

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

The Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching recognizes consistently superior teaching at the graduate, undergraduate, or professional level in keeping with the State University's commitment to providing its students with instruction of the highest quality. Prior to serving on the committee, each member should review the most recent version of the *SUNY Policies and Procedures, Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Faculty Service, Librarianship, Professional Service, Scholarship and Creative Activities and Teaching* provided by SUNY System each year at <http://system.suny.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-staff-awards/chancellors-excellence-awards/>.

CORTLAND COMMITTEE COMPOSITION *(modified from J. Ouellette, Senate Chair, 2017 - 2018)*

In accordance with SUNY Policies and Procedures for the CAET, the committee will include full-time faculty, a representative of the President's Office (ex-officio), the Faculty Senate Chair (or designee), and one representative from the Student Government Association (student member). The senate chair (or designee) will work with the President's Office to fill CAET committee vacancies.

The School of Arts & Sciences will have one to two faculty representatives on the committee. Both the School of Education and the School of Professional Studies will each have one representative.

Every effort will be made to include faculty who have been awarded the CAET, who have been at SUNY Cortland for at least 5 years, and who are tenured. In instances in which full faculty membership can't be completed with these criteria, it is suggested that a step process be used as suggested below:

1. Full-time, tenure-track faculty who have received the CAET (preferably tenured) or Distinguished Teaching Professor rank, including Emeriti faculty (if necessary).
2. Full-time, tenure-track faculty who have received the SUNY Cortland, Rozanne M. Brooks Teaching Award (preferably tenured).
3. Full-time, tenure-track faculty who have received the Fine Teaching Development Award.
4. Full-time, tenure-track faculty who have received other regional or nationally recognized teaching awards (preferably tenured).

Faculty terms are three years in length and begin in January. Terms are staggered to facilitate continuity. ***New members should be advised of the requirement to observe nominees.***

Committee lists, terms of service, and committee procedures will be monitored and maintained by the administrative assistant to the Faculty Senate.

CAET Chair

The chair reviews the SUNY Policies and Procedures for the CAET at the start of each year, confirming the maximum number of awards that may be given. When appropriate, the chair will update this document to reflect any revisions to the SUNY Award procedures.

The chair is responsible for calling meetings, reviewing procedures with committee members, assigning duties to committee members, and working in concert with the President's Office to ensure a smooth process for the committee and candidates.

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

The chair is also responsible for preparing letters of recommendation to the President for nominees that the CAET Committee has decided to support. This letter should provide a strong rationale for how the candidate meets the criteria for the award.

The chair is responsible for overseeing the preparation of the summary statement of the SUNY nomination portfolio for each nominee. The statement (not to exceed 5 pages) will be prepared as collaborative effort between the CAET committee and the President's Office.

The CAET differs from the procedures of other CAE Awards in that the process takes place over two academic years in order to complete teaching observations.

Decision Summary for Each Nominee:

DECISION I—Review CVs and nominating letter in December to decide whether to ask nominees for portfolio due in late February.

DECISION II—Prior to spring break, review portfolios and determine whether to move the nominee forward to classroom observations.

DECISION III—At the end of spring semester (April/May) and following first set of observations, decision as to whether continue with observations/review or decide against the nominee continuing.

DECISION IV—At the end of fall semester (December) and following second set of observations, decision as to whether the nominee(s) should be put forth by the college to SUNY System as one of our nominees. *(At this time, 2018 – 2019, SUNY Cortland can send up to three names in this category).*

PROCEDURES FOR CORTLAND CAET COMMITTEE & NOMINEES

1. The Senate Chair, in conjunction with the President's Office, will notify the campus of the CAET nominations deadline as soon as the information is received from SUNY System. The notification will include candidate eligibility and nomination letter requirements.
2. At the start of the fall semester, the chair of the CAET will contact or schedule a meeting of the committee to schedule/confirm remaining observations for the previous year's (year 1) nominees.
3. As nominations are received (October), the eligibility of each new nominee will be confirmed (see checklist, Appendix A) by the President's Office. Once eligibility has been determined, year 1 nominees will be notified of their nomination by the President's Office and asked to submit their CVs to the President's Office to continue in the process (November).
4. At the end of the semester (December), the chair of the CAET will hold a meeting of the committee (including new members) to:

