Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness at Utah Valley University: Past, Present, and Future

By
Denise Richards and Lisa Lambert
Associate Professors, Department of Student Leadership and Success Studies
University College

Principal Contributors:
Wendy Athens, Senior Director, Office of Teaching and Learning
Anton Tolman, Professor, Department of Behavioral Science

Faculty Senate Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness:
Pauli Alin, Denise Richards, Susan Cox, Michaela Giesenkirchen Sawyer, Mark Wathen,
Jonathan Allred, Marc Jorgensen, Mohammed El-Saidi, Amanda Crabb, Frey Seagrove-Nelson

August, 2018

Table of Contents

Introduction

Background

Teaching effectiveness and its associated definitions, applications, evaluations, and measurements, is an expansive topic but one that is at the very heart of our profession. Not surprisingly, Utah Valley University (UVU) has undertaken many and varied efforts to deepen our understanding of teaching effectiveness with the ongoing goal of improving our practices to achieve student learning outcomes.

The most current initiative, and the catalyst for this paper, was the Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (fall 2017 through spring 2018), initiated and facilitated through Faculty Senate. What follows is a brief step-by-step summary of the context and impetus for creating this Task Force.

1. The Faculty Development Committee (under the auspices of Faculty Senate) in collaboration with the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence[1], began an arduous process of reviewing and developing new SRI questions (approximately 2009).

2. New SRI questions were voted on in Faculty Senate in the spring of 2015; the vote was to adopt the new questions.

3. Larger questions arose at the same time as this vote, such as: 1) Are SRI's even useful? 2) What means of evaluating teachers should we be using here at UVU? 3) Can you really evaluate teaching effectiveness?

---

[1] The Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence (FCTE) was the forerunner to the current Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL).

4. A Senate session addressed these larger questions in November of 2016. This led to a campus-wide forum (April 2017) with Todd Zakrajsek[2] as the invited guest, effectively beginning to address these questions.

5. A workshop on this subject was presented at Faculty Convocation fall of 2017. The suggestion arose that Faculty Senate convene a Task Force to focus efforts on these questions. The Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness was created and commenced fall of 2017 with the intention of devoting the full academic year to this work.

As the Task Force got underway, it was soon clear that the topic of teaching effectiveness was so enormous that it presented members with both constraints and opportunities. The constraints included the relatively short time frame, the sheer vastness of the topic, the ever-expanding literature to review, UVU's own multiplicity of efforts on this topic, and the wide disparity among faculty, departments and schools/colleges of definitions and practices. In spite of these constraints, the opportunities were also numerous. The Task Force realized that this could be a venue to approach the topic with a more structured mindset and attempt to gather data on our current practices and definitions—thereby generating a baseline, of sorts, from which to further analyze and explore forward directions.

Scope of the Paper

Although a more detailed summary of the Task Force's work will be addressed in a later section of this paper, one conclusion became particularly apparent: UVU's faculty (Academic Affairs) need a seminal, scholarly paper to comprehensively address teaching effectiveness. This topic will always be at the foundation of our teaching mission but we continue to address it in

---

[2] Todd Zakrajsek, co-author of "The New Science of Learning: How to Learn in Harmony With Your Brain," (2013), presented a keynote address ("Teaching All Millennials") and a workshop ("Learning How to Learn") to UVU faculty. [https://www.med.unc.edu/fammed/directory/todd-d-zakrajsek-phd/]

bits and pieces through the years. In many cases, we duplicate efforts; knowledge and data is not housed in one place; we seem to forget what we've learned and done; faculty and people in administrator positions come and go; and literature continues to provide "new" ideas. With these realities in mind, the following objectives provide the goals of this white paper:

- Gather and summarize UVU archival knowledge and information on teaching effectiveness
- Summarize and derive meaning from existing literature
- Capture the breadth and depth of work from this year's Task Force
- Formulate significant recommendations about our teaching, our methods of assessment, and where/how policies might be updated, amended, or added

From a broader perspective, we would like to provide a baseline or reference point for future initiatives and research. If we can begin to retain our efforts and build *from* them rather than starting over, we will have the opportunity to advance our teaching practices in meaningful, substantive, and expedient ways.

Historical Record of Teaching Effectiveness[3]

Accreditation

An exploration of the historical record about UVU's pursuit of improving teaching effectiveness begins with a review of the self-studies and affirmations of accreditation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). Accreditations of the institution go back several decades but the most relevant years for the purposes of this paper are 2005, 2010 and 2017.

The 2005 report documents a major shift in focus from a community college offering a few selected baccalaureate degrees to a state college offering 31 baccalaureate degree programs and looked to a time when UVSC[4] would offer post-baccalaureate degree programs[5]. The 2010

---

[3] Disclaimer: The authors made every effort to gather historical records and evidence on the topic of teaching effectiveness at UVU, however, it is likely that efforts and/or information has inadvertently been left out.

[4] Utah Valley State College. The name of the institution changed to Utah Valley University (UVU) in 2009.

[5] UVU Self Study, April, 2005, p. 2

report documents another major shift in focus from a state college offering a full range of baccalaureate degree programs to Utah Valley University (UVU), effective July 8, 2008, offering three master's degrees.[6] The latest report in 2017 documents "significant changes in several areas since its 2010 Comprehensive Evaluation"[7] including enrollment and full-time faculty growth, expanded academic offerings, implementation of structured enrollment, and, the reorganization of academic and administrative structures.

Importantly, included in the more than twenty years of major changes reported in these accreditations is documentation of a steadily increasing need to focus on and improve outcomes assessment and learning outcomes assessment in particular. These reports of learning outcomes assessment signify and give evidence for the following claims: UVU is primarily a teaching institution with high quality of teaching and learning (i.e., effective teaching) using learning outcomes assessment to improve the quality and rigor of its teaching and of its academic programs.

A significant assumption embedded throughout all three reports needs to be identified and made clear: the teaching at UVU is, in all of the accreditation self-studies, assumed to be effective if learning outcomes assessment provides evidence of student achievement of those outcomes. The implication of this assumption is that if learning outcomes assessment and student achievement of those outcomes both improve, then UVU has improved teaching effectiveness.

The accreditation reports also demonstrated sustained improvement of learning outcomes assessment. Examples included: the use of the assessment data to improve courses and programs and multiple other indicators of achievement of student learning (e.g., graduation rates, retention rates, senior exit interviews, portfolios, student satisfaction surveys, external review of student work, licensure exams, graduate record exams, standardized discipline-based exams, admission

---

[6] UVU Self Study, November, 2010, p. 1
[7] UVU Self-Study, September, 2017, pp. 28-29

rates to graduate and professional schools, and surveys of supervisors or managers who hire UVU Alumni).

This is encouraging when departments' assessment data demonstrate high levels of student achievement of learning outcomes and when departments can adequately demonstrate that they are actually using learning outcomes assessment data to improve courses and programs. It is a problem when, as cited in a Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities 2010 recommendation, "student learning outcomes for some programs are incomplete, the use of assessment data beyond the program-level is limited, and few programs provide evidence that assessment data influences program design or delivery." (2017, p. 9)

UVU's response was to take several significant actions to improve program assessment and connect it more effectively to program review, developing "a robust process that ensures all programs have student learning outcomes that are assessed regularly and used for improvement" (2017, p. 9). As a result, "UVU programs have made substantial improvements to student learning as a result of feedback from the five sources of assessment [learning outcomes for academic programs, assessment of Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs) for general education, academic program reviews, specialized accreditations, advisory boards], making assessment of student learning a key tool of continuous improvement at UVU" (2017, p. 10).

Faculty Development

Center for Teaching Excellence/Faculty Development (1990-1996)

UVU's first effort to provide an administrative structure dedicated to faculty development to improve teaching effectiveness was instituted in the early 1990's as the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) and Faculty Development. The first director, Helen Ashton, was a long-time tenured member of the faculty and was reassigned half of her teaching load time to direct the center. The director worked with Karl Worthington, Ph.D., Associate Vice President

for Academic Affairs, to design opportunities for faculty to improve their teaching, and to receive funds to travel for professional development and for instructional development.

During most of this time frame, UVU was a community college. A large proportion of teaching faculty came from the professional trades and other businesses. Few had experience as classroom teachers. The Center offered a course in teacher development that all new faculty were required to complete. The course consisted of multiple components on the aspects of teaching, including: how to design a course, various teaching methods, how to develop a syllabus, and how to write effective exams and evaluate student performance. Each component was comprised of a series of workbooks. Faculty progressed through each component and then moved on to the next component until they completed the course.

Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence (1996-2004)—Lisa Lambert, M.B.A., Director

In 1996, a new full time academic administrative staff was assigned as director of the Center and in 1998 the name of the center was changed to the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence (FCTE). Improving teaching effectiveness was addressed by the FCTE by offering several opportunities for faculty professional development geared toward improving teaching effectiveness including:

- a teacher development course (see CTE above)
- new faculty orientation day
- an annual college-wide conference on teaching excellence and effectiveness with a keynote speaker and related workshops;
- four annual college-wide workshops dedicated to improving teaching (two each major semester);
- workshops for departments on topics related to teaching effectiveness (themes and areas of focus determined by surveying faculty, department chairs and deans);
- the annual Great Teachers Summit (a 3-day workshop focused on the improvement of teaching and teaching excellence hosted by the Northern Rockies Consortium for Higher Education (NORCHE), a multi-institutional group whose mission was to foster effective teaching and student learning);
- training of department chairs on faculty evaluation policy and practices, how to evaluate faculty teaching performance including how to use the results of the student evaluation of teaching;

- one-on-one consultation and coaching for faculty desiring to improve their teaching and/or who had been referred to the FCTE by their department chair or dean for remediation.

