# Making Teaching Matter – Creating Persuasive and Evidence-Based Documents that Support Promotion

PHIL MIXTER: Thank you all for choosing to spend the day this way. I know there's a lot of other things you could be doing. And this is a great way to think about your broader professional development. And then that may be true if you hold an administrative position in your department is another great way to think about how to mentor people, especially those with a great instructional focus in contrast to some other areas of scholarship around the campus.

I know we have a very diverse group of people in the room, and I know we have a very diverse group of people online as well. And the reason I have not overprepared this-- because we're not sure what you bring to this meeting. So we want to be responsive to your concerns, your questions. Please interrupt us. And it's really our pleasure to show you the products of a lot of hard work.

Before we begin, I do want to take a moment to introduce Erica Suchman. Erica Suchman is one of Colorado State's University Distinguished Teaching Scholars-- I think I got that right-- an elite group who have overarching goals at their respective universities. And I believe you're one of the first, if not the first maybe?

ERICA SUCHMAN: From?

PHIL MIXTER: Of those scholars.

ERICA SUCHMAN: No.

PHIL MIXTER: No. Oh, my mistake. Erica and I have worked together through the College of Vet Med. We have what we call a regional consortium, which is basically the five Western vet med groups working together. And one of our initiatives was to develop--

ERICA SUCHMAN: I want to thank you for inviting me. We're going to kind of go through what we did, what work have we done-- the work that we've done. So the first question is, why did we want to come up with an external way to [? evaluate ?] teaching. First thing was there was nothing. So as a person who is a tenured full professor at the teaching level-- so I am a primarily teaching faculty. I'm an 80% teaching faculty. I also have a 5% research portion of my-- [INAUDIBLE]. So sorry, I got them [INAUDIBLE].

But anyway, so I am 80% teaching. And I was able to go all the way to full professor out of state at a new teaching position. So I am a person who commonly evaluates other people who are primarily teaching class. I'm a person who's done that. So I can tell you that often when we get people's packages, I can really not tell.

So when we're asked to review packets, you get almost no quality data or information that were provided. So we get a list of courses, very little information about what did a person do in that course. Did they do two lectures? Did they do 12 lectures? Did they do all the lectures? Did they write the exams? We have no idea. So it's very hard to evaluate somebody's contribution to teaching based on the standard CV that universities use.

So I want to talk about the work of the Regional Teaching Academy for the Consortium of the Western Region Colleges of Veterinary Medicine, the most awkward and horrible name ever. We just call ourselves the RTA, the Regional Teaching Academy. So I'll kind of go through the background. In 2011, the deans of the Western Consortium of Veterinary Medicine-- which is CSU-Davis, OSU, WSU, and Western University in California-- came together to discuss ways that they might effectively collaborate.

And so one of the things that they came up with is that they wanted us to work on how to improve teaching in veterinary colleges. But like Phil said, I know most of you are not in veterinary colleges. We're going to talk about how this could be used more outside of just veterinary colleges. So the Teaching Academy is meant to support the development and implementation of best practices and scholarship in veterinary medicine education. So the idea was, we have this Regional Teaching Academy that has nominated members from each of the universities, who then have to go through a selection process. So it's not just anybody can join. You have to get nominated by your university, and then you have to get chosen to participate.

And so the Regional Teaching Academy came up with three major groups that we thought were big areas of weakness that could be addressed by our group. The first was faculty development. So this was helping to educate faculty about alternative ways to teach in their classrooms that might more effectively reach more students. The second is local peer observation of teaching, how to get a meaningful peer observation. It's not just like your friend coming to your class and saying, yeah, you were great, but actually having a group of people who do it in a meaningful manner.

And I can tell you that Davis implemented this this year, and it was received very positively at Davis from the upper administration. They said, this is the most legit peer evaluation that we've seen. We're not going to talk about that today, but there are materials about this on the website that we'll talk about. But I'm in the group and Phil's in the group for external peer review of teaching. So our mission was to look at how do we really look at teaching in more meaningful ways. So the vision is that we wanted an evidence-based process for faculty to present a rigorous and scholarly external review of their teaching program. So this is our group.

So the packet review, we wanted to have four central criteria. We wanted to see what was the quantity. That's about what you see right now, although I will tell you that half the time you can't really even tell the quantity with the CVs. We wanted to look at what's the quality of what they're doing, what's the impact that they're doing, and are they using scholarship or a scholarly approach.

So our achievements were we created documents. We beta tested those tools. We learned some valuable feedback. We gave it out to potential users. So junior faculty, who were kind of coming up for promotion and tenure, used the packets to fill out the materials, and then they gave their feedback to us. And we modified it based on their feedback, and we tested evaluation rubric ideas. And then we had potential evaluators try those out and simplify that based on the evaluator feedback.

So I should tell you that we did not invent this work from ground up. So we consulted the medical school at UCSF. They have an extensive review process, and they have a beautiful website that explains their reviews. The problem for us was that UCSF is solely a medical school program, so it had nothing about undergraduates, they had nothing about graduate school. It only dealt with clinical medical teaching. So we basically took what they had, and we expanded it in order to add undergraduate education, graduate education, things that we were seeing at universities that have more than just a medical school.

We also took portfolio templates, and we filled them out to make examples. We used some from UCSF, and then we created some of our own that dealt with things like graduate education, undergraduate education, things that people wouldn't be doing in the medical school. And then we uploaded example submissions for use during preparations. A faculty member who wants to use these materials to prepare their teaching portfolio can then go to the website and get examples of how people did this. And then this was rolled out to deans and department heads at all of our respective universities.

So the next step is where we are now. We want to familiarize faculty with the website. This is the website that we'll be using today, so I'll give you guys a minute if you're on your computers to put that in. So it's the teachingacademy. westernregioncvm.org. And then our initiative-- this has an underscore right there, which is hard to see because of the line-- eprt. So we'll be working on that website today. So again, if you don't have your computer with you, please sit near someone who does so you can look at the materials.

Is everybody good? Anybody need more time to finish?

PHIL MIXTER: [INAUDIBLE] show that website.

ERICA SUCHMAN: OK. I have also got a vet screen [INAUDIBLE]. You got it to go? All right. So the basic class is going to be-- and we'll show you this a couple of times-- is a three-part dossier that you put together. The first is a professional CV. So this is basically the CV that you would normally fill out for your university, only it's expanded to include significant teaching activities, including outcomes. So this is basically going to be your normal CV, only we've suggested ways to actually document what you're doing teaching wise rather than just listing, these are the courses I taught, these are the semesters, to give someone a broader feel about what you're actually doing.

Then the next thing is going to be a reflective document that captures your teaching philosophy, maps your five-year goals, and showcases some of your selected teaching activities. So this is not meant to be a snapshot of your entire career around teaching. This is meant to be, what are my five biggest things that I think I've achieved in the time period in which I'm getting evaluated?

