

REPORT OF THE VICE PROVOST  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION  
John J. Duffy

TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE  
November 19, 1993

Presidents Palms has directed Interim Chancellor Whitener, Chancellor Alexander, and myself to conduct a study of potential faculty salary inequity on the campuses paralleling the study done in Columbia. He has appointed a committee consisting of Frankie Cubbedge (Dean of the Library, USC Aiken), Deborah Cureton (Director of Academic Services, USC Lancaster), Lawrence Dark (Executive Assistant to the President for Equal Opportunity Programs), Jane Jameson (Vice President, Division of Human Resources), Walter Parham (General Counsel), Lori Thombs (Department of Statistics), and Marcia Welsh (School of Medicine). I will submit a report to this committee prior to March 15. I will ask the deans to furnish the necessary information to me. If there are salary inequities, we will have to set aside funds from next year's budget to deal with the problem.

I want to bring you up-to-date on the dispute between the College Presidents and the CHE over the funding formula. The College Presidents submitted a proposal. CHE had adopted a staff report which was counter to the College President's proposal. At the present moment, the colleges and the CHE are at a standoff. There is some possibility that the issue may be taken to the Legislature. What particularly bothers the College Presidents is the fact that the CHE formula goes beyond the issue of funding and actually attempts to dictate policy concerning admission of students and emphasis on programs to the colleges.

I want to call to your attention the fact that Distance Education, headed by Susan Bridwell, no longer directly reports to this Division, although there is still a "broken line" connection insofar as the program affects the campuses. Distance Education has been merged with Instructional Services under Susan's direction. I feel that the reorganization will not have an appreciable impact on the delivery of courses to the campuses.

Below is a brief report from David Hunter on the progress being made in securing 300- and 400-level business courses on the campuses which currently do not have them.

Since the reorganization, several meetings have taken place between representatives from Business Administration (Carolyn Jones and Leslie Wingard), Susan Bridwell, and David Hunter, to discuss the possibility of delivering upper-level BADM courses to the five Regional Campuses. As a result of the meetings, we have generated issues/concerns/questions concerning such areas as accreditation, target population, best time to offer the courses, which courses to offer,

campus-based resources, relationship to Aiken business courses currently being offered at several of the campuses, and funding. We are in the process of gathering information related to these concerns and will seek input from all appropriate parties as our work progresses.

I would like an update from the Senate through John Gardner on progress on the System Sexual Harassment policy.

We have been asked to have you nominate a person for us to suggest to the President for appointment to a new System committee on health and safety.

I am enclosing with this report a copy of Trustee William Hubbard's comments to the Board of Trustees on the CHE Two-Year Education.

Also appended to this report is a paper describing the reconstitution of the System Academic Advisory Committee.

I apologize for the fact that I will not be able to attend the Faculty Senate Meeting because I must return to Columbia to attend a meeting at which the TASCOR report will be discussed.

Report on CHE Committee to Study Two Year Education in South Carolina

Given to the Board of Trustees on October 22, 1993

Mr. Hubbard reported that in October 1992 the Commission on Higher Education authorized the creation of a committee to study the future of post-secondary education in South Carolina, focusing on the first two years after high school. The state's sixteen technical colleges and the University of South Carolina's five regional campuses have been closely examined in order to address and, ultimately, come up with a plan to minimize unnecessary duplication of educational services and programs, facilities, faculty members, and other costs associated with meeting the educational needs of South Carolinians.

Eight members were appointed by the Commission on Higher Education to study two year education and those are: from the University of South Carolina, Board members Mrs. Lily Roland Hall and Mr. William Hubbard; from the State Technical Education System, its chairman Mr. P. Henderson Barnette and its vice chairman Mr. Clarence Hornsby, Jr.; from the CHE, Mr. Edwin E. Tolbert, Sr. and Mr. Edward T. McMullin, Jr.; and from the Council of Presidents, President Sanders of the University of Charleston and President DiGiorgio of Winthrop University. This eight person group has been known as the Policy Committee and has met on eight occasions during the past twelve months.