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

- a. Finalize decisions on previous year's (year 2) nominees based on Decision Checklist in Appendix D, final portfolio, and internal/external letters of recommendation (see Observation and Decision-Making Processes below).
 - b. Prepare a 4 – 5 page summary for the President's Office for each selected nominee detailing how each nominee meets/exceeds criteria for the award.
 - c. Work with the President's Office to prepare the SUNY nomination portfolio in accordance with SUNY guidelines (Appendix C). The portfolio should contain substantive evidence (not testimonials) in support of each selection criteria (*SUNY Policies & Procedures*).
 - d. Submit all written observations and any other materials used in the selection process to the President's Office.
 - e. Select a new chair from among committee members. Preference should be given to those with at least a year's experience on the committee.
5. New (year 1) nominees will submit their professional portfolios to the President's Office by the start of the spring semester. Portfolios should be organized according to the criteria in the *SUNY Policies and Procedures*, highlighting service activities. Portfolios may be submitted electronically or on paper. Three to five letters of recommendation, speaking to the quality and impact of teaching, are also required. Portfolio requirements may be found in Appendix B.
6. The chair will schedule a meeting prior to spring break to:
- a. Review the criteria (Appendix D), timeline (Appendix E) and process for the award selection, including expectations for confidentiality, with committee members.
 - b. Review portfolios and nomination letters of new (year 1) nominees to determine who will move forward to classroom observations. This determination should be based on the Decision Checklist in Appendix D, with the exception on the criteria based on observations, and supporting evidence in the nominee's portfolio.
 - c. Assign observations of new (year 1) nominees for the spring semester.
7. At the end of the spring semester, the chair will hold a meeting to determine if the year 1 nominees who have been observed should continue in the process (see Appendix F) and to schedule fall observations, if possible.
- a. Notifications should go out to continuing nominees as well as those who will not be continuing. These notifications should include helpful information so the nominees can improve their portfolios in the event they are re-nominated at a future date (see sample, Appendix H).
 - b. Continuing nominees should be reminded that their portfolios may be updated until November 1.
8. Following notification by SUNY System of award selections (April/May), the President's Office will contact the nominees to inform them of SUNY's decision.

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

OBSERVATION PROCESS

A minimum of three observations will be conducted by each committee member for each nominee over the course of two semesters. In some cases where a scheduling conflict exists, a committee member may need to conduct all three observations in the same semester.

1. Committee members will complete observations in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix G. Use of an observation instrument is strongly recommended to provide consistency in observations.
2. Committee members should make an effort to observe on different days, if at all possible.
3. The observer has the right to inform the nominee that they are coming to observe or ask for a preferred date, BUT that is NOT required. Some observers like to do a combination of one scheduled observation and one drop-in. The choice is left to the individual CAET member.
4. Committee members who are unable to complete any observations in one or both terms should resign from the committee.

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Final decisions regarding nominees will be based on teaching observations and a thorough review of the nominee's professional portfolio using the checklist in Appendix D. Committee members should share their insights about teaching excellence in their disciplines with other committee members to provide context for discussion and deliberation.

1. Committee members must recuse themselves from deliberation on any nominee that is a family member (220.11 PUBLIC OFFICERS LAW, CONFLICT OF INTEREST).
2. Committee members must recuse themselves from deliberation on any nominee for whom they have provided a letter of support. In general, committee members should refrain from providing a letter of support for a nominee in the interest of fairness and objectivity.
3. Committee members must recuse themselves from deliberation on any nominee whom they have nominated. In general, committee members should refrain from nominating colleagues due to perceptions of favoritism.
4. Each committee member will individually determine if the nominees meet all the criteria and should be supported for the award. Individuals nominated for these awards must meet all prescribed eligibility criteria and must fulfill – and preferably surpass – the selection criteria for the award (SUNY Policies & Procedures). *It is imperative that all deliberations of the campus committee remain strictly confidential.*
 - a. Nominees who do not meet all the criteria will not receive further consideration.
 - b. The committee will discuss the nominees who have met, and preferably surpass, all the criteria for the award.
 - c. Nominees who meet/surpass all the criteria may be recommended for the award as long as the number of recommended nominees does not exceed the number of allowable awards.
 - d. When the number of nominees who meet all the criteria exceeds the number of awards that may be given, each committee member will rank order the nominees, keeping in mind that the “primary criterion is skill in teaching.” The top nominees, based on rank order, will be selected.
 - e. A SUNY nomination portfolio (see Appendix B) will be prepared for submission to System Administration for selected nominees. Successful candidates who have electronic portfolios

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

- may be asked to provide certain sections of the portfolio as hard copies for the SUNY review process.
- f. When a nominee that meets all the criteria, but is not selected as the top candidate, the committee chair may offer the opportunity to defer until the following year (see sample Appendix D). If the nominee chooses to defer, s/he does not need to be re-nominated. The nominee will be entered in the next application cycle with a new pool of candidates. Deferred nominees may update their portfolios prior to the next review cycle.

Samples of correspondence may be found in Appendix H.

Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

APPENDIX A

CAET Eligibility Checklist

Candidate Name _____

Eligibility Criteria	Yes	No
Nominee is tenured, tenure-track or full-time non-tenure track for the academic year the award is to be given.		
Nominee regularly carries a full-time teaching load as defined by the campus for full-time teaching. Teaching requirements must constitute more than 50% of the position’s responsibilities. Department chairs are eligible as long as they are carrying a campus-defined full-time teaching load (<i>see SUNY Policies & Procedures</i>).		
Nominee holds full-time academic rank (e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, assistant instructor, full-time lecturer or clinical professor).		
Nominee has completed at least three academic years of full-time teaching at the nominating campus out of a minimum of five years at that campus.		
Nominee is scheduled for a sabbatical during the period of the selection process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If so, the nominee is INELIGIBLE and should be given the opportunity to defer the nomination until the sabbatical is complete.</i> 		

