

Student and Peer Evaluation Usage in RTP Decisions Survey

Report and Analysis: Deborah M. Mullen, Ph.D., Course Learning Evaluation Committee Chair, 2022-2023

March 31, 2023

Methods: A survey of Department Heads and RTP Committees about their usage of Student Course Evaluations of Learning and Peer Evaluations of Teaching was deployed to all eligible respondents at the end of January 2023. The CLE committee deployed the survey at the request of the Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs, the Commission on the Status of Women, and the Walker Center. All groups had input into the surveys constructed in Qualtrics over the Fall 2022 semester.

The department head survey was sent to 31 people, resulting in 16 responses. The RTP committee chair survey was sent to 38 people who were requested to poll their colleagues and respond once per committee, resulting in 13 responses. No college had enough answers from the potential pool to adequately separate the results by college for either survey.

High-level Summary: This report was reviewed by the Course Learning Evaluation Committee before the information was shared with requestors. The survey response rates were too low for college-level aggregation of findings and are therefore presented as a unified aggregation. Comments fall into two categories: Student CLE and Peer Evaluations. Recommendations follow the main thematic comments.

Student CLE

- Due to a widespread understanding of bias, Department Heads and RTP Committee Chairs see these as barometers indicating trends.
- Year-over-year improvement or consistency of high scores from student evaluations is important to reviewers. However, they seem to give some related contextual interpretation to the results with allowances for a new prep, early or late class times, etc. Change (improvement) is seen as necessary by the RTP Committees.
- Comments strongly suggest a campus-wide desire to change to a less biased instrument.
- Noted that several departments' by-laws state that faculty must be higher than the mean scores for the college/department/peers or in the "top third" of all UTC faculty – this is mathematically impossible for all faculty to achieve this mark.

Peer Evaluations

- These are seen as more critical by both Department heads and RTP committees.
- Peer Evaluations are highly variable; every year by the same person, some once every 3 years by peers, the content and scope of the review process are inconsistent even within colleges. Few reviewers are trained instructional designers or Walker Center reviewers.
- Since there is a lack of uniform content reviewed, these reviews are unique to the reviewer.
- Responders were firmly against a UTC-wide peer evaluation framework but were open to a Department and College level synchronization of the process.

Recommendations Based on the Student and Peer Evaluation Survey:

- Any instrument we can move to that will minimize student bias will be an improvement.
- As student CLE are problematic individually, an aggregation example of ways peers present these results to committees and department heads with the added context clues might be helpful to add to the Walker Center New Faculty course. (Mullen and Murphy from RCOB have examples)
- Peer evaluations, as important tools, could be subjective and objective. It was noted that these reviews would be more developmental if a basic standardized outline ensured that reviewers were giving more systematic and consistent feedback. One member of the CLE committee noted that as an essential development tool, there also is no process for appealing or redacting something damaging, unlike the student CLE.

University of Nebraska – Omaha IMPACT Recommendations for Implementation

F-IMPACT

Faculty self-assessment of high-impact practices (HIP) they engage in regularly, then scaled against the UN-O faculty sample average. Faculty can use this to identify HIP to add to classes. All classes should use some of these methods – none should use all.

S-IMPACT

The student version is in the process of being studied at UN-O. They are looking for volunteers also to use. The study aims to validate this survey of HIP and compare student assessment with faculty's assessment to see if they correlate.

Implementation Recommendations

F-IMPACT

- Voluntary self-assessment
- It could be used to help identify efforts faculty might want to add to classes (EDO – teaching)
- All HIPs are research-supported practices.
- It should be concurrent with currently required student and peer evaluations of teaching
- It should be voluntary for inclusion in the EDO and dossiers at this time.
- We need to calculate UTC levels and, when possible, college, and department levels.
- It still does not address all classes (arts, clinical practicums)

S-IMPACT

- All HIP scaled, no subjective items.
- Not yet available; in testing currently
- Student attendance is not measured (so no weighting by # or amount of observation)
- When available, UTC needs to occur concurrently with CLE since faculty handbooks and RTP require these measures
- Unknown yet if the S version correlates with the F version; do students and faculty reports correlate, and in what ways, and to what degree?

CLE Idea for potential addition to the S-IMPACT – What about adding a menu of qualitative items to choose from that are specific and positive-toned? Faculty could pick a few questions and use them in class or in the canvas discussion board to gain student-related comments on HIP. Motivated students might still use this space to make biased comments, but there is peer pressure to be responsive in at least a socially acceptable manner.

- What was the most important thing you will take away from this class?
- What assignment was most useful to you?
- What assignment was least useful to you?
- If you were giving your friend advice on how to succeed in this class, what would you recommend?

Detailed Results:

How frequently does your department change RTP chairs?

