

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs**  
June 6, 2019  
2:30 – 4:00 p.m.  
Odegaard Undergraduate Library 320

**Meeting Synopsis**

1. Call to order
  2. Review of the minutes from May 9, 2019
  3. Chair's report
  4. FCFA Teaching Professor Class A proposal
  5. Update: Class A legislation: contributions of diversity statement
  6. Update: teaching evaluation task force
  7. Good of the order
  8. Adjourn
- 

**1. Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

**2. Review of the minutes from May 9, 2019**

The minutes from May 9, 2019 were approved as written.

**3. Chair's report**

Williams, the chair, attended a Faculty Council Chair luncheon on May 15 and reported to Faculty Senate Leadership and other council chairs. The chair informed the group of FCMA's proposed Class A legislation regarding contributions to diversity statement and articulated questions that were raised by Faculty Senate Leadership:

- Is this intending to add "diversity" to the existing 3 aspects of appointment/promotion/tenure (scholarship, teaching, service)? Cut across them? And since we do articulate what we mean by those, why not also do so for diversity?
- Why add to this section rather than 24-52?
- Would this also impact merit reviews (24-57)?
- I also think there are political considerations, per Mike's comment (the prior revision was explicitly described as \*not\* requiring this, which might raise concerns among many)
- In a future holistic evaluation of a candidate does council anticipate just an evaluation of a personal statement assuming the candidate does not have a significant contribution in any of the three traditional areas of evaluation for appointment and promotion. Just wondering how junior faculty might respond to this requirement. (Can council members easily give example responses for themselves?)

The chair also learned, at the luncheon, that the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning has a subcommittee focused on assessing the undergraduate diversity requirement. The chair recommended that FCMA track this work in 2019-20.

#### 4. FCFA Teaching Professor Class A proposal

The chair notified the council that the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs is working on a proposal to change lecturer titles to “Teaching Professor” titles. More information regarding the proposal and frequently asked questions are located on a shared Google document:

<https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/fcfa-teaching-professor-proposal>

#### 5. Update: Class A legislation: contributions of diversity statement

This work will continue in the fall quarter.

#### 6. Update: teaching evaluation task force

The chair shared documents and summaries from the teaching evaluation task force (Exhibit 1 & 2).

The council provided feedback including the following suggestions:

- A component should be built in where learning by the faculty member is the goal, a sort of non-punitive initial assessment (not part of promotion decision);
- a preliminary professional evaluation, where the faculty member can learn to prepare for future evaluations that do factor into promotion decisions;
- required annual training opportunity be provided to new hires and those facing promotion to learn the best practices for teaching effectively;
- evaluations should be systematic, same process for everyone.

The chair will share this feedback with the task force.

#### 7. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

#### 8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

---

*Minutes by Lauren Hatchett, lehatch@uw.edu, council analyst*

**Present:**           **Faculty:** Brenda Williams (chair), Thomas Lee, Xuegang Ban, Joseph Babigumira  
**Ex-officio reps:** Leyla Salmassi, Ann Madhavan

**Absent:**           **Faculty:** Andrea Otanez, Pietro Paparella, Gautham Reddy, Yoriko Kozuki, Branden Born,  
Joseph Rajendran  
**President’s designee:** Chad Allen  
**Ex-officio reps:** Angelia Miranda, Amy Gabriel

#### Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Compilation of feedback following May 16th forums with CSU.pdf

Exhibit 2 – Teaching evaluation task force May 31 agenda.pdf

## **Compilation of feedback following May 16<sup>th</sup> forums with CSU, UofO, and USC (05.30.19)**

### **A. Regarding current policies and practices associated with STUDENT evaluation of teaching at the UW: What is going especially well and what are our most pressing challenges?**