An individual is not eligible if:

- Individuals holding any Distinguished Faculty Rank
- Recipients of an Excellence Award may not be nominated for an Excellence Award in another category within a five-year interval
- Recipients of an Excellence Award may not be re-nominated for an award in the same category
- Individuals holding academic appointments preceded by the designation “visiting” may not be nominated
- The chief campus officer for academic, student, or administrative affairs, or persons serving in these capacities, may not be nominated for an Excellence Award. Other exclusions include the following (but not limited to) as well as other comparable titles: Direct reports to the President or Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and above, Vice Presidents and above, Vice Provosts and above, Senior Counsels and above
- Individuals should not be nominated in the same season for promotion to Distinguished Faculty rank and an Excellence Award
- Posthumous nominations are ineligible.

APPENDIX B

Professional Portfolio Requirements for Nominees *(from TAC Binder)*

The portfolio must contain:

- An up-to-date vita, including degrees, honors, experience, teaching interests and courses taught, scholarly activity, college service, etc.
- A list of all courses taught in the last five years.
- CTEs from a range of courses taught during the past five years. These must CTEs from courses over a range of time and difficulty level.
- A list of grade distributions for all courses for which CTEs are submitted.
- A statement of the nominee's teaching philosophy.
- A statement of the nominee's grading philosophy.
- A statement explaining in some detail how the nominee teaches, including any specific teaching techniques used.
- All material is to be included in a loose leaf notebook with each section clearly identified. The CAET may solicit additional information as its review continues.
- A minimum of 3 – 5 letters attesting to the effectiveness of the nominee's teaching (a combination from colleagues and students)

Additional guidelines for the award may be found at:

<http://system.suny.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-staff-awards/chancellors-excellence-awards/>

PORTFOLIOS MAY BE UPDATED BY THE NOMINEE THROUGHOUT THE PROCESS

APPENDIX C

SUNY NOMINATION PORTFOLIO (*excerpted from SUNY Policies and Procedures for the CAET*)

The campus selection committee, in conjunction with the President's Office, is responsible for preparing the nomination portfolio submitted to System Administration. For each nominee, the campus must submit one original hard copy (additional copies aren't necessary). It must be collated in the order presented below and must include the following:

Checklist Cover Sheet – This form must be the first sheet of the nominee's portfolio. It is used to ensure compliance with program policies and procedures and for administrative purposes. The form is appended to these guidelines. The Checklist contains the certifications regarding the candidate's eligibility and campus compliance with the program policies and procedures. The campus President must sign the Checklist. Nominations received without this endorsement will be disqualified.

Transmittal Letter – A brief transmittal letter addressing how the candidate meets the selection criteria is required from the campus President. This letter should reflect the campus's rationale for making the nomination and speak succinctly to the candidate's merit. The letter should be addressed to the State University Provost, State University of New York, System Administration, State University Plaza, 353 Broadway, Albany, New York 12246-2915. A separate letter is to accompany each nomination.

Nomination Procedures – A brief explanation is required that describes the mechanism by which nominations were solicited, what evidence was examined by the local selection committee in the evaluation of nominees, and how the local committee arrived at its selection.

Summary Presentation – The Summary Presentation provides the rationale for the campus's nomination of a particular candidate and sets forth candidate merit for selection. It should reflect the committee's objectivity and impartiality in coming to its decision in what is generally a highly competitive campus process. ***It is limited to five pages, excluding the cover page.***

The Summary Presentation is the primary documentation available to those involved in the System-level review to explain the campus' rationale for nominating the candidate for this honor. It must address how the candidate excels in each criterion for selection for the award to which the candidate is nominated (e.g., if there are three selection criteria, then candidate's performance in each must be described) as well as the candidate's most outstanding qualifications and major achievements. The quality of the evidence provided is critical to recommendation. Although excerpts from the recommendations can and should be included, the Summary Presentation must be more than a testimonial. There must be specific, concrete examples of how the nominee fulfills each criterion.

Summary Presentations should not be written by the nominee (or in first person) because this undermines the impartiality and objectivity required of the nomination process. The Summary Presentation is limited to a maximum of five pages, excluding the cover sheet.

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

Current Curriculum Vita (CV) – An up-to-date and moderately detailed CV containing information on the nominee's career must be included in the nomination portfolio. Specific data must include the date of appointment to the SUNY system, highest rank attained and date of appointment to that rank. It should also include areas of specialization, research activities, professional and scholarly publications, honors, and campus and State University service.

Note: None of the nominating documentation will be returned to the campus. We aren't able to accept electronic nomination submissions via e-mail at this time.

SUBMISSION

Check the SUNY Policies and Procedures for the CAET for deadlines and submission details.

