

All Unit Heads

Winter Term - Timely Updates

Wednesday Feb. 26 9:00-10:30am
Gerlinger Lounge



Patrick Phillips

Provost

Distribution of service

Ombuds office feedback

IHP update

Elliot Berkman

Senate Vice President

Senate Elections

Ellen Herman

Vice Provost

Revisions to P&T guidelines

Revisions to expedited tenure policy

Sierra Dawson

Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Co-chair, Continuous Improvement & Evaluation of
Teaching Committee

Lee Rumbarger

Assistant Vice Provost for Teaching Engagement

Teaching Engagement Program Director

Teaching Evaluation updates

Teaching Evaluations

Multi-year effort led by the Senate and Office of the Provost to make teaching evaluation:

**fair and
transparent,**

**conducted against
a clear definition
of teaching
excellence and
criteria that include
units' expectations,**

**informed by data
collected
from peers,
students & faculty
themselves.**

Mental Model Shift

Old model

- Student ratings were primary tool to determine teaching effectiveness
- Faculty in competition: ratings compared against unit and university means
- Someone had to be below the mean

Mental Model Shift

New model

- Student feedback is (really) just one of three voices (data sources) used to evaluate teaching
- Faculty are not in competition: individually evaluated against clear criteria
- Everyone has the ability to meet expectations if they meet the standards.

Updates from CIET committee

- Protocol for redaction of discriminatory, obscene or demeaning student comments (handout);
- Student response rates have been declining for the last few years – dipped this year;
- Response rates highest when first 10 minutes of class used to complete survey;
- Presentation to Senate on March 11;
- Feedback campaign spring 2020.

Continuous Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching (CIET) faculty committee members

Tina Boscha CAS-Hum (Eng)

Melissa Brunkan SOMD

Angela Davis LCB

Edward Davis CAS-NS (Earth Sci)

Bill Harbaugh CAS-SS (Econ)

Jenefer Husman COE (Ed Studies)

Rich Margerum DESIGN (PPPM)

Megan McAlpin LAW

Updates from CAIT group

- You received Teaching Evaluation Criteria document last week;
- First draft 1.5 years ago;
- Testing and iteration by 2018-19 CAIT group;
- Continued critique and changes for 2019-20 CAIT group;
- Proof of concept testing with two mock faculty files – heads letters written.

MOU conditions related to Professional Teaching	Data Sources	Does not meet the condition	Meets the condition	Excels
1. "Readily available, coherently organized, and high quality course materials; syllabi that establish student workload, learning objectives, grading and class policy expectations."	<p>From Students: <u>Student Experience Survey</u> Organization of the course Quality of the course materials</p> <p>Pre-Fall 2019 Numerical course evaluations: Q3 How well organized was this course?</p> <p>Evidence from the Instructor Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.</p> <p>Peer Review</p>	<p><i>Pattern of concern based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.</i></p>	<p><i>Meets the condition consistently or shows a pattern of improvement during the review window.</i></p>	<p><i>Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.</i></p>
2. "Respectful and timely communication with students. Respectful teaching does not mean that the professor cannot give appropriate critical feedback."	<p>From Students: <u>Student Experience Survey</u> Instructor Communication</p> <p>Pre-Fall 2019 Numerical course evaluations: Q5 How available was the instructor for communication outside of class?</p> <p>Evidence from the Instructor Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.</p> <p>Peer Review</p>	<p><i>Pattern of concern based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.</i></p>	<p><i>Meets the condition consistently or shows a pattern of improvement during the review window.</i></p>	<p><i>Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.</i></p>
3. "Students' activities in and out of class are designed and organized to maximize student learning.	<p>From Students: <u>Student Experience Survey</u> Assignment and Projects</p> <p>Pre-Fall 2019 Numerical course evaluations: Q4 How effective was the instructor's use of class time? Q7 The amount that I learned in this course was:</p> <p>Evidence from the Instructor Sources include Instructor Reflections, teaching statement, etc.</p> <p>Peer Review</p>	<p><i>Pattern of concern based on student feedback, evidence from the instructor, peer review.</i></p>	<p><i>Meets the condition consistently or shows a pattern of improvement during the review window.</i></p>	<p><i>Provide evidence the instructor excels with respect to this condition.</i></p>

Teaching Excellence & Evaluation CAIT 2019-20

Jack Boss SOMD (Music)

Nancy Cheng DESIGN (Arch)

Kara Clevinger CAS-Hum (Eng)

Angela Davis LCB

Daphne Gallagher CHC

Jenefer Husman COE (Ed Studies)

Ulrich Mayr CAS-NS (Psych)

Craig Parsons CAS-SS (Poly Sci)

Donnalyn Pompper SOJC

Jen Reynolds LAW

General Updates

- Visited 25 units since September (happy to visit yours too!);
- Refining Student Experience Survey & Instructor Reflection Cognos data reports with input from CAIT group;
- ‘First Cohort’ workshop for career or tenure-track faculty with a major review next year (March 5, 3pm).
- New FAQs, including on the Instructor Reflection, available on Provost’s Project page; workshop on Instructor Reflection (March 9, 1pm)

What can units do next?

- Attend the Defining & Evaluating Teaching Quality workshop (March 10, 3pm);
- Talk about the Teaching Evaluation Criteria document with you unit;
- Invite Lee or Sierra to discuss the changes with your faculty;
- Consider your peer review practices in light of the teaching quality definition.

Questions?

If you want to read more...

<https://provost.uoregon.edu/revising-uos-teaching-evaluations>



[Academic Personnel](#)

[Academic Policies](#)

[Operational Matters](#)

[Curricular Matters](#)

[Faculty Handbook](#)

[About Us](#)

CURRENT INITIATIVES

[Revising UO's Teaching Evaluations](#)

[New System Implementation](#)

[Teaching Evaluation Changes FAQs](#)

[Faculty Salary Equity Study](#)

[UO Leadership Academy](#)

[Provost's Teaching Academy](#)

[Supporting New Faculty Success](#)

[Task Force on the Structure of the College of Arts and Sciences](#)

Revising UO's Teaching Evaluations

[Student Feedback](#)

[Course Surveys](#)

[Self Reflection](#)

[Timeline](#)

[Peer Review](#)

[Evaluation](#)

[Documents](#)

[References](#)

The Office of the Provost and the University Senate have been working together since spring 2017 to revise University of Oregon's teaching evaluation system. Recent research indicates that student ratings may not accurately reflect teaching quality and may be inflected by bias [3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10]. A research project at the University of Oregon similarly cast doubt on the reliability of numerical course evaluations [2].

Cass Moseley

Senior Associate Vice President for Research & Innovation

Conflict of Interest

Conflict of Commitment

International Collaboration & Intellectual Property

Peter Fehrs

Associate Director, ELR

UA Bargaining Update