

August 10, 2021

To: Steven Constable, Academic Senate Chair
Elizabeth Simmons, Executive Vice-Chancellor

From: Joint Senate-Administration Holistic Teaching Evaluation Implementation Task Force

Marisa Abrajano, Provost, Warren College (Co-Chair)
Lisa Adams, Associate Chair, Scripps Institution of Oceanography
Christine Alvarado, Teaching Professor, Computer Science and Engineering
Steve Briggs, Professor, Cell & Developmental Biology (Co-Chair)
Maureen Feeley, Associate Teaching Professor, Political Science
Jamila Francisco, Senator for Social Sciences, Associated Students
Suzi Hong, Professor, Herbert Wertheim School of Public Health; Psychiatry
Carlos Jensen, Associate Vice Chancellor for Educational Innovation
John Moore, Dean of Undergraduate Education
Carolyn Sandoval, Associate Director, Teaching + Learning Commons
Shahrokh Yadegari, Professor, Music

Subject: Report on Holistic Teaching Implementation

Introduction	2
I. Teaching Portfolio	3
A. Categories of Evaluation	3
B. Teaching Statement	4
C. Portfolio Construction	5
II. Evaluation and Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness	6
A. Summative Evaluation	7
B. Formative Assessment	8
III. Revised System of Student Feedback	10
A. Oversight	11
B. Administration	11
C. Questions	11
D. Interpretation	13
E. Training	13
IV. Oversight Committee	14
V. Implementation	14
Concluding Remarks	16

Introduction

In 2019, a Senate-Administration Workgroup on Holistic Teaching Evaluation submitted its [report](#) to the Academic Senate. The impetus behind this effort was to develop a more fair and transparent system of teaching evaluation that supports both student success and faculty development. For many decades, the campus has relegated evaluation of teaching to Course and Professor Evaluations (CAPEs). However, this instrument was never intended to be used in this manner. Originally a student organization, CAPEs were intended as an informal venue for students to share their opinions on courses and professors. Faculty and campus reviewers knew that these evaluations have liabilities and have worried about their use for many years. Furthermore, there is a body of literature that documents how implicit bias may enter into student evaluation - particularly if the questions are not carefully curated. While the student voice provides valuable feedback, the previous workgroup recommended that it should represent one data point among others; this group recommended moving to a more holistic approach to teaching evaluation - one that is based on teaching portfolios.

The Executive Vice Chancellor and Divisional Senate Chair charged this task force with developing a plan to implement recommendations made by the Senate-Administration Workgroup on Holistic Teaching Evaluation. Both the Senate and Senate-Administration councils endorsed the previous workgroup's recommendations. In addition, WSCUC's 2020 [reaffirmation of accreditation letter](#) included a requirement that the campus "Act on the recommendations of the recent Senate-Administration Workgroup on Holistic Teaching Evaluation to develop a new system for evaluating teaching effectiveness."

Specifically, we were charged with three main tasks: 1) developing a portfolio review process for campus reviewers and the necessary infrastructure that will allow the campus to transition to this new mode of teaching evaluation; 2) identifying processes of both formative assessment and summative evaluation as these relate to teaching effectiveness; and 3) developing a more comprehensive way to solicit student feedback on instruction that will mitigate bias, including "creating an appropriate administrative structure to deploy this [student feedback] questionnaire and determine how stakeholders – students and faculty – will engage in its administration." Below we discuss the guidelines we developed for each task. We also recommend the formation of a standing committee charged with the oversight of holistic teaching evaluation. Supplementary and reference materials are provided in the report's [Appendix](#).

While the recommendations below represent a fundamental shift in the way teaching is evaluated, it is worth mentioning that much of what is presented is already happening in many departments. Teaching statements and syllabi are already included in many academic files - our recommendations would expand on a current practice. This will mean new practices in some quarters - in many cases, we have become accustomed to simply allowing computer-driven CAPE reports to present evidence of teaching effectiveness. While convenient, it has many liabilities, as was documented in the previous workgroup report. Recognizing that the holistic portfolio approach will require more effort, we do our best to couch it in a framework that allows for efficient preparation and evaluation. We also provide a timeline that allows for a gradual adaptation of the holistic approach. We believe that in the end we will have a more fair and transparent process that allows faculty to develop as instructors and succeed in their academic reviews.