APPENDIX D

CAET Decision Checklist

Candidate Name _____

Selection Criteria (*adapted from SUNY Policies & Procedures*)

The primary criterion is skill in teaching. Additionally, consideration is given to sound scholarship (usually demonstrated through publications or artistic/creative productions), outstanding service to students, as well as service to the State University and to the campus. The following criteria are to be used in selecting nominees for this award (<http://system.suny.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-staff-awards/chancellors-excellence-awards/>):

Criteria	Indicators	Yes	No
Teaching Techniques & Representative Materials	The observations and portfolio provide evidence that the nominee performs superbly in the classroom.		
	The observations and/or portfolio provide evidence that the nominee maintains a flexible instructional policy that adapts readily to student needs, interests and problems.		
	The observations and portfolio provide evidence that the nominee demonstrates mastery of teaching techniques. (<i>Consideration is to be given to the number of substantially different courses taught, the number of students per course, and the different teaching techniques employed in the various courses</i>).		
Student Evaluations	Student evaluations (in the form of student CTEs) administered and compiled by persons other than the nominee, are presented for several different courses over a period of several recent years and provide clear evidence of the nominee's positive impact on students. The CTE's for each course include the typed comments submitted by the students.		
Scholarship & Professional Growth	The observations and portfolio provide evidence that the nominee is a teacher/scholar who keeps current in their own field and who uses the relevant contemporary data from that field and related disciplines in their teaching. <i>Evidence in this area includes, but is not limited to, publications, grants, presentations at conferences, artistic/creative productions, etc.</i>		
Student Services	The observations and portfolio provide evidence that in relating to students, the nominee is generous with personal time, easily accessible, and demonstrates a continual concern for the intellectual growth of individual students. <i>The focus here is the accessibility of the nominee to students outside of class (e.g., office hours, conferences, special meetings, and the nominee's responsibility in terms of student advisement).</i>		

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

Criteria	Indicators	Yes	No
Academic Standards & Requirements, and Evaluation of Student Performance	The observations and portfolio provide evidence that the nominee sets high standards for students and helps them attain academic excellence. Quantity and quality of work that is more than average for the subject must be required of the students.		
	The observations and portfolio provide evidence that the nominee works actively with individual students to help them improve their scholarly or artistic performance. <i>This individual interaction is an important source of information that indicates the nature and level of instruction offered by the nominee. Consideration is to be given to the quality, quantity, and difficulty of the tasks or work assigned to students.</i>		
	The nominee's evaluations of students' work must be strongly supported by evidence. Nominees must be willing to give greater weight to each student's final level of competence than to the performance at the beginning of the course. *		
Decision	<i>The nominee meets, and preferably surpasses, all criteria for the award.</i>		

**Since expert teachers enable students to achieve high levels of scholarship/creative activity, it is possible that the candidates' marking records may be somewhat above average. But there must also be evidence that candidates do not hesitate to give low evaluations to students who do poorly. For this category, consideration should be given to grading patterns, particularly grade distributions for all courses in at least the last five years. Evidence in support of student performance may also be assessed by the accomplishments of students, including placement and achievement levels.*

APPENDIX E

General Timeline for CAET

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR THE CHANCELLOR'S AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING GO OUT IN AUGUST/SEPTEMBER (as soon as the information is available)

October— The President's Office (ex-officio member), receives nominating letters and CVs.

December—Review CVs and cover letters received for nominees. Decide as a committee whether or not to invite them to submit their portfolios for review, due in February. Request syllabi for spring semester classes.

February—portfolios and letters of support due to the President's Office from nominees.

March—before Spring Break review portfolios and decide whether to proceed with observations. Inform candidates and receive syllabi and teaching schedule (including block-out dates) from nominees to start planning observations.

March, April—observe nominee(s) at least two times each. Refer to the Teaching Evaluation Guidelines to select an observation instrument (Appendix F) for use in the observation process. The CAET committee members should make an effort to observe on different days, if at all possible. The observer has the right to inform the nominee that they are coming to observe or ask for a preferred date, BUT that is NOT required. Some observers like to do a combination of one scheduled observation and one drop-in. The choice is left to the individual CAET member.

May—meet with CAET committee members to review observations and decide as to whether or not nominee to continue to move forward in the process to be observed in the fall semester. Bring completed observation instruments to the meeting to provide evidence for discussion. Request nominee's syllabi for fall classes.

August—receive syllabi and teaching schedules (including block-out dates) from nominees to start planning observations.

September, October, November—observe nominees at least 2 times each, probably not exceeding 5 total observations.

November 1 – final opportunity for nominees to update portfolios

December—meet early in the month to review observations of the CAET committee members. Each committee member should bring their completed observation instruments to the meeting to provide evidence for discussion. Following discussion, the committee must make a decision regarding the nominees - does the committee want to support _____ this nominee to be put forward to SUNY system for approval?

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

Once final decisions have been made, the chair of the CAET Committee contacts the ex-officio member from the President's Office to inform him/her of the choice(s). Any notes or write-ups of the nominees should be collected and provided to the President's Office at this time. Once a nominee has been selected, the nomination summary writing process begins. In addition, the chair or other CAET committee member should be charged with writing a draft of the 5 page summary document of the nomination, which is then sent to the President's Office.

