Guidelines For Preparing a 2020-2021 Chancellor’s Award For Excellence In Teaching Nomination Portfolio

The following guidelines are in addition to the eligibility guidelines from SUNY System Administration available at: http://system.suny.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-staff-awards/chancellors-excellence-awards/ While the SUNY guidelines for this particular award are excerpted in this document, the full SUNY guidelines should also be consulted when compiling a portfolio. A hard copy of the entire portfolio must be submitted to CELT, 100b Edwards Hall by MONDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2020. The portfolio will be reviewed by the campus committee, Provost, and President. Nominators or nominees will be notified after the campus review process has been completed no later than February 19, 2021. If you have questions or would like to discuss how to put together a portfolio, please contact CELT at 395-5088 or celt@brockport.edu.

Please complete and include this checklist with your portfolio

☐ This is not a self-nomination.

☐ The nominee has completed at least three academic years of full-time service out of the five years at Brockport immediately prior to the academic year of nomination.

☐ The nominee is not on sabbatical or other leave during this academic year.

☐ The nominee holds a full-time teaching load with the title of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or assistant instructor. The nominee may also be a full-time Clinical faculty member or a full-time non-tenure track faculty member. (Individuals serving in a part-time capacity or holding a title of academic rank preceded by “visiting” or a similar designation are ineligible).

☐ The nomination portfolio fits in one three inch three ring binder maximum and does not include full articles, books, DVDs, etc.

☐ The nominee and/or nominator(s) have looked at successful portfolios from years past available in the CELT office in 100b Edwards Hall. (Call 395-5088 before visiting CELT to make sure someone is in the office.)

Items to be included in the nomination portfolio with suggested deadlines include:
1. **Table of contents with page numbers**

2. **Nomination portfolio checklist (included on first page of this document)**

3. **Brief cover letter or memo from the nominator(s)** indicating who she/he/they are and specifying whether correspondence about the nomination should be addressed to the nominator(s) or nominee. Please note: the nominator(s) should NOT consist of all members of the nominee’s APT committee. Nominators typically are one or two members of the nominee’s department.

4. **Summary Presentation** – maximum of five single spaced pages. This provides the rationale for the campus’s nomination of a candidate and sets forth candidate merit for selection. It is the only documentation available to those involved in the System-level review to explain the campus’ rationale for nominating the candidate for this honor. **It must address how the candidate excels in each criterion for selection for the award (listed below in the SUNY Guidelines)** to which the candidate is nominated, the candidate’s most outstanding qualifications and major achievements attained. The quality of the evidence provided is critical to recommendation. Although excerpts from the recommendations can and should be included, the Summary Presentation must be more than a testimonial. There must be specific, concrete examples of how the nominee fulfills each criterion. **The Summary Presentation should be written by the nominator(s) and not by the nominee** (or in the first person) because this undermines the impartiality and objectivity required of the nomination process.

5. **Vita** – an up-to-date and moderately detailed vita containing information on the nominee’s career must be included in the nomination portfolio. **Included must be the date of appointment to the SUNY system, highest rank attained and date of appointment to that rank.** It should also include areas of specialization, research activities, professional and scholarly publications, honors and campus and State University service.

6. **Short (1 page or less) letters of support from:**
   a. the Department APT Committee *(should receive portfolio by 9/28/20)*
   b. the Department Chair *(should receive portfolio by 10/12/20)*
   c. the School Dean *(should receive portfolio by 10/26/20)*

7. **Additional supporting materials** should be organized in the portfolio in the following sections. A short (1 page or less) introductory statement summarizing and reflecting on each lettered (a-f) section (where appropriate) is recommended.
   a. **Teaching Methods and Materials**
      i. Statement of teaching philosophy
      ii. Sample syllabi and course materials that provide evidence of:
         1. having taught a variety of courses with different class sizes (indicate if departmental circumstances prevents nominee from doing this);
         2. having successfully used diverse teaching methods and techniques;
         3. course materials that are up to date and routinely revised;
         4. the appropriate use of technology in teaching.
   b. **Grading and Assessment**
      i. How does the nominee set high expectations for students and help them achieve those expectations?
      ii. How does the nominee construct assignments that are rigorous and appropriate for the type and level of the course?
iii. How does the nominee maintain grading patterns that are rigorous and appropriate for the type and level of the course? (Include grade distributions for all courses taught the last two years.)

