness in evidence requirements is that the value of the awards is too insignificant to warrant asking candidates or review committees to invest too heavily in compiling evidence. To test that explanation, awards were arrayed by their monetary value into three categories: equal to or less than $1,000 in cash, between $1,000 and $5,000 in cash, and greater than $5,000 or a base salary award of $2,000 or more. Evidence counts of the awards programs by category showed a slightly higher average number of types of evidence required by the midrange awards (9.8), with the high-end awards next (8.0), and the low awards last (4.1). Most of the awards from the baccalaureate and community colleges, however, fell into the low category (without this group, the average is 5.4). Since analysis by Carnegie Classification category showed that these colleges require less evidence in general, it is possible that institutional type rather than award value is the stronger explanation, especially given that midrange awards in the sample of primarily research, doctoral, and masters institutions require more evidence than do high-end awards.
The lack of match between criteria and evidence, characteristic of all but a few programs, may reflect trust in letter writers to speak to important issues or belief in the sufficiency of vitae to document certain accomplishments, or it could instead point to failure to think through the requirements logically in developing the award. For example, if an awards program stipulates that the scholarship of teaching is a criterion, linking this criterion with a request for documentation of teaching publications or conference presentations or the inclusion of abstracts seems logical.

It is interesting to look at certain of the requirements for evidence in light of the implicit criteria they seem to imply. For example, one of the required pieces of evidence for five awards programs is a set of grade distribution charts from courses offered during a specific period. Will these grade charts be used as measure of student success or grading leniency? Two very different interpretations based on criteria of either rigor or student focus can ensue. Five others ask for details on scholarly papers and presentations on scholarship at professional meetings. Is the implication that excellence in teaching and disciplinary scholarship (considered a troubled relationship in the literature) are directly related?

Standards

How judges were to assess relative or absolute performance on the indicators is uniformly opaque. The issue of standards is a perplexing one, given that no program articulates standards that would be used. The literature on standards with respect to judging teaching excellence is not very extensive either. Gibbs indicates, “Even when institutions have well-defined criteria about excellent teaching, they seldom have standards” (1995, p. 18). Weimer agrees: “Most disciplines have standards for valuing scholarly and professional activities that direct and control practice: for teaching they are conspicuous by their absence” (1997, p. 55). Centra points out, “Though there may not be complete agreement about all criteria to be used, there is even less agreement about what constitutes excellent, good, or unacceptable performance” (1993, p. 7).

In addressing standards for judging teaching excellence, Elton (1998) distinguishes between competence and excellence, which generally requires that the qualities of reflection, innovation, scholarship, and leadership be present to distinguish excellent teaching from competent teaching. Competent teaching is evidenced by performing well on standard dimensions of teaching, such as organization, presentation, assessment, and student relationships. Using different language, but arriving at similar conclusions, Smith (2001) discusses the differences between teaching, scholarly teaching, and the scholarship of teaching. He
indicates that transformative change happens along this continuum, with scholarly teaching being associated with quality of preparation, methodology, and teaching critique, and the scholarship of teaching being characterized by a deeper knowledge base and leadership for teaching. Hounsell (1996) argues that excellence must be distinguished from competence within a given dimension of teaching, and lists indicators of excellence within each of four dimensions: impact on quality of students' learning; impact on quality of curriculum development efforts; impact on quality of teaching at the departmental, college, or university level; and impact on quality of the teaching of the discipline nationally or internationally. McAlpine & Harris (2002) specify levels of acceptable, good/excellent, and exemplary in conjunction with four levels of impact: engagement in learning, actual learning, transfer of learning, and institutional impact.

Ultimately, the use of standards would suggest employing a rubric that distinguishes level of achievement across various dimensions. An example of such a rubric is found in McAlpine & Harris (2002, p. 14). Schonwetter, Sokal, Friesen, and Taylor (2002) show the type of rubric that can be applied to statements of teaching philosophy, distinguishing between superior, average, and poor levels of performance. Because judging procedures were not the focus of this study and were not mentioned in the award descriptions, it is not possible to state whether rubrics are in common use in teaching awards programs. Since it is common practice for judges to use checklists or rating sheets along several dimensions to rank application packets in awards competitions, it is likely that some rubrics, however primitive, are in use. Making these judging documents public to applicants and nominators would reveal the standards to be used and would allow candidates to speak more directly to how they exemplify the specified level of achievement.

