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A decade has passed since the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program (FTEP) at the University of Colorado Boulder published “Variability Among Faculty” as part of POD’s Practically Speaking: A Source Book for Instructional Consultants in Higher Education (1997). Our goal at the time was to present an overview of FTEP and a close look at our individual consultation process, which was—and remains—unusually robust. Here we enlarge upon our earlier report by addressing not only the mechanics of our work but also its chief benefit: fostering reflection as a tool, a skill, and ultimately, a habit for faculty and consultants alike.

In recognition of the broad changes that have taken place in education over the past decade, FTEP has greatly expanded its general programming. Through our Summer Institute: Increasing Student Engagement and Improving Learning with Educational Technologies and Course Re-Design, we have embraced learning technologies that can be employed both inside the classroom and out. We have added symposia in writing, service learning, designing good syllabi, specifying goals for learning, and developing various means of assessment.

Specifically, in our Colorado Learning Assessment Studies (CLAS), modeled on Richard J. Light’s Making the Most of College, Students Speak Their Minds (2001), we promote the qualitative analysis of interviews with undergraduates. In addition, in our President’s Teaching and Learning Collaborative, we offer ways for faculty to investigate researchable lines of inquiry into student learning in specific courses—our form of SoTL, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Throughout, we concentrate on working with “early career faculty” in the pre-tenure years (1-6) by bringing them into conversations about becoming members of the professoriate.

Recently, we have entered into several strong collaborations with departments, schools, and colleges to serve faculty in situ. In these cases, we begin planning with the Chair, whom we ask to identify particular departmental issues and needs by administering a survey to the faculty. Instead of then inviting the respondents to attend a general event in a centrally located room on campus, we design a purpose-built workshop which we hold in their own college or departments, thereby fostering conversation between and among faculty in the same or cognate disciplines. By this means, we have generated ideas for curricular change through learning technologies, syllabi exchanges, and offers of classroom observations.
Significantly, these classroom observations, which have been part of FTEP since its inception, remain key. Our faculty have taught us that observation of their teaching is their highest priority and our most valuable resource. Through consultation that is individual and confidential, we help faculty to identify the most effective aspects of their teaching, to contemplate the less effective aspects, and to modify their pedagogy based on their own specific goals for student learning. Working one-on-one with a consultant on pedagogy encourages faculty to reflect. And reflection, we have found, is our single best tool for bringing positive change to the classroom. For this reason, we regard reflection as the goal and the hallmark of our program, whether our faculty are attending an FTEP event or participating in the consultation service itself.

Consultation Service: Its Rationale and Character

FTEP was founded, and continues to operate, on the premise that there are many ways to teach effectively. Just as there are no formulas for teaching in general, so there are no formulas for giving a lecture, conducting small group discussions, or working with small groups in a large lecture format. And yet faculty often come to us precisely in search of a formula. Believing that the perfect teaching methodology has been codified, somewhere, by someone, with mathematical precision, they assume that if we could just show them this method, they too could become excellent teachers. Our first task is to convince them that pedagogical improvement is a never-ending process without easy answers. Even then, they may insist on didactic, authoritarian prescriptions. Our subsequent task is thus to turn their point of view around, so that they look not to their consultant for answers, but to their own performance, philosophy, and approaches to teaching and students.

Our consultants are experienced Faculty Associates chosen for their ability and willingness to promote self-discovery and reflection in individual, private collaborations with other faculty. The Faculty Associates offer assistance in the form of videotape consultations including classroom observation, 35-item surveys, classroom videotaping, and lengthy discussion. (See Appendices A, B and C.) The Program’s Associates are also trained to offer the FTEP Classroom Learning Interview Process (CLIP) (known as SGID Student Group Instructional Diagnosis in the faculty development profession). (See Appendix D.) CLIP surveys ask students to describe specific teaching behaviors that fall more or less discretely into four dimensions of good teaching: knowledge of content, dynamism and enthusiasm, rapport with students individually and as a group, and clarity and organization.