The FCTE oversaw three iterations of improving the instrument for students to rate teaching including the pilot for moving from a paper and pencil instrument to an online format. In 2003-04, the FCTE also oversaw a pilot program to outsource the student rating of teaching using the IDEA system out of Kansas State University's Teaching and Learning Center. Academic Affairs administration subsequently made the decision that it was too costly and returned to the in-house instrument.

In 2000, the director redesigned the new faculty orientation and renamed it the New Faculty Academy. This academy was an intensive two-day seminar designed to familiarize new faculty with UVSC; provide information on and demonstration of highly effective teaching methods and practices; introduction to current classroom technology; facilitate their start-up activities to prepare to teach; introduce them to faculty resources/services and to student resources/services; and, orient them to the retention, tenure and promotion policy and practices.

UVSC also provided funds for faculty to travel professionally and for new course development. The FCTE was allocated $20,000 each year for the years 1996-2004. These funds did not include funding for faculty professional travel which averaged slightly over $30,000 each year for the years 1996-2004. Faculty applied to the FCTE for funds to assist with travel to professional meetings particularly if they were making a presentation. Funds were allocated to eligible faculty based on approval of department chairs and the Faculty Senate Faculty Development Committee. The FCTE budget also did not include funding for instructional development which averaged nearly $24,000 each year for the years 1996-2004. Faculty applied to the FCTE for funds to be used for a variety of purposes including the development of new courses and curricula to benefit students, and to support other worthy efforts as evaluated by the FCTE and the Faculty Senate's Faculty Development Committee. Funds were allocated to

eligible faculty based on approval of department chairs and the Faculty Development

Committee. However, opportunities for faculty to receive funding for both travel and

instructional development from the FCTE declined as the College added 176 full time faculty

while neither the funding for the FCTE, nor the funding for faculty travel and instructional

development, changed over this period.

Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence (2005-2007)— Jerry Christopherson, Ed.D., Eldon
    McMurray, Ed.D., Co-Directors

UVSC experimented with a different leadership model to direct the efforts of the FCTE

combining faculty and administrative staff leadership. The VPAA appointed co-directors: an

experienced faculty member with half reassigned time and a staff member with experience in

instructional development assigned half time to the FCTE. This model proved ineffective as the

faculty directors did not have the resources of either time or funding to move the FCTE forward.

The co-directors were only able to maintain the programming already established.

Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence (2007-2008)— Ursula Sorensen, M.A., Interim Director

As a result of several factors, the previous co-directors of the FCTE vacated their

positions. As an intern in the FCTE, Sorensen instituted Learning Circles which are book groups

for faculty to read and discuss literature related to the improvement of teaching and learning.

Sorensen also worked for BYU's Center for Teaching and Learning where she helped organize

aspects of an international faculty developers conference. Sorensen learned about the Student

Consultant on Teaching (SCOT) program that had been running at BYU for several years. She

investigated bringing the SCOT program to UVU. Funds were secured to initiate the SCOT

program at UVU in 2008 starting with a coordinator and five regular SCOTs.

Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence (2008-2015)— Anton Tolman, Ph.D., Director, Ursula
    Sorensen, M.A., Associate Director

In an attempt to reorganize and re-establish the FCTE, Scott Hammond, Ph.D., Assistant

Vice President for Academic Affairs, sought external consultation regarding faculty development

and organizational effectiveness. As a result of this process, there was a decision to increase funding support for the FCTE and to hold an open search for a new director. Anton Tolman was selected as the new director with half-time allocated to the FCTE and the other half fulfilling faculty duties, similar to what had been done before. In addition, a new position of Associate Director (full-time staff position) was created, and Ursula Sorensen was selected for that position. In 2012, the FCTE was able to secure another part-time position and hired Trevor Morris as Program Coordinator with primary responsibilities for supporting adjunct faculty and assisting with other programs. Joyce Oliphant continued throughout this time to serve full-time as administrative assistant.

At the time this change occurred, UVU was also undergoing a significant transition. The previous president, William Sederberg, had successfully been able to facilitate the transition of the institution to a university rather than a state college. At the same time, a critical element of the mission was being re-envisioned around the theme of promoting UVU as an "engaged" university. The Carnegie Foundation had just released a new elective classification for higher education as Community Engaged institutions, and UVU was moving in that direction. The meaning of "engagement," however, became an intense matter of debate and discussion across campus through the brief tenure of Elizabeth Hitch as Interim President, and was still going on when Matthew Holland became the new UVU president in 2009.

There were many persons on campus who saw "engagement" as referring solely to activities and programs that involved *direct* contact with community agencies, organizations, and businesses. Clearly such programs exist such as Academic Service Learning and Internships, but there were others, including the FCTE leadership, who argued that the term needed to have broader implications including developing key skills in students to enable them to succeed in the community, a focus on applied learning in curriculum and program development, and the adoption of more interactive and learner-centered forms of pedagogy. To encourage support for

this perspective, Anton Tolman and Jack Christiansen, director of the new Center for Engaged Learning, co-authored a white paper focused on arguing for a broad definition of "engagement" by the university. With the support of many other champions, a broader definition of engaged learning on campus eventually became the default understanding.

As part of this shift towards engaged learning and engaged teaching, the FCTE revised its mission to focus on fostering development of a campus culture supportive of engaged teaching in order to benefit student learning. With the addition of a full-time Associate Director, the FCTE continued previous programs such as new faculty orientation, understanding the Retention Tenure and Promotion system, supporting faculty travel, the annual Great Teachers Summit, and one-time workshops. Expanded program offerings focused on a developmental approach to encourage faculty to learn new and active forms of teaching, to work with cohorts of like-minded colleagues to apply these new pedagogies in their courses, and then to serve as mentors to faculty entering the programs after them. Ursula Sorensen was also central in expanding and further developing the Students Consulting on Teaching (SCOT) program that involved training students in understanding of best practices in engaged teaching and then providing feedback from a student perspective on faculty teaching. This "Core Developmental Program" included the following elements:

- *New Faculty Teaching Scholars* (NFTS) program: a year-long program of both introduction to key aspects of working at UVU and learning the foundations of engaged teaching
- *Teaching Academy*: a year-long program for graduates of NFTS as well as experienced faculty who wanted to expand their learning; fall semester focused on developing a coherent framework around key principles of engaged teaching and then applying it in spring term, receiving feedback from FCTE and peers.

- *Faculty Mentoring Program*: available to graduates of the Teaching Academy, mentors met and consulted with Teaching Academy participants and eager volunteers from NFTS for a full-year, reviewing teaching goals and providing support.

- *Faculty Learning Communities*: these groups focused on continuing discussion, research, and evaluation of effective teaching pedagogies and encouraged participation from Teaching Academy graduates to continue their trajectory of implementation.

- *Students Consulting on Teaching* (SCOTs): SCOTs were available to all faculty who requested them, but new faculty and Teaching Academy participants were especially encouraged to make use of SCOTs as they implemented new course designs and new pedagogies in their classroom.

In addition to these programs, the FCTE was actively involved in the following efforts:

- Regular participation in the General Education committee

- Helping to launch student learning communities involving integrated learning emphasis across at least two courses (an effort that persisted for several years before ending)

- Working with the *Innovation Center* to support faculty to effectively use technology to support student learning

- Supporting some schools and colleges' desire for larger class sizes by helping faculty learn best practices for active teaching in those environments

- Implementing a series of reading groups called "Learning Circles" where faculty would meet roughly every two weeks to discuss chapters of books on emerging pedagogies in order to improve teaching and learning. (The Learning Circles not only gave faculty the chance to discuss, debate, and consider new approaches to teaching and how to facilitate student learning, but they also provided faculty with their own libraries of engaged teaching materials to which they could continue to refer.)

With the departure of Karl Worthington from UVU, Anton Tolman became the UVU representative and Board Member of the Northern Rockies Consortium for Higher Education (NORCHE). Similar to previous efforts, in 2008 the FCTE launched an annual conference called the Scholarship of Teaching and Engagement (SoTE) conference; this conference continued annually for 8 years. NORCHE was a strong and active supporter of the conference which grew from a UVU-only event to involving international participants. The conference also involved Utah legislators and others with interest in community engagement, engaged teaching, and student learning.

As part of an emphasis on accountability and fostering active relationships with campus partners and stakeholders, the FCTE held an annual retreat every year focused on reporting data on participation across programs and colleges or schools, summarizing progress and programs, and sought feedback and ideas from administrators, faculty, and staff on how to improve programs and utilize resources. The FCTE also participated in department chair training sessions and UVU strategic planning.

Office of Teaching and Learning (2015—2017)—Bethany Alden-Rivers, Ph.D., Assistant Vice President for the Office of Teaching and Learning

Several related units were merged to create the new Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL): three of the four units that made up Distance Education (Support Services, Instructional Design Services, and the Innovation Center), faculty development, instructional design and lab support, and Canvas course support for faculty and students. Distance Education Technical Operations was dissolved and its staff joined either Extended Studies, Academic IT, or OTL.

Bethany Alden-Rivers, Ph.D. was hired as the Assistant Vice President for the Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL). Dr. Alden-Rivers brought with her from the United Kingdom a wealth of experience in faculty development. Alden-Rivers worked at shaping the new mission of this new area. The OTL framed its Teaching Excellence program into multiple pathways that

would help faculty as they pursued their professional development goals. These pathways encompassed current workshops and program offerings offered by the OTL as well as adding professional development offerings from Global and Intercultural Engagement and Service Learning. Alden-Rivers also recruited and selected five faculty from various departments to serve as faculty coaches.