Recommendations

Since teaching awards are shrouded by some uncertainties about goals and impact, the most fundamental question for those who are developing or administering awards concerns what the intended outcome of the awards program is. For most awards programs, there are several goals, ranging from symbolizing commitment to teaching to affirming those who teach well and encouraging those who might teach better. Unless a form of convenient symbolism is the only end, all of these goals are better achieved when teaching awards are nested within a broader system of evaluation of teaching that rests on consensus about characteristics of excellent teaching. Until dialogue about the varieties of teaching situa-
tions and expressed values of the institution is brought to bear on the question of teaching effectiveness, teaching awards, as well as other forms of judgment about teaching, will not be grounded in sound criteria and will thus be subject to mystery, distrust, and unexamined personal beliefs of the judges. Use of an intentional approach to teaching awards also helps to dispel suggestions that awards programs are simply popularity contests.

The first recommendation emanating from this study, then, is to be clear about criteria. Although institutions may decide that teaching is very context-specific on their campuses, it is worth the investment of time to think about whether there are broad general qualities, such as effectiveness in promoting student learning, that are characteristic of all of the environments on campus. Beyond this list, specific criteria that may be applied for major types of teaching, such as clinical or studio teaching, dissertation advising, and the like, might be added, to be used in appropriate applications.

The task of putting together such a list is an excellent opportunity to promote discussion of teaching and its evaluation. Through this process, institutional goals can also be promoted. For example, if community outreach is a campus goal, a criterion that identifies service learning or community outreach as an important characteristic for teaching awards is one way to announce this value and to promote its pursuit. Similarly, if a campus wants to promote increased quality of student outcomes assessment or to explore the relationship between certain teaching qualities and student learning, emphasis in the campus criteria on assessment skills would help move this agenda. Trigwell (2001) provides a model for how to align goals and criteria, based on a scheme that connects four acts of teaching with student-learning goals. He draws upon Biggs’s (1999, 2001) work on alignment that stresses connections between goals and activities.

McNaught & Anwyl (1993), who conducted a careful study of the implementation of teaching awards in Australian universities, argue that there are several benefits to articulating criteria. One speaks to accountability: “If the awards are based on clear criteria about excellence in teaching, then the progressive refinement of these criteria will clarify the issue about what it is that university teachers could perhaps be held accountable for” (p. 11). They also emphasize a broad advantage: “The publicized debate about criteria for teaching awards could enrich the ongoing process of defining what is meant by quality in higher education” (p. 10). At the same time, they warn, “There is the risk of trivialising teaching by promoting a set of superficial criteria. . . . Even if broadly based criteria are written, there is a danger that presentation skills will be over-
represented in any selection process” (p. 13). Given the emphasis in the awards programs examined in this study, that danger is indeed an issue, and those programs listing criteria should be wary of this possibility.

Nevertheless, the act of identifying criteria for teaching awards can also support other activities that require evaluation of teaching, such as determining merit increases, reappointment, or promotion and tenure. A given list of characteristics of excellent teaching, such as those that are posted on campus Web sites of some of the institutions in this study, can be the reference point for several activities at once, giving needed coherence to the campus evaluation plan. An additional advantage is gained when faculty organize their files around these criteria so that evidence may be used for multiple purposes, enabling some efficiency in the acts of preparing for annual reviews, awards nominations, and other purposes.

A second recommendation is to link criteria and evidence. Once criteria are identified, it is worthwhile to think about how one would recognize the presence of each in candidates for the award. Would looking at sample syllabi be informative to judge currency of content, if that were a criterion? Would looking at evaluation of teaching items on organization be a useful way to judge candidates’ organization, should the campus decide that excellent teachers display a high degree of organization? It is a good idea to prepare a grid with the criteria and evidence side by side to make sure there is a match. If opinion of secondary sources, such as peers or students, is to be the main evidence, the match can be pursued by asking these informants to speak directly to the criteria. Using a form that calls for short answers to specific questions further encourages informants to contribute relevant information. A final open-ended question will permit comment on other qualities that those recommending candidates want to address.