April/May – SUNY notification to campus

Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

APPENDIX F

Checklist for CAET Committee Meeting

Nominee _____ Date _____

Purpose: Check on observations to make a determination if the CAET committee should continue with the nominee.

Committee Member	Representing	1st portfolio review? (y/n)	# Observations Made in Spring	Continue with Candidate? (y/n)	# observations in the fall	2nd portfolio review? (y/n)

APPENDIX G

Teaching Evaluation Guidelines for Teaching Awards and DTP Rank Promotion March, 2018

Developed by J. Ouellette, Chair of Faculty Senate

Purpose of Classroom Observations

Classroom teaching observations provide reviewers with a first-hand teaching-related documentation separate from the portfolio provided by the nominee. The instruments in this appendix are provided to guide the observer, enhance reflection on teaching excellence, and provide structure and consistency across observations. Observers may use any instrument within the appendix or their own but the same tool should be used for every observation.

It is important to remember that observations for teaching awards and rank awards (DTP) are summative not formative (that is, they are used for award/personnel decisions).

Requirements

Each member is required to make a total of 3 observations over two different terms and preferably different courses. In some cases where a scheduling conflict exists, a committee member may need to make all three observations in one semester.

Record keeping

Regardless of the observation format used, observers should always provide the following with each observation report: 1. Instructor name 2. Course number and title 3. Approximate number of students in the classroom 4. Day and date of the observation 5. Start and stop time of the observation (this need only be approximate) 6. Observations should be written or typed 7. Original or copies of the observation must be provided to the chair of the committee for record keeping (see below).

Confidentiality

All nomination materials including observations are strictly confidential; similarly all committee communications, whether in writing or oral, are also confidential -- as is the final decision of the CAET and reviews above that level.

Copies of each observation will be kept in a confidential binder by the CAET chair and will be sent to the President's office if the nomination is forwarded to the President. Otherwise all copies of observations will be destroyed.

All observers should be mindful of their behavior when visiting an individual's classroom. Practices adapted from Kachur et. al., 2013 can be viewed in from Appendix B:
<http://teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching-support/peerobservation-of-teaching/>)

Faculty Teaching Observation Topics and Questions for Focus and Observation

(from TAC Binder/2009)

- **Lesson Preparation and Accessibility.** Does the lesson demonstrate clear preparation in materials? Is the structure and process of the day's lesson clear to students? Are students able to access the content/materials/information from the class before, during, or after the class meeting? Is it clear where they can go for additional learning/help, either in the syllabus or during the presentation?
- **Content and Structure of Lessons.** Is the structure of the lesson clear to the student at the beginning of the class? Does the structure of the lesson make sense? Is there a structural progression that gives students time to absorb and process the content (e.g. lecture, question, discussion)?
- **Content Relevance and Clarity.** Is information clearly presented? Are new or complicated concepts illustrated, connected to prior learning, and scaffolded, so students can apply prior knowledge and anticipate future information about the learning cycle? Is material given in a context for its relevance to future learning?
- **Engagement.** How does the instructor demonstrate his/her ability to keep students focused and engaged? What are the elements of the day's work that illustrate this, and how do students demonstrate their engagement?
- **Questioning and Interaction with Student Learning.** Are questions posed to the students throughout the lesson to check for student understanding, and give students a chance to think and express deeper processing? Are students encouraged to ask/answer questions (not just "Any questions?" wait two seconds and proceed)? Do students interact with each other, either through short discussion, problem-solving, and/or presentation of questions?
- **Use of Visuals, PowerPoint, and Other Media.** Is there appropriate illustration of concepts using available technology? Is the technology smoothly integrated as a meaningful part of the day's work? Do students attend to and appear to process using the media?
- **Personality and Disposition: Enthusiasm.** Are there clear verbal and non-verbal messages that indicate this professor is invested, interested, and enthusiastic about this lesson, about the students, and about their relationship in the classroom? Does this professor demonstrate the ideals of the profession of teaching – impeccable preparation, care for student achievement, acceptance of diverse views, and irrefutable connection to his/her subject matter and its induction into the knowledge base of the students' future professional lives?

What to Observe?

Adapted from: <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/peer-review-of-teaching/>

Content knowledge

- Selection of class content worth knowing and appropriate to the course
- Provided appropriate context and background
- Mastery of class content
- Citation of relevant scholarship
- Presented divergent viewpoints

Clear and effective class organization

- Clear statement of learning goals
- Relationship of lesson to course goals, and past and future lessons
- Logical sequence
- Appropriate pace for student understanding
- Summary

Varied methods for engagement, which may include...