A Technical Support Group consisting of ten members was also formed to aid the Policy Committee in collecting and analyzing relevant data. USC has been represented very ably on the Technical Support Group by Dr. Robert Alexander, Chancellor at USC Aiken; Dr. George Reeves, Deputy Provost; and Dean Pete Arnold, Dean at USC Lancaster. The Technical Support Group has met separately from the Policy Committee on eleven occasions during the past twelve months. In addition the Policy Committee and selected members of the Technical Support Group visited three of the state's technical colleges; they were: Central Carolina Technical College in Sumter, York Technical College in Rock Hill, and Technical College of the Low Country in Beaufort. On those same visits and public hearings, the campuses of USC Sumter, USC Lancaster, and USC Beaufort were visited.

Through meetings with administrators, faculty, students, and members of the local communities, the Committee and the Technical Support members ascertained the extent to which local institutions meet the post-secondary education needs of their areas efficiently and economically. During these meetings, hundreds of individuals were heard from--representing diverse interests. They presented their views on post-secondary education and answered specific questions posed by the Policy Committee.

Having completed that work, at its last meeting the Policy Committee adopted six overriding principles. These six principles will guide the drafting of the final report of the Committee which is due to be completed by November 30. The principles are: (1) we should promote greater cooperation, particularly in the areas of libraries, laboratories, equipment, special staff, faculty, common academic programs, scheduling, facilities, planning and development; (2) this report and this committee would recommend that no action be taken which would inhibit access to higher education in South Carolina; (3)

special care should be taken in approving new facilities so as to avoid unnecessary duplication; (4) institutions should clearly differentiate and sharply define their missions and the missions of the two systems; (5) there will be no merger of the technical education system and the USC regional campuses; and (6) each service area has unique demographic characteristics and needs and must be allowed to be responsive to the unique demographic characteristics and needs of that area. Those are the guiding principles which are currently governing the drafting of the final report. The University is represented on the drafting subcommittee by Mrs. Hall and Dr. Reeves. Other members of the drafting subcommittee are: Don Peterson of the State Technical Education System; Clarence Hornsby, the vice chairman of the State Tech Board; and Gail Morrison of the Higher Education Commission.

It is the hope of all members of the Policy Committee and the Technical Group that the job is done in such a manner as to resolve the issue once and for all. This is about the 15th or 16th time that such a study has been commissioned by the Higher Education Commission over the last 15 or 20 years. Incredible resources have gone into this project. All institutions have been called upon to come forward with extensive information; hundreds of people were heard from throughout the course of the study. All involved in the study want to have the information be accurate, to have a report that speaks for itself, and to have the recommendations in the report resolve the issue once and for all. It is also hoped that the information gathered will be a valuable resource in determining what overall efforts might be involved in possible restructuring in higher education. This could be a great resource in any future discussions by the Legislature, or any other body, about the future course of higher education in South Carolina.

## The Proposal

The Academic Planning Committee hereby proposes the creation of a new committee, to be called the System Academic Advisory Committee, the nature of which is described below. Further, the Committee proposes that the existing Academic Planning Committee, and also the existing System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee, be abolished, since the new Committee would render these two existing Committees unnecessary and duplicative.

**General Purposes:** The System Academic Advisory Committee would be charged with identifying and advocating ways of strengthening the academic mission of the University system consistent with the University's ideals of campus diversity and autonomy. To this end, it would provide an institutional forum for the regular exchange of information regarding existing forms of intercampus cooperation, integration, and sharing (for instance, in faculty development, curriculum goals, academic programs, collaborative research, support services), and for the articulation, development, and/or review, of proposals to improve existing, or to create new, forms of intercampus and systemwide cooperative academic ventures.

Relatedly, it is expected that the President and Provost shall consult with and seek advice from the System Academic Advisory Committee on all proposals and initiatives believed likely to affect the academic mission or programs of more than one campus, and similarly to look to the Committee for help in resolving systemwide academic problems, in establishing new programs having a systemic effect, and in developing academic priorities.

**Powers:** All recommendations made by the Committee will be advisory only. The Committee shall ordinarily make its recommendations to the President and/or Provost, but may, at its discretion, make recommendations to the Core Planning Group and/or to faculty Senates or other faculty governing bodies.

To help insure Committee oversight of and participation in academic initiatives that have or may have systemic impact, the Committee shall be sent copies of all letters of intent proposing new academic programs. Those proposals which, in the view of the Committee, have or are likely to have an impact on more than one campus or on the system as a whole can then be identified as deserving of Committee review.