So for example, when I went up for full, I wouldn't put in everything I did as an assistant to associate. I would only include what I was doing from associate to full. And so I'm like, these are the five big things that I really want you to focus on. And I can tell you I had lots of other things. I had to really think, what are the things I want to showcase here? The things I'm going to have to leave out, they're going to show up in here. But these are the big things that I really want to flesh out and say, these are my shining achievements during this time period.

And then your appendices, which at CSU-- and I don't know how it is at WSU-- but at CSU, these do not leave my department. So this is just something from my department to help evaluate. So this is judiciously chosen evidence that supports your narrative portion of your teaching portfolio. We'll go through how you create each of these things.

So on the website, you're going to see, we're going to talk about the teaching domains, examples of teaching activities. OK, I don't know how that just happened. We're going to see examples of teaching activities in each domain, instructions for reporting each activity, and suggestions for reporting outcomes. So all the stuff that you would need if you're going to create these kinds of documents are on the website.

So I presented this to the Council of Deans at CSU-- so all the deans for all the colleges. The first time I presented it, they said, way too much, way too much. This is going to be too long. No one's going to want to read that. It has to be shorter. So based on that feedback and other people getting the same feedback at their universities, we went through and developed this process where it's not a gigantic document, other than the educator CV. But everybody's CV is pretty big. And people can choose to ignore the teaching stuff if that's what they want to do.

So it starts with a cover section, which has your title page. We have an intro letter from the Regional Teaching Academy about how to look at an educator's packet, an executive summary-- which is something you'll create, which is two pages max-- and then a table of contents. The educator's curriculum vitae is what we suggest you put in. Now this works at some universities. I think at WSU it does.

So at Davis, for example, they have a very prescribed way. They have to put everything in little boxes, and so they cannot do this. It absolutely says, list your classes. And that is all you do. You don't have any options for doing anything but that. But here at WSU, you are able to create an educator's CV. At CSU, we're able to do that as well.

And then the teaching portfolio itself-- and I'll explain what's the difference between these things-- is your reflective document. It's 16 pages max, so it's not like someone has to read a

100-page document. It's just 16 pages. So it has your position descriptions-- so what are your percent appointments. Oh, I think that thing's a touchscreen. There we go. I'm just figuring that out. I'm like, why does it keep doing that to me?

All right. And then the teaching philosophy, which everyone should be creating a teaching philosophy for when you go up for promotion and tenure. Your five-year goals. So what are the things you want to do in teaching and education in the next five years? And then your highlighted achievements. And you can do up to five of these, and each of these should be a max of two pages. If I can just do this now. Maybe. Nope. [INAUDIBLE] when I want it to. All right. So again, so this is kind of summarizing this again. So you get your 12 pages. You have your executive summary that's one to two pages, and then a highlighted activities. Each of these two pages max.

So domains. So people freak out often when they see all these domains. So this list of domains was originally created by the University Distinguished Teaching Scholars at Colorado State University. So we created a whitepaper for the university to help them think about how to help faculty document what they're doing and teaching in more meaningful ways, which first serve as a discussion of what is included in teaching. What can people put down when they're talking about teaching? So we came up with this list of things that counted, and so this became kind of the backbone on which the Regional Teaching Academy created our documents, based on the UCSF documents.

So the very, very most important thing to notice is that most faculty will not be active in all domains. There's only a very senior faculty who has large roles all over in education reform, in curriculum development, that's going to have activity in all of these domains. So most faculty are going to have activity in one or two of these domains. So again, so this is the website, in case anybody has not gotten it yet. So we're going to kind of go through what's available on the website, and we're going to go through how to document your teaching.

AUDIENCE: Can you go back to the list? That was really useful.

ERICA SUCHMAN: Absolutely.

AUDIENCE: I was going to ask if that's available on the site.

ERICA SUCHMAN: That is on the web. Actually, all the documents in there, this is built into it. So we'll be going through activity to show you. So in fact, each of these will have its own sheet that you can fill out on the website, depending on which ones work for you. So if you don't have anything in, let's say, educational research, curriculum/program development, you're just not going to fill those out because it's not pertinent to you.

So this is a snapshot of the website. So on there, you'll notice you have applicant tool box and a reviewer tool box. So this gives applicants everything they need for instructions to fill out all these materials and how to think about documenting what they're doing in education. And

then there's a reviewer tool box, and you can go there to look to see what does the Regional Teaching Academy say that they're going to use in order-- We all of sudden have a blue-- is that correct?

AUDIENCE: Spokane [INAUDIBLE].

ERICA SUCHMAN: OK.

PHIL MIXTER: It's OK.

ERICA SUCHMAN: I'm like, all of a sudden, I see a big blue X. So, I forget where I was.

PHIL MIXTER: You were talking about the reviewer's tools so people can see how they'll be reviewed.

ERICA SUCHMAN: So if you're interested to see what we think a reviewer would look at, it's a good place to go look and think of. So even if you're not in veterinary medicine and you're not going to submit your materials to the Regional Teaching Academy to have it evaluated, it gives you an idea of the kinds of things you should be thinking about to document what you're doing so that somebody outside WSU can look at what you're doing and say, this is a significant contribution. And if all you're doing is listing your classes, it's extremely difficult to do that.

So the applicant's tool box contains recommendations about the types of materials to include, recommendations about how to add domains to your CV. Some universities are more flexible. WSU is flexible. Fillable forms that can be downloaded and used to create your executive summary, your teaching portfolio, and your highlighted activities. Examples that were filled out by RTA external review committee members. So we all created documents for each of the domains. So you can look in the domains and say, OK, this is what kinds of stuff they would say. And then links to the examples from UCSF.

But again, these are really only going to be relevant to people who are in the veterinary school and who are teaching clinically. If you are teaching in undergrad programs outside of the veterinary school, you're going to want to do the Regional Teaching Academy one because these are broader. Now I did not touch it that time. The UCSF ones are solely about medicine.

So this is an example. So this is Domain 1. So this is the sheet for Domain 1. So there is going to be a sheet for each of the domains. And so you could say, I am active in Domain 1 and Domain 3, and so I'm going to take those two sheets and I'm going to fill those out. And I'm going to ignore all the rest of them because I'm not active in those areas.

And this just kind of gives you these fillable sheets that you can fill out. We did get a little feedback that sometimes the sheets are a little cumbersome to fill out, but we don't have the technological ability to make them better at this moment. So you're putting your name, your college department. And then this is meant to be just kind of-- you're just going to kind of list

your things here. And remember, these are going to get fleshed out in a much bigger way in your teaching portfolio.

So I would say that these are useful documents for teaching, for submitting to your promotion and tenure, because they do a better job even at your university saying, here's exactly what I'm doing. So people can really see and think about is this significant. So I would say it's useful for any percentage of teaching.

