# PART-TIME FACULTY EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AWARD

**PURPOSE**

As a means to further the University’s efforts to recognize outstanding faculty and to acknowledge the many and important contributions of the nontenure line faculty, this policy establishes an awards program for recognizing part-time faculty excellence in teaching and outlines a process for selecting and making these awards. This award is intended to recognize instructors who have not historically been eligible for university teaching awards.

# POLICY

One Part-Time Faculty Excellence in Teaching Award may be given per academic college annually. Each award will consist of a certificate signed by the college dean and a monetary award of $1,000. All faculty members teaching 75%or less FTE in both long semesters of the preceding calendar year are eligible for these awards, exclusive of those faculty members who have received this award in the preceding three years.

# PROCEDURE

Each college review committee will be composed of the Nontenure Line Faculty Committee (NLFC) members and liaisons for the college; therefore all departments within the college will have representation. The longest serving college NLFC member will serve as chair of the college selection committee.

Should an NLFC member or liaison apply for this award, a nontenure line faculty member from that department will be designated by the NLFC to serve on the selection committee.

# Application Process

* 1. Applications will be solicited via a faculty-wide email sent by the Faculty Senate.
	2. The deadline to submit 2017 applications to the Faculty Senate email is **March 10**. The Faculty Senate’s administrative assistant will upload supporting documentation to the TRACS Part-time Teaching Award project site by March 28 for review by the applicant’s college selection committee.
	3. Applicants are instructed to follow the guidelines listed below, and to address the Excellence in Part-time Teaching Award rubric (attached) in the application form and documentation. The college selection committee will use this rubric to review submissions.
	4. Upon receiving applications, the Faculty Senate will notify respective department chairs, school directors, and college deans.

# Guidelines

1. Each applicant must submit supporting documents to the Faculty Senate email account and by doing so, will grant approval to the NLFC to review his or her application materials. All documents will be confidential and available only to the committee. The Faculty Senate will notify chairs and deans of the faculty in their units who have applied for the award.

2. The application materials to be submitted are:

* + 1. Completed application form (following page)
		2. Narrative response statement (300-word maximum) to each of the four teaching practice prompts listed below. The statement for each prompt should cite one example of teaching effectiveness and explain how that example supports the response.
			- What are your personal strengths as a teacher? (Clear, detailed information about personal strengths as a teacher, with multiple examples)
			- How has your teaching changed since you began teaching and what have you done to improve it? (e.g. Have you adopted new kinds of assignments to better meet students’ needs? Have you changed the way you deliver content or assess student work? Have you experimented with innovative technology or new pedagogical techniques?)
			- Give an example of a teaching challenge you have encountered and explain how you’ve dealt with it. (Clearly conveyed with detailed information on how it was solved or managed)
			- Please give examples of innovative assignments and course design components that promote active learning and/or engagement (e.g. group projects, peer review, teamwork opportunities, cooperative learning, problem-based learning, discussion).

c. Texas State CV highlighting teaching development (e.g. teaching workshops, continuing education, curriculum development projects) and accomplishments (e.g. teaching awards, honors)

1. One course syllabus
2. Three written student comments that address teaching effectiveness (e.g. letters, comments from evaluations, emails)
3. One written letter of support from a full-time faculty member in your department

3. Applications that do not include the documentation outlined above or are not submitted by the specified deadlines will not be considered. Ranking of applicants will be based on information in the application materials as applied to the attached rubric.

# Committee Recommendations

Upon completion of the college committees’ reviews, the NLFC Chair will submit the committee’s recommendations to the Faculty Senate for endorsement. Once approved, the NLFC Chair will notify the College Deans of the award recipients.

# Deans’ Offices Responsibilities

The Deans will send the award announcement letters to recipients and present certificates, or other suitable awards, at the fall college convocation meetings.

Texas State University

**Part-Time Faculty Excellence in Teaching Award**

Application Form

Name Net ID

Department College

Current TXST teaching appointment FTE%

Number of long semesters of TXST teaching

Brief statement (100 – 150 words) of your qualifications for this award:

***Part-Time Faculty Awards for Excellence in Teaching Rubric***

**Applicant’s Name:**

**Applicant has completed all steps in the application process and has provided all required materials:**

Yes No

* Application Form
* Texas State CV
* Course Syllabus
* Written Student Comments
* Statement #1
* Statement #2
* Statement #3
* Statement #4

## **Teaching Practice Narrative Statements**

## Evaluator Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1) What are your personal strengths as a teacher? |  |
| 2) How has your teaching changed since you began teaching and what have you done to improve it?  |  |
| 3) Give an example of a teaching challenge you have encountered and explain how you’ve dealt with it. |  |
| 4) Please give examples of innovative assignments and course design components that promote active learning / engagement. |  |

**Possible points 4-5 2-3 0-1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teaching Development endeavors cited in CV** | Ongoing professional development cited specific to course needs or teaching improvement. | Minimal development cited or is not specific to course or teaching improvement. | No professional development or teaching improvement activities cited. |
| **Statement #1** Strengths as a teacher | Clear, detailed information about personal strengths as a teacher, with multiple examples. | Limited information related to personal strengths and vague examples. | No clear information on teaching strengths and no examples provided. |
|  **Statement #2**Teaching improvement | Multiple examples provided that indicate teaching improvement and how changes have impacted learning effectiveness. | Limited examples that somewhat convey improvement in teaching and some learning effectiveness. | Examples of teaching improvement not provided. |
|  **Statement #3**Teaching challenge and management / solution(s**)** | A teaching challenge is clearly conveyed with detailed information on how it was solved or managed. | A teaching challenge is not clearly described and its management is unclear or not relevant. | Information regarding a teaching challenge is not provided. |
| **Statement #4**Innovative Assignments/ Course Design | Learning activities provide multiple opportunities for students to interact.Course activities promote a high level of active engagement. | Learning activities provide a limited number of opportunities for students to interact.Course activities provide some active engagement. | Learning activities do not provide opportunities for students to interact. Course activities do not provide for active engagement. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teaching Effectiveness evinced in written student comments.** | Three written comments are provided and each one clearly indicates teaching effectiveness. | Two of the three comments clearly indicate teaching effectiveness. | One of the three comments clearly indicates teaching effectiveness. |

# TOTAL (30 points possible)

Additional comments / notes: