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Summary
A memo from the Provost addressed to deans and chairs and dated September 5, 2013 specifies the items required in tenure and promotion dossiers – see the relevant excerpt in the Appendix. The purpose of this document is to provide additional information and guidelines for faculty preparing the teaching portion of these dossiers. This document was developed by the University Teaching & Learning Center’s Faculty Advisory Board\(^1\).

Note:
• A promotion candidate does not need to address every item.
• It is expected that, at a minimum, dossiers will include the required items (indicated below).
• Schools and departments are encouraged to examine how expectations might differ between promotions to Associate and to Full Professor.

See also: the UTLC Peer Review Guidelines document on this page: http://tlcProvost.gwu.edu/tenure-promotion

A. (Required) Teaching Statement and Reflection: Past, Present, and Future

In three pages or less, with specific examples from your courses, describe your approach to teaching, what you have learned from your teaching, how you have sought to improve your teaching, and how you will continue to develop your program of teaching.

B. (Required) Courses taught during period of evaluation

1. Course list. Starting with the table below (and potentially expanding it), list each course you have taught, the enrollment, and whether graduate or undergraduate. If a course is a new prep or if you made any major changes to the course, please indicate that in the last column, with optional details provided separately in item B.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th># enrolled</th>
<th>grad/UG/other</th>
<th>New prep/redesign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Note: this version is more or less the same as the version posted in November 2013, with minor edits reflecting the change of name to UTLC.
2. **Illustrative examples.** For at least one but no more than three courses from the list above and using no more than one page per course, list the learning objectives(outcomes and the topics, the teaching approach, some of the learning activities, and some example assessments of learning outcomes you used. Syllabi for these courses may be included or referred to using a web address.

C. **Teaching Effectiveness**

1. *(Required) Internal peer reviews.* Departments are encouraged to provide reviews from more than one peer who observes the candidate’s teaching. The review is expected to include a longitudinal evaluation, across several years, based on the items in the UTLC’s Peer Review Guidelines.

2. *(Required) Student feedback and comments provided by department.* Departments should assemble representative student feedback, striving to avoid a mere reporting of ratings, and provide a meaningful analysis that includes comparisons with similar courses (with similar enrollments) taught by others.

3. **External peer reviews.** Departments may also provide at least one letter from a colleague who is not in the department and who observes the candidate’s teaching.

4. **Student letters.** These include student letters attesting to excellence not just in teaching but also, for example, in mentoring, guidance, advising, or supervision of undergraduate research. One compelling way of demonstrating impact is to get letters from alumni describing the impact of the candidate’s teaching, mentoring, and interaction on their personal and professional lives.
   a) **Student letters supplied by candidate.** These include letters written by students who have completed courses taught by the candidate.
   b) **Student letters sought by department/school.** Departments are encouraged to solicit letters from a variety of students who have taken the candidate’s courses or have been advised by the candidate, while accommodating the usual guidelines of anonymity and random selection.

5. **Teaching awards or other special recognition.** Examples include GW-wide awards, national awards, and departmental and school awards.

Note: a single peer letter can attest to several items across the categories A-D here. Letter writers are encouraged to identify which categories and items within categories their comments address.

D. *(Required) Development and Continual Improvement*

This section lets a candidate describe efforts taken towards learning and applying new techniques in teaching. It is understood that exploration of new approaches is an important part of development, even if the approaches do not always produce desired outcomes, and that it may take a few attempts to adapt a successful technique from elsewhere. Examples in this category include but are not limited to:

1. **Professional development activities.** Examples include self-reported attendance of teaching conferences or workshops, or peer letters certifying development.

---

2 Here, a peer is typically understood to mean someone of equivalent or higher rank but outside the department.
2. Letters from the UTLC certifying completion of UTLC programs such as the Faculty Learning Community for Junior Faculty, or the Peer Reviewed Exploration in Teaching programs.

3. Implementation and application. Examples include: self-reported description of having tried workshop techniques or new ideas in pedagogy, or peer letters that describe such implementation.

4. Results of implementation. Evidence that the techniques attempted above had an impact, as reviewed by peers, or by consultation with a university unit that evaluates teaching.

5. Collaborative teaching. Co-teaching is one way to learn pedagogical techniques from peers. This category excludes courses that are merely co-taught simply by dividing up the lectures. Instead, collaborative teaching includes courses that are team-taught with groups of instructors in the same classroom, or where the instructional team spends significant time working together to design course materials.

E. (Required) Impact on Department, GW, and the Discipline
This section lets a candidate describe contributions to the curriculum, mentoring, materials used by others, and the broader educational mission of the department, GW, and the discipline. Examples in this category include but are not limited to:

1. Curricular contributions. Description of effort directed towards, and outcomes resulting from, developing new core courses or overhauling existing courses, especially required or general education courses. Description of contributions to curricular reform and program development.

2. “Downstream” peer letters documenting impact of core courses. Many faculty expend tremendous effort in teaching core or general education courses. Letters that attest to the value of well-taught foundation courses can be solicited from both students and the faculty in downstream courses.

3. Textbooks, materials, or techniques used by others. Description of textbooks, course materials, websites, pedagogical approaches, and media authored by the candidate that are being used by other faculty.

4. Mentoring or training other faculty, TAs, postdocs, student groups. This does not include standard research mentoring given to the candidate’s PhD students, but instead should be limited to training or mentoring regarding teaching.

5. Contributions to assessment. Description of any particularly significant role the candidate has played in assessment of courses or programs.

6. Scholarship of teaching and learning. A list of SOTL publications or presentations. Note: SOTL contributions are often listed under research but may be listed here as well.
APPENDIX: Provost’s Requirements (teaching portion excerpt)

• **Teaching Statement and Reflection: Past, Present, and Future.** In no more than three pages, with specific examples from courses taught, the candidates will describe their approach to teaching, what they have learned from their teaching, how they have sought to improve their teaching, and how they will continue to develop their program of teaching.

• **Courses taught during period of evaluation.**
  
  o **Course list.** List of courses taught, the enrollment, whether graduate or undergraduate, and whether a new preparation or redesign was required.
  
  o **Illustrative example.** For at least one course from the list above and using no more than one page per course, candidate will list the learning objectives/outcomes and the topics, the teaching approach, some of the learning activities, and some example assessments of learning outcomes used.

• **Teaching Effectiveness**
  
  o **Internal peer reviews.** Departments are encouraged to provide reviews from more than one peer who observes the candidate’s teaching. Peer evaluations are especially valuable when they are done longitudinally over several years prior to the candidate’s year of review.
  
  o **Student feedback**, both numerical scores and comments, provided by department.
  
  o **Teaching awards** or other special recognition of teaching.

• **Development, Continual Improvement and Pedagogical Innovations.** Description of efforts taken to develop or apply new techniques in teaching to improve learning.

• **Impact on Department, GW, and the Discipline.** Description of the impact on curriculum development and pedagogy at the university and in the discipline.