

# OCOB Evaluation of Teaching Task Force

Patricia Dahm, Garland Durham, Patricia McQuaid and Eduardo  
Zambrano

# Charges

- 1. Formulate specific wording for a potential faculty vote potentially eliminating written student evaluation for Winter and Spring 2019.
- 2. Clarify policy and contractual limitations.
- 3. Develop a vote recommendation supported by arguments, pro and con.
- 4. Provide long-term recommendations on this issue by March 1, 2019.

# Short Term Recommendations

3. The FC and the Dean's Office will reach a common understanding about how the written portion of the SETs are to be used inside the College for any purpose

*This common understanding will be in writing and made available to faculty*

# Short Term Recommendations

**3. The FC and the Dean's Office will reach a common understanding about how the written portion of the SETs are to be used inside the College for any purpose**

*This common understanding will be in writing and made available to faculty*

# Short Term Recommendations

**4. Resolution and Report:** The FC will hold a Faculty vote regarding a comprehensive system of evaluation of teaching

*The system explicitly regulates how the quantitative and qualitative portions of the SETs are to be used (and not to be used) for the purpose of RPT*

# Deliverables

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| To:      | OCIR Faculty Council  |
| From:    | Teaching Task Force   |
| Subject: | Short and Long Term Recommendations regarding the use of Student Evaluation of Teaching for tenure and promotion  |
| Date:    | November 1, 2010  |
|          | <b>Short Term Recommendations:</b>  |
|          | 1. Inform all OCIR faculty of their rights and obligations that it is inaccurate (including information coming from the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)), to be used in the PDR (Performance and Development Review) process. The University has the right to make changes to the SET instrument, but the faculty member has the right to request for it to be rejected. The relevant section of the Union Contract that confers these rights is attached. |
|          | 2. The Faculty Council (FC) will negotiate with the Deans Office a collaborative and swift procedure for these findings to be communicated to the appropriate Deans Office and the Office of the Provost.   |
|          | 3. The FC and the Deans Office will need a common understanding, informed by existing policies and legal counsel, about how to handle the information contained in the SET instrument and how to use it in the PDR process.   |
|          | 4. The FC will hold a Faculty meeting regarding a common system of evaluation of teaching that provides faculty with a clear understanding of what is expected of them in terms of teaching performance, and how to evaluate their teaching performance according to the policies in the University Faculty Personnel Policies, and how to use this information in the PDR process.   |
|          | 5. The FC will hold a Faculty meeting regarding a common system of evaluation of teaching that provides faculty with a clear understanding of what is expected of them in terms of teaching performance, and how to evaluate their teaching performance according to the policies in the University Faculty Personnel Policies, and how to use this information in the PDR process.   |
|          | The long term recommendations are incorporated into this memo as Appendix 1.  |

Memo

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Executive Order 1097 Index Card!</b>   |  |
|   |  |
| <b>I. Introduction</b>  |  |
| The purpose of this index card is to serve as background documentation to the University Council of the Faculty (UCF) regarding the use of the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) instrument in the Student Evaluation of Teaching as we are to use both the College for any purpose. This document underscores our commitment to the teaching mission.   |  |
| <b>II. Background</b>   |  |
| Executive Order 1097 (EO 1097) is a Policy by Provost that applies to all four campuses (University of California, Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Merced). The policy requires that teaching evaluations be conducted annually for all faculty members. The policy also requires that teaching evaluations be conducted annually for all teaching faculty in the university's academic units, including staff, part-time, and visiting faculty. The policy also requires that teaching evaluations be conducted annually for all teaching faculty in the university's academic units, including staff, part-time, and visiting faculty. |  |
| <b>III. Questions, with Answers</b>   |  |
| 1. Can university administrators start to investigate from whom come the results of the teaching evaluations?   | Administrators shall not investigate from whom come the results of the teaching evaluations.   |
| 2. Can university administrators start to investigate from whom come the results of the teaching evaluations?   | Administrators shall not investigate from whom come the results of the teaching evaluations.   |
| 3. Is it a requirement, a best practice or a norm of the case for the university administrators to periodically review through student evaluations of teaching whether or not one or more obligations are met?  | Not required.  |
| 4. What is the obligation?  | It would be for university administrators to be able to review or analyze the teaching evaluations to the extent that they are provided or presented. This information may be used by the university administrator to determine if there is a problem with a particular professor or to determine if a professor is in danger of being dismissed or not. |
| 5. Is it a requirement, a best practice or a norm of the case for the university administrators to periodically review through student evaluations of teaching whether or not one or more obligations are met?  | Not required.  |