I. Teaching Portfolio

A central recommendation of the Senate Administration Workgroup Report was to move the campus beyond student evaluations as the primary source of evidence for teaching effectiveness and to a more holistic system of evaluation that would incorporate multiple forms of evidence, as recommended by [APM 210-1-D](#). Specifically, the Report recommended that teaching effectiveness be holistically evaluated based on: 1) *a teaching portfolio* that documents effective teaching, 2) *a teaching statement* that contextualizes this evidence for academic review committees, and 3) *a department chair's summary/assessment* of these materials, which incorporates departmental discussion and explains how materials align with department standards. Similar to the process by which departments establish standards for excellence in research/creative work, it is expected that departments will also establish standards for excellence in teaching that are appropriate to their discipline. It is this process, which begins at the department level, and as is described in [APM 210-1-D](#), that will guide holistic evaluation of a faculty candidate's teaching effectiveness. As noted in our Workgroup's charge, "this [process] requires that instructors, departments, department chairs, and campus reviewers all have a common understanding of how portfolios are constructed and interpreted." To guide and support this common understanding, and build on recommendations of the earlier Workgroup, this section includes four subsections: A. Categories of Evaluation, B. Teaching Statement, C. Portfolio Construction, D. Evaluation of Evidence.

A. Categories of Evaluation

The Senate Administration Workgroup on Holistic Teaching Evaluation recommended organizing teaching portfolio materials into five evaluative categories: 1. Classroom

Teaching;¹ 2. Mentorship; 3. Professional Learning and Development; 4. Pedagogy Research, Scholarship, and Inquiry;² and 5. Educational Leadership. Of these five, our workgroup views the first two as central to (nearly) every faculty member's responsibilities as an educator. Thus, **it is expected that every faculty member's portfolio should address these two categories: Classroom Teaching (if classroom teaching is expected) and Mentorship (if mentoring is expected)**. The only cases where either of these categories should be omitted are in cases where the faculty member does not have classroom teaching or mentoring responsibilities.

The remaining three categories - Professional Learning and Development (as this relates to teaching and mentoring); Pedagogy Research, Scholarship, and Inquiry; and Educational Leadership) may be addressed in the portfolio as appropriate to the individual faculty member. However, engagement in novel educational scholarship (as opposed to use of educational scholarship outcomes or assessment of teaching efforts) may be presented separately from the teaching portfolio (as it may fall under a separate review criterion, e.g., in the Teaching Professor series). Additionally, Educational Leadership may be discussed as part of the teaching portfolio or as part of a faculty member's service contributions.

B. Teaching Statement

A faculty candidate's [teaching statement](#) serves as a roadmap for interpreting and contextualizing evidence included in the teaching portfolio. It is similar to a research statement that a faculty member would write to highlight evidence of excellence in research and other creative accomplishments, but with a focus on accomplishments, practice, and goals related to teaching and mentoring. A faculty candidate's teaching and research statements are components of a general "Candidate Statement," where the faculty candidate provides guidance to evidence of standards of promotion as outlined by the APM, PPM, and their departments, with respect to proposed rank and duties.

A strong teaching statement will document a faculty member's teaching effectiveness, including activity that demonstrates a commitment to continued learning and improvement. It should address the expected evaluative categories listed above and include the following elements (although they need not be ordered as below):

1. A critical reflection on **Classroom Teaching** (if classroom teaching is expected). This reflection should: (1) refer to evidence that highlights what is working well, and (2) critically examine opportunities for improvement and outline a plan for improvement. It will also typically include a discussion of:
 - a. teaching responsibilities during review period³

¹ This evaluative category was named "Teaching and Supportive Learning" in the earlier Report, but we recommend renaming this "Classroom Teaching."

² This category was named "Research, Scholarship and Inquiry" in the earlier Report, but we recommend renaming this "Pedagogy Research, Scholarship and Inquiry."