To help insure Committee involvement in and knowledge of plans affecting the academic mission of the University, the Chairperson of the Committee shall be a voting member of the Core Planning Group.

**Procedures:** Though Committee decisions will be made by majority rule, the Committee shall always strive to reach decisions on the basis of consensus instead.

To help meet the Committee's charge of improving communication between campuses, copies of all agenda and of all minutes will be sent to the chief academic officers of each campus.

proposal for a System Academic Advisory Committee continued

It is expected that the Committee will ordinarily meet once a month during the academic year. It is expected, too, that the Committee will hold some of its regularly scheduled meetings at campuses other than the Columbia campus.

Membership: As the Chief Academic Officer of the system, the Provost shall be an ex officio, non-voting, member of the Committee.

One student, representing the undergraduate students in the system and selected by their leaders in a manner to be determined by them, shall be a voting member of the Committee.

All other members are to be selected by the respective faculty of each of the campuses in the University system as follows: five representatives from the Columbia campus, two representatives each from the Aiken, Spartanburg, and Aiken campuses, and one representative each from the other five campuses. (Hence the total membership will be ~~17~~, including the student member and not counting the Provost.) Selection of faculty representatives will be determined by the respective campuses in accordance with their policies and procedures. Ordinarily, representatives are to be selected from ~~the~~ the ranks of full time faculty.

15 (coastal)  
out

Tenure of the student member shall be for no more than three years. Tenure of the faculty members shall be for three years. The members shall select their Chair at the start of each academic year, and no person may serve as Chair for more than two years during his or her tenure on the Committee.

(This ends the proposal.)

**STUDY OF GENDER BIAS USING SALARY MODEL  
USC SUMTER FALL 1993**

The following report is based on a statistical analysis of data gathered over a period of years. For several years, the USC Sumter Administration has used a computerized salary model to determine the equity of annual raises (when available). The purpose of this model is to examine a variety of factors (annual evaluations, discipline, years of service, etc; explained further below) in order to generate an optimum equitable salary for each individual faculty member. Using the model it is also possible to generate the same type of information for all faculty within a given rank. The columns below marked "Projected" indicate optimum average salaries for faculty in each rank, taking into account all relevant factors.

		SALARY	ADJUSTED	YRS	EVAL	DEFICIT	PROJECT
Total f	14	\$36,594	\$34,626	11.5	7.1	\$6,408	\$41,034
Total m	31	\$39,094	\$37,188	11.2	7.2	\$6,685	\$43,873

Note 1: the adjusted salary column converts all salaries to a 9 month standard with administrative stipends removed (as if the administrator converted to 9 month status). Administrative salaries include only Librarians, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the Division Chairpersons. The average salary differences can be due to things other than gender (i.e., years of service, level of evaluation, and Discipline). With years of service and evaluations so similar, the focus should be on Discipline (there are four times more males in the Sciences and Business than there are females; 17 to 4, or 55% to 29%). Recall that, all things being equal, salaries in the Sciences and Business are higher than Humanities & Arts salaries. In addition, (data not presented above) males tend to average 3.6 average years at rank compared to 2.6 for females.

Note 2: as indicated in Note 1, the projected salary is affected by the level of evaluation. Since the evaluators and the process of evaluation have changed over time, two additional evaluation models have been computed. One model is based on the average of the last 10 years, and the other is based on the last 5 years. This information is presented below:

		SALARY	ADJUSTED	10-yr	5-yr
Total f	14	\$36,594	\$34,626	\$41,807	\$42,469
Total m	31	\$39,094	\$37,188	\$44,527	\$44,837

**RANK OF INSTRUCTOR**

Excluding 12 month faculty at Instructor rank (administrators), there are only two faculty at the rank of Instructor, one male, one female. Both are in the Division of Business Administration. Both are on one-year appointments. Both receive exactly the same salary.

**RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

SEX	NO	SALARY	ADJUSTED	YRS	EVAL	DEFICIT	PROJECT
female	2	\$31,000	\$31,000	1.0	7.0	\$3,183	\$34,183
male	7	\$34,328	\$32,727	4.7	7.4	\$3,934	\$36,661

Note 4: Data include Division Chairperson. Part of salary difference is likely due to Discipline (Business, Math, Science vs. Humanities and Education) as well as years at rank (3 vs 1).