- 1) What is going well: online access to evaluation forms using a variety of devices. Going well: unit-level access to aggregate data. Most pressing challenges - low response rate, focus on about 3 numeric scores when I have seen faculty/chairs review evals
- 2) We have a system (IAS) that makes it relatively easy to collect and organize feedback from students. However students are overwhelmed by the number of evaluations and the quality of this feedback is dubious. Students provide open-ended feedback about the course, but much of it doesn't contain specific action items or is beyond my control (e.g. what time the class meets, the exams being too hard)
- 3) I seem to get slammed especially in lower-division courses where students don't seem to know what the evaluation is or what it's for -- students need to be oriented and taught how to evaluate teaching so they're able to reflect on their own learning. I have heard of a program at another university where they switched to signed student evals and it was successful in shifting to a more constructive dialogue.
- 4) nothing is going well, get rid of the numerical score
- 5) Students are asked inappropriate questions, like whether their instructor is knowledgeable about the subject matter -- on what basis are they qualified to answer such a question?! The potential for bias is enormous on questions like that, and I assume bias is manifest.
- 6) So much was raised on this topic by the panel. I've been thinking about these topics for some time and I was excited to see these Trail Blazers sharing their experiences.
- 7) The largest challenge that UW (and other research universities) must face is combating the ingrained implicit bias in SETs. The aspect that is going well is the effort being put on by UW faculty to address these problems and provide a clear solution.
- 8) Many of our faculty remain upset about the shift to online course evaluations because "the research shows" that students don't respond to online course evaluations at rates as high as in-person evaluations. When we send out an email about ordering course evaluations, we include a list of best practices for getting better response rates, but the same faculty who say "the research shows" that online course evaluations are less effective are unwilling to take any of the steps that research suggests might improve response rates for online evaluations. As far as I can tell, teaching evaluations aren't actually being used as a mechanism for the department to gauge the effectiveness of instructors or to check in with instructors about additional training. There are a couple of instructors who we get constant complaints about and whose evaluations tend to be worse than other instructors in our department, but no one is doing anything with that information.
- 9) There is a mismatch between the tool being used to evaluate courses and how the results of that tool are used in HR, promotions and the Merit review process. The current online survey has poor completion percentages and reflects student satisfaction with a course and not the effectiveness of the course. As faculty and administrators, we tell faculty that these numbers aren't used as an evaluative tool, but they are. There's a certain hypocrisy when a Chair says, "Don't worry about the numbers; my numbers are low too." And then in a faculty meeting discussing the hiring of part-timers says, "Well, this persons numbers were a bit low, we may want to reconsider hiring them next year." So we need to decide: what is the purpose of doing these surveys? If it's customer satisfaction, then collect the data and use it in an appropriate manner, but don't equate it with teaching effectiveness.

- 10) I think we could do a better job of crafting questions psychometrically valid questions that evaluate teaching engagement and that move away from capturing students liking of instructors.
- 11) They don't ask the questions that we're really interested in learning about. And, the open question of what the evaluations get used for. I think the bubble filling component doesn't tell the kind of rich story we're looking for about the classroom experience of our students. And it's too easy to dismiss the results of low evaluations.
- 12) The anonymity granted students in their evaluations is problematic to the overall process. It encourages bullying and rude behavior. If the eval content is to be a part of the permanent record, in the spirit of true democracy, there should be no anonymity. Instructors evaluate students all the time and we are not afforded anonymity. Imagine how much more frank and impactful our advice could be to students if it could be made anonymously? In its current state, I find the student evals' negative value far outweighs the positive value, both in content and in effect on my mental attitude towards my job. As practiced, I find they are little more than a form of social network bullying on the part of students. We would never tolerate an instructor bullying a student, nor bullying among students, but inexplicably, bullying instructors is facilitated and encouraged by the University.
- 13) We know that student evaluations do not always reflect the quality of teaching, and are heavily influenced by events just before or during the evaluations (e.g. cookies). They may also be affected by ethnicity and accent of the teacher. Comments are usually much more useful than numerical evaluation. Student evaluation should be part of teaching evaluations but they have to be taken with a grain of salt.
- 14) What is going at least adequately is the fact that virtually all instructors give evaluations (which they have to do to be eligible for salary increases). Most of the current forms are reasonably done, and do provide some useful info. But response rates are not adequate and therefore one cannot trust the results. Evaluations reflect responses of either those who love the course or those who are very unhappy. More importantly, the current forms don't really assess learning. One of the most comprehensive challenges is that to really assess learning fully, one must have multi-year approaches. Not all learning is evident at the conclusion of a course. Doing mid-quarter evals is good in that instructors can adjust what they are doing, but to assess learning, you need to know what was learned by students at the end of the course, some months later, years later, etc. And I am not convinced we really capture learning - this seems elusive. further, students may not know what they have learned, even if learning has occurred.
- 15) Student evals are easy. That's the best I can say for them. Students are "likeability" scores and I don't see that changing by improving questions.
- 16) I do think the online student evaluations work well. I like that we are able to add some questions and that different forms are available. I do think too much emphasis is placed on the quantitative scores because they are "easy" to interpret for promotion reasons and summative assessment. We don't help faculty develop skills in interpreting the assessments for formative use.
- 17) Moving away from a customer satisfaction survey and toward formative assessment is critical.
- 18) Most pressing challenges: 1.) students need opportunities to give feedback throughout the quarter, not just at the end, 2.) student course evaluations aren't widely seen as a helpful teaching and learning tool, but more as an obstacle for P&T--so we have many missed opportunities with these
- 19) Having a centralized delivery system for student evaluations is very convenient and students know what to expect. Most pressing challenge - the questions we ask students do not tend to