Dr. Alden-Rivers was responsible for the OTL being accredited from the Higher Education Academy (HEA). The HEA began in the UK and its purpose is to champion teaching excellence. HEA's mission is to improve learning outcomes by raising the status and quality of teaching in higher education. The OTL is now able to award Fellow and Associate Fellow within the HEA upon completion of the specified requirements which are facilitated through the pathways. If a faculty member wants to become a HEA Senior Fellow or Principal Fellow, the OTL assists these faculty with their application which is submitted directly to HEA. Costs for applications are covered by the OTL.

Office of Teaching and Learning (2017—present)—Wendy Athens, Ed.D., Senior Director

In 2017, there was a leadership change in the OTL as Wendy Athens replaced Bethany Alden-Rivers and the position title was converted from Assistant Vice President to Senior Director. The process of earning accreditation with the Higher Education Academy (HEA)[8] was completed; motivating faculty to earn HEA fellowship became a priority as it was viewed as external validation of teaching excellence. During 2017-2018, more than 30 faculty earned HEA fellowship under the direction of Trevor Morris, who was promoted to an exempt position called Faculty Development Specialist. Trevor also had responsibility for the delivery of the Teaching Excellence Program (TEP), which was a matrix of faculty development opportunities with seven pathways. The TEP had been conceptualized by Bethany Alden-Rivers and actualized by the

---

[8] The Higher Education Academy (HEA) changed its name to Advanced HE [Higher Education] in 2018.

efforts of the entire faculty development team, including Wendy Athens (functioning as the Senior Director), Associate Director, Ursula Sorensen, Trevor Morris, and Administrative Assistant Jena Giddings. The TEP was very ambitious and enfolded Service Learning and Global-Intercultural certification pathways, delivering approximately 90 events in both the Fall and in the Spring.

Five faculty coaches were provided one course release to function as mentors to new faculty and develop/deliver workshops. These five coaches also served as members of the newly established OTL Faculty Advisory Committee, initiated by Dr. Athens in concert with Faculty Senate. The remaining five members were elected via the Faculty Senate to represent all colleges and schools. The committee members met monthly and were involved in decision making with respect to faculty development as well as online and hybrid course development and delivery. An important accomplishment of the committee and the OTL was earning endorsement of both the Academic Affairs Council and Faculty Senate on the Flexible Learning Strategic Plan, which included several faculty-related aspects such as certifying faculty to teach online through the Pathway 3 program. Faculty were paid to complete the 20-hour training.

There were several faculty recognition efforts including the establishment of the Academy Awards (to recognize excellence in online course design and teaching) and emphasis on the Faculty Senate Teaching Excellence Program (with corresponding elimination of a separate OTL effort). A learning community was formed for online instructors that completed the Pathway 3 online certification program and these faculty were tapped for input on online-related decisions.

As the OTL looks forward, there will be greater emphasis on making connections between faculty development efforts and classroom impact. Pathway 3 online certification was the most intensive professional development experience offered and its alumni will provide longitudinal measurement of classroom impact. Another classroom impact measure will be a set

of action research projects focused on online course design. These action research projects will span the 2018-2019 academic year and provide evidence for effective online course design and recognition avenues for faculty. Second, it will be important to make faculty development more accessible and discipline-centric by appending "Spark" workshops to department meetings. Department chairs will choose 15-30 min Spark workshop topics that will be most relevant to their faculty needs. This will nurture conversations about teaching within departments. Third, the HEA fellows will be leveraged to function as mentors to junior faculty, reducing the need for five Faculty Coaches. The coach role has been reorganized as Faculty Development Associate. Denise Richards and Anton Tolman will serve as Faculty Development Associates in 2018-2020. Their role will include providing guidance to OTL, facilitating Pathway 3 online certification, developing/delivering workshops, and seeking opportunities for OTL to better support teaching excellence and student success.

Student Rating of Instructor (SRI)

Some method of students evaluating or rating their instructors' teaching has been a part of UVU's faculty teaching performance evaluation from the earliest days when UVU was a technical and trades training school. This piece has variously been referred to as the Student Evaluation of Teachers or Teacher (or Instructor) Evaluations or Evaluation of Instructors. Currently referred to as the *Student Rating of Instructor (SRI)*, this method of rating teaching performance has a complicated and conflicted history primarily because of the numerous different ways it is interpreted and used by academic leaders and decision makers.

Over the last twenty years, multiple committees[9] have been tasked with exploring the SRI from almost every angle, from investigating the latest research on student ratings of instructor to

---

[9] Many of these committees originated in, or were facilitated by, Faculty Senate. Details can be found in the Senate's minutes: https://www.uvu.edu/facsenate/minutes/index.html

examining the students' use of the instrument. The aim has always been to update and improve UVU's instrument, procedures and use. What follows is a partial list of questions regarding the SRI at UVU and its use. Keep in mind that some of these questions have been addressed; some have been addressed multiple times; some have elicited good solutions but not necessarily good implementation; and some may still need to be addressed.

- What is the purpose of SRIs at UVU?
- Are SRIs formative? Or, are they summative?
- Are SRI's useful? If so, how? If not, why not?
- Are student ratings of instructors related to learning?
- What do lower ratings mean?
- Does our SRI assess teaching techniques that influence student learning outcomes?
- How can we align and leverage SRIs for faculty use to improve teaching effectiveness if we have not identified and do not assess student learning outcomes?
- Do the best teachers get the best ratings?
- Are ratings based solely on popularity or an instructor's ability to entertain?
- Are ratings affected by situational variables (i.e., possible biases)?
- Are students qualified to evaluate their instructors and courses on aspects of teaching targeted by the question or statement?
- Are student ratings reliable and valid, and how do we know?
- How will we get the numbers of students rating their instructors so that the n value is considered valid?
- Do students rate instructors on the basis of expected or given grade?
- Can students make accurate judgments while still in class or in college?
- Is the time frame in which SRIs are open for students to rate their instructors strategic for faculty and students?
- What is the teaching improvement plan based on SRI numbers?
- Are teaching improvement plans based on SRI feedback implemented? How do we know?

There are several important historical realities about the SRI that bear mentioning.[10] The first of these is *how* the SRI has been used. In fact, the purpose and use of the SRI at UVU has often been difficult to identify because schools and colleges, and deans and department chairs, have used SRIs differently and inconsistently. The relative emphasis placed on the SRIs was also variable across academic entities, yet these results were used to evaluate faculty teaching performance, teaching competence, and retention, tenure and promotion. In many cases, SRIs were the main and/or only piece of evidence used in the evaluation of faculty teaching

---

[10] Although this section of the paper is written in past tense, it should be noted that most of the points made apply to present day.

performance. This kind of idiosyncratic institutional application of the SRI often led to suspicion and cynicism, and trust from faculty plummeted. In addition, SRI results have been used for personnel decisions, such as hiring, awards, and merit raises. Such widespread usage (with its accompanying inconsistent application) underscored the need for reliability and validity in the instrument and its delivery.

Secondly, there has been no requirement to administer the SRI consistently amongst the student body, resulting in invalid results. Individual faculty often used the "carrot" or "stick" approach to encourage students to fill out the rating. Even with these "strategies," numbers of respondents were low in many cases; without incentives, the numbers were even lower. It became even more complex when one considered that these incentives (or "penalties") contributed to the significant variability in the number of responses and the quality of those responses. Again, this called into question the reliability and validity of the SRI and its processes.

A significant attempt to align research and practice was in 2003-2004. Academic Affairs in consultation with Faculty Senate and the FCTE decided to explore an outside source for student ratings of instructors. Based on solid research, UVU piloted Kansas State University's (KSU) Teaching and Learning Center's IDEA system. Central to the KSU Teaching and Learning Center's mission was to stay current on research on student evaluations of teaching and questions of reliability could be answered through the research that underpinned the IDEA system. Furthermore, the IDEA system had a survey that got to the heart of helping faculty improve their teaching to influence the achievement of student learning outcomes. This Diagnostic Form came with a report that helped faculty interpret their students' input to guide efforts to improve teaching. Faculty results were compared to a national database. To date and to the authors' knowledge, this was the first time UVU had attempted such a significant undertaking to address SRI challenges. The results of the IDEA system pilot are unclear. There were several relevant executive leadership and organizational changes during this time. For an undetermined reason, the reports from this pilot were never distributed to the faculty and to our knowledge the results were not publicly (i.e., Faculty Senate, FCTE) reviewed.

In response to long-standing faculty objections surrounding the SRI, including the validity of the instrument, a significant study and revision of UVU's SRI instrument began in approximately 2009. The Faculty Development Committee (under the auspices of Faculty Senate), in collaboration with the FCTE (Anton Tolman), carried out an extensive literature review of best practices and studied the findings on how to design the most effective instrument. This effort included a comparison of other higher education institutions, including those that opted for external methods of conducting the SRI process. Academic Affairs administration made the decision not to employ an external method, due to prohibitive costs. The committee then spent approximately two years revising items on the SRI. The intended outcome of this item revision was to develop a scale from which UVU could reliably gather data to test its effectiveness. Items were added to try and tap into UVU's relatively "new" adoption of engaged learning (i.e., engaged activities). Again, Academic Affairs administration rejected this iteration of the SRI instrument, stating that there were too many items and they didn't think students would take it. Yet another revision was produced, this time pared down from its previous version. After a protracted review by Faculty Senate, this version was supported for a pilot period to test the new scale. Although volunteer departments were the first to pilot the new scale, subsequent institutional research and data analysis revealed that return rates were similar to the previous scale and the new instrument was adopted by all departments in Academic Affairs.