Note 5: as indicated in Note 2, level of evaluation has an effect on the projected salary. Averaging across the last 10 years and the last 5 years did not alter the data for the females; the new projections for males was \$36,704 and \$36,841, respectively. This is not surprising given the difference in average years of experience.

**RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

SEX	NO	SALARY	ADJUSTED	YRS	EVAL	DEFICIT	PROJECT
female	7	\$35,674	\$32,966	14.4	6.8	\$6,878	\$39,844
male	7	\$34,001	\$34,001	9.9	7.2	\$6,445	\$40,446

Note 6: Data include Division Chairperson and Librarian. As a starting point, since the number at rank are the same, one would generally expect similar data for the two groups. In this case, years of service and level of evaluation play off each other. Also, (data not presented) again males have more years in rank than females (5.1 versus 4.0).

Note 7: the data concerning the different models for determining level of evaluation are presented below:

		SALARY	ADJUSTED	10-yr	5-yr
female	7	\$35,674	\$32,966	\$40,832	\$41,783
male	7	\$34,001	\$34,001	\$40,561	\$40,858

**RANK OF PROFESSOR**

SEX	NO	SALARY	ADJUSTED	YRS	EVAL	DEFICIT	PROJECT
female	4	\$42,649	\$40,502	14.3	7.8	\$8,219	\$48,721
male	16	\$43,975	\$40,984	15.4	7.5	\$8,282	\$49,266

Note 8: data include Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Chairpersons, and Librarian. Data not presented indicate that males average 3.5 years at rank and females average 1.3.

Note 9: data from the different models of level of evaluation are presented below:

SEX	NO	SALARY	ADJUSTED	10-yr	5-year
female	4	\$42,649	\$40,502	\$49,699	\$50,349
male	16	\$43,975	\$40,984	\$49,940	\$50,874

**ADDENDUM ON ETHNIC CONSIDERATIONS**

There are all kinds of minority classifications beyond those which we are legally bound to use. For a complete picture, the data presentation requires greater complexity. "Questions direct data collection; the data dictate their presentation (Castleberry, 1993)." Since the data is based on such a small number of observations, it is impossible to present a summary without identifying the salaries of individual faculty.



DATE: November 11, 1993  
TO: Whom it may concern  
FROM: Robert Castleberry  
RE: Salary Considerations

This report describes the current salary model and its goals.

I. **History:** Concern with the mechanism for the periodic adjustment of salaries led the Division Heads and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to undertake a series of salary studies beginning in the mid-1980's to help us understand salary distribution on this campus. Did inappropriate factors, such as gender or race, affect salary? What factors seemed to best explain the current allocation of salaries?

In 1987 data were collected on the faculty: initial date of employment with Clemson,<sup>1</sup> whether currently on the faculty or not, initial status (9-month faculty, chairperson, 12-month faculty, deans), end of the year evaluations to date, academic division (department), area of expertise, degree(s), beginning rank, current rank, date of hire, date of termination or the current year, previous academic experience, previous other professional experience, sex, race, current status (9-month, chairperson, etc.), when started in 12-month position, when ended a 12-month position, whether tenured or not--and if so, when--promotion history, starting salary, and current salary.

Multiple regression analyses were used to account for the variability of starting salaries by differentially weighing the other factors (sex, race, year started, administrative position, etc.) to find that weighing of factors which best "explained" starting salary. About 95% of the variability of starting salaries seemed to be determined by a combination of date of initial employment, initial status, and the academic division in which the faculty member was employed.<sup>2</sup> To a lesser extent, degree and previous experience were important. Sex and race did not seem to have affected salaries.

The results of these analyses served as the basis for the current salary model (see Section III).

---

<sup>1</sup> Until 1973, when this campus became a part of the USC system, we were a campus of Clemson University.

<sup>2</sup> There are four academic divisions at USC Sumter: 1. Arts and Letters; 2. Business and Economics, 3. Humanities, Social Sciences and Education, and 4. Science, Math and Engineering.

II. Goals: The goals of the salary model are to:

- acknowledge the multidimensional nature of salary determination and identify those dimensions that are most relevant to our campus,

- assist in the determination of salary raises and summer school compensation,

- identify a target salary for each faculty member which is consistent with the identified factors for our campus and which can be used to distribute the "inequity correcting" salary raises ("bottom-end adjustments") which are periodically mandated by the State or System Administration.

