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Objectives

1. Focus on the new framework for teaching evaluation and the importance of alignment;

2. Remember how we got here and who is working on this project;

3. Underscore the mental model shift from comparisons between faculty to evaluation against standards;

4. Share protocol for student comment redaction;
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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.
University Senate

2019/20 CIET Senate Committee

- Faculty from every school/college and division of CAS
- 1 CAIT member
- Faculty Senators
- Teaching Engagement Program
- Office of the Provost
- Registrar’s Office
- Graduate student
- Undergraduate student

2019/20 Teaching Excellence & Evaluation CAIT

Kara Clevinger CAS-Hum (Eng)  Jen Reynolds LAW
Craig Parsons CAS-SS (Poly Sci) Donnalyn Pompper SOJC
Ulrich Mayr CAS-NS (Psych) Daphne Gallagher CHC
Nancy Cheng DESIGN (Arch) Angela Davis LCB
Jenefer Husman COE (Ed Studies) Jack Boss SOMD (Music)
Continuous Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching (CIET) faculty committee members

Jenefer Husman COE (Ed Studies)
Angela Davis LCB
Rich Margerum DESIGN (PPPM)
Melissa Brunkan SOMD
Megan McAlpin LAW
Edward Davis CAS-NS (Earth Sci)
Bill Harbaugh CAS-SS (Econ)
Tina Boscha CAS-Hum (Eng)
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.
March 2018
Senate creates Continuous Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching standing committee, adopts **Midway Student Experience Survey** and **Instructor Reflection**

January 2019
Senate adopts **Warning and Guidance on Student Evaluations of Teaching** statement in “all files for instructor evaluation”

April 2019
Senate votes to replace current Course Evaluations with **End-of-Term Student Experience Surveys**

August 2019
United Academics and University co-sign Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that defines **teaching quality standards**

Fall 2019
All new instruments available campus-wide

February 2020
Amendment to MOU giving units until Fall 2021 to modify criteria document, if desired

Fall 2020
Teaching quality definition and standards adopted campus wide per MOU.
Instructor Reflection

What’s good about it?
• Captures instructor’s voice, goals, efforts at course level,
• Ensures instructor’s voice is available alongside students’

Midway Student Experience Survey

What’s good about it?
• Uses UO’s resources to support a good practice: taking the pulse of class and making adjustments/clarifying goals, expectations
• Responds to students’ desire to affect their own experience

End-of-term Student Experience Survey

What’s good about it?
• Focuses on student learning
• Asks specific questions, doesn’t produce numerical scores; used alongside peer review and instructor reflection when teaching evaluation occurs against criteria
Teaching & Learning Elements

Professional:
• Organization
• Quality of the course materials
• Instructor communication
• Assignments or projects

Inclusive:
• Inclusiveness
• Accessibility
• Relevance of the course content

Research-informed:
• Clarity of assignment instructions and grading
• Feedback
• Active learning
• Challenge in this course
• Support from the instructor

Other positive factors:
• Opportunities for student interaction

Beneficial to your learning; neutral; needs improvement for your learning.
Which is most beneficial? What most needs some improvement?
Protocol for redaction of discriminatory, obscene and demeaning student comments

Handout: protocol
Teaching Evaluation Criteria document
– sent to unit heads in February
– unit can modify (or not) and submit by Fall 2021

Handout: sources of evidence
What OtP and TEP are doing to support faculty, heads, and Faculty Personal Committees

- Attending faculty meetings when invited (today is #26)
- Holding workshops:
  - First Cohort of faculty being evaluated
  - Peer Review revitalization
  - How to talk to your unit about teaching quality
- Teaching Quality Criteria & Reports
- Templates for faculty teaching statement and heads letter
- Tools and templates to support effective peer review
If you want to read more...

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

Revising UO’s Teaching Evaluations
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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 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].
Questions?