Multiple committees have addressed the SRI and its myriad of associated issues and have worked hard to explore and understand the current research in this area. There has been progress, notably in the improvement of the SRI instrument itself. In addition, and outlined in the next section of this paper, UVU has studied the label "rating" versus the label "evaluation" and learned that it is important how we phrase this aspect of our teaching practice. Students are more than capable of providing *ratings* on instructors; it is less certain whether they are in a position to provide *evaluations* of an instructor's teaching. Lastly, the committees, faculty development directors, and faculty studying the research of the SRI have definitively concluded that using this instrument in a *formative* context rather than a *summative* one is a more effective use. Whether all of the entities in Academic Affairs have adopted and implemented this finding is unclear. In

conclusion, even though this is the most researched area in higher education[11], there has been a "noteworthy lack of consensus among scholars as to their legitimacy and validity as measurement instruments."[12] UVU has a rich history of scholarly review and analysis regarding the SRI, but like the research, we can continue the pursuit.

Summary Review of Literature on Evaluation of Teaching

UVU has struggled with the challenge of defining what is good or effective teaching so much so that we have never fully defined or operationalized it in policy or practice. As a result, UVU does not directly assess teaching effectiveness. This summary compiles definitions of effective teaching utilized by several colleges and universities and professional academic organizations. These definitions identify effective teaching skills clarified in the literature that an institution might contextualize, operationalize, and promote.

The literature highlights alignment in broad support for certain teaching meta-skills (i.e., general and reusable skills) that can apply to a wide set of teaching challenges. This summary identifies and correlates an array of data sources for evaluation of teaching meta-skill attainment and highlights necessary institutional scaffolding to support effective teaching.

Most university faculty have little formal training in the complex meta-professional skills involved in designing and delivering instruction or assessing student learning outcomes. Faculty tend to teach in the same way they were taught (Arreola, 2007). Effective teaching skills can, however, be learned and the potential exists to profoundly impact student learning (Hattie, 2009; Henard, 2012; Jankowski, 2017; Mayhew, 2016; Trigwell, 1999).

Effective evaluation of teaching effectiveness rests on the institution clearly articulating expectations and properly supporting faculty in reaching those stated outcomes (AAUP, 2015).

---

[11] Berk, R. (2013). Top 10 Flashpoints in Student Ratings and the Evaluation of Teaching (p.6).
[12] Hornstein, Henry A. "Student evaluations of teaching are an inadequate assessment tool for evaluating faculty performance." (2016) Taylor and Francis Online.
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1304016

As Devlin and Samarawickrema (2010, p. 112) posit, there is no universally accepted definition

of teaching effectiveness in higher education:

> "Effective higher education teaching is a 'contested concept' with varying
> definitions. . .Effective teaching has been broadly understood as teaching that
> is oriented to and focused on students and their learning. . .that it requires a set
> of particular skills and practices as identified by research and that it meets the
> requirements of the context in which it occurs. . ."

We believe it is a professional responsibility of faculty and academic administrators to

define effective teaching and to establish guiding criteria for evaluation and assessment. This

reinforces the urgent need for UVU's faculty and academic administrators to collaborate and

develop a working definition for what constitutes teaching effectiveness. This conceptualization

must be linked to UVU's four core themes--engaged, serious, inclusive, and focus on student

success. These are the strategic priorities of our institution, and they also ought to be for our

teaching as well.

Definitions of Teaching Excellence

The Association of American Universities (AAU) has developed a framework that guides

faculty to use teaching practices shown by research to be effective. The AAU Undergraduate

STEM Education Initiative focuses on STEM education, but the developed framework is

generally applicable across academic disciplines. Faculty are encouraged to use student-centered,

evidence-based, active learning pedagogy. The framework includes three layers of pedagogical

practices, scaffolding, and cultural change and is detailed in Table 1, column 2 (AAU, 2013).

Table 1. Comparison of Criteria of Effective Teaching

Criteria	Association of American Universities, 2013	Australian Learning and Teaching Council, 2008	Fink, 2008	American Council on Education, 2017
Clear expectations	Articulated learning goals		Managing course events	Transparency of learning goals, assessment criteria, student progress
Subject matter expertise and course design	Implement evidence-based effective teaching practices	Development of curricula and resources that reflect a command of the field	Knowledge of subject matter; designing integrated learning experiences	Pedagogical approaches including incorporation of high impact practices, personalized learning, and active learning
Assessment and feedback	Develop and utilize instructor-independent tools to assess student learning; teach for and measure long-term retention; use assessment instruments for hard to assess outcomes such as problem solving skills	Approaches to assessment and feedback that foster independent learning	Designing integrated learning experiences	Formative and summative assessments allow students to learn by doing relevant tasks with feedback
Alignment	Explicit alignment of learning goals with assessments and learning activities		Designing integrated learning experiences	Coherent curriculum which aligns assessment and learning activities to outcomes
Teacher-student interactions	Engage students as active participants in learning	Respect and support for the development of students as individuals	Interacting with students	
Support for whole student	Ensure inclusion; implement practices known to enhance students' self-efficacy	Approaches to learning that influence, motivate, and inspire students to learn	Designing integrated learning experiences	Students should play active role in learning and self-regulate
Improving over time	Use data on student learning to refine practice	Scholarly activities that have influenced and enhanced teaching and learning	Improving over time	
Evidence of student learning	Use data on student learning to refine practice		Evidence of student learning	

The Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC, 2008) articulated the essence of effective teaching as being (Table 1, column 3):

1. Approaches to teaching that influence, motivate, and inspire students to learn

2. Development of curricula and resources that reflect a command of the field

3. Approaches to assessment and feedback that foster independent learning

4. Respect and support for the development of students as individuals

5. Scholarly activities that have influenced and enhanced teaching and learning

Fink's (2012) encapsulation of teaching excellence aligns to the AAU and ALTC

definitions (Figure 1, column 4). He states the fundamental tasks of teaching rests on disciplinary

knowledge, course design, interactions with students, course management, and improvement over time. In Fink's integrated course design process, the instructor uses backwards design to align outcomes with assessments and learning activities, creates a thematic structure for the course and chooses an instructional strategy, develops a grading system, and plans for evaluation of teaching. Importantly, Fink's *Taxonomy of Significant Learning* includes metacognitive, interpersonal, and affective outcomes. Evidence of student learning is an important criterion of effective teaching in the Fink model.

In the white paper, *Unpacking Relationships: Instruction and Student Outcomes*, the American Council on Education posits that learning and teaching are complicated processes and instructors cannot make students learn but should create an environment in which they can learn. "To move toward fostering learning as opposed to doing instruction, faculty need to be supported to incorporate more active and student-centered learning methods. Faculty also need to help students make connections between various learning experiences and the end goals of higher education by supporting student-centered learning environments. Instruction matters. And higher education needs to provide support for faculty to help students attain outcomes" (Jankowski, 2017, p. iv). Five areas of intersection between instruction and student outcomes are identified which align with the criteria of ALTC and Fink: transparency of expectations and evaluative measures, pedagogical approaches including actively engaging students and personalizing learning, leveraging both formative and summative assessments, supporting learner self-regulation especially through reflection, and maintaining coherence by aligning assessments and learning activities to outcomes (Table 1, column 5).

Common themes emerge from these notable sources. Effective teaching practices include clearly stating expectations and assessment criteria, aligning assessment and learning activities with outcomes, actively engaging students in learning, incorporating both formative and

summative assessment in support of student learning, supporting learner self-regulation, and improving over time which includes using data on student learning to improve one's practice.

Multimodal Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Arreola (2007) emphasizes an effective faculty evaluation system is to meet two purposes: 1) meaningful feedback information to guide professional growth and enrichment, and 2) evaluative information on which to base merit and promotion decisions. The key to constructing a system that serves these differing purposes is in the policies determining the distribution of data gathered. The research is clear: formative data should be reviewed privately by the faculty member and used for improvement plans; summative data can be reviewed by administrators or committees. (Notably, UVU uses the SRI for both formative and summative purposes.)

For each criterion of effective teaching, an appropriate source of information must be identified as demonstrated in Table 2 using the Fink model of teaching excellence. The underlying belief is that effective teaching skills are progressively developed thus longitudinal analysis of evidence is essential.

Table 2. Criterion of Effective Teaching and Related Sources of Information Using Fink's Model

Teaching Criteria: Fink Model (2008)	Data Sources
Course management • Preparation • Organization • Clear expectations for assignments • Prompt and accurate grading • Use of Early Alert intervention	Syllabus, punctuality of classroom/office hours/grade submissions, Early Alert usage
Knowledge of subject and course design • Real-world connections • Relevant learning outcomes • Effective learning activities • Alignment of learning outcomes with assessments and learning activities • Adapt to students' needs	Course design blueprint, Canvas courses, syllabus, peer review of curriculum, evidence of disciplinary scholarship
Assessment and feedback • Assessment as a learning tool • Prompt and constructive feedback	Samples of assessments, peer observations

Interactions with students • Positive attitude towards students • Support self-regulation and metacognition • Support peer to peer dialogue	SRIs, peer observations, SCOT observations, Canvas analytics
Improving over time • Invest in professional development about teaching • Apply new knowledge about teaching • Actively assess teaching	Instructor self-report, documentation of professional development and pedagogical research, HEA fellowship, longitudinal SRI analysis
Evidence of student learning	Samples of student work including examples of "A", "C", and "F" work

Institutional Scaffolding for Effective Teaching

In the AAU framework (2013), effective teaching practices must be supported by cultural change and institutional support. Senior administrators must make a public commitment to evidence-based, student-centered teaching, and there must be a dependable connection between the stated importance of effective teaching and actual deployment of the policies and practices. Exemplary faculty must be recognized and empowered to mentor junior faculty. The institution must adopt robust measures of teaching effectiveness beyond student ratings and assure in the hiring process that there is substantial promise of teaching effectiveness. The institution must align incentives with the expectations for teaching excellence including tenure and promotion criteria, support/recognize pedagogical research, and develop measures of departmental/college commitment to evidence-based teaching. Other ways that the institution can support effective teaching include provision for faculty professional development, access to learning tools and resources, and include teaching intervention analysis into program evaluations.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (Henard, 2012) elucidates policies and practices to foster quality teaching to include seven policy "levers":