The topic of standards is the third link in the chain. How will one distinguish an extraordinary level of innovative teaching from ordinary levels? How will one determine if a given candidate’s scholarship of teaching is excellent compared with that of others? It is recommended that those framing or implementing awards programs be explicit about standards. Deciding on standards requires that dialogue about criteria and evidence be extended to another dimension, one that identifies levels of achievement on each criterion. Examples from the literature cited above (McAlpine & Harris, 2002; Schonwetter et al., 2002) may serve as a guide.

Although carefully framing or revising a teaching awards program requires considerable thought, exchange, and exploration, the activities involved are at the heart of institutional self-assessment and planning. The rewards can be found in the shared understandings that accrue as well as in the clarity, efficiency, and trustworthiness of the awards program itself.
APPENDIX A
Sampling Methods

To locate descriptions of teaching awards programs at United States institutions of higher learning, the first strategy was to use publicized descriptions on the World Wide Web. Since this study was not seeking to calculate the incidence of teaching award programs in various types of institutions, but rather to content analyze the requirements for existing awards programs, the first sampling approach was to focus on those institutions that had teaching development programs listed on the Web site of these programs maintained by the Center for Teaching Excellence at the University of Kansas (http://www.ku.edu/~cte/resources/websites.html). The rationale for this choice was both practical and logical: It reduced the number of programs to be sampled based on the reasoning that institutions with teaching center Web pages were likely also to support awards programs and that these programs would be more likely to be described on the Web. Established in the 1996 by a University of Kansas professor who systematically explored the Web for teaching centers’ pages, this list is continually updated as other centers request to be placed on it. It thus does not include all teaching centers in the United States, and those that are included are the most likely to be the most visible and active ones that participate in the major professional organization and that know of the list. The Kansas site is widely acknowledged to be the most complete list and is the most widely used, so it was selected for use in sampling on the basis of providing the most likely list of “information rich” sources.

At the time of the sampling, the Kansas list contained links for 194 colleges and universities. Each of the 194 institutional pages referenced in the Kansas list was searched for descriptions of teaching awards. If none were found, the institution’s home page or pages for academic affairs and other administrative units that might be involved in teaching awards were located and reviewed for relevant information. Materials that referred to teaching awards were printed out. Most of these were from research, doctoral, or masters universities. There are two possible reasons for this result. First, among there are no known current studies that describe the incidence of teaching centers at institutions within each Carnegie type, a recent study by the POD Network of its membership showed that its membership represented approximately 57% of the research universities in the United States, 23% of the masters I and II institutions, 10% of the liberal arts colleges, and 2% of community colleges (Fink, 2004). These figures do not indicate which universities have teaching centers, particularly in the case of community colleges, which have their own major association for professional development. However, they do indicate that the larger institutions are more likely to have a teaching center than are smaller institutions, which are more likely to have more informal arrangements to support teaching, such as faculty development centers. They therefore would not be represented on the Kansas list. Secondly, smaller institutions are more likely to use the Web less for internal communications, since established patterns and proximity are more conducive to print and personal contact.

To obtain a sample that was more representative of liberal arts and community colleges, letters were mailed to the chief academic officers of 100 of these institutions, chosen by stratifying by institutional type and using random selection within each type. Letters were followed by emailed requests. These methods resulted in responses from 29 additional campuses, 10 of whom indicated that they did not have programs.

As materials from both methods of data collection were examined, eliminated from the sample were all awards that were not for individuals (such as teaching awards to entire departments) or that were combined awards, such as university professorships that acknowledged excellence in teaching, research, and service. Awards were not eliminated based on the locus of the award, so some college or department awards were included, although most are at the campus level. Awards that focused only on one aspect of teaching, such as advising, were eliminated; awards based on the status of the candidate (junior vs. senior professor) were included. Immediately eliminated was any award for which there was not enough information, chiefly those that indicated that further information on criteria or requirements for submission had to be obtained by going to an office or calling an individual. Of the information gleaned from these multiple methods, 118 programs from 66 institutions were judged appropriate for coding from the Web search and 26 programs from 19 institutions from the mailed survey, bringing the total sample size to 144 programs. Table A1 shows the resulting sample size and response rate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Usable Responses (institutions)</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Usable Responses (programs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web Pages Accessed</td>
<td>194 accessed</td>
<td>66 (128 without program meeting study criteria)</td>
<td>N/A *</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed Surveys</td>
<td>100 mailed</td>
<td>29 (10 with no program)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All pages were searched and thus part of the data pool. However, only 34% had programs described on the Web sites that fit the study criteria.