\*I requested Edwards' deletion during the months of December/January 2010 (off) of the OCIR (University of California, Los Angeles) teaching evaluations and was denied. I am still at the Office of Equal Opportunity.

|  |
|--|
| <b>OCIR Evaluation of Teaching Task Force's Report</b>   |
|  |
| <b>A DISPOSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE ORDER TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS</b>   |
| <b>Section I. Definitions</b>  |
| The University Faculty Personnel Act (UFP) defines effectiveness in section 1097 as ten factors: (1) teaching effectiveness, (2) research effectiveness, (3) scholarly effectiveness, (4) professional effectiveness, (5) service effectiveness, (6) communication effectiveness, (7) administrative effectiveness, (8) educational effectiveness, (9) demonstrated effectiveness in class, (10) enhancement of student learning, and (11) professional development.   |
| <b>White House Review Committee (WRC) is to play an effective role in these ten factors.</b>   |
| White House Review Committee (WRC) is to play an effective role in these ten factors. It is also to be noted that the University Faculty Personnel Act (UFP) defines effectiveness in section 1097 as ten factors: (1) teaching effectiveness, (2) research effectiveness, (3) scholarly effectiveness, (4) professional effectiveness, (5) service effectiveness, (6) communication effectiveness, (7) administrative effectiveness, (8) educational effectiveness, (9) demonstrated effectiveness in class, (10) enhancement of student learning, and (11) professional development. |
| None of this is to be construed to be the obligation of any person, neither, in the conduct and carrying out of the teaching effectiveness.  |
| <b>Section II. Executive Summary Statement</b>   |
| We recommend performance in teaching effectiveness as the teaching effectiveness using the classification used in the UFP.   |
| <b>IV. Recommendation</b>  |
| • For teaching effectiveness and teaching evaluations, we recommend that teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure be based on teaching evaluations of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  |
| • For teaching effectiveness and teaching evaluations, we recommend that teaching evaluations of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  |
| • For teaching effectiveness and teaching evaluations, we recommend that teaching evaluations of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  |
| • For teaching effectiveness and teaching evaluations, we recommend that teaching evaluations of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  |
| To validate this classification, we recommend that the teaching evaluations from faculty of the UFP are evaluated to determine the classification for teaching effectiveness. We also recommend that the classification for teaching effectiveness be determined by the University Council of the Faculty (UCF) and the Office of Equal Opportunity.   |
| <b>Appendix A: Full description of the Summary Instruments</b>   |
| <b>Section III. Call for Further Information</b>   |
| OCIR need their comments when they are ready to provide for records, needs, needs, and so on, and need the UFP and OCIR definition of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure. We also recommend that the classification for teaching effectiveness be not only "teaching effectiveness" but also a classification for the use to the classification.  |

EO 1097 Material

Report

# A system for the evaluation of teaching

## Section I: Rationale

The University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document establishes the ten factors that define effective teaching performance

**CAL POLY**  
SAN LUIS OBISPO

**AP 109 - DPRC**  
Faculty Evaluation Form  
Department Peer Review Committees  
<https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policies/rpt>

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ FACULTY RANK: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

COLLEGE: \_\_\_\_\_ DEPARTMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

This is an evaluation for (check applicable action):  Retention to a probationary year.  
 Tenure     Promotion     Periodic Review

**FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION**

***Justification for Recommendations***  
(Reference: University Personnel Action Procedures and Criteria: <http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/> → Policies and Procedures) Evaluative statements should be accompanied by supporting evidence. If the evidence does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the reviewing levels for amplification.

The evaluator should review effectiveness of the faculty member primarily during **this** evaluation period. The evaluation should reflect both (1) **evidence of merit** and (2) **suggested areas for improvement**. Reference any resources used for evaluation; such as class visitation, conferences, and materials provided by the faculty member. If more space is needed, use an additional page.

\*I. **Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of courses, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student advising, and other factors relating to performance as an instructor. (Include results of Student Evaluation Program.)

\*Nonteaching academic personnel are to be evaluated on their professional performance.

Evidence of Merit: \_\_\_\_\_

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement: \_\_\_\_\_

II. **Professional Growth and Achievement:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's educational background and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies, publications, presentation of papers at professional and scholarly meetings, and external validation of scholarly activities.

Evidence of Merit: \_\_\_\_\_

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement: \_\_\_\_\_

III. **Service to University, Students, and Community:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; co-curricular activities; diversity-related activities; department, college and university committees; Academic Senate and its committees; individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

AP109 – DPRC (revised 9/2018)  
Page 1

# A system for the evaluation of teaching

## Section II: The Summary Instrument

We summarize performance in each of the factors that contribute to teaching effectiveness using the classification used below:

**Appendix A: The Summary Instrument**

**Teaching Performance Factors: Summary  
(Cal Poly UFPA Section II.B.1)**

**1. Competence in the discipline**

Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

**Evidence of Merit:  
Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:**

**2. Effectiveness in communicating ideas effectively**

Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

**Evidence of Merit:  
Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:**

**3. Versatility of teaching techniques**

Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

**Evidence of Merit:  
Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:**

**4. Appropriateness of teaching techniques**

Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

**Evidence of Merit:  
Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:**

**5. Organization of courses**

Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

**Evidence of Merit:  
Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:**

**6. Relevance of instruction to course objectives**

Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

**Evidence of Merit:  
Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:**

**7. Methods of evaluating student achievement**

Far exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Exceeds the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Meets the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.  
 Does not meet the Cal Poly/OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

i

# A system for the evaluation of teaching

## • Section III: The Checklist Instrument

### Appendix B: The Checklist Instrument

#### Teaching Performance Factors Checklist (Cal Poly UFPA Section II.B.1)

The Teaching Performance Factors Checklist provides standards for teaching performance evaluations through class observation and course content review. The first, second, and third tiers include a progression of recommended teaching and course design practices. The substandard tier includes items that are contrary to best practices and/or Cal Poly/OCOB policies. The checklist can be used for two purposes. It can be used as a developmental tool to provide faculty formative feedback to enhance their teaching, showing progression over multiple observations. It can also be used as an evaluative tool to document evidence of teaching performance for retention, promotion or tenure.

To calibrate this classification with the Summary recommendations from Section V of Form AP-109 we establish that the thresholds for evaluation of teaching that define "Meets the Cal Poly and OCOB standards of teaching performance for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure" are to be high enough so that reaching this level or above is to be interpreted as being sufficient (that is: 'above the bar') with respect to that factor for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure.

#### Checklist Conditions

- Effective use of the checklist requires that observer and observed have met prior to a class observation and review of course content and discussed class format and purpose and will meet for a debrief after the observation and review of course content.

#### Observer

- Observes a minimum of one class session.
- Is familiar with the course learning objectives listed in the syllabus.
- Understands the content of the course well enough to evaluate effectiveness of instruction in that topic.