Policy Lever 1: Raising awareness of quality teaching

- Prioritize quality teaching as a strategic objective
- Establish a teaching and learning framework that aligns institutional mission with rank/tenure/promotion, faculty development, and assessment
- Strengthen scholarship of teaching and learning

Policy Lever 2: Developing excellent teachers

- "...The need for a new profile for teachers in higher education that includes pedagogical competencies." (p.17)
- "...the key challenge for quality teaching is to develop subject-specific experts into excellent teachers" (p. 17)
- "There is evidence that participation and engagement in professional development activities are related to the quality of student learning." (p. 17)
- There needs to be a collective commitment across faculty to the collaborative process of improving teaching quality
- Anchor teaching in the quality culture of the institution
- Articulate pedagogical competencies required for quality teaching
- Upgrade pedagogical skills through professional development
- Recognize inspired teaching

Policy Lever 3: Engaging students

- "Student engagement is most powerful driver of quality teaching when it involves dialogue." (p.21)
- Give students a clear role in fostering quality teaching
- Develop reliable survey instrument for gathering student feedback

Policy Lever 4: Building organization for change and teaching leadership

- Map the distribution of responsibilities in teaching and learning
- Ensure that individual faculty can easily adapt teaching and learning strategy to their values and style
- Establish and empower a center for teaching and learning
  - Support and lead dialogue re quality teaching
  - Ensure follow-through
  - Ensure consistent implementation of teaching and learning strategy

Policy Lever 5: Aligning policies to foster quality teaching

- Strengthen coherence across policies
  - Coordinate quality teaching with human resource policies, e.g. overload rates, evaluation, hiring language about teaching excellence, etc.
  - Coordinate quality teaching with technology policies
  - Coordinate quality teaching with learning environment policies
  - Coordinate quality teaching with student support policies

Policy Lever 6: Highlighting innovation as a driver for change

- Encourage teachers and students to be active innovators
- Strengthen institutions as "learning organizations"
- Embed support for innovation into institutional policies
  - Knowledge-sharing platforms
  - Transferability of projects

Policy Lever 7: Assessing impacts

- Embed evaluation of quality teaching within broader evaluation processes
- Include support for quality teaching evaluation
- Use an array of evaluation instruments
- Emphasize careful interpretation of evaluation results
    - Transform evaluation results into more effective teaching practices and support through mentorship

In conclusion, the literature provides criteria that institutions can use to establish clear expectations for defining and evaluating teaching effectiveness. These criteria function as learning outcomes for faculty. Just as an individual faculty member assesses student outcome attainment as feedback on his/her teaching effectiveness, an institution can assess faculty outcome attainment as a measure of its effectiveness in supporting faculty. The evaluation of faculty outcome attainment necessitates the use of multimodal data to capture the multi-faceted skills of effective teaching. There are several policy and provision levers that an institution can utilize to enhance teaching effectiveness.

Abbreviated Summary of SRI Research

There are more than 2,000 references on the topic of student ratings and the evaluation of teaching. "In higher education there is more research on and experience with student ratings than all other measures of teaching effectiveness combined" (Berk, 2013). Despite the volumes of research and results that have been replicated many times over demonstrating the complexity with student ratings, we are still laboring over and debating these troublesome issues. A review of some of these issues includes:

- The terms *evaluation* and *ratings* are conflated causing faculty to reject the validity of SRIs;
- "Evaluation" is a misnomer and its use should be abandoned for "student rating scales" (Berk, p. 19-20);
- Student ratings are persistently used for summative decision making when they should be used primarily for formative purposes;
- Student ratings are unreliable because of persistent low response rates since moving to the electronic administration of the SRI;

- Academic leaders use student ratings as the "universal barometer of teaching performance" (Berk p. 6), when the research is clear that we should instead be using multiple sources of evidence for evaluating teaching effectiveness including peer classroom observations, peer review of course materials, external expert rating, self-ratings and reflections, videos, student interviews, exit and alumni ratings, employer ratings, mentor's advice, administrator ratings, teaching scholarship, teaching awards, learning outcomes measures, teaching (course) portfolio, and measures of how students perform in subsequent courses;
- Student ratings are biased based on gender, and on other kinds of bias such as racial and ethnic and pose legal risks (Mitchell & Martin, 2018).

The SRI literature is replete with strategies and recommendations for how to remedy the issues that continue to plague the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Nevertheless, there is conflicting research on student ratings. These conflicts allow space for persistent myths to continue about the reliability and validity of student ratings. Perpetuated myths—debated in the literature--include:

- Only retrospective ratings can be valid;
- Student ratings are not correlated with good teaching or with student learning;
- Student ratings are meaningless and thus should not be used in decision-making;
- Student ratings are a popularity contest;
- Students rate higher teachers who are easy and not challenging/undemanding;
- Teachers can manipulate students to rate them high by giving undeserved high grades and lenient assignments, lowering the level of teaching and entertaining students;
- Student learning abilities and skills affect ratings so that poorer students rate teacher lower;
- Student ratings measure consumer/customer satisfaction

A *sampling* of other arenas of significant research on student ratings are: (1) how to recognize—from the ratings—evidence of effective teaching. The question that drives this area of SRI research is whether or not students' opinions about the quality of instruction is "considered worth knowing because students are consumers of the teaching process" (Hativa 2014). Though debated, some research suggests that "students appear to be capable of identifying a professor's strengths and weaknesses, and of making consistent judgments of faculty teaching" (Hativa p. 30) and that SRIs are correlated with almost all other measures of effective instruction (Hativa, p. 46); (2) the level of difficulty of courses and whether students rate faculty who teach such difficult courses receive lower ratings (Hativa pp. 62-64); (3) the

various practices designed to achieve higher ratings from students such as decreasing course workload and/or giving undeservedly higher grades (Hativa, 2014); (4) instructor personality and teaching style and whether this has any impact on student ratings (Hativa, p. 4); (5) that student ratings are merely measures of student satisfaction because "whether a student is overwhelmed by 'happy or pleased feeling' at the end of a course is likely to depend on many factors that have nothing to do with instructor's teaching effectiveness" (Uttl, et. al., 2017). (6) that student ratings "have no or only limited validity as a measure of instructor teaching effectiveness because both [the student ratings] and measures of learning are influenced by teaching effectiveness irrelevant factors such as academic discipline/field of study, student interest, student motivation, instructor sex, instructor accent, class level, class size, class meeting time, etc." (Uttl, et. al., 2017); (7) that an instructor can "teach to the rating instrument" and achieve higher ratings (Uttl, et. al., 2017); and (8) whether there is any significance whatsoever to substantive correlations between student ratings and learning (Uttl, et. al., 2017).

The sheer volume of the most current literature (and including the abundant history of literature) on student ratings of instructor underscores the need for a comprehensive review (see the Recommendations section of this paper). Perhaps if we are able to fully understand and differentiate the many categories of research associated with the SRI, we will be more adept at addressing the areas still in need of our attention.

Task Force on Teaching Effectiveness

Introduction

As noted in the introductory paragraphs of this paper, the context for forming this Task Force was largely rooted in various entities in Academic Affairs (Faculty Senate, OTL, etc.) exploring SRI concerns. Inevitably, discussions about SRI usage—including the instrument and its relative effectiveness—led to even weightier questions about teaching effectiveness. Some of

these issues, although mostly philosophical and rhetorical in nature, were, and are, at the heart of what we do as faculty. Some questions that commonly surface include: How do we define teaching effectiveness? How do we measure teaching effectiveness? Is it even possible to measure it? How do we evaluate teaching effectiveness in a meaningful way? Do SRIs usefully and meaningfully assist us in these endeavors?

Further brainstorming, workshops, and discussions occurred: some informal and some in more formal settings. Following a workshop on this subject at Faculty Convocation fall 2017 and in conjunction with incoming Faculty Senate President, Dr. Craig Thulin, a Senate Task Force was formed to focus our efforts as a university faculty on these vital issues.

A preliminary outline for the Task Force included these components:

1. What do we already know as UVU faculty? With the vast, collective knowledge within our faculty, how can we gather this information in a systematic, useful way?

2. How do we, as UVU faculty, define teaching effectiveness?

3. What would a current review of the literature reveal and subsequently inform us of potential directions?

4. What is OTL's role in the area of teaching effectiveness?

5. What is the status of our existing SRI instrument?

6. Where do we need alignment and/or adjustments to existing policies that include aspects of teaching effectiveness?

Early meetings of the Task Force attempted to address the sheer scope of this topic and it was daunting. Not only was there uncertainty about historical efforts in this area but also a fair amount of skepticism existed as to the feasibility of accomplishing tangible outcomes. With an eye toward practicality, it was decided that the Task Force would attempt to focus on the first two tasks (see above): comprehensively gather data from all schools and colleges in Academic

Affairs to determine a status or baseline of current practices and definitions. The reasons to begin with this strategy included:

a. There were a lot of diverse and variable methods and practices already in existence and without understanding this fully, it would be almost impossible to draw conclusions.

b. Multiple entities (FCTE, OTL, Faculty Senate, OEL, IR, etc.) had addressed teaching effectiveness in a variety of ways (surveys, research projects, etc.). There did not seem to be anything definitive, consistent or aligned with results from these efforts.

c. If the Task Force could provide a thorough representation of both definitions and practices from our schools and colleges, it might be possible to find a way forward that would build upon what we already know and highlight areas that need attention.