No matter the intervention, our consultations tend to span a relatively brief period of time. Typically, a faculty member will contact FTEP during the course of a semester, will meet once or twice with a consultant, and will then return to the classroom to put into practice the ideas that emerged during talks with the consultant. Although we offer to work with faculty members on a continuing basis, requests for additional consultations and follow-ups are few. Because most faculty are satisfied with meeting once or twice with our Faculty Associates, we are usually able to accommodate the occasional request for extensive assistance. More frequently than long-term consultations, faculty request another consultation a year or so later.

In establishing the understanding that there are many ways to teach effectively, we emphasize to faculty that the purpose of discussing teaching is to become insightful and reflective about learning and pedagogy, then to act upon new insights in the classroom. Our Associates are careful to respect the fine line between exchanging ideas, on the one hand, and telling a faculty member how to teach, on the other. Their role is to develop a shared collaboration with teaching. Central to our work is the concept that teaching well and proudly is a process pursued over an entire career, rather than a product of limited attention over a short period of time. Outstanding teachers continually refine their pedagogy and praxis throughout their lifetime in the professoriate.
In order to inform faculty of our services, each fall we send a Consultation Service to Faculty e-memo to all tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as to instructors at CU. Our website (http://www.colorado.edu/ftep) explains the goals and philosophy of the consultative process, describes the forms of assistance we offer, and gives a registration link, which includes an evaluation process once the consultative work is completed. Judging from the comments we receive when we ask how faculty learn about our services, we know that word of mouth from peers plays an important role in attracting clients.

When requests are received, we pass them along to our FTEP Faculty Associates, experienced faculty whom we have trained to function as consultants. These Associates combine expertise in both teaching and research with enthusiasm and strong interpersonal skills. We recruit them not only for their general excellence in teaching and scholarship but also for a specific pedagogic expertise: for example, teaching large courses, graduate seminars, first-year students in first-semester and first-year seminars, or sophomore-level critical thinking courses in the core curriculum of the College of Arts and Sciences. Other areas of expertise include integrating multicultural perspectives into course design, employing the Socratic method, using collaborative learning in the sciences, and teaching courses heavily infused with writing. The Associates are assigned by the Director, who matches the faculty client’s stated concerns and requests to the faculty consultant’s strengths. In making assignments, the Director attempts to preclude problematic pairings: for example, matching a junior faculty client with a senior Faculty Associate from the same department, who would likely be judging the assistant professor’s dossier during a review. Our 2009-10 Faculty Associates, all associate or full professors, represent the following disciplines: computer science, communication, sociology, education, art and art history, anthropology, political science, humanities, and engineering.

**Motivation and Expectations of Faculty Clients**

Faculty approach the consulting process with a variety of motives and expectations. Theoretically, all of our clients volunteer: they request our services of their own accord, after having reflected on their pedagogy and its effect upon their students’ learning. In practice, however, as we have discovered from our cadre of Faculty Associates in the videotape consultation service, at least some of the faculty who come to us have been mandated to seek out the Program’s services. They have been pressured to improve their teaching by Chairs, Deans, departmental or college requirements for promotion and tenure, or by student complaints.

Ideally, our clients are receptive to change and willing to collaborate with a consultant to explore ways of producing it. We achieve our best results with clients who seek a collaborative guiding relationship, consisting of conversations about the broader intellectual issues of teaching and learning. By contrast, when we work with those who seek only narrowly specific, prescriptive advice, our consultative relationships have limited potential for success from the start.

Among the true volunteers, some are already successful in teaching but want to do even better; others are not doing well and want to improve. These clients tend to be relatively open-minded about adjusting their approaches to teaching or even making wholesale pedagogical changes. Among those who have been coerced, some do not genuinely want help, while others are open to it, provided that it is offered with great tact. But even when the coerced are receptive, they do not give up resistance easily, perhaps because they cling to the notion that “I haven’t done anything for the students to be upset about.” Lurking behind this notion may be the sentiment that “I was taught this way. Why shouldn't that be good enough for these students?”

