

## FACULTY ASSEMBLY TEACHING EVALUATION TASK FORCE

### REPORT SPRING 2019

Last year, the FCQs were redesigned by a group of faculty in order to more accurately evaluate our courses. Our committee was asked to investigate how to use these FCQs. We believe that each college and department should choose its own teaching evaluation process, methods, and criteria. With this in mind, the FA President has charged us to give some direction and guidance to the colleges and faculty, specifically to:

- 1) Identify how to use the new FCQs in merit and RPT review;
- 2) Recommend two additional measures to use for teaching evaluations in merit and RPT review;
- 3) Propose best practices to the faculty assembly (by May) and then to the colleges; and
- 4) Consider how to make recommendations that all colleges and departments can effectively use.

Note: Regents' policy **requires** that each unit use at least **three** measures for teaching evaluations for both annual merit evaluations and RPT decisions. FCQs must be used as one of those measures. (See: <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009>.)

#### **Concerns about FCQ Validity** (From Previous FCQ Redesign Committee)

- FCQs do not correlate with student learning or teaching effectiveness/quality.
- FCQs are a measure of student satisfaction and liking.
- FCQs are biased by faculty characteristics such as gender, age and race, which are protected classes.
- FCQs are affected by course characteristics such as rigor, time of day, required vs. elective, class size, on-line vs. on-campus.

#### **Recommendations for Annual Merit Ratings and RPT Criteria**

1. The previous FCQ committee (that redesigned the FCQs) reported that student evaluations across the country are biased against a number of groups of faculty including women and minorities. Their recommendation was that departments and colleges **abstain from using** an FCQ question for "Overall Instructor."

Link that discusses bias in student evaluations (in general):  
<https://www.uccs.edu/women/fcqs-bias-student-evaluation>

2. Because we recognize that numerical scores on the FCQ may contain bias, we recommend that any evaluation based on the numerical ratings be used for **no more than one third** of the overall teaching rating of the faculty member.

3. We recommend against averaging FCQ scores for use in merit reviews. But, if Departments and Primary Units choose multiple FCQ measures, we recommend that they use an **average of the selected FCQ measures** (with the exception of an overall instructor score). For example, an average score for questions relating to the instructor could be used along with an average score of those questions relating to the course as a whole.
4. We recommend that averages of FCQ scores be used only under conditions where the **majority of students** registered for the course **have responded** (making a more statistically significant response rate). The departments could decide what an appropriate response rate is, but we might suggest a minimum of two-thirds of students responding. When this is not met, evaluation of only the more qualitative constructive criticism of the course should be considered.
5. We recommend that trends over time in teaching effectiveness be examined, rather than focus on an individual course, semester, or year in isolation. It would be important to note improvements or lack of improvement over the review period.
6. We recommend only looking at growth over time for individuals and not comparing instructors across platforms (in-class vs. online) or courses (intro level vs upper division), or within departments/units or across colleges.
7. We recommend that departments separately consider undergraduate and graduate courses, as well as on-campus and online courses when considering student FCQ responses, since these types of courses are very different in student evaluation responses.
8. We recommend that faculty ask students to complete online FCQs at the beginning of a lecture during the FCQ time on their laptops, tablets, or phones.
9. We also recommend that if faculty give “micro-incentives” for students to take the FCQs, that they do **not offer more than 1%** of the course points for doing so. One model might be to offer a graduated scale for response rates: 1% course grade points for 100% participation, 0.9% for 90% response rate, etc. Our experience is that faculty receive close to 100% response rates under these conditions.
10. Other suggested measures should make up at least **two-thirds of the teaching evaluation rating** for merit review and RPT.
  - Example to demonstrate teaching effectiveness: a **Teaching Portfolio** that discusses the measures used by your department. Such a portfolio might include:
    - **A reflective teaching statement or teaching philosophy** that also describes teaching goals for the next few years.
    - **Documentation of teaching**, to include syllabi, course descriptions, assignments, lectures, exams, problem sets, and sample materials.