Each school and college elected a representative to comprise the Task Force. These members became the designees to interview deans and/or department chairs and record current definitions and practices. To keep it uncomplicated, the Task Force decided on the following questions to ask in these interviews:

- What is your definition of teaching effectiveness?

- What are your current practices in assessing teaching effectiveness?

- What is working?

- What is NOT working and/or missing?

Simultaneous to these first two tasks, two members of the Task Force began to collect archival data with the goal of incorporating past information and data into the current landscape. It was around this time that the thinking of the Task force coalesced around a significant observation:

- *If* we could capture a comprehensive look at what our schools/colleges were doing;

- *If* we could gather a "collective" understanding of how UVU faculty defined teaching effectiveness;

- *If* we could combine these two pieces with our rich, historical perspectives and efforts;

- *If* we could determine where the current literature intersected and converged. . .then

We might be able to both operationalize the term teaching effectiveness *and* identify key

conclusions and recommendations allowing us to move forward in a substantial way. In spite of

the sheer enormity of this projected work, the Task Force began to gather data.

Summary of Results

A review of the data collected from schools and colleges (primarily deans and department

chairs) follows. The first question asked in the interviews was: *What is teaching effectiveness to*

you? Responses were categorized in several general themes. The predominant theme was,

unsurprisingly, focused on student outcomes. In fact, the most frequent response from those

interviewed defined teaching effectiveness as being directly linked to achieving student

outcomes. Related to this were multiple responses on student engagement. That is, teaching

effectiveness was tied to levels of how engaged students were in the classroom.

The data results also indicated that teaching effectiveness, as described by those

interviewed, contained elements of care for both the student and their own teaching practices.

For example, if students can apply what they learn it is an indication of effective teaching. There

was also a clear association between a teacher's lack of complacency (i.e., continuing to hone

one's skills, teacher motivation, etc.) and being an effective teacher. In other words, if the

student is cared for and applying what they learn, it is directly related to how motivated the

teacher is and how willing they are to seek out diverse pedagogies. There is almost a symbiotic

relationship between a student's learning outcomes and the teacher's energy for ongoing

improvement.

Interestingly, a number of respondents indicated that attempting to define teaching

effectiveness was difficult. These responses seemed to be tied to the inability to *measure* good

teaching. This inability to adequately or accurately measure effective teaching led some to

declare that there was "no real definition." This inherent frustration with measurement and assessment was a key finding in these data.

The second question asked of those interviewed was: *What are your current practices in assessing teaching effectiveness?* The following list captures the responses from the data and are listed in the order of highest number of responses to the lowest.

- Peer evaluations
- SRIs
- Student summary assessments
- Annual reviews
- Professional level reviews (e.g. OTL, SCOTs)
- Self-reflections
- Student surveys
- Unsolicited student comments
- Syllabi
- Tenure portfolios
- Graduation rates/student progress
- Accreditation
- Multiple measures of evaluating teaching

There are two key observations noted from these results. One, it is clear that UVU faculty and departments employ a variety of practices to assess teaching effectiveness. Second, the lowest number of responses occurred in the "multiple measures" response. In spite of having a variety of types of measurement, we can perhaps conclude that we don't have a systematic process whereby we utilize and leverage multiple measures consistently.

The third question in the interviews was: *What is working* [regarding teaching effectiveness practices]? The highest number of responses, encouragingly, was in the category of professional development (i.e., formal and informal approaches and strategies to improve teaching). It is probably safe to deduce from this that departments are involved in their own informal teaching improvement practices and that OTL is responsible for the more formal methods of faculty development.

The responses to this third question elicited what appears to be some contradictory results: there were numerous instances indicating that what was working was, in fact, the use of multiple measures. For example, professional development approaches, collecting multiple assessments, and student work, were all given as examples of what was working. If multiple measures of assessing teaching effectiveness were reported as a very low number in current practices (interview question #2), but is also reported by many as something that is working, we have a possible disconnection between perceptions and practice that may indicate a need for additional information.

The fourth question asked in the interviews was: *What is not working?* There was a wide spectrum of responses to this question. The category with the greatest number of responses was SRIs. It is safe to state that a significant number of the respondents felt the SRIs played too big a role in assessing teaching effectiveness and were not necessarily even helpful.

In analyzing the data in this section, it seems important to summarize the full spectrum of categorical responses (see below). Although there were small numbers associated with each of these, collectively they paint a picture of where UVU faculty need to direct their focus.

- Full-time faculty need to be teaching introductory courses
- Adjunct faculty need to be treated better
- Annual Reviews: some department chairs are not holding faculty accountable; no enforcement of annual goal completion
- No definitions, especially within the annual review verbiage
- Collaboration and communication needs to improve among faculty
- Continual re-creation of systems; need to update existing systems
- Faculty need to be encouraged [and rewarded] to think and teach independently

This list of "what is not working" covers a broad swath of issues. In fact, it appears as though the invitation to articulate what is not working was like opening Pandora's box; a lot came out. In an attempt to bring meaning to this part of the results, we have concluded that faculty and academic leadership would all benefit from better alignment between policy and practice; confidence in

leaders to do their jobs; and better communication between all stakeholders. These issues are addressed in the recommendations section of this paper.

Recommendations[13]

Overview

In writing, reviewing, and studying the sections of this paper (history, Task Force, and current literature), it is no small undertaking to articulate possible recommendations. A layer of complexity is added when one pauses to consider what the conceivable reasons might be for making the recommendations in the first place. With that in mind and to contextualize this section of the paper, we offer some observations.

UVU has incurred enormous growth in the last 15 years. Growth of this magnitude is naturally accompanied by factors such as limited resources, evolving academic units, restructuring of various operations, changes in schools and colleges, etc. Administrative turnover is also inherent in organizations of UVU's size. It is somewhat understandable, therefore, that the application of some of our core practices (i.e., evaluating and improving teaching effectiveness) manifests itself in uneven and inconsistent ways.

Administrative turnover and restructuring leadership positions lends itself to differences in vision. Although the thread of the "two-tiered" (dual) mission has been strong and consistent at UVU for many years, other aspects of UVU's mission and vision have shifted according to various leaders' inspirations. This is not necessarily a negative factor but it does affect the many moving parts in Academic Affairs, including faculty and addressing how to measure and improve teaching effectiveness.

---

[13] At the end of the paper is a summary list of all recommendations.

Academic Affairs encompasses a vast network of leadership, including multiple layers of vice presidents (associate), deans (assistant and associate), department chairs (assistant), and various faculty leaders. It is the observation of these authors that accountability has often been a missing piece in this network. Certainly, this is not always the case and it would be impossible to identify all the areas that employ measures of accountability and those that do not. What appears more certain is that academic leaders and their units often function with a fair degree of independence and personal interpretation of policies and operations. This leads to widespread inconsistency in decision-making, in policy implementation, and in the overall management of one's unit. Accountability is a complex issue because faculty deeply appreciate and embrace independence and self-governance; on the other hand, faculty are often the first to identify pockets of injustice, unfairness, or the inconsistency of their administrators. Nevertheless, accountability (or lack thereof) is an issue that has the potential to impact every person, process, and policy under the Academic Affairs umbrella.

Another multifaceted category that affects the functioning of Academic Affairs is our policies. At the top of the list is the lack of policy deployment, the process that "aligns, both vertically and horizontally, an organization's functions and activities with its strategic objectives."[14] A specific example of the lack of policy deployment is UVU's four core themes: engaged, serious, inclusive, and focus on student success. If these are the strategic priorities of our institution, and therefore of our teaching, shouldn't they be linked to our definition of teaching effectiveness and engaged teaching? It follows that a comprehensive and holistic model of teaching effectiveness would generate the following questions: (1) How do faculty course designs/syllabi/assignments demonstrate serious content, engagement, inclusion, promote student success, and involve interactions with peers and faculty? How would faculty demonstrate this in

---

[14] http://www.leanuk.org/article-pages/articles/2014/august/05/deploying-policy.aspx

their RTP portfolios? (2) How do we assess student perceptions of integrated course design in the SRI's for formative evaluation? How do RTP committees use these criteria to evaluate faculty? (3) In faculty-student interactions, does the faculty member demonstrate respect for all students? How do they demonstrate this? (4) Does the language of the syllabus, assignments, etc., acknowledge inclusive emphases and offer some diversity in how students approach their own learning? We identify this as an example of the lack of policy deployment because the core strategic goals should be deployed throughout all of the institution in these areas and link all the way back to teaching effectiveness.

Great effort is taken, consistently, to write, review, and update the policies that drive Academic Affairs. Our observation, however, is that often when we update a policy, we miss how it affects another policy; we don't necessarily connect and integrate all the pieces. In addition, many of the leaders in Academic Affairs (e.g., deans, department chairs) don't consistently read and understand policies similarly. This leads to uneven implementation, including sometimes completely ignoring a given policy. In the final analysis, it doesn't matter how hard our administrators and faculty senators work to forward meaningful policy; if it is not read, understood in fundamentally similar ways, implemented (effectively deployed), and adhered to, it is difficult to see the point.

Framework

In reviewing both the teaching effectiveness components of this paper and considering the organizational observations outlined above, our recommendations (by category) can be framed around two central themes: *knowledge management* and *alignment*. **Knowledge management**, a term used more commonly in the business world, is simply a way to organize and retain information. From a knowledge management expert, it is "…an integrated approach to identifying, capturing, evaluating, retrieving, and sharing all of an enterprise's information

assets."[15] We know that our efforts and initiatives regarding teaching effectiveness are valued but if we do not work harder to retain these "assets" in a systematic way we inevitably and repeatedly recycle work. This is exhausting and discouraging. If the history section of this paper has taught us anything, it is that UVU has been working on teaching effectiveness (in all of its facets) since we became a higher education institution. We need to both honor that history and *leverage* this past knowledge.