At CSU, we're really urging our-- and in my department, we're go to start requiring-- that junior faculty with a teaching position over 50% are going to start filling out these documents so that we can better evaluate them. In our college, we had Kristy Dowers. She's in the clinical sciences. She used these, and she did get tenure. So it has gone through a process, and people have used them successfully. And I know there's somebody at OSU that's going through the process right now.

So the intended learning outcomes for today. So we want you to get a big picture view of the RTA, like what we've done, a promotion review package for educators, including understanding the difference between an educator CV and the teaching portfolio. So the educator's CV is like your regular CV, only it's expanded to say, here's what I'm doing on an educational level.

The teaching portfolio is really taking your five highlights of your time in which you are getting evaluated and saying, here's the big things I want to highlight and really flesh out for you so you can see what it is I've been doing. And then learn about the external peer review of promotion factors that is happening at the RTA. And prepare people who can mentor other junior faculty to learn how to use these materials. All right. So, this is where Phil takes over.

PHIL MIXTER: I need the microphone.

ERICA SUCHMAN: Oh yes.

PHIL MIXTER: Thank you, Erica. And I want to, as we move forward, remind you of a couple of working assumptions here. These tools are really prepared for people who have a large instructional component. Erica just mentioned if your instructional load is over 50% of your appointment, then these are great tools. If your instructional component is 10%, you may decide, I really want to focus on that 90% of my appointment, which is something else in this endeavor. But I think you'll find ways to enhance your documentation for review in any way.

I think before I go forward, you've been listening for a while. We've got folks who just logged in from across the state. But I want to pause and remind you of sort of this is a framework that may or may not work for you. Our experience is that new frameworks in the review process are sometimes immediately met with it can't be different, right? That's something we don't recognize. That's not how my CV is formatted. You did it wrong. Those are all common responses to something new. So this framework is designed to give you some insights into why we're doing this.

And again, for those who have large instructional components, the scholarship, the peer review, the grant evaluation that comes with other kinds of scholarship doesn't exist for you. That's what Erica said. We didn't have a way to do external review, even though that's what folks in administrative positions and leadership positions really crave when they're trying to make a decision about promoting you at any level, whether your career track or tenure track. But let me stop and ask if folks have comments, concerns, questions. We're going to get into the weeds and work with these frameworks, and that may answer your questions. But help me understand. Yeah?

AUDIENCE: So I didn't even know that WSU sent people's teaching portfolios out for external review. Is that really a thing?

PHIL MIXTER: Did everyone hear the question? The question was, I wasn't aware that WSU actually sent teaching portfolios out for external review, is that a thing? My experience here at WSU is it varies a lot unit to unit. So your unit may value external letters. Your unit may depend on you to tell your department head or unit chair who to solicit letters from. And Erica alluded to that sometimes ends up being a, quote unquote, "buddy letter," and administrators above your unit may or may not see them as valuable.

This process is designed to be blinded in a certain way and more, let's call it, more objective. I don't know that we have the ability to call it an objective external peer review. But it's someone at another institution who doesn't have sort of the provincial lens of working with you every day writing a letter based on the materials you provide.

AUDIENCE: Is this like a service that you guys offer that we can get you guys to do this for us, and then have your, ta-da, yeah, this is fine, or whatever, your review. This is what you're offering.

PHIL MIXTER: So it's a good question. So this organization has been supported by deans of five regional veterinary schools. And right now, that service is available to people in WSU's vet college, College of Vet Med. Whether we do it for anyone who asks, it's young and we haven't had that opportunity yet. I think we'd be receptive, but I think we have to be careful what we ask for. We're promoting the framework in an effort to do that.

AUDIENCE: So if you are not in the vet med school, could you send the stuff to somebody else in another university and say, here's the framework, please evaluate me based on the Vet Med's kind of ideas, and here's my [INAUDIBLE] evaluation period.

ERICA SUCHMAN: Another thing is we should make-- at the end of the list, people from the RTA have been working on this. These are [INAUDIBLE]. If you guys are a primarily teaching faculty member, you should write my name down because I'm a professor who's teaching [INAUDIBLE]. Very rare to find that.

And when you go for evaluation, you have to find some [INAUDIBLE] who will understand your position who is actually [INAUDIBLE] hire. When I was [INAUDIBLE], it was very hard just to find people to evaluate me. And it was very hard for my department to find people to evaluate me. So you should be trying to start collecting your list of people who are external to WSU, who you are not collaborating with, who can [INAUDIBLE].

PHIL MIXTER: So again, there are two ends here, right? There's the front end of preparing documents that really do capture what you do in a broad and diverse way other than a line on your CV that I taught Bio 107 one year. That doesn't mean much to someone outside of your unit maybe, or even outside of WSU proper. And the other way is to think about garnering connections, networking with people who could act as external reviews, and that your unit would be receptive to an external letter that's meaningful.

AUDIENCE: Thank you.

PHIL MIXTER: Yeah. Great question. Before this framework existed, our sense is that wasn't happening a lot, unless you networked with someone like Erica who knew someone who knew someone and had the secret handshake. Great question. Other questions, concerns?

AUDIENCE: Yeah, I just have a general question for you. One of the things I've seen in my career is a continual discussion at administrative levels related to teaching workload. I specifically teach a one credit class, which is one heck of a lot of effort, but I teach another two credit, which is almost nothing. Yet at the administrative levels, I have seen all sorts of models put in place, algorithms. I've got a memo dated back to 1965 from WSU looking at putting in these complicated formulas and such. Has the Academy being able to address or discuss that particular aspect of teaching?

PHIL MIXTER: I would say we haven't addressed workload directly. And I know my particular unit in the College of Vet Med has had that discussion about how challenging that is. One way to think about these frameworks is if you're putting in a lot of development and preparatory time, you're approaching your one credit seminar in a very scholarly way that takes hours of labor every cycle, you should be able to capture that here in a way that you wouldn't by just listing it as a one credit seminar on your CV.

That you'd be able then to spotlight it in these components to say, I work really hard at making this special, or, I put a lot of time, I'm using this scholarly work as a basis. And maybe justifying your claims of it being incredibly labor intensive in a unique way. And this gives you a framework to explode that and spotlight that and get some feedback about whether other people agree that that's where you should be putting your time and effort. Is that helpful?

ERICA SUCHMAN: At CSU, we have four departments within our College of Veterinary Medicine. It's not [INAUDIBLE] within the four departments. And we're just trying to work on that now, trying to figure out what is a [INAUDIBLE]. And it's really different from department to department. [INAUDIBLE]

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE], but I--

PHIL MIXTER: Oh, OK. So I apologize. I'll do a better job of repeating for our distant sites. Yes?

AUDIENCE: Just a quick question. You were also talking about quantitative data. Are you looking at student achievement in loose terms [INAUDIBLE]?