- **Demonstration of teaching effectiveness**, such as formal and informal student evaluations, comments from peer observers or colleagues, and letters from students.
  - **Materials demonstrating student learning**, such as student papers, lab books, and graded work with teachers' feedback.
  - **Activities to improve instruction**, including design of new courses, participation in seminars or professional meetings about teaching, new methods of teaching, assessing learning, grading, and preparation of a textbook, lab manual, or courseware.
  - **Contributions to the teaching profession and/or your institution**, such as publications in teaching journals, papers delivered on teaching, textbook reviews, supporting colleagues on teaching matters, and work on curriculum revision or development.
  - **Honors, awards, and recognitions**, which include teaching awards and recognitions as well as invitations to consult or give workshops, advice, or write articles.
- See: <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/teaching-portfolios/>
- Additional measures to be used in a teaching portfolio, or elsewhere, for consideration might include:
    - Peer and subject matter expert reviews.
    - New course development.
    - Revision of course materials.
    - Conversion of courses to online format.
    - Teaching innovations, including online courses, Quality Matters review, use of technology in courses, active learning approaches, innovative assessments or assignments.
    - Use of evidence-based teaching practices.
    - Analysis of syllabi (in terms of rigor and complexity of material, and change from one semester to another).
    - Examples of lessons/lectures/ class activities if not in a formal teaching portfolio.
    - Student interviews or letters regarding teaching effectiveness.

- The use of standardized exams and their scores, if available from national organizations.
- Participation in teaching-related professional development workshops, meetings, etc.
- Mid-course evaluations, and faculty end-of semester evaluations.
- Self-reflections and/or teaching logs from faculty.
- Mentoring students/ advising.
- Research with students, independent studies/internships/ service-learning.
- Feedback from advisees including graduate students and undergraduate research assistants.
- Examples of student work that show what students accomplished in the course using pre/post course quizzes assessing students' learning of key concepts. Students' names would not be identified.
- General education components should be recognized such as Summit, Inclusiveness, Sustainability, Writing Intensive, Navigate, GPS course efforts.
- Study abroad, community engagement, or other high impact practices be given special consideration.
- Larger class sizes.
- Scholarly research and publication on teaching.
- Presentation of peer-reviewed papers at conferences related to education/pedagogy.
- Attendance and participation in conferences related to education/pedagogy.
- Authorship of scholarly textbooks.
- Student alumni opinions within 2-5 years of graduation.
- Professional awards related to the education process.
- Grants in support of teaching and learning.
- Advising of undergraduate and graduate students in research.
- Examples of student work related to the course (e.g., projects, reports, essays, exams, homework, etc.). Students' names would not be identified.

These are not meant to be an exhaustive list, but are suggestions that departments and colleges could consider.

11. For Merit Reviews, departments should consider options that might be used to develop a rubric that will result in a numerical score. One approach to considering the three (or more) measures to be used in evaluating the teaching component of our Merit Review (and promotion and tenure) might be as follows:

- **Measure 1- FCQ scores** (Regents require the use of FCQs) up to 30% of the teaching evaluation. Articulated responses to student ratings and comments could be considered. If the department wants to use numerical ratings, question (to be determined by the department) scores could be averaged.
- **Measure 2 - Professional development activities** (workshops, conferences relevant to teaching and learning)
- **Measure 3 - Out of classroom** (mentoring students, advising, research with students, independent studies/internships/service-learning, work with students)
- **Measure 4 - Curricular impact** (course revisions, moving a course online, developing a course online)
- **Measure 5 - Contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning**
- **Measure 6- Personal development and assessment measures** (mid-semester/end of semester questionnaires, student focus groups, personal and peer evaluations, articulated responses to student comments).

Members:

Andrea Bingham ([abingham@uccs.edu](mailto:abingham@uccs.edu)), College of Education

David Moon ([cmoon@uccs.edu](mailto:cmoon@uccs.edu)) – School of Public Affairs

Nicole Huber ([nhuber@uccs.edu](mailto:nhuber@uccs.edu)) – LAS, Natural Sciences (representing the Non-Tenure Track FA Committee)

Wendy Haggren ([whaggren@uccs.edu](mailto:whaggren@uccs.edu)) – LAS, Natural Sciences

Karin Larkin ([klarkin@uccs.edu](mailto:klarkin@uccs.edu)) – LAS, Social Sciences (rep. FA Women's Committee)

Michelle Neely ([mneely2@uccs.edu](mailto:mneely2@uccs.edu))- LAS, Humanities

Farida Khan ([fkahn@uccs.edu](mailto:fkahn@uccs.edu)) – LAS, Social Sciences

Morgan Lee ([mlee@uccs.edu](mailto:mlee@uccs.edu)) – Beth-EI College of Nursing and Health Sciences

Kathleen Tomlin ([ktomlin@ucce.edu](mailto:ktomlin@ucce.edu)) – College of Business

Michael Calvisi ([mcalvisi@uccs.edu](mailto:mcalvisi@uccs.edu)) – College of Engineering and Applied Science

David Weiss ([dweiss@uccs.edu](mailto:dweiss@uccs.edu)) – LAS, Natural Sciences, Chair