The second theme framing our recommendations is **alignment**. As outlined above, we have inconsistency with our decisions, policy deployment, accountability, and operations within our schools and colleges. Imagine for a moment, if how we evaluate teaching effectiveness was aligned with annual reviews, merit pay, and post-tenure. What if all of our RTP committees were aligned with the expectations of Academic Affairs leadership and policies? What if the strategic plans of OTL, OEL, and Faculty Senate were all in sync? We could undoubtedly make a long list here but the point remains: aligning the entities in Academic Affairs with our processes, policies and implementation could use our collective attention.

Recommendations by Category

With these two themes as a framework, we offer our recommendations, by category:

- *Teaching Effectiveness Model*
- *SRIs*
- *Policies*
- *RTP*
- *Assessment*

Teaching Effectiveness Model

In alignment with the data collected on how UVU faculty, deans, and department chairs define and articulate the meaning of teaching effectiveness; what they believe to be problematic areas (i.e., what is not working); and what is reflected in the literature, **it is the recommendation**

---

[15] Taken from the KM World website, http://www.kmworld.com/Articles/Editorial/What-Is/What-is-KM-Knowledge-Management-Explained-122649.aspx. January 2018.

of the authors and the Task Force to adopt a model of teaching effectiveness that includes a

holistic definition and comprehensive framework. The Task force studied and recommended a

model developed by Dee Fink. Fink (2013) posits that teaching has four fundamental tasks:

knowledge of subject matter, designing learning experiences, interacting with students, and

course management. From these tasks, Fink goes on to outline the primary criteria for effective

teaching: 1) The design of the learning experience; 2) The quality of teacher-student interactions;

3) The learning achieved by students; and 4) The teacher's efforts to improve over time. The

image below captures Fink's model:

Criteria:	Primary Source of Information:
I. The Design of courses	Course design materials
II. Teacher-student interaction	Student questionnaires, Peer observations
III. Quality of student learning	Samples of student learning materials
IV. Getting better over time	Teacher self-report, Documentation

Another model of teaching effectiveness has been developed by The Association of

American Universities (AAU). The AAU framework guides faculty to use teaching practices

shown by research to be effective. The AAU Undergraduate STEM Education Initiative focuses

on STEM education, but the developed framework is generally applicable. Faculty members are

encouraged to use student-centered, evidence-based, active learning pedagogy. The framework

includes three layers of pedagogical practices, scaffolding, and cultural change and is detailed in

Table 1, column 2 (AAU, 2013)

Table 1. Comparison of Criteria of Effective Teaching[16]

Criteria	Association of American Universities, 2013	Australian Learning and Teaching Council, 2008	Fink, 2008	American Council on Education, 2017
Clear expectations	Articulated learning goals		Managing course events	Transparency of learning goals, assessment criteria, student progress
Subject matter expertise and course design	Implement evidence-based effective teaching practices	Development of curricula and resources that reflect a command of the field	Knowledge of subject matter; designing integrated learning experiences	Pedagogical approaches including incorporation of high impact practices, personalized learning, and active learning
Assessment and feedback	Develop and utilize instructor-independent tools to assess student learning; teach for and measure long-term retention; use assessment instruments for hard to assess outcomes such as problem solving skills	Approaches to assessment and feedback that foster independent learning	Designing integrated learning experiences	Formative and summative assessments allow students to learn by doing relevant tasks with feedback
Alignment	Explicit alignment of learning goals with assessments and learning activities		Designing integrated learning experiences	Coherent curriculum which aligns assessment and learning activities to outcomes
Teacher-student interactions	Engage students as active participants in learning	Respect and support for the development of students as individuals	Interacting with students	
Support for whole student	Ensure inclusion; implement practices known to enhance students' self-efficacy	Approaches to learning that influence, motivate, and inspire students to learn	Designing integrated learning experiences	Students should play active role in learning and self-regulate
Improving over time	Use data on student learning to refine practice	Scholarly activities that have influenced and enhanced teaching and learning	Improving over time	
Evidence of student learning	Use data on student learning to refine practice		Evidence of student learning	

In adopting such a comprehensive model of teaching effectiveness, UVU faculty would be able to address their teaching practice, assessment, and ongoing professional development with a comprehensive approach. **It is also recommended that Faculty Senate consider how a model like those identified here might be incorporated into policy or policies.** Recommendations and advice, no matter how sound, do not have a high probability of implementation or success until there is a policy in place articulating specific expectations.

---

[16] This table can also be found on p. 23 in the Summary Review of the Literature

The authors further recommend that the Office of Teaching and Learning take an active and "hands-on" role in directly assisting faculty and RTP committees with the implementation of the model of teaching effectiveness selected (or developed) while providing a more consultative role with deans and department chairs. To reiterate, if there is alignment with the adoption of this model and the key stakeholders in Academic Affairs, the potential for its success increases significantly.

Student Rating of Instructor (SRIs)

As noted in the history section of this paper, it is critical to acknowledge the diligence already exercised in reviewing and understanding the research and in analyzing UVU's SRI instrument. There is an ongoing *intentionality* regarding the evaluation of SRIs, the instrument itself, and its usage. It is encouraging to realize that UVU need not "start over" in this area of our teaching practice. However, it seems clear that the SRI instrument and its usage continues to elicit enduring conflict resulting in faculty having low confidence and frustration at the lack of consistency. While acknowledging that there will never be a perfect instrument or process, we can do better. In continuing the commitment to our understanding of the SRI and our responsibility to derive our practices from the research, **it our recommendation that UVU conduct a comprehensive literature review of the SRI and its many associated issues**. Building upon the work of many faculty and committees, we need to pull together the many disparate research conclusions and claims and make sense of them.

Although we recognize that USHE requires some form of student rating of faculty teaching, UVU faculty and administrators need to achieve better consensus on the "what" and the "how" of this process. For example, we ask students to rate their instructors using the SRI. An approach connected to a holistic and comprehensive model of teaching effectiveness might be to revise Policy 631 to be "Evaluations of Courses and Faculty", more accurately conveying

what needs to happen. Therefore, **our recommendation is to work towards the goal of consensus in the following areas:**

1. **The best instrument to use.**

2. **Understanding and aligning our motives for usage.**

3. **Definitively addressing and answering the questions outlined in the history section of this paper.**

From our practice as faculty and from the research, we know that using multiple pieces of evidence of teaching effectiveness results in a more holistic portrait of a faculty's performance and progress. Assuming that we adopt a comprehensive model of teaching effectiveness, **it is our recommendation that we work to modify policy that is explicit (rather than implied) in requiring the usage of multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness—both in an individual faculty member's teaching practices and portfolios, but also in how supervisors are evaluating the faculty member.** Additional pieces of evidence include, but are not limited to: alumni ratings, peer evaluations (internal and external), self-assessment, syllabi and course documents, and other examples as identified in departmental RTP criteria. If, for example, peer evaluations are used as one of the multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness, it would follow that we need to develop a meaningful and useful peer evaluation. If this tool were to use the same dimensions of teaching effectiveness as Fink's model it could quite easily be adapted for faculty to use to evaluate their peers teaching any type of course. **It is therefore recommended that a consistent effort be made to provide and/or create more useful ways to measure and assess these alternative types of teaching effectiveness.**

We noted in the SRI history section of this paper that the literature provides us with ample data about the various components of the SRI (validity, reliability, gender bias, and other forms of bias, etc.). Research has also indicated to us that SRIs should be designed and used for the *formative* purpose of improving teaching practice or performance, but they have often been

used as a *summative* tool to assist in personnel decisions. **It is our recommendation that as decisions are made about the numerous questions and issues surrounding the SRI, we agree to be informed and guided by the research so that whatever we conclude has been built upon that foundation of current literature.**

We have identified in this paper that our students' use of the SRI is wholly inconsistent, sporadic, and often motivated by the "carrot/stick" approach. **We recommend that UVU review whether students are all required to participate in the SRI and the time frame in which they have access.** With a revised policy, we may be able to resolve some immediate problems with return rates.

We also recommend meeting with the officers of UVUSA to hear student experiences with, and thoughts about, SRIs. These student representatives may have valuable feedback and other information that could inform our deliberations over how to improve the SRI process.

Lastly, it is important to remember how often SRI issues are conflated. That is, it is commonplace to hear complaints about *how* the SRI is used, when in fact, the actual issue might be the instrument itself. Likewise, there are often protests about how unreliable the results are when the issue instead might be the lack of policy requiring all students to take it. **It is our recommendation, then, to separate the issues.** This might seem like an obvious point given the context of this entire paper, however, as we detect ongoing conflict, understanding, and inconsistent implementation, it is incumbent upon us to more carefully dissect the pieces of this category. When we have clarity about what each issue is regarding the SRI, we are more likely to find solutions that will actually solve problems and be sustainable. Once the issues have been identified and separated, **it is our further recommendation that policies containing SRI definitions, practices, and usage requirements be re-examined and revised to align with any of the recommendations listed above (to the extent that they are adopted).**

Policies

As the Task Force collected data from all of our schools and colleges last school year (2017-2018) and subsequently reviewed the collective responses, one "reality" became demonstrably clear: UVU does not have a specific policy on teaching effectiveness and its many dimensions (e.g., definitions, measures, assessment, etc.). We have implied in all of our accreditation reports that we have effective teachers because students are achieving learning outcomes but we have not measured teaching effectiveness directly. We also have policies that identify aspects of teaching effectiveness such as the Student Evaluations of Faculty and Courses (631), Annual Faculty Review policy (633), Faculty Tenure (637), and Post-Tenure Review (638).[17] In some departments and/or schools and colleges, these policies and their implicit references to facets of teaching effectiveness have been implemented and been successful. It is the estimate of the authors that the majority of our academic departments do not have strategies and operations that consistently assess or address the full spectrum of teaching effectiveness (e.g., Fink's and the AAU's models including setting clear expectations, subject matter expertise and course design, assessment and feedback, alignment, teacher-student interactions, support for whole student, and improving over time). Furthermore, departments' assessment measures and their application are uneven and wide-ranging—some of which are sound, purposeful assessments; others are less so. **It is the recommendation of the authors and the Task Force that a policy be drafted (or a current policy modified) that is purposeful in addressing the full spectrum of teaching effectiveness.** Although implied above, this policy would include a comprehensive model of teaching effectiveness, identify and solidify the faculty member's relationship with OTL, outline and offer multiple assessment options, and include the SRI instrument and accompanying usage in this new (or modified) policy. It likely goes without

---

[17] There are likely other faculty policies that mention aspects of teaching effectiveness; those identified are the primary ones.

stating that any new (or modified) policy would need to align with existing policies that contain elements of teaching effectiveness.