PHIL MIXTER: Right. So the question is about the sort of data you might include as you prepare these materials, in terms of student achievement specifically. You may be in a unit where the data they like to use is student course evaluations. And I will tell you that the evidence is that they're highly biased for a number of reasons that make them not the thing I want my teaching judged by.

For that reason, you could create a situation where, for example, you describe or develop a student learning outcome, and you collected about your student's ability to achieve that outcome. I'm being very general here because the audience is very general. And that would be very helpful for an external reviewer to say, year one I did this, I got data back, my approach to that learning outcome has evolved, and I have assessment pieces that demonstrate students are meeting that objective more effectively than they did when I started. That's professional development. That's the kind of trajectory that you want to demonstrate to the people evaluating you, as well as the other members of your unit who are deciding on your promotion.

I think it's easy for me to say, so you have to develop ways to capture data. Christy and the folks at AOI have a number of modules available for writing outcomes, and Eric will be talking about that tomorrow in a one-hour seminar tomorrow morning. But additionally, that would be the kind of data that would be much more useful than the hours taught in assessing the quality and the development, maybe that time you put in. That's a real common theme here is that we're looking for those measures of quality, not just simply quantity. Other topics? And you folks online tell me if I'm doing a good job of getting the audio out to you. Yes?

AUDIENCE: Yeah, so I was wondering if during this morning you would talk a little bit more about what you just said regarding student evaluations.

PHIL MIXTER: We're not going to get into the weeds on the student evaluation question today for a number of reasons. I think of it as kind of a sticky wicket. It's a very complex topic in your unit, whether they value them, whether they understand why there are biases that students apply. And many students say, fine, well give us another measure. And I think that would be the way to think about how do you measure your own teaching.

I happen to be a bioscientist, so I think scientifically about creating a situation where I could collect data about how students are progressing, whether they understood that concept well. And that's my feedback to say, well, it seems like I tried something innovative that looked good on paper, but it didn't help my students meet that learning objective. So either I have to do

another experiment the next time I teach the class, or I have to think more about analyzing the data in a way that really tells me what would help my students meet that objective.

ERICA SUCHMAN: One easy thing to add that I've been doing for the part of the eight years or so to help with the [INAUDIBLE] is I always do a pre-test on the first day of class. And then as I'm-- oh, sorry-- I use a pre-test on the first day of class, and it's always the same pre-test. And then those questions the students don't know, but they're going to end up in their final. And so I can look at how are they doing with that. And then I make changes one semester to the next. I can look and see are my changes making a difference. And the things that I put in my pre-test are the concepts that I know my students traditionally at the end of the class are still struggling with.

So I'm really looking to see like, can I move the needle on these difficult concepts for students? And I always tell them on the first day, I'm like, don't freak out, the average is going to be 25%. It always is. This is the stuff I expect you to know at the end, not the stuff I expect you to know now. But it gives me a way to look and see from one semester to the next am I moving the needle by changing what I'm doing.

PHIL MIXTER: I suppose the other added value of that approach is if the content of the prerequisite class has changed or students' experience coming in has changed. You're also more aware of where they are to begin with. And if you have to do some remediation or some sort of-- oh, you didn't remember the thing you were taught last semester because I just assumed you remembered everything. So that's a good way to think about it.

ERICA SUCHMAN: And look, the CSU, we don't even allow the use of [INAUDIBLE] in class.

PHIL MIXTER: So CSU doesn't allow them? That's an interesting way to look about it. Yes, help me.

AUDIENCE: My question isn't in the documentation. But I was just wondering what recommendations are if you had frequently seen [? through course load ?] [INAUDIBLE], especially when those things are out of your control, are there ways to document your own [INAUDIBLE] over time [INAUDIBLE] teaching [INAUDIBLE]?

PHIL MIXTER: That's a great question. So to repeat the question in case you missed it, if you're teaching assignments are changing often, and you don't have the continuity to collect data over numerous cycles, and those assignments are out of your control, how does this framework help you capture that? Again, my hope-- and I'll ask Erica to think about her response to this question-- maybe the thing you want to stress is that you're nimble, that you have a skill set that is overarching and allows you to apply certain skills to any class you teach, presumably within one single area of expertise.

I don't know your area necessarily, but the idea would be that while you can't collect data on the same detailed learning objective, can you collect data-- maybe it's even student responses

about their experience. It might be qualitative rather than quantitative in an effort to demonstrate that you're helping them learn how to learn or something more universal. Do you have a response to that question, Erica?

ERICA SUCHMAN: Yeah, I think two parts. One is that in the five highlight parts, that's one of the things I would highlight. I'd be like, I am constantly revamping courses. I'm not just doing the same thing. And that's something in your teaching CV that you can address. Because if you're just listing your classes, they can't tell like, oh, and it changes every semester. You should be saying, and I'm reworking this class. I mean, so you put a little write-up under everything about how much work it's taking you to retool every semester. So you have to think of your CV and your materials. This is your only opportunity to present what it is you're doing to people who don't really know what you're doing.

Even in your department, you think people know what you're doing, but they really don't. I'm on the Promotion Tenure Review Committee. And I look at people's stuff, and I'm like, ugh. And I'm like, oh, I had no idea they were doing that. And my department has 89 people. I mean, I look some people up on the web. I'm like, I don't even know who this is. So you have to be saying to yourself, I am telling my story to someone who does not know my story. And so you need to make it clear in that document, like every semester, everything's changing, everything's getting redone, so that they can see this is a ton of work.

PHIL MIXTER: Do you have any insights into the kind of measures you could use in the short term single cycle? Yeah, I was thinking universal skills were something that isn't core specific perhaps. But I don't have any other great ideas. Maybe this diverse group does.

ERICA SUCHMAN: I would think it'd be more talking about how much you're at this point. And then if you teach a class two or three times, going back to your old data and saying, how does that compare?

PHIL MIXTER: So in this context, whether it be annual or review. And I should add here at WSU, Activity Insight is our online database. And there are a number of areas where you can add and document your teaching activities, and you should feel free to use these frameworks to help you sort of bin or organize that in a helpful way. And maybe that's a way for you to self-advocate with your administrator, with someone who says, I'm hitting whatever pitch you throw me, but it would be more useful for all involved if I had the opportunity to stick with something and polish it over time. And maybe they're completely aware of that, and that's just not the pragmatic reality.

AUDIENCE: I have a question.

PHIL MIXTER: Yes, we're listening.

AUDIENCE: This is WSU Vancouver. [INAUDIBLE]. Is timeline a problem with promotion? What I mean is that if an instructor is really working hard and going above and beyond, that you have

to be an instructor for five years before you get a promotion, is that true? Or basically, is there a timeline for promotion? Do you have to have certain years in instruction before you get promotion, even though you're working hard?