#### Checklist items

- Are observable actions and behaviors of the instructor, not the behaviors of students.
- Require when appropriate a review of the syllabus, lecture notes, websites, textbook, software, videos, assignment descriptions, grading rubrics, exams and other course and program materials.
- Describe practices that can be implemented within a wide variety of teaching models, both traditional and innovative.
- Reflect actions and behaviors that should be observable in nearly all classes, regardless of level, field, or student population.
- Some items in the 'Far Exceeds' column may not be applicable/relevant to certain courses, which should be noted in the comments sections.
- Were developed to include best teaching practices relevant to most teaching environments at OCOB.

| Teaching Performance Factors Checklist<br>(Cal Poly UFPA Section II.B.1)   |   |   |   |  |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| DIMENSION  | Below the Cal Poly and OCOB Teaching Policy Standard  | Meets the Cal Poly and OCOB Teaching Policy Standard  | Exceeds the Cal Poly and OCOB Teaching Policy Standard  | Far Exceeds the Cal Poly and OCOB Teaching Policy Standard   |  |
| 1 Competence in the discipline <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Knowledge of subject</li><li>Discipline specific language</li></ul> | Instructor does not appear to understand course content.                                    | Instructor's factual statements are consistent with current knowledge in the field.<br><br>Instructor correctly answers questions about course-level content. | Instructor answers questions confidently, clearly, and simply.  | Instructor ties current content to topics or knowledge from the profession and/or more advanced courses. |  |
|  | Instructor does not use, or incorrectly uses, discipline-specific and/or academic language. | Instructor uses discipline-specific and academic language.  | Instructor explains use of discipline-specific terms.   | Instructor facilitates the use of discipline-specific language by students.                              |  |
| 2 Ability to communicate ideas effectively <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Presentation form</li></ul>                             | Instructor uses inappropriate or offensive gestures and/or speech.                          | Instructor volume, pace, and diction allow observer to follow the class session.  | Instructor incorporates appropriate eye contact and effective non-verbal communication (e.g., hand gestures). | Instructor is engaging, responsive, and constructive in both tone and content of their speech.           |  |
|  | Instructor displays a negative attitude in tone and/or content.                             | Instructor faces students when speaking.  | Instructor avoids distracting mannerisms or speech patterns, such   |  |  |

a

b

# A system for the evaluation of teaching

## Section IV: Guidelines for Using SETs in an Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

As part of the evidence of merit for factor '8. Relationship with students in class' we recommend reporting the fraction of students that strongly agree/agree or strongly disagree/disagree with the statements in item 2.13 and 2.14.

| NUM   | QUESTION   |
|-------|--|
| 2.1)  | This instructor is a good educator for this course.  |
| 2.2)  | The objectives for the course were made clear.   |
| 2.3)  | The course instruction was consistent with the stated course objectives.                             |
| 2.4)  | The instructor was well-prepared for each class.   |
| 2.5)  | The instructor used class time in a productive manner appropriate for the course.                    |
| 2.6)  | The instructor summarized or emphasized major points in lectures or discussions to clarify material. |
| 2.7)  | The instructor was readily available for consultation during his/her scheduled office hours.         |
| 2.8)  | The instructors tests and/or graded assignments adequately covered the material.                     |
| 2.9)  | The instructors overall grading system was clear and fair.   |
| 2.10) | The instructor promptly returned graded materials to students.                                       |
| 2.11) | The workload for this course was appropriate in relation to the other courses of equal credit.       |
| 2.12) | My interest in the subject matter has been stimulated by this course.                                |
| 2.13) | The instructor was concerned with students learning and was helpful.                                 |
| 2.14) | The instructor made me feel comfortable about participating in class.                                |
| 2.15) | I would recommend that the instructor use the textbook/course materials again.                       |

# A system for the evaluation of teaching

## Section V: Final Reflections

The recommendations in these documents are comprised of what we can act on **right away** at the OCOB level, without needing any other parts of the University or the Cal State system to make changes at this point, and in full exercise of our Faculty rights.

We also offered long term recommendations, which should be discussed at a later date.

**Deliverables**

**Memo**

**EO 1097 Material**

**Report**

# Thank You!

Patricia Dahm, Garland Durham, Patricia McQuaid and Eduardo  
Zambrano