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

Student Feedback
Self Reflection
Peer Review
Documents

Course Surveys
Timeline
Evaluation
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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 inflicted 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].
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