A faculty member’s initial motivation in seeking our services already embodies expectations about the
outcome. In the best of circumstances, the rapport developed with the Faculty Associate leads to a provocative discussion of attitudes, fears, and dilemmas, revealing additional motivations not apparent at the outset. When otherwise hidden issues are unmasked, a shared meaning of what it means to teach emerges. Clients discover that professors have in common many teaching dilemmas, which they can investigate collegially and speculate upon together. Just as a mask comes off in good teaching, revealing authenticity, dynamism, and enthusiasm, so masks come off in effective consultations, which also rely on the qualities of open mindedness and authenticity.

In a real sense, neither the faculty client nor the consultant knows what to expect at the outset of a consultation. For some, wonderment and surprise find their way into the conversation. In order to negotiate unexpected emotions, the consultant must draw on experience, tools, and intuition; display excellent listening skills; and have a sense of the right time and place to suggest new teaching strategies or course re-design. In a conversation about a dimension of the professoriate as intimate as teaching, consultants usually rely on the language of probing. Questions like “Can you say more about that?” prove to be quite appropriate. After all, we cannot say why some students respond to some teaching and teachers and not to others. We can only explore such anomalies in hopes of developing a rich rapport.

These and other parameters affecting consultations for teaching are summarized in Figure 1 below.

**Parameters Affecting Consultations for Teaching**

1. **Length of professional career**
   status: new---seeking tenure/or reappointment---mid-career adjustment---nearing retirement

2. **Knowledge and awareness of pedagogy**
   little or none----------------------------moderate----------------------------------------advanced
   but seeking more looking for 1 or 2 tips

3. **Conditions surrounding the consultation**
   extreme emotional upset, with--------------insecurity prevails;-----------------confident, looking for
   blame paced on self, outside discreet help sought affirmation of
   life, students, or administration discreet help sought affirmation of
   teaching prowess

4. **Motivation for seeking help through consultation**
   coerced by Chair, Dean-------------------driven by poor ratings-------------------------fully voluntary

5. **Expectations for assistance**
   formula for achieving------------------tips to respond to----------------in-depth analysis
   teaching excellence specific challenges of teaching

**Portraits of Faculty Members Served**

Below are representative portraits of our faculty clients. Inevitably, the portraits overlap, but the fundamental distinctions are well worth considering.

1. Faculty who come for consultations after having received *mediocre ratings on student evaluations* tend to be emotionally and intellectually shattered by the students’ refusal to judge them as good teachers. Some are also hostile and resentful of students’ opinions. Broad as the University of
Colorado mandated course evaluations are in scope, they still provide some indication of areas of teaching performance that need attention. One key in consultative work is to discern where the faculty member’s perceptions and students' perceptions are mismatched.

2. Faculty facing a retention, tenure, or promotion decision usually propose that they are making an effort to strengthen their teaching practice, rather than claiming to be very good teachers already. Some are aware of teaching deficiencies and may well feel guilty for having waited too long to address them. Of these, some may be eager to receive assistance but lack the time to put newly learned techniques into use before the promotion decision is made; others may resent the university evaluation system as a whole. A third group of faculty members coming up for review seek endorsement at this juncture in their careers that their teaching practices are solid. In these cases, the consultation may be quite fruitful, particularly since the granting of tenure somewhat lessens the demands for concentration solely on research.

3. Confident and competent teachers seek professional affirmation of their ability and performance, as well as ways to make pedagogical shifts, including perhaps a more focused goal on writing or the design of new goals for teaching and evidence-based learning. They are seeking validation of their good teaching from a reputable source. These professors often assist the effort of the program by recommending our services to their colleagues, becoming departmental boosters of teaching excellence, and becoming workshop presenters or, eventually, Faculty Associates. In short, they become emissaries for the consultation service of the program. Meanwhile, their teaching is likely to continue improving.

4. New faculty who seek our services want to begin their professional careers on the right foot. Bob Boice's research has shown that those faculty whom he calls “quick starters”—those who become confident and comfortable teachers early in their careers—are more likely to seek help from faculty development programs in their first year than those who do not. He argues persuasively that the key to their success is that they concentrate on the process of teaching rather than the content.