- In-class writing – Analysis of quotes, video, artifacts
- Group discussions
- Student-led discussions
- Debates
- Case studies
- Concept maps
- Role plays
- Poster sessions
- Think aloud problem solving
- Jigsaws
- Field trips
- Learning logs, journals

Presentation

- Projects voice
- Varied intonation
- Clarity of explanation
- Eye contact
- Listened effectively
- Defined difficult terms, concepts, principles
- Use of examples
- Varied explanations for difficult material

Student engagement

- Student interest
- Enthusiasm
- Participation

Teacher-Student Interactions

- Effective questioning
- Warm and welcoming rapport
- Use of student names
- Encouraging of questions & discussion
- Engaged student attention
- Answered students effectively
- Responsive to student communications
- Pacing appropriate for student level, activity
- Restating questions, comments
- Suggestion of further questions, resources
- Concern for individual student needs
- Emotional awareness of student interests, needs

Appropriateness of instructional materials

- Content that matches course goals
- Content that is rigorous, challenging
- Content that is appropriate to student experience, knowledge
- Adequate preparation required
- Handouts and other materials are thorough and facilitated learning
- Audio/visual materials effective
- Written assignments

Observation Sample Templates

(Adapted by J. Ouellette from the Univ. of Toronto 2017 can be found at:
<http://teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching-support/peer-observation-of-teaching/>)

The Narrative Log

Below we have included a sample narrative log that allows the observer to record a behavior (both instructor and student), a technique or a reaction occurs, as well as the observer's comments or questions related to what is happening in the classroom.

Example log:

OBSERVATIONS	ACTION/COMMENT
Opening/warm – shared anecdote	A method for establishing rapport with the students.
Review of administrative details	Details provided regarding an upcoming assignment and related tutorial.
Surveyed students to see what they remembered from previous lecture	Students remembered little – what do you attribute this to?
Began lecture by sharing goals for this class	Goals provided direction for the class. How did you feel regarding the amount of time spent setting up the class?

Open-Ended

PROCEDURE: After reviewing the syllabi and lesson/class for that day the observer should comment on specific aspects of the lesson the observed (you may add questions; or just use a blank page).

OBSERVER FEEDBACK

- 1) If known, describe the key goals/outcomes for the lesson.

- 2) Describe the instructor's content mastery, breadth and depth.

- 3) Describe the method(s) of instruction/assessment.

- 4) Describe the clarity and organization of the lesson.

- 5) Describe the form and the extent of student engagement.

- 6) Overall impressions.

Checklist

This form focuses on description regarding agreed upon items for observation based on the pre-observation meeting. Comments may be used by the observer to explain their observation and to provide reflection and additional insight. A sample format for these comments is as follows:

Example scale (one could also use a Likert type scale)

During discussion, the instructor pauses after asking questions. Yes No

POSSIBLE ITEMS FOR CHECKLIST FORMS BY CATEGORY

INSTRUCTOR ORGANIZATION

The instructor states the relation of the class to the previous one.
The instructor knows how to use the educational technology needed for the class.
The instructor posts class goals or objectives on the board or a slide.
The instructor gives specific instructional outcomes for the course.
The instructor provides an outline of the organization of the class.
The instructor conveys the purpose of each class activity.
The instructor summarizes periodically and at the end of class or has the students do so.
The instructor revisits objectives at the end of class.
Students are made aware what preparation (readings or other assignments) they should complete prior to the next class.

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

If used, videos, websites and other resource materials have a clear purpose.
Handouts or digital resources are appropriate in number and subject.
The instructor gives assistance or insight into reading or using assigned texts.

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

The instructor's choice of teaching techniques is appropriate for the goals.
During discussion, the instructor pauses after asking questions.
The instructor acknowledges student contributions to discussion, helping students extend their responses.
The instructor keeps discussion on track or facilitates small group discussion.
The instructor mediates conflict or differences of opinion, and encourages students to do the same.
The instructor demonstrates active learning techniques. The instructor provides explicit directions for active learning tasks.
The instructor allows enough time to complete active learning tasks, such as collaborative work.
The instructor specifies how active learning tasks will be evaluated.
The timing of classroom activities considers attention spans.
The instructor relates class to course goals, students' personal goals, or societal concerns.
The instructor offers "real world" application.
The instructor helps students apply theory to solve problems.

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

The instructor's statements are accurate according to the standards of the field.
The instructor incorporates current research in the field.
The instructor identifies sources, perspectives, and authorities in the field.
The instructor communicates the reasoning process behind operations or concepts.
The instructor corrects bias in assigned materials.

PRESENTATION

The instructor can be seen and heard.
The instructor avoids extended reading from notes or texts.
The instructor varies lecturing with active learning techniques.
The instructor speaks at a pace that allows students to comprehend what is said.
The instructor uses appropriate examples, metaphors and analogies.
The instructor uses humor appropriately.
The instructor is enthusiastic about the subject matter.

RAPPORT WITH AND RESPONSIVENESS TO STUDENTS

The instructor addresses students by name, as possible.
Delivery is paced to students' needs.
The instructor provides feedback at given intervals.
The instructor uses positive reinforcement.
The instructor incorporates student ideas into the class.
The instructor encourages students to build on each other's comments and ideas.
The atmosphere of the classroom is participative.
The instructor is available before or after class.
The instructor pays attention to cues of boredom and confusion.
The instructor provides students opportunity to mention problems/concerns with the class, either verbally or in writing.
The instructor models good listening habits.
The instructor demonstrates flexibility in responding to student concerns or interests.
The instructor is sensitive to individual interests and abilities.

