mental evaluations of lecture, seminar, and graduate-student teaching. Dossiers accompanying tenure proposals now include a “teaching statement” so candidates’ work as educators can be assessed. Finally, he said, in a few departments, “peer support” was under way: a first step toward the compact’s recommendation that faculty members invite colleagues to their classes to monitor, evaluate, discuss, and learn from effective teaching techniques, or to correct deficiencies.

The effort is far from systematic to date: Smith characterized the measures overall as “lots of little things,” all of which need to be pursued to effect broad improvements in teaching.

Along the way, all sorts of complicated issues arise. A basic one is the proper expectation for teaching in a research university. During the review of the undergraduate curriculum, then-FAS dean William C. Kirby wrote, in his 2005 annual letter, “We can equal the best small colleges in teaching and inspiration.”

There are no exact metrics for determining such rankings: the best, crude measure is students’ response to “satisfaction” surveys—but those available give the nod to learning contexts where students have most contact with faculty members, and where professors’ obligations are most focused on teaching. Harvard’s senior survey, reported recently in the Crimson, generally shows greater satisfaction in smaller concentrations, with smaller classes, than in the very largest ones, with greater reliance on large lectures. The 31-member Consortium on Financing Higher Education surveys student satisfaction with academic experiences at select, private schools (including Harvard and the other Ivies). The results are confidential, but those who have seen them say liberal-arts colleges score higher than universities, and institutions like Princeton—with lesser commitments to professional schools, and a culture focused on teaching—rank higher than peers. Although reliable data are scarce, much of the teaching in FAS is conducted by people other than tenured or tenure-track faculty: a 2010 study of “non-ladder” appointees indicates that nearly 50 percent of arts and humanities enrollments were taught by lecturers, preceptors, and others (for instance, in language classes, Expository Writing, and many tu-

### Harvard Portrait

**Surprisingly**, the director of the Center for Global Tobacco Control at the Harvard School of Public Health was once a smoker himself. Working with emphysema patients at Boston’s Carney Hospital inspired him to quit. He has since taken up healthier hobbies—he and his wife, Susan, have a 70-acre farm in Vermont and, he says, “I could cut wood all day long”—but he’s devoted his career to freeing others from nicotine addiction. His work has taken him all over the world to advise countries on curbing smoking. Although that is his long-term goal, he admits that places like Greece and Armenia, with some of the globe’s highest smoking rates, are “nirvana” for researchers. (In Massachusetts, where only 14 percent of people report smoking daily, doing research “is really, really hard. We just don’t have the subjects.”) Connolly has led studies in settings from pubs (measuring airborne particles pre- and post-smoking ban) to playgrounds (using GPS data to show that tobacco companies were targeting children with billboards). He has lectured to Major League Baseball players about the dangers of smokeless tobacco—earning the nickname “Dr. Chew” from one team. He spent 17 years with the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, overseeing a comprehensive tobacco-control campaign, including ads that became a national and international model, and leaving just before the state enacted its 2004 ban on smoking in public places. He soon ran afoul of the ban in his new role as professor of the practice of public health: to allow smoking in his lab, so he could study new theories of nicotine addiction, he recalls, “We were told, ‘You’re breaking state law.’ We had to get an exemption.”