5. Faculty who come to us requesting an in-depth analysis of their teaching believe that every aspect of their teaching must be examined. Although they may be enjoying moderate success, they tend to have little confidence as teachers because their discipline has not lent them any assistance in pedagogy, in new research in the field, or in organization of the content. We can easily accommodate their wishes by administering our 35-item survey of good teaching descriptors, describing and discussing our observations of their class, and giving them a videotape of the class for their own perusal. Presumably, they then work on improving their teaching on their own. We comply with their resistance to a full consultation, even though we realize that this method is not ideal. We expect to be asked for a follow-up consultation, perhaps a year later, when the faculty member has come to realize that teaching can be analyzed objectively and that a consultation can generate incremental steps toward positive change.

6. Faculty who are mystified about teaching—and we encounter them frequently—begin with a relatively blank slate. As a result, a consultation can be quite fruitful. Yet because mystified faculty have such limited conscious awareness of their own teaching behavior, let alone the craft of teaching, the consultant may have to work carefully to construct a framework for viewing teaching as an objective and somewhat measurable act. For these faculty, establishing a research base in teaching and learning is important.

7. Faculty who come to us during a turbulent transition period in their personal lives may be in the midst of raising a new family, undergoing a divorce, recovering from the death of a loved one, enduring chronic illness, or experiencing unresolvable departmental conflicts. What they share is the knowledge
that this turbulence is infringing on their academic and professional lives. To assist them means being a good listener and then helping them to focus on teaching as well as time management.

8. Some chronologically older but vital professors approaching retirement come to us feeling out of step with “new” developments in teaching, although they retain an interest in good teaching as a process. It is always a joy to encounter faculty with a quarter century or more of teaching experience who are determined to stay current with pedagogical innovation.

9. Professors who are unwilling to solicit advice from their colleagues for fear of future retaliation come to us in hopes of improving their teaching through a discreet collaboration away from departmental constraints and politics. Having made the initial commitment to seek outside help, they frequently establish excellent collaborative relationships with our faculty associates.

10. Faculty who request long-term help, rather than a one-time-only intervention, recognize the virtually unlimited potential of the consultative process. These faculty are kindred spirits in that they value teaching as highly as we do. Frequently, they are assistant professors who would like to be mentored over at least a year in good teaching practice, often with a new eye toward developing student engagement.

11. Faculty who seek assistance with a very specific teaching problem are usually undertaking a new assignment—for example, teaching a very large course—for the first time. Such professors may be remarkably skilled in, say, graduate seminars, but not in undergraduate, first-semester, or first-year survey courses. With a returning emphasis at CU on the first-year student, many faculty members are especially interested in “refreshing” their teaching by assimilating research on cognitive development in learning.

12. Faculty who come to the service laden with some evidence of poor performance are often tenaciously prepared to blame someone for their failure. Some blame their students entirely, others blame themselves. Such professors do not view teaching and learning as reciprocal. In this instance, the consultant may want to suggest some readings and arrange an opportunity for the client to observe others' teaching.

In responding to these immensely varied motives and expectations, Faculty Associates must be prepared to call upon an equally varied repertoire of assistance strategies and tactics, strengthened by the same interpersonal abilities that have made their own teaching exemplary. Above all, they need to be tactful, discreet, and sympathetic listeners. In addition, they have to be skilled in the subtle art of suggestion, so that each idea for teaching improvement emanates from a collaborative exchange of ideas, not solely from the Faculty Associate. They must attend to the faculty client's stated expectations but be ready to welcome other insights that emerge from collaboration.

Teaching consultants need to “see” the professor, in just the same way that a good teacher “sees” a student—that is, as a whole person, rather than just as a teacher in a particular course or as an expert, say, in cell biology. Every teacher is a person with a range of concerns, predicaments, life issues, strongly held worldviews, and sentiments. This fact helps explain why Faculty Associates and faculty clients from vastly different disciplines have successfully collaborated, despite different ways of teaching, disciplinary epistemologies, and learning strategies.