APPENDIX B
Coding Taxonomy

Faculty Teaching Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CODINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CK content knowledge; shows mastery of subject field(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL campus leadership; includes ways in which candidate promotes quality teaching (mentoring, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G global statement about teaching excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM impact on student learning; shows promotion of student growth and development during and beyond their classroom experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN innovation, new course development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS no criteria specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O other/miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD professional development; efforts to continue own academic growth, such as conferences, symposia, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG range of teaching experiences; includes breadth of teaching activity (different types of courses, different teaching styles, advising activities, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC student-centeredness; shows interest and concern for student learning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST scholarship of teaching; includes publications, presentations, experimentation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE specific characteristics of teaching excellence; includes quality of teaching performance and possession of pedagogical skills/knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B (Continued)
Coding Taxonomy

Faculty Teaching Awards

**EVIDENCE CODINGS**

- **AV**: audio/video/Web-based documentation (various)
- **BC**: documentation of involvement with students beyond the classroom
- **CO**: classroom observation of candidate (committee visits, etc.), peer review
- **CN**: list of contributions to the growth and well being of the university/department/etc.
- **CV**: curriculum vitae or resume
- **EV**: course evaluations, or samples/summaries thereof
- **GR**: description of growth and self-learning over time
- **IN**: innovations/creativity in teaching (methods, tools, courses, etc.)
- **LA**: letters/evidence of support/recommendation from administrators (dean, chair, etc.)
- **LF**: letters/evidence of support/recommendation from faculty and/or peers
- **LS**: letters/evidence of support/recommendation from students (current and former)
- **LX**: letters/evidence of support/recommendation (not specified)
- **NA**: documentation of nomination acceptance (letter, form, packet, etc.)
- **NL**: nomination letter(s) from person(s) nominating the candidate
- **OT**: other/miscellaneous
- **PS**: listing/documentation of professional activities or publications within subject area
- **PT**: listing/documentation of professional activities or publications related to teaching
- **PD**: documentation of professional development activities (workshops, etc.)
- **PH**: teaching philosophy / statement on teaching
- **REC**: list of previous recognitions for teaching, mentoring, etc. (awards, etc.)
- **REF**: names of references to be contacted by selection committee
- **SW**: samples of student work, and course instruction surrounding the assignment
- **SY**: course syllabi and/or assignments
- **TP**: teaching portfolio
- **TR**: list of current/recent teaching responsibilities (course load, class size, etc.)
- **TS**: description of teaching style / teaching methods
- **U**: unspecified

APPENDIX C
Comparison of Findings by Institutional Type

Analysis of the samples by institutional type showed some significant differences in the types of criteria and evidence required for the awards in the study. Pearson Chi-Square tests were computed to determine significance. Starred items in Table C1 indicate significant differences between the samples. These show that baccalaureate and community college awards programs are more likely to stress campus leadership for teaching as a criterion for awards. They are also more likely not to request specific evidence, especially differing from other institutions in not requiring student ratings data, curriculum vitae, philosophy of teaching statements, and syllabi to show candidate worth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Category Name</th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global or no criteria specified at all</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific characteristics of teaching</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on student learning</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered approach</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content knowledge, mastery of subject</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Leadership in promoting teaching</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of teaching activities undertaken</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development efforts</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of teaching activities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development efforts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). (+ = positive correlation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Category Name</th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letters of nomination or support</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Student ratings of instruction</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Curriculum vitae</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Philosophy of teaching statement</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of teaching responsibilities</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Syllabi or other course materials</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review summary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of professional contributions--teaching</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolio</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of contributions to promoting teaching</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of previous recognitions for teaching</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of student involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of growth in teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of professional development activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions of innovations in teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified “additional documentation”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**No evidence specified at all</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). (- = negative correlation, + = positive correlation)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). (- = negative correlation).
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