CLARITY

The instructor defines new terms or concepts.
The instructor elaborates or repeats complex information.
The instructor uses a variety of examples to explain content.
The instructor makes explicit statements in order to draw student attention to certain ideas.
The instructor pauses during explanations to allow students to ask questions.

INSTRUCTION IN LABORATORIES, STUDIOS OR FIELD SETTINGS

Experiments/exercises are well chosen and well organized.
Procedures/techniques are clearly explained/ demonstrated.
The instructor is thoroughly familiar with experiments/exercises.
The instructor is thoroughly familiar with equipment/ tools used.
Assistance is always available during experiments/ exercises.
Experiments/exercises are important supplements to the course.
Experiments/exercises develop important skills.
Experiments/exercises are of appropriate length.

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

Experiments/exercises are of appropriate level of difficulty.
Experiments/exercises help to develop confidence in the subject area.
The instructor provides aid with interpretation of data.
The instructor's emphasis on safety is evident.
Criticism of procedures/techniques is constructive.
The instructor works well with student and other parties in the setting.
Clinical or field experiences are realistic.

IMPACT ON LEARNING

The instructor helps develop critical thinking skills and problem-solving ability.
The instructor broadens student views.
The instructor encourages the development of students' analytic ability.
The instructor fosters respect for diverse points of view.
The instructor helps students develop awareness of the process used to gain new knowledge.
The instructor stimulates independent thinking.

CREATING AN INCLUSIVE CLASSROOM

Instructor creates an equitable and inclusive classroom that respects gender differences, diverse ethnocultural and faith communities, family structures, student abilities/needs and differences in socioeconomic status.
Instructor conveys the belief that all students can learn and succeed.
Instructor conveys openness and warmth and encourages students to interact with others the same way.
Instructor provides text, resources and learning materials in the classroom that reflects diversity of culture, ethnicity, faith, and language, and differences in socioeconomic status, physical ability and family structure.
Instructor uses resources that present both local and global images and perspectives.
Instructor uses technology to provide additional visual, oral, aural and/or physical supports for students who need them.
Instructor uses instructional strategies that reflect diverse learning styles.
Instructor uses a variety of assessment tasks so that students with different learning styles can achieve success.
Instructor provides accommodations for students who require extra time or additional explanations.

Items are adapted from Chism (2007) and University of Minnesota Peer Review of Teaching Guide (2009).

Sample Likert scale using some items from the above list is on the following page (scale anchors and format developed by J. Ouellette).

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

Example Likert Scale Using Checklist items (Note: items can be copied and pasted from previous list; rows can be added)

Observed Characteristic	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A Use X	Comments
The instructor posts class goals or objectives on the board or a slide.	1	2	3	4	5		
The instructor summarizes periodically and at the end of class or has the students do so.	1	2	3	4	5		
The instructor identifies sources, perspectives, and authorities in the field.	1	2	3	4	5		
	1	2	3	4	5		
	1	2	3	4	5		
	1	2	3	4	5		

An example with different scale anchors

Observed Characteristic	Not at All	Inconsistently	Adequately	Very Well	Extremely Well	N/A Use X	Comments
The instructor posts class goals or objectives on the board or a slide.	1	2	3	4	5		



Northeastern University
*Center for Advancing Teaching and Learning
 Through Research*

**FACULTY PEER OBSERVATION AND FEEDBACK OBSERVATION
 ORGANIZER**

Learning Focus	Strengths	Questions/Considerations
Prior Knowledge: What evidence did you see of the instructor assessing, using, correcting, or otherwise engaging with students' prior knowledge of the course material?		
Knowledge Organization: What evidence did you see of the instructor helping students organize course concepts to build appropriate understanding of the material?		
Motivation: What evidence did you see of the instructor making clear the material's value and relevance to real world phenomenon? What evidence did you see of the instructor making clear the kinds of effort necessary to acquire the skills being taught?		
Mastery: What evidence did you see of students integrating and applying skills they were acquiring?		
Practice and Feedback: What evidence did you see of students getting practice using course concepts towards an explicit goal and getting feedback on that practice (for example, practice questions, in-class activities, etc.)?		
Class Climate: What evidence did you observe of the class climate being a good fit for students' social, emotional, or intellectual needs? What active engagement among students did you see?		
Self-Directed Learning: What evidence did you see of students getting help learning how to learn? (Assessing the demands of a task, evaluating their own knowledge and skills, planning, monitoring their own progress, and making adjustments as needed?)		
General Delivery/Facilitation: What aspects of delivery or facilitation drew your attention? Consider aspects of presentation skill, student-to-student interaction, student questions both asked and answered, use of technology, structure and pace of activities, etc.		

APPENDIX H

Samples of Correspondence

FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR/PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

SAMPLE OF EMAIL ANNOUNCEMENT FOR NOMINATIONS (send end of spring and end of summer)

To the SUNY Cortland Community,

Nominations Sought for 2018-2019 SUNY Chancellor's Awards for Excellence

Nominations are now being accepted for the following awards: Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Librarianship, Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Professional Service, Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Scholarship and Creative Activities, Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Faculty Service, Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching, Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Adjunct Teaching, and SUNY Shared Governance Award. [For end of spring semester: Summer is a great time to be thinking about potential nominees and drafting a nomination letter!]