By way of example, one of the Program’s Associates, a professor of Environmental, Population, and Organismic Biology, provided meaningful consultation for a dance professor. The collaboration was successful not only because each was open to something new but also because each was profoundly human, dedicated to the craft of being a professor, and aware and respectful of different ways of
knowing. In another pairing, a faculty client was panicked by the thought of watching herself on video, so the Faculty Consultant compassionately shared her own video. In a third case, a department chair teaching a sophomore-level science course had been unable to express exactly what was wrong with the course from his perspective. After a viewing of the taped class (without interruption from the consultant, who was unable to find points for engaging the faculty member in a discussion of pedagogy or praxis), the professor turned off the tape and said, “I know exactly what I am doing wrong. I am teaching at way too high a cognitive level without telling the students how I got there. Now I know what to do.” That insight, facilitated simply by the artifacts of the consultative process and not by collaboration per se, made him a different teacher. In a less happy case, a junior faculty member arrived at his fourth-year evaluation newly married, beginning a family, and adopting his spouse’s family too. He appeared passive, dispirited, and disconnected—what we would call a resistant and closed faculty client. At the end of a difficult effort on our part, he asked (twice, in different ways) “Do you think I’m a good enough teacher to be promoted?” These were the most powerful questions he asked; he asked no questions about becoming a more satisfied or satisfying teacher.

Today, we intentionally develop links between our consultation service process, on the one hand, and our Symposia, Workshops, and Forums on Teaching and Learning and on Learning Technologies, on the other. All of our offerings are reflective in nature. We offer twenty-five workshops during an academic year, including Promoting Discussion in Introductory Courses in the Sciences, Evaluating Student Learning in the Humanities, Active Engagement in the Large Lecture Course, and Provoking Critical Thought in Classrooms in the Social Sciences. Our most popular workshop is Teaching in a Nutshell, which focuses on body language and vocal tone. It concentrates on three principles for enhancing presentation skills and provides each participant with a seven-item checklist of tools for using these principles. We find that this workshop whets faculty appetites for videotape consultations. Taken together, our workshops offer faculty formal ways of observing students’ behavior as they learn. Our consultation process then helps faculty not only to analyze this behavior for clues to improve teaching but also to identify appropriate and agreed-upon dimensions for change.

Benefits of reflection

As our faculty portraits have made clear, reflecting on one’s work in the classroom is not an easy task. As a tool for change in cognition, it can actually be threatening. Far from being easy to volunteer for, it is often avoided, if only because practitioners’ egos are at the heart of the experience, which involves cobbling together a variety of skills, experiences, and knowledge. When faculty do not want to change, when they contend that they know perfectly well how to teach their subject matter despite student feedback to the contrary, or when they believe that their teaching practice is not a process to be regularly examined and monitored, they call to mind the students described in John Holt’s seminal work How Children Fail (1964). Holt describes scenes of instruction where students fail largely because they imagine that there is nothing they can do to improve their work. Out of pure anxiety, they will not re-read essays or exams before turning them in to be graded; they simply want their assignments to be out of their hands, as if the die has already been cast. Commonly, they take evaluations of their work to be evaluations of themselves, and they imagine that change is impossible. But research suggests otherwise, not only for students, but for their teachers as well.

In working with faculty, FTEP points to research by Schon (1983) and by McAlpine and Weston (2001) recommending reflection as a means to change professional practice. We cite Schon’s differentiation between two types of reflection: reflection in action, by which he means “an opportunity to gather evidence and take action immediately,” and reflection on action, by which he means looking back to a course and thinking about what has been learned and what needs to change the next time it is taught (Schon 1983). In FTEP, we employ both forms of reflection and ask our faculty clients to think along
with us in each mode. In addition, we adopt McAlpine and Weston’s “generic orientation in which any reflection is good because teachers can then be more intentional and deliberate in their thinking about teaching” (McAlpine & Weston, 2000, p. 363). Our consultations are emblematic of McAlpine and Weston’s observation that “reflection serves as a mechanism for turning experience into knowledge about teaching. Ongoing use of the process of reflection is essential for building knowledge, and increasing knowledge increases one’s ability to use reflection effectively and to develop as a teacher” (p. 364).