PHIL MIXTER: Thank you for your question. I'll just repeat the question. If I heard it, I'm assuming everyone heard it. But again, is there a minimum/maximum time you need as an instructional person to get a promotion? I am going to predict that's very unit and college specific. And I don't know what other people's experience is, but my sense and my own personal experience is that a unit would want to get to know you well enough to know that they want to retain you. But I would think that clock would be negotiable with your department administrator. I don't know if other people have insights into that. I'm seeing some nodding here.

AUDIENCE: I work with [INAUDIBLE], and you could tell her ask Pat.

PHIL MIXTER: OK. So your colleague in Pullman says to ask Pat Carter, your unit head. So I don't think that's a fixed thing across units at the university, but I am probably not in a position to say that unequivocally. But that's a great question. Again, in this context today, the more data you can gather, the stronger case you have. You might be able to put together something in two or three cycles, two or three academic years, let's say.

But obviously, we're talking about things that have some value and enhancement over a number of cycles. And if you teach the same course three semesters-- spring, fall, summer-- then maybe you've got enough data to make the argument that I should be promoted in my career track, in my clinical track-- if you're still using that terminology-- or in my tenure promotion track.

AUDIENCE: Thank you.

PHIL MIXTER: I hope that's helpful. Other questions? I'll say just to the folks in Pullman-- if you need to step away or need to take a break, we've got to break sort of built in in a little bit, but we want to sort of get you working. And then we're going to send you out on your own here pretty quickly. So the vision of this process involves two parts.

I mentioned the front end, where you would prepare documents and you would have a whole series of input on developing materials. You'd be able to see the process transparently so you know how you're going to be reviewed. And again, like students understanding a rubric for an assignment or what's going to be on the test, then you have a sense of how to prepare those documents in preparation for some sort of external review.

For those of you familiar with the National Institutes of Health and how they review applications for medical funding, we use their style of a panel. Multiple people review these documents. There's a single primary reviewer, maybe a secondary reviewer, but no less than three people have input on your reviews, so it's not predicated on just one person's

interpretation. And then we prepare a document. We have some boilerplate kind of language to explain this process to your unit. And then some very specific information about what an individual is doing, where their strengths are, what's emerging, what represents a certain amount of work.

And the issues, again, of external review are from our perspective. Is this person active, has the quality, has the quantity, has the scholarship in their approach, and do they look good from where we sit at our other institutions? That's the goal is to have that external review document as your promotion packet moves out of your unit to another administrative level, maybe the dean of your college, and above to the provost and beyond. OK? Everybody understand sort of the system? I know not all of you are familiar with this kind of panel review, but you probably had something. Don't worry about whether you understand what the NIH uses, but I hope that makes sense.

OK, so let's talk a little bit more about a couple of these other features, these other components. We talked a little bit about making this document useful for anyone who's going to read it. The argument is there might be some administrators who are just going to read the executive summary. That's all they have the capacity for, all they choose to read. That's great. We have a CV, which is focused on domains and focused on information, that is useful for educators.

Some of you may have an area of interest in scholarship that compels you to write a certain kind of CV. But in my world as a scientist, the scientific CV involves a lot of papers, funding, and education credentials. But again, it doesn't really expand and tell people outside of your unit what it means, what you're using for educational development. We talked about the hard work you put in developing classroom materials, in developing instructional experiences for your students, and we're trying to get you to convey that in a way that's not unit specific using jargon outside of your unit so that other people can understand when you try and self-advocate.

So you can go to our website. Again, I know a number of you have brought this up. And let's go into the applicant tool box, and again, look at these domains in a little more detail. I have a colleague who said this is like ordering takeout from their favorite restaurant. There are a whole bunch of tick boxes in each of these domains.

And again, the domain structure is just bins you can put certain kinds of activity into. If you've done things like done some professional development, maybe you've gone to a conference to help you be a better instructor, maybe you've applied those things you learned to your class in one or two cycles, then you have some areas where you can expand some narrative and tell people about the hard work you've done in your own discretionary time.

Additionally, if you're mentoring-- maybe you're an advisor for half of your time-- I don't know about you, but that takes up an incredible amount of my capacity. Writing letters of recommendation-- the standard CV won't give you credit for mentoring students, advising

students, spending hours with them on their academic program, on their professional development, what have you. This gives you an opportunity to expand that and tell that part of your professional story. OK?

So what we'd like you to do, again, is think about using this sort of domain structure and get started in these areas. So this slide says something about a worksheet, but what we would like you to do is access the website, and again, begin to export those fillable forms and try to start this process of thinking differently about your documents.

So what I'm going to predict is that most of the people here who have been engaged by this are in a few roles, but most of you teach at some level. So domain 1A is teaching. And I'm going to assume that almost everybody has that in their wheelhouse in something they want to develop. If you're an administrator or a staff person and you're trying to help other people develop these materials, take a look at domain 1A, because again, these are focused on individuals with a large instructional component. And we assume that's sort of a common thing.

So you may be active in one or two of these domains, but my assumption is that most of you are going to have teaching in common. So go ahead and take a look and begin to describe what you do in this particular domain, and you can answer these questions. What I'm going to do is just give you some examples of the kinds of things we're going to look at. Other folks have told us that seeing the examples are helpful.

OK, so here's the classic way your CV kind of looks. I taught cell physiology. It's a five credit course. And I've taught it for five years. Right? Maybe I taught a clinical block or a seminar for those of you, and here's the course title out of the WSU catalog. Right? For someone from outside our unit, we have no idea whether the lab is five hours a week or 25 hours a week or 55 hours a week.

We have no idea whether you were the course chair and leader. We don't know whether you taught it alone, whether you taught it as a team. We don't know how many students were there. This information is a list, but it's not rich in terms of someone trying to do a qualitative assessment evaluative kind of role. Is that clear? You understand why this list is too limited, even though it's a line on your CV?

All right, so consider a more rich-- and we appreciate that you have to develop this kind of narrative. So here's that same sort of list, and here's some narrative specifically about your role. In terms of both exactly what you do, how much time you put in, and again, whether you're a leader, whether you give a one-hour cameo every term or something like that, someone externally, it gives them an idea of your specific role. OK?

Additionally, now you can include some general outcome data. In the College of Vet Med, again so far, we're using student course evaluations still, although there's some move to change that. The course evaluation data by itself is not very useful in isolation. So again, if your course rating of 3.85 overall out of five is included, we don't know, is that a good number for you? Is that a

good number with these students? Is that a bad number? Now you have some of these other data that's available through Blue, our student course evaluation metric, that gives a little more information about how the students respond.

And again, the instructor composite score is something that has to do with your relative rating compared to your peers in your unit. OK? That may take some time and energy for you to get that kind of data. Maybe you want to encourage your unit to think differently. If they're going to use student course evaluation-- I know this was an area of concern for some-- to make that data richer, to give you some relative values to your peers in the unit.

OK, so in mentoring and advising-- again, maybe you mentored some PhD students, maybe if you have a clinical appointment, maybe you mentored a few clinical fellows, what have you-- again, this is the list, but it doesn't tell us about the richness of your ability to mentor. It just says that you did it. And we have no idea whether that's a lot, whether that's a little. There's nothing contextual about it.