iv. How does the nominee provide formative and constructive feedback to students?

v. How does the nominee employ methods of student assessment that match course content?

vi. When student assessment must be subjective, how does the nominee develop scoring criteria (rubrics) to increase objectivity?

c. Engagement with Students (letters from students should be placed in this section)
   i. Evidence of availability to students outside of course hours (1:1, groups, or clubs)
   ii. Evidence of work with students on independent or directed studies, or on theses and projects
   iii. Evidence of student tutoring, mentoring, or providing extra help.
   iv. Evidence of research collaboration with students
   v. Evidence of student success with regard to employment, graduate school, certification exams, honors/awards, publications, presentations, etc.

d. Feedback and Evaluation
   i. Summary and discussion of IAS results (include average means for the first four items over the nominee’s career at Brockport and discuss teaching changes made as a result of IAS feedback)
   ii. A representative sample of full original printouts of IAS results (include the most recent forms for all courses taught) with the grade distributions for these courses
   iii. Statement by a peer(s) (any faculty member at Brockport) who has observed the candidate’s classroom teaching in the last year

e. Professional Development
   i. How does nominee keep up-to-date with developments in his or her field?
   ii. How does nominee incorporate new developments into his or her courses?
   iii. What teaching professional development opportunities has the nominee taken advantage of?
   iv. How has the nominee incorporated teaching professional development into his or her courses?

f. Teaching and Scholarship/Service
   i. Does the nominee maintain an active program of scholarship?
   ii. How does the nominee balance or incorporate scholarship and teaching?
   iii. How is the nominee’s teaching related to his or her service?
   iv. Does the nominee conduct scholarship related to teaching and learning?

SUNY Guidelines

To be used primarily to draft the “Summary Presentation” document but also to inform the support letters and additional supporting materials.

Nature of the Program

The Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Teaching recognizes consistently superior teaching at the graduate, undergraduate, or professional level in keeping with the State University’s commitment to providing its students with instruction of the highest quality.

Selection Criteria
The primary criterion is skill in teaching. Additionally, consideration is also given to sound scholarship (usually demonstrated through publications or artistic productions), outstanding service to students, as well as service to the State University and to the campus. The following criteria are to be used in selecting nominees for this award:

- **Teaching Techniques and Representative Materials** – There must be positive evidence that the candidate performs superbly in the classroom. The nominee must maintain a flexible instructional policy that adapts readily to student needs, interests and problems. Mastery of teaching techniques must be demonstrated and substantiated. Consideration is to be given to the number of substantially different courses taught, the number of students per course, and the different teaching techniques employed in the various courses.

  - When available, student evaluations (in the form of student questionnaires administered and compiled by persons other than the nominee) presented for several different courses over a period of several recent years may provide a clear idea of the nominee's impact on students.

- **Scholarship and Professional Growth** – Candidates must be teacher/scholars who keep abreast of their own field and who use the relevant contemporary data from that field and related disciplines in their teaching. Evidence in this area includes, but is not limited to, publications, grants, presentations at conferences, artistic productions, etc.

- **Student Services** – In relating to students, candidates must be generous with personal time, easily accessible, and must demonstrate a continual concern for the intellectual growth of individual students. The focus here is the accessibility of the nominee to students outside of class; e.g. office hours, conferences, special meetings, and the nominee's responsibility in terms of student advisement.

- **Academic Standards and Requirements, and Evaluation of Student Performance** – Candidates must set high standards for students and help them attain academic excellence. Quantity and quality of work that is more than average for the subject must be required of the students. Candidates must work actively with individual students to help them improve their scholarly or artistic performance. This individual interaction is an important source of information that indicates the nature and level of instruction offered by the nominee. Consideration is to be given to the quality, quantity, and difficulty of the tasks or work assigned to students.

Candidates' evaluations of students' work must be strongly supported by evidence. Candidates must be willing to give greater weight to each student's final level of competence than to the performance at the beginning of the course. Since expert teachers enable students to achieve high levels of scholarship, it is possible that the candidates' marking records may be somewhat above average. There must also be evidence that candidates do not hesitate to give low evaluations to students who do poorly. For this category, consideration should be given to grading patterns, particularly grade distributions for all courses in at least two recent years. Evidence in support of student performance may also be assessed by the accomplishments of students, including placement and achievement levels.