- Annually = 4
- Every 2 years = 2
- When the current chair decides to step down/retires = 3
- As needed = 2
- Usually the highest ranking/longest employed member of the faculty chairs until they retire.
- Election held annually, but our tendency is to nominate the same person until they, in effect, step down.

Do your departmental by-laws quantify the expectations for student and peer evaluations? (note across Colleges, there was inconsistency)

- 16 “No” from RTP and Dept. heads
- 1 skipped.
- Student evaluations that place the candidate at least in the upper third of evaluations across the University.
- Peer review of teaching, but only if teaching is 50% or more of position.
- External peer evaluation of tenure and promotion dossier (2);
Colleague/peer evaluations of teaching (but not a specific quantity)
- (i) Student evaluation results with median scores of 5.0 or greater for all Course Content and Delivery and Course Instruction questions (scale of 0-7 with 7 being best) on average during the three (3) years prior to tenure consideration.
(ii) A majority of peer-evaluation ratings of “very good” or “excellent” during the last two semesters of peer evaluations.
(iii) Evidence of responding positively to reasonable criticisms offered through student and peer evaluations, by showing a willingness to change and improve.

To demonstrate excellence in teaching, a candidate for tenure and/or promotion must also provide additional evidence of teaching commitment and success. Evidence of excellence in teaching can be demonstrated by some combination of the following: regular student teaching evaluations with median scores greater than six (6); nomination and/or receipt of teaching awards; high quality teaching materials; evidence of updating and developing new courses; unsolicited positive feedback from former students; use or development of innovative teaching methods (e.g., flipped classrooms; experiential learning; recitation section); participation in teaching development workshops or fellowships; authorship on lab manuals; authorship on a textbook; other comparable activities.

- established reputation as an effective teacher, using methodology appropriate to the level, subject, and course goals, as evidenced by student evaluations, peer review, and may include letters from alumni;
- We specify the number of semesters of student evaluations that be submitted and the number of peer evaluations required, but we do not quantify how the evaluations factor in to the overall evaluation.

- Quality teaching is central to the role of each faculty member and has long been recognized as the primary mission of the College and the University. Excellence in teaching may be judged by:
 - a. Student evaluations and trends in student evaluations
 - b. Faculty member's assessment of her/his student evaluations
 - c. Department Head's assessment of the student evaluations
 - d. Analysis of the faculty member's teaching philosophy
 - e. Contribution of the faculty member to recognitions received by students
 - f. Evidence provided by student comments
 - g. Feedback from students, alumni, recruiters, employers, and graduate schools
 - h. Review of syllabi for coverage of appropriate topics
 - i. Other items such as number of course preparations, development of new courses, and teaching in multiple modalities

Additional criteria used to assess teaching quality include, but are not limited to:

- a. Engagement in teaching and learning scholarship
- b. Supervision of independent studies
- c. Supervision of student research activities
- d. Support of the Success Center with respect to advising and career counseling

When considering student evaluations over time, I (we) prioritize:

(Please rank: 1=highest priority and 5=lowest priority)

- 2 blank responses

When considering student evaluations over time, I (we) prioritize: (Please rank: 1=highest priority and 5=lowest priority)	Highest priority 1	2	3	4	Lowest priority 5	Average
Yearly Improvement	9	6	4	4	0	2.1
Consistency year to year	1	10	10	2	0	2.6
Meeting or exceeding a specific threshold as defined by the Department	6	3	4	5	5	3
Similarity with colleagues' average scores	2	3	4	11	3	3.4
It depends (please explain)	5	1	1	1	15	3.9

- It depends on:
 - o Difficulty of course. Course in major or general service to college. Undergrad v. grad course.
 - o I expect faculty to reflect on their scores to help me put them into context.
 - o I look for consistency in performance if there is overall good performance and improvement in courses, particularly if aspects of teaching may need to change to meet students's needs or learning.
 - o Some faculty are in the process of developing advanced expertise in an area of teaching. This is taken into consideration. Also, faculty training AND years of experience in teaching andragogy and its applications are taken into consideration.
 - o There are myriad factors that go into evaluating teaching. We will have a professor review the faculty member's teaching and review their syllabus and materials for

alignment with the course. If the professor has high evaluations, we would look less at the improvement but the consistency. We do review the student evaluation comments to see what they are saying.

- since student evaluations are very unreliable, we look for patterns of specific strengths and weaknesses to develop an overall picture
- Definite patterns of recurring comments across semesters and years, e.g. frequent complaints about being slow in replying to students' emails
- We consider a range of factors when considering student evaluations over time, including those listed here, but do not consistently rank the factors in any order.
- In reality, yearly improvement is important for those who start out weak. Consistency is important for those who start out strong.
- We review the evaluations holistically including all of the factors mentioned
- We look for areas that need improvement and assess those going forward.