³ Typically this will include the total number of courses taught, level of courses (e.g. graduate, undergraduate - upper/lower division); type of course (seminar, lecture, lab, etc.); general size of course

- b. goals as instructor
 - c. pedagogical strategies for achieving these goals
 - d. impacts on student learning, including analysis of how evidence and feedback have been incorporated to improve teaching/mentoring (linking to evidence in the portfolio), and impacts on diversity
 - e. plans to improve teaching effectiveness in the next review period
2. A critical reflection on **Mentorship** (if mentoring is expected). This reflection should: (1) demonstrate a commitment to mentoring by referring to key example(s) of supporting evidence, and (2) address mentoring and advising goals, reflecting on successes or failures in achieving these goals. It will also typically include the following components:
- a. mentoring strategies, efforts, and plans, including descriptions of approaches and rationales
 - b. mentoring outcomes, and evidence of effective mentoring: e.g., outcomes (changes made, new mentoring techniques/strategies) and trainee outcomes (completion of degrees, employment, student evaluations)
 - c. proposed changes in mentoring strategies (informed by feedback/reflection)

As appropriate, the statement may also address the remaining categories of Professional Learning and Development, Pedagogical Research, Scholarship, and Inquiry and Educational leadership, or any other categories relevant to the portfolio's design.

C. Portfolio Construction

The teaching portfolio serves to support the teaching statement and provides (more) direct evidence of teaching effectiveness and continued improvement for each of the included categories. Building on the earlier [Senate-Administration Workgroup Report](#), here we provide recommendations for expected evidence and examples of additional forms of evidence that can be included for each category.

1. **Classroom Teaching** (if classroom teaching is expected):
- **Expected:** Course [syllabi](#): The portfolio should include a syllabus for all courses taught during the review period or the most recent offering of each unique course taught, as recommended by departments. Syllabi should also meet departmental standards. Note that syllabi may take a variety of forms - some may have week-by-week schedules, others might not. Essential are the goals of the course and a discussion of student expectations. The Commons provides [template syllabi](#)
 - **Expected:** Student Feedback. The portfolio should include evaluative questions from the Student Instructional Input Program (SIIP) (discussed

(large-enrollment, small seminar, etc.), and explain whether teaching and/or mentoring load was higher/lower than expectations during the review period.

below) and any additional questions faculty would like to include, in addition to graduate student course evaluations.

- **Expected:** [Teaching Effort Quantification Table](#)
- **Examples of additional forms of evidence that may be included:**
 - Additional course materials (assignments, exams, supplemental instruction materials, rubrics, etc)
 - Examples of student work
 - Peer observations and/or observations by educational specialists from the Teaching + Learning Commons
 - Any other evidence that the faculty member feels illustrates the effectiveness of their teaching. This may include evidence of new approaches or steps to ensure academic integrity.

2. Mentorship (if mentorship is expected)

- **Expected:** [Mentoring Effort Quantification](#)
- **Optional:** [Guided Mentoring Template](#), which can be adapted by departments to meet departmental mentoring expectations/standards.
- **Examples of additional forms of evidence that may be included:**
 - Any other evidence that the faculty member feels illustrates the effectiveness of their mentoring.

If applicable, evidence may also be included for the categories of Professional Learning and Development, Pedagogy, Research, Scholarship and Inquiry and Educational Leadership. Example sources of evidence for these categories are outlined in the [Workgroup Report](#).

II. Evaluation and Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

The [Workgroup on Holistic Teaching Report](#) recommended that a clear distinction be maintained between “formative assessment” and “summative evaluation” of teaching effectiveness in order both to support faculty in incorporating evidence-based methods into their teaching and guide evaluation of their accomplishments through academic review processes. The previous workgroup defined this distinction as follows:

Summative Evaluation

- The purpose of teaching evaluation is to inform personnel decisions and judge the results of mentorship and development. Instructors are accountable to high standards of teaching effectiveness, as detailed in [APM 210-1-D](#): ‘Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion.

- Evaluation begins at the department level and becomes part of the basis for academic personnel recommendations for campus reviewers. Department evaluation should take discipline and department standards into account and rely on multiple data points” (Workgroup Report, 2).