McAlpine and Weston, as well as Schön, suggest that faculty become better teachers when they develop habits such as: “repeated reflection, feedback, working with master teachers on student learning, reading current pedagogical research in the discipline to adopt other practices” (McAlpine, Weston, Beauchamp, Wiseman & Beauchamp, 1999). FTEP attempts to foster these habits by asking the following questions during our consultations:

- What have you learned (from the videotape, for example, or from the survey administered to your students)?
- What is your process for designing a course, or for presenting a particular topic, or for addressing a specific difficulty that students are experiencing?
- What insights have you drawn about these processes or about your teaching in general?
- What are the implications of these insights for your future practice as a teacher?
- What new questions do you have?

Questions like these help to make tacit knowledge explicit (Shulman, 1987), so that it can be examined, evaluated, and reflected upon.

Reflection, then, is at the heart of everything we do in FTEP. It characterizes our productivity on behalf of faculty, as well as their consequent productivity on behalf of their students. It is our hallmark, our key for promoting change, as faculty construct new knowledge for their students and achieve new insights into their own pedagogy and praxis.

**Appendix A**

The Three Stages of a Consultation: Observation, Survey, and Videotape

Once a Faculty Associate has contacted a faculty member, the next step in the consultative process is a classroom observation. The observation and subsequent discussion give faculty an extra set of eyes from a disinterested yet experienced visitor who can hold the mirror up to them as teachers. The discussion with the observer provides faculty with an opportunity to discuss subjects that are usually not mentioned within the department, like the theory and praxis of teaching.

We also suggest that faculty have our 35-item Survey of Good Teaching Characteristics administered to the class being observed. Based on earlier lists of teaching behaviors developed at Berkeley, this survey asks students to rate performance on a five-point Likert scale over a wide range of observable behaviors. Examples of descriptors include “Is accessible to students outside of class” and “Uses a range of gestures and movement.” The survey is administered by the Associate in the last ten minutes of class time with students recording their responses on computer answer sheets. These sheets are coded by the university’s Testing and Assessment Center and
returned to FTEP. The Associate reviews the results of the survey with the faculty member, concentrating on items that were rated relatively high and low as well as those that show a greater than average standard deviation. After the discussion, the faculty member retains a copy of the results. Videotaping is the consultative intervention that arouses the most anxiety among faculty. Every year at least a couple of faculty specify that they do not want to be videotaped. After all, video is an unforgiving medium. However, the curiosity to see oneself on the screen is generally strong in the video age and most faculty appear to benefit from the experience. Many faculty have already undergone a three-minute videotaping and critique as part of our popular *Teaching in a Nutshell* workshop, which is presented by one of our theatre professors. Others have been taped here or at other institutions in the past and have become critical viewers of their own performance.

Used sympathetically, video is a powerful impetus for self-reflection and self-improvement. Harold Nicholson has said “We are inclined to judge ourselves by our ideals, others by their acts.” Video allows the performer to view his or her work impersonally, as others do, judging by acts rather than ideals. Once the ideal view and the actual view are disentangled, progress can be made toward improvement. Faculty are given the only copy of the videotape to take home with them.

**Tools**

1. Consultation Service Brochure
2. 35-Item Survey

**Appendix B**

**Instructions for Survey of Teaching Behaviors**

Below is a list of statements about teaching. We would like your help in determining how well each statement describes the teaching you have received from your professor in this course (please exclude your recitation section). This survey is intended to help identify good teaching skills but will not be used to evaluate your professor. We wish your responses to be anonymous, so do not write in your name or ID number on the answer sheet. All that we need are your responses to the statements, written in #2 pencil on the answer sheet. Please use an A to E scale, where A indicates that you think the statement is very descriptive of your professor’s teaching, C is somewhat descriptive, and E is not at all descriptive. For example if you think that the statement (#11) “Summarizes major points” is less than “somewhat descriptive,” but not quite “not at all descriptive” of your instructor, you would fill in the circle under D for response #11 on the answer sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very descriptive</th>
<th>somewhat descriptive</th>
<th>not at all descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please leave blank any items that you are unsure of. When you are finished, please pass both the list of statements and your responses to the aisle, and we will collect them. Thanks for your help.