yield constructive responses for evaluating quality of teaching. (They tend to reflect instructor popularity and the respondent's course grade.)

- 20) Finding in-class time for students to complete surveys is very challenging. The online forms are great - I love being able to add course-specific questions for feedback.
- 21) Well- automated each term, most pressing challenge is that course evaluations do not correlate with student learning gains. Students can feel good about a course but not learn a thing. Additionally, questions on the evaluations ask students to evaluate things that do not correlate with teaching effectiveness (like enthusiasm, or how much they 'learned'- without defining what 'learned' means). Evaluation numerical scores are not consistent, I experienced a 1.0 variation on the scale, for classes taught in the same term, using the exact same course website, meeting within 24 hours of each other.
- 22) Implicit bias against women.
- 23) Going well: increasing recognition that the existing SETs are biased and should not be used for promotion/tenure/merit decisions. Pressing challenges: Developing/identifying new tools for evaluating excellent teaching and integrating that into the existing collegial-review process with support and reward for faculty that are making progress improving their teaching
- 24) Student response rate /incorporation of assessments for on-line and hybrid courses /feedback from instructors on improving their courses

**B. Regarding current policies and practices associated with PEER evaluation of teaching at the UW: What is going especially well and what are our most pressing challenges?**

- 1) no comment - I'm not a teacher
- 2) Peer evaluation is required every 1-3 years depending on rank. However it is unclear how reviewing faculty are chosen and trained to conduct peer evaluations. For instance (in some cases!) I have been observed by faculty who provided relatively unhelpful or vague feedback. Some faculty would meet with me in person to discuss my teaching, others would just submit a report to the department chair as part of my annual review. There are also limitations, because it appears that any tenured member of the department is eligible as a peer-reviewer, despite some of them not being interested or aware of modern evidence-based teaching strategies. More detailed feedback from faculty who are both interested in pedagogy and trained reviewers would be appreciated.
- 3) Peer evaluation seems pro forma -- only positive comments, no actual engagement re: instructor's goals or challenges with course, no constructive feedback re: areas for improvement.
- 4) it is a joke
- 5) Peers don't know how to evaluate each other.
- 6) As an undergraduate student I feel unable to answer this question.
- 7) We require our faculty to do annual peer reviews. Every year a large number of them do not do this before the deadline.
- 8) We have peer evaluations? We have peer observations that occur in an entirely haphazard manner.
- 9) We need better training for evaluators, a toolkit or checklist (rather than a blank page), more random assignment of peer evaluators (that allows for faculty input as well). I would also add that

in my unit the burden of getting peer evaluations is entirely on faculty and there on no real reminders until merit review time and then everyone rushes to get their friends to write a love letter. I think it's difficult for many faculty to approach prospective evaluators -- it requires a lot of initiative and activates power dynamics. I think units need to take on more responsibility for arranging peer evaluations WELL IN ADVANCE of merit reviews and take on the burden of making them fair and uniform.