Formative Assessment

- Assessment is oriented towards the improvement of teaching and is part of faculty instructional mentorship and development. It is supportive and confidential; it does not become part of a faculty member’s file. The purpose of teaching assessment is to provide constructive feedback to instructors so that they might improve pedagogical practices and better enable student learning” (Workgroup Report, p. 2).

This section presents a guide for how departments can carry out each type of assessment of teaching.

A. Summative Evaluation

Summative evaluation is applicable during the merit review process. A candidate’s teaching statement and portfolio will be evaluated for how well it demonstrates the candidate’s teaching excellence. To guide and support faculty candidates’ presentation of evidence in teaching statements and portfolios, as well academic reviewers’ evaluation of this evidence, this section introduces a general guide for what to consider in evaluating teaching excellence and providing feedback. It is expected that departments will use this guide to establish standards of teaching excellence and mentoring appropriate to their discipline, and provide feedback to faculty through each review cycle.

Below is a list of criteria that can aid in evaluating the faculty candidate’s teaching effectiveness. For all of the following criteria, the following aspects may be considered: 1. effectiveness in the included category, 2. learning or improvement during the current review period, and 3. plans for improvement in the next review period.

I. To evaluate Classroom Teaching (if expected):

1. Evaluate the candidate’s **course design** for one or more courses. Consider:
 - Are [course learning outcomes \(CLOs\)](#) clearly articulated and formulated at an appropriate level?
 - Are [assignments and assessments aligned](#) with course learning outcomes?
 - Are there opportunities for low-stakes formative feedback prior to summative assessments?
 - Are **student expectations** clearly communicated?
2. Evaluate the candidate’s **use of instructional strategies**. Consider:
 - What [evidence-based teaching practices](#) are employed?

- How does the candidate's teaching demonstrate commitment to **diversity, equity, inclusion**?
- How does the candidate's teaching demonstrate commitment to promoting **academic integrity**?
- 3. Evaluate the **impact on the students**. Consider:
 - What evidence is there that the students **achieved the learning outcomes** for the course?
 - What are the themes in the **student evaluative feedback**? Are there any problematic patterns?
- 4. Evaluate the candidate's **responsiveness to evidence**, and **growth as a teacher**.
 - How has the candidate responded to evidence that suggests modification is needed (e.g. consistent patterns in student feedback, or a weakness in the course design)?
 - What has the candidate done to show growth as a teacher during the review period?

II. To evaluate Mentorship (if expected) consider the following:

1. What evidence does the candidate provide that their **mentoring is effective**?
2. Does mentoring demonstrate commitment to **diversity, equity, inclusion**?
3. What evidence is there of **growth and improvement** as a mentor during the current review period?
4. How **appropriate is their plan to improve** in the next review cycle?
5. Are there any **consistent problematic patterns in mentoring feedback** or other evidence?
6. Is the **mentoring load appropriate**, given departmental expectations?

Finally, aspects of professional development, educational research, or educational leadership may also be considered in the department's assessment of a candidate's teaching effectiveness.

B. Formative Assessment

Unlike summative assessment, which is applied during the merit review process, the goal of *formative assessment* is to provide early feedback to help a faculty member continuously improve their teaching. This is a powerful tool, and we recommend that junior faculty engage in regular formative assessment that occurs separately from the merit review process. In this section we discuss the primary tools that may be used for formative assessment to guide departments in developing more robust processes in this area.

1. **Review of syllabi for formative assessment:** Course [syllabi](#) provide an effective tool for faculty to document and communicate course outcomes, expectations, and an outline of what students will do to achieve course learning outcomes. A formative assessment of the syllabus can be done by peers or education specialists in the [Teaching + Learning](#)

[Commons](#). If a course does not have a syllabus, peer mentors or educational specialists can help the faculty member develop one. If the syllabus is lacking required components such as learning outcomes, these mentors/education specialists can help the faculty member develop these.

2. **Review of other course materials for formative assessment.** A review of course materials for formative purposes can help faculty reflect on their teaching philosophy and practice and how well course materials such as readings, assignments, exams, and other materials align with stated course learning outcomes. Early formative feedback can help faculty make improvements to better support student learning and become more effective educators. Formative reviews can also provide a documented trail of professional improvement and evidence of a commitment to teaching effectiveness.