So if you just continue to list individuals, that's helpful at one level. But all you've got in the end is a list. So consider a few more bullets about your role in the professional development about the individuals you mentor one-on-one if you're a graduate advisor. If you're a PhD advisor, you want a little more detail about why these PhD students are going on from WSU to do great things. Right?

And that shift from simply listing, creating a table, to adding just a few more items about your pivotal role in their career gives an external reviewer a lot more information. Is that clear? Again, your unit may not see this as useful. Your unit may know Ted Cruz pretty well, right? Theodore, excuse me. And in this case locally, you don't have to necessarily include that information because it's common knowledge. But externally, you absolutely have to, OK? Yes? [INAUDIBLE]

AUDIENCE: Can you include honors thesis and undergraduate advising in here?

PHIL MIXTER: Absolutely. You can include your role in the undergraduate honors thesis. I would absolutely implore you to. That's an incredibly labor intensive effort, right? But again, if you list, I did two honors theses last year, that's not very helpful externally. So if that student found that experience enriching, it was pivotal in helping them get into professional school and move on in their career. And again, if they graduated last year, their career isn't that long. But as you compile lists of these individuals, where you spent hours with them one-on-one really making a difference, this helps capture that in a more rich and deeper way.

AUDIENCE: So if I had an advisee that was like a superstar student and I wrote 15 letters of recommendation for a scholarship [INAUDIBLE], I could really--

PHIL MIXTER: Right. If you're putting time in on that individual and that individual is a superstar in part because of your mentoring, this is your opportunity to self-advocate and say, I had a role in that.

AUDIENCE: So we can put undergrads in here.

PHIL MIXTER: Yeah. Yeah. And again, it's easy to overstate that at one level. But more often, we tend to understate it by just listing them as, well, as just an honors thesis. I knocked those out in a weekend, yeah. And that never happens, right? It's a much more iterative process. Yes?

AUDIENCE: Kind of on that same thing, is it appropriate to take credit for things like putting in a lot of time to accommodate [INAUDIBLE] requests, things that are like part of our job basically, but like also [INAUDIBLE] to do it early [INAUDIBLE]?

PHIL MIXTER: Right. So that's a great question. The question is, how do you use this framework to really capture where you're putting your energy capacity and bandwidth? And I think if something like Access Center requests or other aspects of your work are not captured other places when you list a class, then that could become a sub-bullet or a bullet to say, there were a high proportion of these special needs, or a high proportion of my time was spent doing this.

So again, if you teach a one credit seminar where students show up, listen for an hour, and go away, maybe that doesn't take up a lot of your bandwidth. But if it's an interactive sort of seminar, where students are doing a lot of the work, you meet with them one-on-one, you spend time outside of the class grading their written projects, those sorts of things, then this is your opportunity to explain that to other people. Because if not, if they're just using credit hours as some sort of metric, they're like, well she's only doing five credit hours of semester, right? That doesn't seem like a full pull in our unit, but they won't know what a full pull is unless you tell them. Yes, a question?

AUDIENCE: My question is about PhD students. So I don't sit on committees, but let me give you an example. I have a PhD student who was my TA part of a semester and now is teaching his own class, and I have been giving him an extraordinary amount of mentoring and helping him prepare and be ready because he's teaching this class. Would you look at that as somebody evaluating portfolio saying, oh wait a minute, you're not on their committee, you're not an official advisor to that student. But I am definitely advising that student in a way.

PHIL MIXTER: I think if you're mentoring junior members in your unit, if you're mentoring junior members in your area of scholarship-- whether that's locally, regionally, or nationally-- and you don't tell anyone, then they wonder, what are you doing all day, right? So, absolutely. Again, this is a framework, and I want you to adopt a framework and put up walls and paint them the color you want to paint them. Put your own paintings on the wall and highlight the things that are taking up your time and professional capacity. Because if you don't, no one knows. Yes, Ray?

AUDIENCE: There's a detail on that. I'm just thinking of the communications. Would it be advisable for her to make sure that the student's chair actually knows that you're doing this. Because if this shows up in a report to the chair, this is all an informal, [INAUDIBLE], ask the chair of the committee and the chair says, I have no idea, this could be [INAUDIBLE]. So I would think with their communication--

PHIL MIXTER: Yeah. And it would add some transparency to that relationship, the professional relationship, to make sure you're giving the kind of feedback that--

AUDIENCE: And there's no [INAUDIBLE] for [INAUDIBLE].

PHIL MIXTER: Right. I think that's a helpful way to put it. And again, on your annual review, there are, in Activity Insights, some ways to talk about mentoring. And the focus has been students, but my recollection is there's some wiggle room there. And if you make an entry that I'm mentoring this first-time teacher and we meet two to three hours every week for a semester, suddenly it's 60, 70 hours. And that's something you should get credit for. Great questions. Yes?

AUDIENCE: Maybe a tough question, but I think that one that is important. I've known enough administrators in my career here that I think there could be the potential for pushback, i.e. you're padding your CV. What's your experience been with that?

ERICA SUCHMAN: I think that goes to the question about the access and stuff like that. I think you want to be careful about not including stuff that everybody has to do. Unfortunately, RDS students are an issue for everybody. So I think you want to really be careful about just saying these are things I do. And going to her point with the-- I think you should be putting this in your yearly activity summaries.

Don't just wait until it's time for promotion and tenure, and then they give you the smack back on it. This should be a yearly conversation that you're having with your department so that they aren't blindsided when you come up for promotion and tenure. And if they think it's padding, you can have that conversation then, and you can figure out how to document in ways that's palatable to them.

So I think my advice is do this consistently, not just every time you come up for promotion because then that is like a big, oh, this is so different, oh, what is this? Whereas if they've been seeing that routinely, it becomes more the norm. And so my yearly activity summary, I'm like, I'm telling you everything I do so that you can't go, well, that's not that bad, she's only teaching four classes in the fall. I'm like, well, and I'm doing all this stuff for these classes. So I think it's important to kind of create your [INAUDIBLE], and you've got to do that by doing it consistently. Does that makes sense?

PHIL MIXTER: And that sort of addresses Ray's point that if you're crossing unit lines and doing something in another unit because you have another kind of relationship-- you're mentoring a

new teacher, for example-- if someone says, you shouldn't be doing that, that's their unit's responsibility, then you want to know that in the small cycle, not the big cycle.

ERICA SUCHMAN: Yeah, exactly. And this is your opportunity to get feedback on what you're doing. And if they say, that's not how we want you to spend your time, don't spend your time that way.

PHIL MIXTER: Yeah, that's a great point. Thank you. All right. So again, a lot of ways to richly document what's happening. I know Sean asked about honors thesis. At WSU, there are levels of honors thesis. Passed with distinction would indicate something differently than just passed. And then an update about their professional trajectory in terms of where they've gone from WSU.