- 10) At the Tacoma campus, we have an active Teaching Squares peer group running each quarter. I find it refreshingly intellectual and enlightening compared to the useless student eval system which encourages sexism, ageism, racism, and disrespectfully rude bullying akin to the commentary on Yelp or other sites.
- 11) There is no clear procedure of peer evaluations in place, or how they are used for promotion or tenure.
- 12) Peer evals, as several of the panelists noted, are often worthless. They are ways in which colleagues can make each other feel good. People get their friends to do them, and perhaps in part because of that, the reviews do not offer constructive suggestions or serious feedback.
- 13) Peer evals are VARIABLE, that's the best I can say for them. Peers are uninformed, and that MIGHT change with improving tools. But more likely to improve by changing evaluators.
- 14) My department does have a pretty good system for peer review in that a reviewer is selected by the curriculum committee and tracking is in place. I think we could improve in training the reviewers in best practices for peer review and for integrating more holistic review into the process.
- 15) Most pressing challenges: 1.) having a template for peer evaluation to avoid bias, 2.) offering support & resources for doing (and responding to) peer review effectively.
- 16) Going well: These are happening. Pressing: At least in my department, Peer evaluation consists of one person (the same person every year) coming to watch 15-20 minutes of a single class, then submitting the same report each year. There is no variation in perspective or activities observed.
- 17) It is extremely challenging to find the time to perform evaluations, and receiving useful feedback is challenging as others are often pressed for time.
- 18) Well- we have excellent peers for evaluation. Pressing challenges - no consistency in types of evaluation. Some peers do not know what to look for in a classroom.
- 19) How make sure that peer evals aren't just rubber stamped - that the evaluations are equitable no matter which individual provides the review and the depth of feedback is similar across reviewers.
- 20) Going well: Having faculty observe each other's teaching has been an effective way of increasing awareness of active learning methods through direct observation. Challenges: Existing collegial evaluation forms/letters are tied directly to merit/promotion so often evaluators are hesitant to include any valuable constructive feedback on what should be improved in their colleague's teaching. Also the current process is highly variable - some people start with a blank sheet of paper and write a letter, others use forms that are not tied to evidence-based approaches. This can introduce bias and also does not provide reviewees with any information on what criteria they are being evaluated on.
- 21) giving peer reviewers a framework for their evaluation (too scattered right now)

**C. What were the most promising ideas you learned from our colleagues from CSU, UofO, and/or USC? In other words, what are they doing that we ought to give serious consideration to?**

- 1) I liked the idea of using Tableau visualizations to summarize evaluation data at the institutional, unit and instructor level. I like the idea of 'branching' evaluation forms that follow up based on your responses.
- 2) Focus on peer review in addition to or instead of student ranking, including training and incentives for faculty to act as peer reviewers. Focus on getting student feedback for specific areas of teaching, not just general question about what they liked or disliked. Being transparent throughout the process and making sure to collect feedback from a broad range of interested parties.
- 3) Training for peer review. Template. Self-reflection: goals for the course, what's going well, what's not
- 4) get rid of the overall rating from a student evaluation. Ask a series of targeted questions
- 5) That two of the three greatly reduced the role of student evaluation! Wow!
- 6) I especially enjoyed the digital integration that UofO applied for their data dashboard prototype. An easily accessible website with that level of analysis seems highly beneficial. Increased student feedback to help analyze the campus environment from CSU was also seemingly highly relevant to UW--especially with the competitive nature of capacity constrained majors and rigorous 4.0 grading system.
- 7) Having the ability to break down feedback based on the type of feedback (i.e., see all feedback related to inclusivity) would be useful. It seemed like most of the institutions were moving to a model that mainly relies on peer evaluations. I think this is problematic because it has the potential to give even less weight to student voices, when students already have very little power on our campus. The issues with bias in evaluations are important to consider, but it's still not clear to me that bias will be any less common in peer reviews by our faculty. Our faculty are almost all white men.
- 8) I liked Pos system of midterm, final and instructor reflections. This also needs to be a process that is mandated and scheduled and done in-class.
- 9) Better triangulation of data (self, student and peer evaluations), data dashboards=awesome, psychometrically validated evaluation items for student surveys.
- 10) I liked the attention to diversity and inclusion that that UofO included. That really resonated with me. Their inclusion of a faculty reflection I thought was good. It made me wonder if some of that reflection might also be available to students so they could understand the context of challenges or new components. I can imagine a place were students could see the instructor's own reflection on novel approaches, and inviting the students to say "oh ya, I really liked that activity, you should keep it" or "it didn't work, but if you tweaked it this way, we could have learned that topic more readily."
- 11) We should seriously consider anything else besides the arbitrary student eval system as currently practiced.
- 12) Self reflection by instructor may be useful, although there is clearly a conflict of interest if these evaluations were to be used for promotion and tenure
- 13) Just the fact that all three institutions have made such progress and are really thinking deeply about addressing this issue made me hopeful we can do the same here. I really love that UofO included a faculty reflection as part of the eval process, as reflection is so critical for growth and

