

To: OCOB Faculty Council
From: OCOB Evaluation of Teaching Task Force
Subject: Short-and-Long Term Recommendations regarding the use of Student Evaluation of Teaching for Personnel Decisions
Date: November 30th, 2018

Short Term Recommendations

1. Inform all OCOB faculty of their rights to request that any information that is inaccurate (including information coming from the Student Evaluations of Teaching -SETs), be redacted from the PAF. AS-759-13 resolution states that the written portion of SET is to pertain to teaching and course effectiveness. Anything in the SET that is not about teaching and course effectiveness is therefore inappropriate, does not belong in the PAF, and an instructor has the right to request for it to be redacted. The relevant sections of the Union Contract that confer these rights are: Sections 11.2, 11.4-11.5 and 11.13-11.14.
2. The Faculty Council (FC) will negotiate with the Dean's Office a collaborative and swift procedure for these faculty rights to be exercised. The full cooperation between the Dean's Office and the FC is expected in this regard.
3. The FC and the Dean's Office will reach a common understanding, informed by existing policies and legal counsel, 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.
4. The FC will hold a Faculty vote regarding a comprehensive system of evaluation of teaching that provides guidance for determining whether an instructor meets, exceeds, or far exceeds standards with respect to the factors that define effective teaching performance according to the policies in the University Faculty Personnel Actions, Section II.B.1. Further, 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 retention, promotion, and tenure. None of this is to be construed to be the adoption of new policies. Rather, it is the codification and fleshing out of existing policies, and therefore in full compliance with them.

The long-term recommendations are incorporated into this memo as Appendix 1.

Appendix 1: Long Term Recommendations

1. Change the questions asked in the SET to reduce gender, race, age and other biases, and to elicit information about student engagement and personal responsibility taken within a course as well as teacher behaviors. The reform of the questionnaire includes removing the written portion of the SETs as part of the official evaluation instrument.
2. Continue to use the SET to assist the Faculty in improving instructional design, the quality of the educational experience, and to shape the self-reflective teaching statements that Faculty use in their tenure packets. Faculty will also be expected to collect their own qualitative feedback from the students, for the purpose of improving instructional design as well.
3. Evaluate teaching for personnel decisions (retention, promotion, and tenure) using a carefully designed peer review model that involves observation of teaching, course design, effectiveness of student advising (if applicable), and a review of the faculty's self-reflective teaching statement. Modify the use of SETs for personnel decisions (retention, promotion, and tenure) whereas SETs inform understanding of classroom climate and student engagement, supplementing peer evaluations. SET information will be reported using “% agree” language, rather than average point values.
4. All evaluators are to receive training on how to best use the evaluation checklists that define the peer review model.
5. The process is to be adopted once it has been sufficiently understood (and obtained buy-in) from evaluators and the evaluated. Getting this right is more important than hitting any particular deadline. That said, given that student evaluations are likely to be disadvantaging a large segment of our faculty, it is important that we work diligently on this.
6. The process is to include both ‘formative’ (i.e., informal) and ‘summative’ (i.e., formal) peer evaluations (as opposed to only ‘summative’ evaluations).

PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING TEMPLATE
(main items in bold)

- a. **Observation of teaching**, considering the following factors
 - i. instructional plan
 - ii. communication of clear goals for the class session
 - iii. time management
 - iv. classroom climate
 - v. presentation form
 - vi. presentation substance
 - vii. knowledge of subject
 - viii. discipline specific language
 - ix. contextual relevance and transferability
 - x. appropriate content or level (relevant to course objectives)
 - xi. extent of active learning
 - xii. formative assessment/feedback
- b. **Course design**, considering the following factors
 - i. syllabus format
 - ii. communication expectations
 - iii. learning objectives
 - iv. grading
 - v. assignments and assessments
 - vi. course materials (such as lecture notes, websites, textbooks, software, videos, audio, etc.)
 - vii. course outline
 - viii. samples of student work
 - ix. expectations about student participation and engagement
- c. Effectiveness of student advising, if applicable
- d. Review of the faculty's teaching statement