**List of Descriptors**

1. Stresses general concepts and ideas.
2. Uses effective examples and illustrations.
3. Applies examples and specific instances to larger ideas.
4. Discusses recent developments in the field.
5. Knows if the class is understanding him/her or not.
6. Discusses points of view other than his or her own.
7. Gives references for more interesting and involved points.
8. Is well prepared.
9. States objectives for each class section.
11. Summarizes major points.
12. Identifies what she or he considers important.
15. Uses a variety of instructional media (for example: films, overhead.)
17. Encourages class discussion.
18. Asks questions of students.
19. Encourages expression of opinions other than his/her own.
20. Has students apply concepts to demonstrate understanding.
21. Gives assignments that encourage synthesis of course material.
22. Provides personal help to students.
23. Has genuine interest in students.
24. Relates to students as individuals.
25. Is accessible to students outside of class.
26. Uses communication technology effectively (e.g., email) in order to facilitate accessing the professor of the course and classmates.
27. Has an interesting style of presentation.
28. Is enthusiastic about the subject.
29. Speaks clearly.
30. Uses nonverbal communication effectively (e.g., eye contact, facial expressions, gestures, movements.)
31. Uses speaking voice expressively.
32. Has interest in and concern for the quality of teaching.
33. Motivates students to do their best work.
34. Has a sense of humor.
35. Handles awkward situations effectively.


**Appendix C**

**Guidelines to a Faculty Associate for Conducting a Consultation**

1. Before meeting the client:
   - Prepare a preliminary plan of action.
   - Consider issues that might arise given the discipline, class size, etc.
2. At the first meeting:
   • Get the client to say why your help has been requested.
   • Assure the client that you are not a threat; avoid being seen as an authority figure.
   • Listen as much as possible without interfering.
   • Get the client to disclose areas of concern or nervousness; try to judge the depth of any anxiety.
   • Explain that to understand the situation more fully, you will have to collect data through observation, surveys, etc.
   • Ask to see documents from a current course being taught: syllabus, text, homework, assignments, tests.
   • Ask the instructor to elucidate his/her objectives in teaching the course.

3. First observation of a class:
   • Attend the class from the point of view of a student
   • Take thorough notes during class, both of content and of instructor behavior.
   • Keep in mind the four categories of teaching characteristics:
     1. Knowledge of subject material
     2. Rapport
     3. Enthusiasm
     4. Clarity and organization—and how they apply to the teacher and the class.

4. Meeting the client after observation:
   • Try to say something positive about the client’s teaching.
   • Be an active listener, thus increasing empathy and trust.
   • Be very slow to make recommendations. Try to get the client to suggest his/her own ways of improvement.
   • Concentrate on just one issue or one possible area to improve per meeting.

5. Approaches to doing a videotape consultation:
   • Give the client a remote control device so he/she can stop the tape whenever something troubling occurs.
   • Get the client to suggest his/her own agendas for improvement.

List compiled with the help of articles in Lewis & Povlacs (1988).

Appendix D

Classroom Learning Interview Process (CLIP)

Upon request, a FTEP Faculty Associate will meet with students in a particular class to gather information about their learning experiences. Class interviews can be conducted anytime during the semester when the faculty member still has time to respond to student feedback by making adjustments. CLIP is useful for all faculty, whether new or experienced, who wish to view their students’ learning process through a different lens. In the College of Arts and Sciences, the Dean has approved the CLIP Report as a multiple measure of teaching for a faculty member’s teaching portfolio.

CLIP usually takes about 45 minutes of class time. Although results are confidential, faculty may use them not only for critical self-reflection but also as one of the measures of teaching requested by their
departments.
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