change and having that captured side-by-side with what happened in the course is so valuable, and I hope to see that component as part of the efforts here. I also think their dashboard is fantastic and could see AXDD having a hand in creating something for us, that could possibly be an extension of the current instructor dashboard.

- 14) I really liked the idea of having templates for peer evaluations, and having a systematic way of choosing who will do the peer evaluations. I think it's important that by the time people come up for promotion (both to Assoc and Full Prof, or Senior and Principal Lecturer), they have peer evaluations from a variety of colleagues. And people outside the dept can do peer evals, as appropriate.
- 15) Notion of having a panel of trained peer evaluators do all the evaluations, or head up all the evaluations (maybe with a non-committee-member side kick so all get a chance to partake and be "trained" by those who do it for their service work).
- 16) I really was impressed with the U of O system for doing student, peer and self-reflection evaluation. I like the move away from a concrete number score and more nuanced evaluations.
- 17) I really like the compilation of data into the figures from UofO, and how those map onto the criteria.
- 18) I appreciated the process of making midquarter feedback a standard practice.
- 19) Less/no emphasis on quantitative student responses; evaluation by committee with rotating members observing different colleagues.
- 20) I like the process that UO used to gather feedback related to three broad constructs. These three questions seem to provide a framework to structure the feedback rather than multiple seemingly unrelated minute details.
- 21) I loved how U of O used a variety of techniques to assess teaching effectiveness: peer evaluation, student evaluation (mapped to learning gains), providing protocols and training for teaching observations, expecting faculty to observe others, and providing a tool that gives credit for thoughtful reflection on teaching (which many of us do already but don't receive credit for it).
- 22) Careful implementation of peer teaching evaluations. 1) Incorporating faculty in to the discussion of how we define excellence in teaching. 2) creating a suite of tools including self-reflection, student voice and peer eval to assess teaching. 3) U of O in particular had a great way to synthesize all the information from students and self-reflection (though missing the peer eval piece) on an electronic dashboard that would be very helpful.
- 23) their attention to the involvement of instructors in their evaluations (to be fair, I wasn't able to attend all the session—for me to answer a question like this it would be helpful to be able to look at an archived version of the session)
- 24) I was stunned by USC's statement that student evals were being replaced (for merit review reasons) by peer review. My faculty and many others on campus treat peer review as a necessary evil they have to do. They spend a minimal amount of time on it and I would consider their input to be less useful than that obtained from a well designed student evaluation. For this to work, there would have to be significant training, time commitment etc. With my average faculty members clocking above 60 (probably closer to 75-80) hr workweeks, it is completely unfair to keep on dumping more work on them and just expect it to happen. ... UofO emphasized instructor reflection. How do you enforce this? And how useful can it be with untrained instructors?