I know from my own personal experience, it's really hard to track students longitudinally. But again, if you've helped shoot them out of a cannon into a great career, this is a great time to connect with them annually. I'm just checking in. I want to know what's going on. And then you also get that richer discussion maybe for your own use about how are things going. How did WSU help prepare you? What could we do better? I know those things take time, but it's a great way to more accurately and more effectively self-advocate and sing your own praises.

All right. So I mentioned the areas of professional development. And again, this is a couple of ways that we think about these things. If you're involved in AOI's teaching workshops, if you're involved-- as I am-- with our Teaching Academy in the College of Vet Med, if you're doing things, taking online modules that are available to you, if you spend months that you're not salaried, but doing professional development, you can list them pretty effectively.

But again, the goal would be to really enhance this to say, I learned something here, and I'm applying it effectively to enhance my teaching. So essentially, make that professional activity an enhancement to your CV. But the only way to do that is to write a short burst of narrative about how it's working. What changed after you went to that workshop and had that thunderbolt moment? A-ha, I could do this differently. Again, ideally, as we mentioned earlier, you'd collect some data. A lot of people go to workshops, get really excited, and then they go back home and fall right back into their same old, same old. But in this case, you could talk about how you're enhancing and renewing your teaching.

It looks like folks are still having rich discussions. And I hate to break those up, except to sort of keep us on a schedule here. I've heard a lot of discussions about a lot of different things. I hope you've got into using these frameworks. And I heard some discussions about college politics and departmental politics. And as much as I want to hear more about those, we're not going to tangent off into that world and get mired there.

So I wonder if anyone has any questions or comments about the tool box you dove into. If you have affirmations, strengths, things you think you should share out, we're happy to do that across the bigger group right now. And I know there are a couple of tables in Pullman that were

departmental groups, and I think that was very useful. Questions? Other discussion? Things you want to share with your colleagues across WSU? Well that was truly--

[LAUGHTER]

I counted till five. When you ask the class a question, you've got to count till five. Did anyone have an insight, have an a-ha moment about how they could capture their activities in a new and different way? Yes, Rick.

AUDIENCE: I did. I mean, I think--

PHIL MIXTER: Going to move the mic to you.

AUDIENCE: The new online whatever it's called that we did for annual reviews, the online reporting system--

PHIL MIXTER: Activity Insight.

AUDIENCE: Thank you. Sorry about this, guys. Activity Insight I think provided some more opportunity to describe what one was doing than I remember from the older system. So I guess that was a good lead up to this. Really, I don't have any specific questions. But I do think just as a matter of principle, it's a really helpful exercise and a good practice to try and create at least one paragraph descriptors of what one has done.

Because I have a very traditional teaching CV that I submit every year, and so it raises the question to me, well, what has the value added from all these various things that I've done? Which I think I can answer. But I think it's a really good way to be self-reflective about this. Even if not going up for promotion or anything like that, just to be aware of myself about what I'm doing, which presumably will let me be more purposeful about what activities I choose to engage in. So I think this has been a very helpful exercise.

PHIL MIXTER: Thanks. And again, I'll emphasize the reflective past as well as the prospective future. So you can now articulate to your department head where you plan to go with some more information about where you've been. Yes? I'm coming to you with the microphone.

AUDIENCE: All right. Thank you. I'm also from the history department. And I'm really enjoying this. I'm finding it really useful, valuable. And particularly, the emphasis on teaching, which is pretty much what I do. Research is not part of my annual evaluation. But I live with people who research really is part of their annual evaluation. And it's an inescapable because most of your promotion depends upon what your research is.

And the question I have-- which we're not going to answer here-- is, when are we going to see this intersection occur? I hope we do see it. I think we will see it because of what's happening right here, when I see the emphasis in the university upon the importance of teaching. What

I'm really hoping to see is teaching factors into promotion in ways that it doesn't now and that people are rewarded for putting time into their teaching as well as their research, that promotion doesn't depend upon just research, the way it does now.

PHIL MIXTER: Thank you. I think, again, having mechanisms-- we talk about this framework and this process of external review as kind of a game changer in the world I'm in, the bioscience world, where a lot of the research emphasis is very prevalent. So I empathize with that and share your concern and hopes that this will help change the culture.

And we know that that's going to take a while. It's going to take some cycles. But now you've got some tools to help tell your story, self-advocate, and potentially get meaningful external review from your colleagues across the nation or regionally that would help that argument that you're a fine effective teacher, you have data to support that, and people across the country share that view. You're promotable for that reason. Great stuff. Let me ask the branch campuses if anybody wants to chip in anything. We see you on the screen, and feel free to interrupt us at any time.

AUDIENCE: Hi, [INAUDIBLE].

PHIL MIXTER: Welcome.

AUDIENCE: From WSU Vancouver. I also really am enjoying this event. And it is giving me a lot of tools to play with, which is really interesting. One of the things I want to ask is, what constitutes the scholarly approach? It's ambiguous for an instructor. What things are included under scholarly work? Could you just expand that, what it exactly means?

PHIL MIXTER: I think both Erica and I will take a turn. But we use scholarship as a broad term because there's so much diversity across the university. And when we talk about a scholarly approach to teaching-- and I'm not sure if that's what you were asking about-- the idea is that you're using evidence-based practices. You're examining the role of the literature about education and instruction and teaching as you develop your materials, regardless of the area of expertise. So you're using practices that have a scholarly basis. Did I misinterpret your question? Or is that what you were--

AUDIENCE: That's exactly what I'm asking.

PHIL MIXTER: Right. So again, if you're in a certain area-- my area happens to be microbiology. If I'm an expert in microbiology, that's my area of expertise. That may or may not mean I'm a good microbiology educator. And the idea is that there's some demonstration. Maybe it's professional development activities. Maybe it's discretionary time that I use to read up on educational practices. Maybe I apply something that's been proven to work in medical schools or in History 101 on the campus of the University of Nebraska. But that scholarly approach means that I'm bringing in a rich scholarly approach, evidence-based approach, to my teaching.

ERICA SUCHMAN: Yeah, I would say basically the same thing. That it's you're doing professional development. You're paying attention to the literature. You're demonstrating. But the key thing is you got to demonstrate how are you using that information, right? It's not enough to say, I go to workshops, but I never implement anything in my classes based on them. But it's kind of keeping track of, what am I doing to make myself a better teacher? How am I using that stuff? And then the last step is, and how am I looking to see if that's actually making a difference? Am I looking to see if this makes a difference? Or am I just making changes, and maybe they work, and maybe they don't, and I don't really pay attention?

PHIL MIXTER: It's a great question. Thank you.

AUDIENCE: Thank you [INAUDIBLE].