III. Model: The model currently assumes that the following factors should influence a faculty member's salary:

- Length of employment in the system (based on when the faculty member was hired). In general, the assumption is that higher salaries should go to those who have worked here the longest.

- Degree and area of expertise. Ph.D.s are generally paid more than Master's-level faculty; in response to market realities, faculty in Business and Science are paid more than the Arts and the Humanities.

- Previous experience. Faculty who have taught at other institutions should be hired at a higher rate than those fresh out of graduate school.

- Promotions. The USC System provides a salary supplement to acknowledge promotions in academic rank. Since this supplement varies over time, the model should be able to incorporate varying promotional supplements.

- The Annual Performance Appraisal. The model assumes that faculty who have received overall annual evaluations of "outstanding" should have higher salaries than those who have been evaluated as "satisfactory".

The model determines a faculty member's "target" salary based on the following formula:

$$\text{target} = \text{base salary} + \text{expertise} + \text{experience} + \text{promotions} + (\text{years here} * \text{average merit}) + \text{supplement}$$

The model treats these identified factors as necessary and sufficient. Note that such factors as race and sex are viewed as irrelevant and are not part of this formula.

- Base salary (related to length of time in the System) is determined by everyone hired up to 1975 having a base salary of \$10,040. This base is increased by \$1,140 for each year after 1975. These figures are based on a linear regression analysis of the salaries of the faculty in the Division of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education.

-Area of expertise is determined by degree and discipline. The model assumes an M.A. in arts. The data are consistent with the statistical analysis done on this campus and, in general, with salary reports on the greater academic community:

	ma	ma+	phd
arts, education, and humanities	\$0	\$500	\$1000
business	\$2000	\$2500	\$5000
math and sciences	\$2000	\$2500	\$3000

- Previous experience is recognized at the figure of \$200 per year of teaching at another institution. (This figure is somewhat arbitrary but still consistent with our past history.) The model assumes no previous experience. Since this model is based on a starting point of 1975 for this campus (this date was chosen since it is related to the metamorphosis from Clemson to USC and because of the size of the faculty [number of data points] available), there had to be a way to honor the teaching done for those at the Sumter Campus of Clemson. The arbitrary but still workable figure of \$500 per year was set.

- Promotional increments are now set by the University at \$2,500 for promotion to assistant professor; \$3,500 for promotion to Associate Professor; and \$5,000 for promotion to Professor. These figures have periodically been adjusted upward. The model assumes that everyone starts at the instructor rank. Also, adjusting these figures upward retrospectively alters the promotional increment for all faculty.

- Annual Performance Appraisals are considered as evidence of "longevity merit." The model's use of the Appraisals takes into consideration not only the length of service to the institution, but also one measure of the quality of that service. Each year the faculty are evaluated and are assigned an "overall" evaluation on the Annual Performance Appraisal form. Starting with 1980, the model averages these evaluations to provide an "average overall" evaluation.<sup>3</sup> A nine-point scale results, where 0 = unsatisfactory, 5 = satisfactory, 7 = above satisfactory, 9 = outstanding. Using this scale, the model awards \$1140 per year of service to a 5.0, and each unit above 5.0 is worth an additional \$225. These figures are linked to the yearly increase in base salary and a preferred

---

<sup>3</sup> There continues to be dialogue on the possibility of averaging over some other time frame (e. g., the last five years).

target for "merit" raises.

The model assumes a 9-month faculty status. Therefore, 12-month faculty salaries must be converted. To do this, these salaries are multiplied by 9/11ths and the administrative supplement (\$4,500 for Chairpersons and \$10,000 for the Associate Dean) is removed. This is the process that would be used if one of these individuals were changed to a 9-month faculty status.