**D. What ideas do you have for change at the UW with regard to the evaluation of teaching? Please be specific.**

- 1) 1 - reduce or eliminate "ranking" questions since these seem to have the lowest quality. 2 - emphasize open-ended questions that focus on specific teaching concepts. E.g. instead of "what did you like about the course" ask "in what ways did the course engage you?" Also, make it clear whether students should be evaluating the course or the instructor, that is, if a student objects to how the the grade distribution is determined or how many book chapters are covered in the class, is that "fair game" for the evaluation? 3 - place a larger emphasis on peer review of teaching. 4 - Provide more training for faculty who will conduct peer review, including how/what they should observe, what specific feedback they should provide
- 2) Not sure how already-overworked faculty can take the time to do more meaningful peer evals of teaching in which they look at syllabus and observe or participate in more than one class session.
- 3) More resources for faculty at Tacoma campus.
- 4) I'm new to this and eager to learn - no specific suggestions at this time.
- 5) Integrate more student feedback for reviews. Integrate more midterm reviews.
- 6) Make sure that the opportunity for student feedback is not lost and that that feedback is still something that factors into personnel decisions.
- 7) I'm still in the process of trying to get my head around all of this. All I know is that whatever we've been doing hasn't enhanced my teaching and only results in me questioning my abilities as a teacher and erodes my job satisfaction.
- 8) What I mentioned above about units taking on more responsibility to arrange peer evaluations with more structure and training. I think it's essential to create a cultural change in which the burden of soliciting good and fair peer evaluations shifts from faculty members to units -- that would be a major contribution this task force could make. The data dashboard would be amazing.
- 9) I think slimming down the bubble component, then making the comments more available to school/college leadership would be good. Those individual comments aren't readily available unless a faculty chooses to share. And adding questions about inclusive environment would be good.
- 10) Eliminate the student eval system. Consider that two of the most respected professions in American culture are lawyer and doctor. I can't imagine either one of those professionals asking their client or patient to evaluate their work. If a lawyer asked me to do this, I would ask who was paying for the time. If a doctor asked me to do this, I would run from the office to find a new doctor. Why in the world do we ask students to evaluate our teaching? When we want to be considered a real profession, we will grow up and stop doing this. We will implement a system that gives careful consideration to the profession of teaching from the standpoint of intellectual knowledge and understanding that can only come from those that have practiced the discipline, similar to currently established legal and medical review boards. Anything less is making a joke of our profession.
- 11) The purpose of evaluations should be clearly specified. I also could imagine a system that is somewhat split between evaluations for improvement, and evaluations for promotion and tenure. The former would be much more useful for improving teaching quality. I also suspect that it would be useful to have more involvement from the central UW. The Center for Teaching and Learning

is a hugely useful resource that could be greatly expanded. PS: I tried to participate in the zoom session, but really had issues hearing people, so I gave up.