PHIL MIXTER: Other questions or items of discussion? I really do want to encourage each of you, as I mentioned to some of you in the room here in Pullman, pivot on this workshop. If you're concerned about how your unit will receive a document in this format, please ask. Maybe you're having annual review types of discussions now. I know our unit's doing that.

This is a great time to say, I want to adopt this new format. A, is that OK? B, are you receptive? C, can I show you the website if you want to learn more? But the important thing is I want to tell my professional story. I want to be valuable to WSU. I want you to understand I'm valuable to WSU. And furthermore, I want people outside of WSU to understand my value as an educator in whatever context I'm working in. OK?

Our goal here is to equip you, but I want to remind you that it's a workshop. You've got to apply the things we're talking about and have those discussions with your unit head. Maybe they have to bubble up to the dean or provost level as well. We talked a little bit about Kelly Ward, our provost who died unexpectedly last year, who was really a champion of this transition. And this transition has stumbled a little bit because of her untimely death.

But I think that WSU is moving towards a framework where they could be more evaluative about an instructional role. And there's an understanding that more and more people are delivering student credit hours, who need a mechanism for professional development, a mechanism for promotion. And depending on your unit, that may or may not include tenure.

All right. So we're going go on and talk a little bit more about the teaching portfolio. Again, in this big picture you've seen before, we talked about the educator's CV as a way to effectively compile in a broad and deep way, a rich way, sort of everything you've done, maybe everything you've ever done. But at least in terms of your current activities, have a sense of what that means, conveying that to someone externally. The teaching portfolio is what we like to call your greatest hits album. Right? I know you got a lot of hits, but you're going to have to choose a few that you want to spotlight.

And the teaching portfolio, again, is designed to be very individualistic. You get to contextualize this story for yourself. And the idea is it's a highlight reel. It's the bright spots that you want to make sure people evaluating you know. So this part is not going to be comprehensive. It's not going to be wide. But it should be deep. OK? It's actually going to be narrow and deep. Is that clear? This is sort of a way to offset the all-encompassing compendium of the CV, and now move to really telling your highlighted story.

And again, we like a structure that has an executive summary. And we like highlighted activities to be succinct. We're aware that folks making these decisions are going to be hard-pressed to read a 100-page document that you generate. So instead, we're going to ask you to be focused and be succinct in this way. So you can, again, go to our website, and you can bring this up. Maybe some of you have already done this on the other side. But let's-- whoops, I'm trying to go backwards-- let's have you jump to the teaching portfolio part and now think about one or two activities you want to highlight.

ERICA SUCHMAN: So we want to talk about things that you might be doing in learner assessment, educational research, curriculum/program development, and educational leadership. I don't remember what exactly [INAUDIBLE].

PHIL MIXTER: [INAUDIBLE]

ERICA SUCHMAN: Oh yeah. So this is kind of how you develop new ways of assessing your students. And so test development maybe that are being used by multiple courses or multiple sections or things that might pre-test and post-test, I would talk about that. Educational research is really are you doing educational research that you're presenting at other meetings or that you are publishing in journals. Not everybody is going to have this, but some people will. And if you do, you really want to document that.

Curriculum and pedagogical program development is are you developing new courses, are you helping your department develop a curriculum plan or program development. And then lastly is education leadership. So are you taking a leadership role in your university? Do you work on the Committee of Teaching and Learning, something like that? Are you working with a professional society? So both Phil and I are very active in the American Society for Microbiology in their education board, in their education board of activities. So that's the kind of stuff that we would document under educational leadership, the work that we're doing there. Any questions about this? Yes?

AUDIENCE: It's not a question, but a comment.

PHIL MIXTER: Don't forget to repeat the question.

ERICA SUCHMAN: OK.

AUDIENCE: I just want everyone to be aware that last year, changes were made to the faculty manual so that activities that include the assessment of student learning outcomes for a program are now recognized in the teaching category. So if you're involved in activities where you're looking at student work for the purpose of scoring outcomes related to your program beyond your course, those are things that should be documented and count in the teaching category. We are working to get changes in Activity Insight, where there will be a section where you can do that. We don't have those yet. But this year under teaching, there's "other teaching," that category. And if you go in there, that would be a place where you could document those activities.

ERICA SUCHMAN: OK, I'm going to try to summarize that for those of you-- could you hear that, or should I repeat that? Can't tell. OK. So she was saying that if you are working on assessments, that you should document that, and that there currently isn't a good place to do that in your--

PHIL MIXTER: Activity Insight.

ERICA SUCHMAN: --Activity Insight. And so you should put that under "other teaching activities." And WSU is trying to look at that.

AUDIENCE: So the learner assessment, are we talking about developing an entirely different way to assess learning or just writing a different example that's never been used before?

ERICA SUCHMAN: A different way of assessing. Like a non-traditional way of assessing student learning. All right. So this is kind of the processes that we are envisioning for the Regional Teaching Academy. And so this is just for you all to start thinking about how you may move your areas into thinking about evaluating this way. So faculty members would submit their packet for review. They would get reviewed by two regional Teaching Academy members, who are in the external review teaching group.

Now, this is going to be truly external because if someone from CSU, for example, submits their packet, I am immediately disqualified from reviewing their packet. So it has to be somebody from the other four universities. Those will then go to the full panel to meet and discuss. So that's the panel that's going to review, but it wouldn't include anybody from CSU issue for me. And then the committee would write a letter to the home institution, and that would serve as one of the external letters of evaluation.

Now that would just be one letter. And the way that it would work is either the faculty member or the PTR Committee would put that as one of the letters. And so in my department, we're really pushing that would not be one of the letters that the faculty member would have to give. It would be one that the department would give. So the department would be requesting the Regional Teaching Academy to do an external evaluation on that teacher. I don't know if you have--

PHIL MIXTER: Yeah. I mean, the idea is it would be outside WSU and truly external [INAUDIBLE].

ERICA SUCHMAN: Do you know if you guys have a plan for who submits it?

PHIL MIXTER: It's unit specific.

ERICA SUCHMAN: Unit specific. OK. So for those who have not gotten to that point yet, usually when you submit your packet, you are asked to provide a list of external evaluators. And it's usually four or five people that you would submit. And then your promotion and tenure committee submits a list, too. And then they have to get a certain number from the two lists, and no more than, I think, half of them can be from your personal list. So some of the people you put on your list are going to get picked, and some are not.

Whereas if you put this external review as your promotion and tenure, one of the ones that they pick, then you know it'll get picked. Because the five, for example, let's say I put them on my list, but my promotion and tenure review committee doesn't pick them. There's one to be chosen, then it doesn't get used. So we're trying to make sure that it gets used. But that's a lot of working with our departments to make that happen.

All right. So, these are all the committee members who have been working on this. We've been working on it for like five or six years now. We're finally at the point where we're rolling this out. So you can see that we have people from all of the five universities. Any more questions? Comments or feedback? We all good? All right, thanks a lot.