Faculty who participate in a formative peer review of their course materials could benefit from a review of the totality of the class materials, or from a selective subset of materials or activities. These latter materials might include practices that instructors are uncertain about or that students have raised concerns about in course evaluations. Recommended procedures for formative evaluation of course materials include (Chism, 2007):

1. Collect a representative sample (across courses and time) and information about the context in which they are used.
 2. Prior to any formative review, identify the instructor's questions or concerns so that these can be addressed in your review.
 3. Review the materials (identify appropriate instruments). [See customizable example](#).
 4. Discuss feedback with the instructor.
 5. Remain available for help if needed.
3. **Peer observations for formative assessment.** At the instructor's discretion, these observations may also figure in summative evaluations (see section I above). Decisions about peer review of teaching should be made at the department level, although the department may choose to enlist a faculty member from outside the department. The following provides options for departments to help make informed decisions based on their context.

Peer review as a formative mechanism provides feedback directly to the faculty member. Its purpose is to provide guidance for strengthening teaching. Before the peer observation, instructors should be invited to articulate the pedagogical goals and context of the course and of the session being observed. The goal of the feedback should be to help the faculty member see where they could improve the learning experience. The feedback should not "penalize" faculty or discount methods that are not currently working, but show promise. Rather it should focus on both what the faculty member does well and provide suggestions for improvement.

Here we provide examples, guidelines, and sample classroom observation forms that can be customized to better meet a department's needs. These forms may facilitate the development of written peer observations:

- 1) **Pre-Observation Form**: The faculty member whose class will be observed fills this out and shares it with the observer prior to the observation. This gives the observer context for the class session being observed and allows the instructor to identify particular areas they would like the observer to focus on. It also allows them to identify information that would be helpful to know (e.g. "this quarter has been particularly challenging because ...").
 - 2) **Observation Notes Form**: Rather than trying to fill out a feedback form during the class, it is more helpful to take detailed notes that can be used to fill out the feedback form later. This form provides some suggestions for what to focus on during the observation.
 - 3) **Classroom Observation Feedback Form**: This is filled out by the observer after observing the class. Note that there are many examples of forms that can be used. This form includes common criteria across disciplines that relate to teaching efficacy and can be tailored accordingly.
 - 4) **Post-Observation Reflection Form**—This can be filled out by the faculty whose class was observed. These reflection questions can be helpful for faculty when they are putting together their tenure and promotion files.
4. **Review of student feedback for formative assessment.** Student feedback can provide valuable information in helping a faculty member understand where they can better meet the learning needs of their students. This feedback can come in many forms, from mid-quarter evaluations administered by the faculty member, to more formal Course and Professor Evaluations (revised under the Student Instructional Input Program, below). Helpful guidance on collecting and responding to early student feedback can be found [here](#). The role of student input as a formative feedback tool is discussed in section III below.

III. Revised System of Student Feedback

The campus currently relies heavily on student input to evaluate teaching effectiveness. While the student voice is an important data point, it should not be the sole evaluative basis. Furthermore, there is a large literature that documents how implicit bias has figured into student evaluations. In this section, we summarize the previous committee's recommendations regarding using student evaluation data for both formative and summative evaluation and suggest how these suggestions might be implemented.

A. Oversight

As the Senate-Administration workgroup report noted, the current oversight of Course and Professor Evaluations (CAPEs) is minimal and inconsistent. A student director has been hired by the Office of Undergraduate Education and supervised by staff in that office. Most of the implementation is handled electronically by Information Technology Services (ITS). The student director has typically spent about ten hours a month answering email questions and occasionally receives and vets requests for question additions and changes. There is a faculty advisory committee, but its engagement is minimal. The following makes recommendations regarding various aspects of student input. We replace 'CAPE' with 'Student Instructional Input Program' (SIIP).