- 12) More education and training around peer reviews. Better recognition and reward for active learning. Recognition and reward for time and effort invested in improving teaching.
- 13) See above for peer evaluation ideas. As for student evaluations, I really don't know. Drawing on our peer institutions who are exploring this terrain is a great first step. I do think also exploring resources from various disciplinary associations might be helpful.
- 14) have it have meaning. If it is a merit review, have there be merit related outcomes. 2) have peer evaluators know what they are doing and per the above, feel that it is important 3) have there be a longitudinal flavor to this, like in industry. "Last year you said you wanted to work on xxxx. How is that going this year?"
- 15) It is so interesting to me that CTL used to have a resource document: Assessment of Teaching and used something called the "assessment pie". it is one of my favorite documents and I don't think available any more on their system. I have a paper copy that I carry always! We built our PHGH major using this evaluation system - midway focus groups, peer review, self-reflection of faculty, student feedback.
- 16) I found the University of Oregon's three-pronged approach (research-based, inclusive, and and engaged) and their instructor evaluation tool particularly effective. I would love to see UW adopt a similar approach and tools. 2.) I also appreciated Oregon's intentional, systematic approach to peer review and think we could benefit from these as well. 3.) All three schools' initiatives emerged from collaborations with their university teaching and learning centers. Is there anyone from our Center for Teaching & Learning on the UW Senate Task Force on Teaching Evaluation? If not, should there be?
- 17) I would like to see more attention paid to the quality of teaching, particularly in heavily research-focused departments. Requiring more faculty (both tenure and lecture-line faculty) to be involved in the evaluation process would be a start to raising awareness of quality teaching, as well as attention to problem areas lurking within the department.
- 18) Since time is an issue (for me), I wish that evaluation was a normal part of the process... the iterative continuous improvement process rather than one more thing to do on top of our already busy schedule. Again, using the UO example, it may be useful to make reflection a required component after every quarter. There would be major rejection at first, but it may become automatic... which is what it should be.
- 19) Do not use student evaluations as a measure of teaching effectiveness. They are biased, inconsistent, and incomplete descriptions of the classrooms.
- 20) There was just a study published, maybe in PLoS, that adding a statement to the instructions for student evals that states that implicit bias can impact ratings for women, POC, and LGBTQ instructors raised the ratings of instructors from that group but did not affect the ratings of white males. Could we add a statement like that to our forms? I'm sure I citation would be helpful, but maybe you already know of the study!
- 21) Develop a new campus-wide student eval form based on the work of U of O, USC and Col State, that will be used to inform instructor teaching but not used for merit/promotion. 2) Change the faculty code and academic HR language that currently requires the use of SETs for evaluation for merit/promotion. 3) Task departments with developing or adapting an evidence-based classroom observation rubric to be used in collegial evals 4) Task departments with developing a process for peer-review that will promote and support improvements in teaching - possibly having a

rotating review panel that is trained in using an observation tool and then observes all junior faculty yearly and senior faculty every 3 years.

- 22) make it less adversarial and biased (especially in favor of males)
- 23) An issue at just about any institution of higher learning is that the people who teach at the highest level have typically no training at all to do so. In fact, the only part of our job we are trained to do is the research part. Many schools put in a pro-forma training as part of faculty orientation but that cannot accomplish much. We're talking about 40% (nominally) of a faculty's effort, according to the fairly standard 40-40-20 rule (I am wont to say it's more like 80-80-40). Perhaps a more extensive training of new faculty is in order?
- 24) One danger is that those people who are excellent teachers will balk at spending more time on this. A few years ago the center for teaching and learning produced some guidelines that our college briefly considered adopting, which would have required instructors to write teaching statements and philosophies for each course they were teaching. I am sure it would have helped some teachers but for most it would have presented just more burden and they would have absolutely resented it.

UW Task Force on Teaching Evaluation  
Agenda for Meeting #2  
May 31, 2019, 10:30-11:30  
MGH 258 or Zoom (<https://washington.zoom.us/j/425420350>)

1. Re-introductions
2. Discussion of May 16th forum feedback (*questions presented in feedback form copied/pasted below; compilation of responses attached*)
  - a. *Regarding current policies and practices associated with STUDENT evaluation of teaching at the UW: What is going especially well and what are our most pressing challenges?*
  - b. *Regarding current policies and practices associated with PEER evaluation of teaching at the UW: What is going especially well and what are our most pressing challenges?*
  - c. *What were the most promising ideas you learned from our colleagues from CSU, UofO, and/or USC? In other words, what are they doing that we ought to give serious consideration to?*
  - d. *What ideas do you have for change at the UW with regard to the evaluation of teaching? Please be specific.*
3. Constructing an agenda for 2019-20
  - a. Summer: Curation of “best practices” insights and research
  - b. October-November: “Listening tour” with deans, elected faculty councils, et al.
  - c. December-January: Synthesis of ↑ and development of “alternative futures,” i.e., a range of answers to the question, “How might we at the UW be a leader among our peers in the assessment and evaluation of teaching by the year 2025?”
  - d. February-April: Series of forums to present alternative futures concepts, elicit feedback, and generate further ideas
  - e. May: Development of recommendations for Senate leadership
4. Logistics/miscellany
  - a. Task force membership: Continuation? Gaps? Regularly invited guests?
  - b. Meeting scheduling