IV. Modifications: Some of the targeted dollar figures used by the model were later adjusted downward. A look at our salaries indicated that our current actual salaries were well below the targeted salaries; the model was very different from reality (partly because of the lack of significant raises over the last several years). Considering the existing model as a useful but only approximate model, we modified it in an attempt to get a more workable end result (a target salary that would be easier to reach). The following changes in base rates used by the model produced an overall rate within 4.5% of the then current salaries; that was a few years ago:

	from	to
Clemson experience:	\$500	\$400
Other experience:	\$200	\$150
Base salary:	\$10,040	\$9,040
Satisfactory merit:	\$1,140	\$1,000
Additional Merit:	\$225	\$200

V. Statement: Concerning this model: it uses the same rules for everyone (it doesn't discriminate against any one individual), and it predicts a higher salary for almost all faculty. The information it provides will facilitate distributing bottom-end adjustments in an equitable manner and for predicting appropriate starting salaries for new faculty. If a faculty member's target salary is less than his or her current salary, he or she would not get any bottom-end adjustment. Under no conditions could a faculty member's current salary or merit salary (annual salary increase based on merit, see above) be reduced with this model.

## Teaching Effectiveness

Definition: Teaching effectiveness is the amount of progress students make on teacher defined goals consistent with professional standards in that discipline.

### CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING

#### Criterion:

#### Suggested Documentation:

#### COURSE DESIGN

Effective teaching involves the development of clear course goals which must be consistent with both the mission of the campus and the role of the course in the curriculum.

Effective instructors clearly connect stated goals of the course to the assessment of student learning.

1. Personal narrative statement
2. Sample syllabi
3. Sample exams
4. Development of new course
5. Peer review

#### STUDENT LEARNING

Students demonstrate progress in achieving course goals.

1. Alumni survey data
2. Pre- and post-test
3. Results of standardized exams
4. Samples of students' work
5. Success in subsequent course(s)
6. Post graduation employment statistics
7. Peer review of testing instruments

#### KNOWLEDGE

Effective instructors demonstrate a breadth and depth of understanding of the subject appropriate to the level of the course and students' backgrounds.

1. Degrees, certification, credentials
2. Professional publications and/or presentations
3. Course materials (syllabi, exams, etc.)
4. Attendance at professional meetings, conferences, seminars

### COMMUNICATION ABILITY

Effective instructors make themselves clear, state objectives, summarize major points and provide examples. They present material in an organized manner, and encourage student participation.

1. Personal narrative statement
2. Student evaluations
3. Classroom visitations
4. Video tapes, syllabi, course materials

### INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT

Effective instructors continually reassess their teaching methodologies and course content, and seek to enhance their teaching skills.

1. Personal narrative statement
2. Outcome measures
3. Attendance at teaching effectiveness workshops, seminars, etc.
4. Sample syllabi
5. Teaching diary

### PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Effective instructors are approachable and available. They are respected and are fair in all dealings with students. Their enthusiasm about teaching and their subject serves to motivate and inspire their students.

1. Student evaluations
2. Classroom visitations
3. Peer evaluations
4. Administrative evaluations

## References

- Abrami, P., D'Apollonia, S. and Cohen, P. (1992).  
Validity of student ratings of instruction: What we know and  
what we do not. The Chronicle of Higher Education. July  
21.
- Aubrecht, J. Are student ratings of teacher effectiveness valid?  
(1979) Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Cashin, W. Defining and evaluating college teaching.  
(1979). Center for Faculty evaluation and Development.
- Duke, D. Developing teacher evaluation systems that promote  
professional growth. (1990). Journal of Personnel Evaluation  
in Education 4: 131-144.
- Eble, K. (1971) The recognition and evaluation of teaching.  
Washington: American Association of University Professors.
- Kremer, J. (1990). Construct validity of multiple measures in  
teaching, research and service and reliability of peer  
ratings. Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 82, 2,  
213-218.
- Lacefield, W. (1986). Faculty enrichment and the assessment of  
teaching. The Review of Higher Education. Vol. 9, 4, 361-  
379.
- Murray, H., Rushton, J. and Paunonen, S. (1990). Teacher  
personality traits and student instructional ratings in six  
types of university courses. Journal of Educational  
Psychology. Vol. 82, 2, 250-261.
- Ory, J. (1991). Changes in evaluating teaching in higher  
education. Theory Into Practice. Vol XXX, 1, Winter.
- Seldin, P. (1993) The use and abuse of student ratings of  
professors. The Chronicle of Higher Education. July 21.
- Seldin, P. (1991). The teaching portfolio. Bolton, MA: Anker  
Publishing.
- Seldin, P. (1990) Changing practices in faculty evaluation.  
San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seldin, P. (1988). Evaluating college teaching. San Francisco:  
Jossey-Bass.