professional development activities must be explicitly linked to teaching and improving teaching in and out of the classroom.)

- All nominees should be asked to accept their nomination and to subsequently (within a given timeframe) submit the appropriate documents. The Committee will provide examples of the types of documents that reflect each of the criteria. However, nominees are at liberty to submit the ones most relevant to them, and may also present others that do not appear on the list, but may also speak to the criteria.

- The Committee decided that an assessment of student learning should also be included in their decision for the award. Therefore, in addition to the nominee-submitted documents, we are considering administering electronic surveys of students currently enrolled in the nominees’ classes. These courses would be the nominees’ regular course offerings (that is, not special topics). Adria Updike volunteered to create and administer the surveys after nominees have accepted their nominations. These evaluations would replace letters from students. We also discussed the possibility of offering students some incentive (such as small gift cards to the book store or merit points) for their participation. The Chair will investigate the feasibility of either of these options.

Adjourned: 3:00 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Kamille Gentles-Peart, Chair
Faculty Development Committee of the Senate
ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting of February 12, 2014

Call to order: 2:05 pm

In attendance: Bob Engvall, Steve Esons, Kamille Gentles-Peart, Adria Updike, Christine Fagan, Gokhan Celik

- The FDC received constructive feedback on the revisions to the criteria for the Excellence in Teaching Award submitted in January. Much of the comments were related to the absence of quality of teaching in the proposed criteria. Based on the feedback, the Committee came to the following decisions:

  ➢ The award should recognize faculty who demonstrate excellence in what they do as well as a commitment to continued improvement in teaching.

  ➢ There should be a distinction between criteria and evidence: “criteria” refers to the qualities that the nominees should exhibit in order to qualify for the award, and “evidence” refers to the documentation that nominees will be asked to submit to illustrate their fulfillment of the criteria.

  ➢ The criteria for the award are:
    - Leadership in promoting teaching and learning inside and outside of the classroom.
    - Ability to communicate effectively and inspire students.
    - Ability to prepare students for life after college.
    - Professional development and research in teaching.

  ➢ In order to help the Committee make its decision, nominees (all candidates under consideration) will be asked to submit the following. These documentations should not exceed one page each, and should include, but are not limited to:

    1. Two letters of support from peers or other faculty (at least one from faculty outside of the nominee’s departmental home).
    2. A list of his/her major/regular teaching responsibilities (courses taught in the last 3 years), and corresponding syllabi.
    3. Documentation of contributions to the development of programs and/or courses that have been incorporated into the University curriculum.
    4. Evidence of involvement with students outside of the classroom (such as community engagement and service learning projects, etc.).
    5. Evidence of engagement in the scholarship of teaching and other activities that may improve one’s knowledge and delivery of content. (These