We recommend a more robust structure that allows for greater faculty and student oversight; we also recommend that area experts from the Teaching + Learning Commons be involved. To this end, we recommend a committee structure to oversee SIIP: a sub-committee of the standing committee that oversees the holistic teaching evaluation process. It is important that it has broad representation (student – through Associate Students, faculty, the Commons, Undergraduate Education, and ITS). The group would be charged with periodically evaluating the program, trouble-shooting any issues, and curating the student input questions.

We would like to address the possible concern that a student-run CAPE program is replaced with more faculty oversight. There are two points: 1. For many years, there has been minimal student involvement; the proposed restructuring actually increases the student voice in the oversight of student input on instruction. 2. Because student input is used in the evaluation of faculty files, it is appropriate that faculty be involved in its oversight. Finally, in accordance with Senate Council recommendations, engaging the Teaching + Learning Commons provides much needed expertise in the science of course evaluation.

B. Administration

CAPEs are currently administered by ITS, who maintains the website and sends automatic communications to students and faculty. Undergraduate Education staff interfaces with ITS on any changes and supervises the student director. We envision the administration of the Student Input Program to be similar, minus the student director position.

C. Questions

We recommend adopting the recommendations of the Holistic Teaching Evaluation Workgroup regarding the questions used for student input. This committee based these questions on the student evaluation literature, with an eye to choosing questions that mitigated against implicit bias. The proposed questions are included in the Appendix.

One recommendation was to bifurcate the questions into assessment and evaluative categories. The former would only be available to the instructor (unless they choose to include them in their portfolio); their purpose is to provide useful information about student engagement in the class (e.g. how often they attend, come to office hours, etc.). The evaluative questions would be included in faculty files, as they evaluate aspects of instruction. The questions are also flagged as optional or obligatory. The optional questions often refer to practices that may not be relevant for all courses (e.g. use of technology). Departments and faculty should choose which of these to include.

The question bank is divided into four areas: 1. *Student participation*: These questions probe student participation in terms of attendance, office hour use, etc. All of the questions are for formative assessment, as this is useful feedback for instructors, but does not directly measure teaching effectiveness; 2. *Practice*: This section pertains to the execution of the course – these questions focus on the instructional activities. All of these are for evaluative purposes, but they are also all optional because the instructional activities will vary from course to course; 3. *Student Learning*: These questions are all evaluative and ask students for feedback on how the course helped them learn and engage in the material; 4. *Structure/Inclusiveness*: The questions in this section ask about ways the instruction is structured and how students are included in the learning process. These are evaluative. Each question asks for a 1-5 rating.

The appendix also includes several open-ended prompts to elicit student comments. Campus reviewers of faculty files find student comments particularly useful in providing context for numeric scores; thus, these should be included in faculty files. Again, it is important that these prompts focus on pedagogical practices and avoid soliciting general comments that might be based on extra-pedagogical factors.

Also included are several questions regarding the effectiveness of instructional assistants, including open-ended prompts for comments. This type of feedback is crucial for improving the student experience and learning through the use of graduate and undergraduate student instructional assistants. Graduate students often rely on this feedback when going on the job market.

Note that there are no summative questions of the ‘recommend course/instructor’ type. While these provide quick ways to get a read on student input, they are particularly prone to bias and tend to encourage looking for a quick bottom line.

Departments and faculty will have the opportunity to decide which optional questions to include. In addition, as is the case with CAPEs, faculty may submit their own questions. It may be useful for departments to do the same in order to focus on discipline-specific factors. We recommend that these questions be vetted by the oversight committee.

D. Interpretation

Currently, CAPEs are sent to instructors, department chairs, and included in faculty files. The numerical scores, but not the comments, are publicly available at cape.ucsd.edu. In addition, departments and campus reviewers receive scatter-plots of departmental CAPE scores for 'recommend instructor'. The CAPE scores are reported as averages.

We recommend a few changes – the resulting system may be more difficult to implement, but should provide a fairer and more informative method of reporting scores. First, we recommend replacing average scores with histograms. This is considered a best practice in the course evaluation literature, as averages obscure variations in scores. Understanding these variations is informative. We realize that this will make the reporting and interpretation of the reports more complicated; however, it will add value to the information provided by student input. We note that without an average score, it will not be possible to produce scatterplots.