As stated above, we will always have the potential to become entangled with the many moving parts of our faculty experience unless a better effort is made to align and integrate policies, procedures, deployment, and practices. To that end, **it is our recommendation that a methodical, purposeful effort be made to align policies (e.g., tenure, annual reviews, post-tenure, etc.) that have natural areas of convergence; and that these policies be aligned with initiatives and efforts by departments such as OTL, OEL, etc.**

Policies that have efficacy and the potential to succeed in the outcome they were written for often fall short of these expectations. It is our observation that there are two central reasons for this: 1) Faculty, department chairs, deans, and even mid-level administrators often do not read or understand the policy. Or, they may read parts of a policy and then extrapolate interpretations that may or may not be accurate. One of the results of these behaviors is that faculty experience uneven and sometimes unfair evaluations and decisions. 2) Even when there is clear understanding of the policy and its implementation, accountability and adherence to the policy may be absent. This could be because there isn't a mechanism in place that empowers the leader to take action, or, it may be that there simply isn't the will to enforce a policy.

We must be able to rely on the processes already in place and that academic leadership will exercise due diligence with respect to reading, understanding, and implementing policies; this *is* our recommendation.

RTP

In consulting with the chair of the Faculty Senate RTP Committee, it became readily apparent that definitions, criteria, related evidence and reliable measures of teaching effectiveness are largely absent across departments, schools and colleges on the campus. This situation creates challenges for the university-wide RTP committee as they field appeals and try

to adjudicate RTP issues. By providing the committee with a common framework and consistent criteria, committee members will be able to conduct their work in a fair and equitable manner. Having no model or measures of teaching effectiveness also presents challenges for tenure-track faculty. Faculty should know from the moment they design their tenure plan how UVU, and their respective department and school or college, defines and measures teaching effectiveness, and with criteria serving as evidence of effective teaching. **Our first recommendation, then, is that we modify the existing RTP policy and processes to include a model of teaching effectiveness (and its concomitant definitions and key indicators). Our second recommendation is that RTP policy be coherent, integrated and aligned with the model of teaching effectiveness adopted by the faculty.**

Assessment

UVU regularly and systematically collects assessment data on student learning outcomes and has demonstrated continuous improvement of its related assessment practices. However, in all of the accreditation self-study reports, UVU implies that teaching is effective *because* of students' achievement of learning outcomes. These reports include no other evidence of teaching effectiveness. UVU has not yet made explicit in policies and practices that evidence of students' achievements *is* evidence of effective teaching. Furthermore, the current methods used to evaluate faculty teaching performance do not assess or measure whether a faculty member's teaching is effective. In other words, we have not yet connected or integrated assessment of student learning outcomes with assessment of teaching effectiveness. The most significant benefit of assessing teaching effectiveness ought to be the feedback provided to faculty so they can refine and improve their courses and teaching practices to provide students with better learning experiences. **We therefore recommend that UVU develop a holistic, correlated, and aligned process that connects and integrates student learning outcomes assessment with teaching effectiveness assessment.** This recommendation might be appropriately placed in the

aforementioned teaching effectiveness policy; in this case, this recommendation would be inclusive of that.

It is clear from the authors' investigation and the results of the Assessment Subcommittee of the Re-envisioning the Undergraduate Education Committee (RUEC)[18] that access to institutional assessment data is difficult at best; at worst, the data is simply not available. In many cases, the data were never gathered. Nevertheless, assessment *is* happening across the campus in various entities but the data collected is generally only available and useful to those entities. Despite past efforts to integrate assessment processes across the campus, we have been unable to coordinate and integrate efforts, or to assign a place for the data to be housed (including a repository for faculty data and artifacts, and another repository for accreditation data) in order for data to be accessible and useful. **We recommend that Academic Affairs (1) form a committee to oversee academic assessment (oversight); (2) tie assessment to PBA and RTP processes (accountability); and (3) begin the intentional creation of a self-regulating culture of assessment within academic departments, schools and colleges**.

---

[18] The RUEC was formed in January, 2018 at the request of former President Matthew Holland to explore the full spectrum of our students' undergraduate experience.

Conclusion

The phrase *teaching effectiveness* is ubiquitous in higher education. Inherent in this phrase are multiple dimensions, meanings, and perceptions; every faculty member brings a unique voice and experience to these meanings and perceptions. Regardless of this complexity, as faculty we are called upon to lend our best thinking and understanding to this core aspect of our practice. If we do not fully engage in drilling down into the many facets of teaching effectiveness, we are not doing our jobs. We have attempted in this paper, in some small measure, to capture the history of this important topic at UVU; we have worked to summarize the work of the Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness; and, we have sought to articulate the many potential recommendations that might propel us forward.

The value of this paper, in the final analysis, will depend on our ability to retain its information and leverage its "findings" to continue the work. It is our last recommendation to create a system for retaining and aligning the numerous and diverse efforts and initiatives taking place in Academic Affairs. Managing our knowledge and our information is vital to efficiency measures and to our ability to maintain a teaching effectiveness improvement trajectory. It would also be a demonstration of respect to the hundreds of faculty who have paved our way with their efforts and to those who continue the important work of defining and evaluating teaching effectiveness.

References

Literature Review: Evaluation of Teaching (July, 2018). Prepared by Wendy Athens, Senior Director, Office of Teaching and Learning, Utah Valley University.

Available upon request.

Association of American Universities (2013). AAU: Policy documents and reports. 11th ed.

Arreola, R. (2007). Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System: A Guide to Designing, Building, and Operating Large-Scale Faculty Evaluation Systems. 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Devlin, M. & Samarawickrema, G. (2010). Criteria of effective teaching in a changing higher education context. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 29(2), 111-124.

Fink, D. (2008). Evaluating teaching: A new approach to an old problem. *To Improve the Academy: Resources for Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development,* 26, 3-21.

Framework for Systemic Change in Undergraduate STEM Teaching and Learning. (2013). Washington, DC: Association of American Universities.

Hativa, N. (2014). Student Ratings of Instruction: Recognizing Effective Teaching, 2nd ed. Oron Publications

Jankowski, N. (2017). Unpacking relationships: Instruction and student outcomes. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Uttl, B., White, C.A., & Gonzalez, D. W. (2017). Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 54, 22042.

Summary List of Recommendations

Teaching Effectiveness Model:

- Adopt a model of teaching effectiveness that includes a holistic definition and comprehensive framework.
- Faculty Senate considers how this model might be incorporated into policy or policies.
- The Office of Teaching and Learning takes on an active and "hands-on" role in directly assisting faculty and RTP committees with the implementation of the model of teaching effectiveness selected (or developed).

SRIs:

- Conduct a comprehensive literature review of the SRI and its many associated issues.
- Work towards the goal of consensus in the areas of: the best instrument to use; understanding and aligning our motives for usage; and definitively addressing and answering the questions outlined in the history section of this paper.
- Work to modify policy that is explicit (rather than implied) in requiring the usage of multiple pieces of evidence of teaching effectiveness—both in an individual faculty member's teaching practices and portfolios, but also in how supervisors are evaluating the faculty member.
- A consistent effort be made to provide and/or create better ways to measure and assess some of these alternative types of teaching effectiveness.
- Be informed and guided by research as we make decisions about the numerous questions and issues surround the SRI.
- Review whether students are all required to participate in the SRI and the time frame in which they have access.
- Meet with the officers of UVUSA to hear student experiences with and thoughts about SRIs.
- Separate the issues first.
- Policies containing SRI definitions, practices, and usage requirements be re-examined and revised to align with any of the adopted recommendations adopted here.

Policies:

- A new policy be drafted that is purposeful in addressing the full spectrum of teaching effectiveness.
- A methodical, purposeful effort be made to align policies (e.g. tenure, annual reviews, post-tenure, etc.) that have natural areas of convergence; and that these polices are aligned with initiative and efforts by departments such as OTL, OEL, etc.
- We must be able to rely on the processes already in place and that academic leadership will exercise due diligence with respect to reading, understanding, and implementing policies.

RTP:

- Modify the existing RTP policy and processes to include a model of teaching effectiveness (and its concomitant definitions and key indicators).
- RTP policy needs to be coherent, integrated and aligned with the model of teaching effectiveness adopted by the faculty.

Assessment:

- UVU develops a holistic, correlated, and aligned process that connects and integrates student learning outcomes assessment with teaching effectiveness assessment.
- Academic Affairs: 1) Forms a committee to oversee academic assessment (oversight); 2) ties assessment to PBA and RTP processes (accountability); and 3) begins the intentional creation of a self-regulating culture of assessment within academic departments, schools, and colleges.