To be eligible for the Excellence in Librarianship Award, individuals must possess an MLS and must have served as a full-time librarian at SUNY Cortland for at least three years of five years of service. Eligibility for the Excellence in Professional Service Award is limited to those non-classified service employees with more than 50% of their work assignment in non-teaching services and who have completed at least three years on campus of five years continuous full-time professional service. Faculty nominees for the Excellence in Scholarship and Creative Activities award may hold any academic rank, but they must have completed three years of full-time service of five on their home campus prior to the year of nomination. The Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Adjunct Teaching is limited to those faculty teaching a partial load. Full-Time Lecturers may be nominated in the regular Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching category.

The criteria for the promotions are attached. Complete SUNY policies and procedures for these awards may be found at the following URL address: <http://system.suny.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-staff-awards/>.

Persons wishing to nominate someone for these awards should submit the nominee's name and a detailed justification not to exceed two typed pages to Virginia Levine in the President's Office **no later than October 1**. (Note: Nominations submitted without detailed justification will not be reviewed by the committee.)

Nominations may also be submitted by email, to virginia.levine@cortland.edu. Individuals may not self-nominate for these awards.

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

FROM THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE/SENATE CHAIR

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT NOTIFICATION

Dear **XXXX**,

Thank you for accepting an appointment to the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching Committee. We have attached the committee's procedures so you can familiarize yourself with them before the committee becomes active for the next promotion cycle. Your three-year term begins January **YEAR** and ends January **YEAR**.

Your willingness to contribute to this important committee is greatly appreciated!

Best,

Name

President's Office

Name

Chair, Faculty Senate

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

FROM THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

SAMPLE LETTER TO REQUEST CV FROM ELIGIBLE NOMINEES

TO: **NOMINEE**
FROM: President's Office
DATE: **DATE**
RE: NOMINATION FOR CHANCELLOR'S AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

NAME OF NOMINATOR has nominated you for the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET). Congratulations on this recognition of your work.

If you would like the CAET Committee to proceed with a review of your candidacy for this award, you need to submit a CV by **November 1**. If the committee determines that you are a viable candidate, you will be notified and asked to submit a portfolio and letters of support to the President's Office by **March 1**. You can find guidelines and criteria for the award at the SUNY website:

<http://system.suny.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-staff-awards/chancellors-excellence-awards/>.

If you have questions, you are welcome to contact me at **PHONE** or **E-MAIL ADDRESS**.

Best wishes.

FROM THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

SAMPLE PORTFOLIO REQUEST

CONFIDENTIAL

Good afternoon. Congratulations! The Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee met recently and requested your portfolio for review in consideration of this award.

Your portfolio and letters of support are due on **March 1**. The portfolio should be organized to reflect the criteria for the award. Please bring it or send it to the President's Office, Miller Building 408, and I will notify the CAET committee of its availability for review.

Criteria, policies and procedures for the promotion can be accessed at: <http://system.suny.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-staff-awards/chancellors-excellence-awards/>.

If you have questions at any time, please feel free to contact me.

Best,

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

FROM THE COMMITTEE CHAIR

DEFERMENT OFFER

CONFIDENTIAL

Good afternoon.

As members of the selection committee for the CAET, my colleagues and I were pleased to have the opportunity to review your application for this award. Your accomplishments in the area of **XXX** were impressive. This year's applicant pool was exceptionally strong, and after much deliberation, we selected another candidate to put forward to SUNY.

At the same time, we found your qualifications for this award to be quite strong. We would like to invite you to keep your application active for consideration in next year's CAE cycle. Please let me know if you would like your application to be considered again next year. If so, you may update your portfolio before the review process starts again.

We are grateful for the time and effort you put into this process and we thank you for your ongoing contributions to our campus and the SUNY system.

Sincerely,

NAME of Committee chair

On behalf of the CAET Committee

Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (CAET) Committee

FROM THE COMMITTEE CHAIR

SAMPLE LETTER FOR THOSE NOT SELECTED WITH FEEDBACK

CONFIDENTIAL

Good afternoon.

As members of the selection committee for the CAET, my colleagues and I were pleased to have the opportunity to review your application for this award. Your accomplishments in the area of **XXX** were impressive. This year's applicant pool was exceptionally strong, and after much deliberation, we selected another candidate to put forward to SUNY.

The committee noted a few areas in your portfolio that could be strengthened to help you address the rigorous criteria for this award. These include **[list suggestions]**. We hope these suggestions will be helpful to you, should you be nominated again. **OR**

If you are interested, a member of our committee would be happy to provide you with feedback on your application materials. Please let me know if you would like to meet with a committee member to get this feedback.

We are grateful for the time and effort you put into this process and we thank you for your ongoing contributions to our campus and SUNY.

Sincerely,

NAME of Committee chair

On behalf of the CAET Committee