Currently, student comments are restricted. Many years ago, when the CAPE organization produced CAPE books, their staff summarized comments in short paragraphs. The process was very time consuming then, when there were far fewer courses than now. Hence, this practice is not practical. Associated Students discussed CAPEs with students and found that students would like to have access to comments. While we realize that this is probably not possible for privacy reasons, we recommend that some type of word cloud be created and be part of the report posted on cape.ucsd.edu.

When departments and chairs review academic files, it will be up to the chair to interpret the results of SIIP reports, based on the departmental discussion. The chair's letter will need to discuss both histogram distributions and student comments. This will tend to be more qualitative than the current practice (where averages are typically reported, often with reference to the scatterplot), but the discussion might be structured around trends associated with each of the three areas (the first area is for assessment only). These can then be put into the perspective of departmental expectations.

E. Training

Because student evaluations of teaching may be subject to implicit bias, we feel it is important to provide students with training. This could be in the form of a few obligatory screens before going to the survey or provided periodically throughout the academic year. One way to mitigate bias in student feedback is to provide guidance for students, emphasizing the important role students play in commenting on and improving instruction. Several universities provide materials for students, including videos, instructions, etc.

The training should cover the following areas: 1. The purpose of SIIP reports is to improve instruction and to evaluate faculty for promotion; 2. Implicit bias – what it is and how it might factor into student instructional input; 3. Tips for constructive comments – see Appendix for an example from the University of Michigan.

In addition, the oversight committee should be charged with determining best practices for encouraging participation, including, perhaps, opportunities to complete questionnaires in-class. Even with educational opportunities around student feedback, it is possible that some comments exhibit bias. This issue has been discussed with respect to graduate student instructional assistant evaluations; we recommend exploring such a policy for all student feedback. In particular, we recommend establishing a procedure whereby instructors can identify biased responses and ask that they be removed.

Overall, student input on instruction is an important component for assessing and evaluating teaching effectiveness. However, the campus has defaulted to the use of CAPE reports for faculty files when these were not designed for that purpose. A revision to the way student input is solicited and reported is in order. We hope that these recommendations will make the process more useful – both for students and faculty.

IV. Oversight Committee

The Workgroup on Holistic Teaching Evaluation recommended that a standing oversight committee be formed to monitor the holistic teaching evaluation process. We recommend that this committee include faculty, administration, and representatives from the Commons. A sub-committee - charged with advising on the Student Instructional Input Program - would also have Associated Students, Undergraduate Education, and ITS representation.

The Holistic Teaching Evaluation Oversight Committee would include, among others, the Director of the Engaged Teaching Hub, a CAP representative, the director of Academic Personnel Services, a representative from the Council of Chairs, and the Faculty Director for Faculty & Leadership Development. The committee would be charged with:

- Monitoring holistic teaching evaluation (e.g., trouble-shooting, evaluating, and recommending changes)
- Creating training materials for faculty, chairs, campus reviewers
- Overseeing, through a sub-committee, the Student Instructional Input Program

V. Implementation

The transition to holistic teaching evaluation represents a significant change in the way academic files are assembled and evaluated and will represent a cultural shift around the way our campus evaluates teaching excellence. While we recognize that the portfolio review process will require more work than simply assembling CAPE reports, the added value - both in terms of encouraging pedagogical reflection and allowing for more nuanced teaching evaluation - should be considerable. In order to ease into this new approach, we suggest a multi-year implementation. It should be noted that much of the associated work is essentially one-time - i.e., the teaching statement and portfolio, once assembled, can be updated incrementally in future years. In this way, holistic teaching materials will be similar to updated bibliographies,

and can become a regular part of the file preparation process. Similarly, departments, chairs, and deans, once they have gone through the process a few times, will be able to evaluate teaching more efficiently, in a manner similar to how research and service are evaluated. The following is a proposed implementation timeline:

- Summer 2021:
 - Distribute this report to departments, divisions, and campus reviewers for comments
 - Work with ITS to implement the transition from CAPEs to SIIPs (for implementation in Fall 2021)
- Fall 2021:
 - Panel and charge the Holistic Teaching Evaluation Oversight Committee
- Fall-Spring 2021-22:
 - Schedule meetings between Oversight Committee representatives and academic departments, divisions, and CAP
 - Follow up with training workshops for faculty and campus reviewers
 - Encourage faculty - particularly those whose files will go forward in 2022-23 - to include syllabi and short teaching statements in academic files
 - Encourage departments to develop teaching standards by the end of Spring 2022
- Academic year 2022-23:
 - Campus reviewers begin to comment on teaching statements and other materials, in addition to CAPEs (residual) and SIIPs
- Academic year 2023-24:
 - Encourage more detailed teaching statements to match additional portfolio material (including SIIPs, syllabi, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness)
 - Campus reviewers include more elements in evaluating teaching effectiveness
- Academic year 2024-25:
 - Holistic teaching evaluation reaches steady-state

	Senate/Admin	Department/School	Faculty
Summer 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribute report to departments, divisions, and campus reviewers for comments ● Work with ITS to implement the transition from CAPEs to SIIPs (for implementation in Fall 2021) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide feedback on implementation report 	

Fall 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panel and charge the Holistic Teaching Evaluation Oversight Committee 		
AY 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule meetings between Oversight Committee representatives and academic departments, divisions, and CAP Follow up with training workshops for faculty and campus reviewers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solicit Pilot departments/Faculty to trial process Encourage faculty - particularly those whose files will go forward in 2022-23 - to include syllabi and short teaching statements in academic files 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optional Syllabus development Optional teaching statements
AY 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campus reviewers begin to comment on teaching statements and other materials, in addition to CAPEs (residual) and SIIPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage the development of teaching standards by the end of Spring quarter 2022 	Optional adoption of Portfolio assessment (faculty decision or department decision?)
AY 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campus reviewers include more elements in evaluating teaching effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage more detailed teaching statements to match additional portfolio material (including SIIPs, syllabi, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness) 	Required adoption of all elements of Portfolio assessment
AY 24	Steady State - Full implementation		

Of course, as holistic teaching evaluation unfolds, we will learn more about how to streamline the process, while allowing for meaningful, nuanced, evaluation. The Oversight Committee will be charged with interfacing with faculty and departments to continue to refine the process.

Concluding Remarks

The move to holistic evaluation of teaching inevitably will require additional effort by faculty in assembling and describing evidence of teaching effectiveness, but the committee strongly

believes that the benefits to faculty and students of this new mode of teaching evaluation far outweigh the costs. It is also the case that much of what we recommend - e.g., teaching statements and syllabi - are already included in faculty files.

As noted in the earlier [Senate-Administration Workgroup Report](#), problems with using student evaluations as the primary form of evidence for evaluating teaching effectiveness are well documented, with multiple studies finding evidence of gender-, age-, and ethnic-based bias. Recent research has demonstrated that this potential for bias can be mitigated through a range of reforms that include attention to the types of questions asked, student training, efforts to increase response rates, and replacing average scores with histograms. Our proposed “Student Instructional Input Program (SIIP)” incorporates these (and other) research-based reforms to replace the existing Course and Professor Evaluations (CAPES) and ensures that students’ perspectives continue to inform evaluations of teaching effectiveness.

One great benefit of *holistic* evaluation of teaching is that faculty have the opportunity to describe their pedagogical goals, strategies, and impacts in their own words, drawing on multiple sources of evidence beyond student evaluations. Moreover, the Report also outlines processes and recommendations for formative feedback of teaching effectiveness, such that faculty are in a position to succeed through summative evaluation processes of academic review for promotion.

Ultimately, it will be the responsibility of departments to develop standards of excellence for teaching effectiveness relevant to their discipline, similar to existing standards of excellence for research and other creative works, and to ensure that their faculty receive the support and feedback they need to succeed. When taken together, ideally formative assessment and summative evaluation of teaching result in student mastery of course learning outcomes and improved teaching to reach this goal. Thus, implementing a holistic method of teaching evaluation also moves the campus one step closer to achieving its vision of a student-centered university.