When examining variation in student evaluations, how important are these course-specific factors.

- 1 blank response

When examining variation in student evaluations, how important are these course-specific factors	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	Extremely important
The first time a class is offered	0	0	13	8	3
Course level (introductory, upper-level, graduate)	4	6	4	6	4
General Education vs. major specific	6	5	4	6	3
Perception of course material complexity ("hard" class)	3	4	8	6	3

When examining variation in student evaluations, how important are these class-related factors.

When examining variation in student evaluations, how important are these class-related factors	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	Extremely important	
Class size (small or large)	3	4	14	2	1	
Modality (face-to-face, online, asynchronous, synchronous, hybrid)	5	2	10	5	2	
Time of day (8 am, after 5 pm)	12	6	4	2	0	
Summer (accelerated)	7	10	5	1	1	
% DFW rates ("D", "F", or "Withdraw")	8	5	5	4	1	* 1 blank
% of students submitting an evaluation	4	9	5	4	2	

How are course development and design considered in the annual evaluation and/or promotion and tenure process? (e.g., new course proposal, content, activities, assessments)

- they are considered but we have no rating system
- Faculty are recognized for new course development; trying new teaching activities, engagement in curricular change, etc.
- To demonstrate excellence in teaching, a candidate for tenure and/or promotion must also provide additional evidence of teaching commitment and success. Evidence of excellence in teaching can be demonstrated by some combination of the following: regular student teaching evaluations with median scores greater than six (6); nomination and/or receipt of teaching awards; high quality teaching materials; evidence of updating and developing new courses; unsolicited positive feedback from former students; use or development of innovative teaching methods (e.g., flipped classrooms; experiential learning; recitation section); participation in teaching development workshops or fellowships; authorship on lab manuals; authorship on a textbook; other comparable activities.
- It's a consideration, but I couldn't quantify it. It's part of a holistic assessment of the faculty performance.
- I encourage faculty to design new courses and improve their current courses. I understand (through personal experience) that students don't respond well to change, even if it's an improvement. Therefore I take that into consideration when viewing student evaluations of teaching -- *if* I know of the faculty activities. So they must describe in their EDO reports or promotion dossiers.
- faculty are encouraged to innovate and therefore when a new course is developed and offered for the first several times the student evaluations are weighed with the understanding that the faculty member may still be working out fine details, timing and projects for the class. It is likely that the evaluations will reflect the fact that the class is new and will need time for adjustment.

- They are an important component of a faculty member's teaching portfolio. There is an expectation that most faculty will engage with developing and designing courses throughout their careers.
- The department's RTP committee and head, I believe, value, appreciate, and recognize those who expend time and effort attempting to continuously improve their existing courses, create and offer new courses, and experiment with new teaching methods (such as experiential learning, for instance), activities, assignments, and assessments.
- Successful curricular development and design is recognized as a valuable contribution (pertaining to teaching) in the EDO and RTP processes.
- It is considered in light of accreditation and how faculty must work to maintain course requirements and student learning in light of this. It is considered in all faculty members' work.
- Department faculty have very little independence in pursuing new course development or making changes in content due to accreditation standards. Innovations in teaching activities and assessments are considered as part of the annual evaluation and though its iterations, the promotion and tenure process.
- We consider course development to show leadership.
- The department head should be the one to provide the basis for feedback on that facet of it. The faculty member designing a new course that is needed due to a change in curriculum is quite important. If they are readily willing to develop a needed course, then that certainly demonstrates their willingness to support the students and programs that will help our students succeed.
- As pedagogical activities, these things fall under Teaching in our dept. (Teaching, Research, Service - the triad)
- Course development and design are considered through an evaluation of course materials including syllabi, assessments, etc. The development of new courses and improvement of existing courses are viewed favorably.
- Part of an overall evaluation. More critical is activities of departmental need
- The RTP committee is not very involved in the annual evaluation process, only promotion and tenure. In my experience, this has not been taken into account very much, although it should be.
- Our by-laws list designing a new course as one thing that might earn one exceptional merit.
- * New preparations and new modalities are considered more highly. We also tend to focus more on quantitative means and student comments over the rigor or types of assessments.
- As evidence in the consideration of teaching and service
- Course development and design are broadly considered as service to the department. New course development is often also positioned as evidence of activity in teaching. Course content is proposed by individual faculty and reviewed by the faculty as a whole. Full proposals are drafted, discussed, and approved at the departmental level before submitting to the UTC curriculum committee.
- Not applicable. We don't often know this info.
- Examples of materials are required to be submitted
- 2 blanks

How much importance does your RTP committee place on faculty responses/changes to student evaluations?

- A great deal = 3
- A lot = 7
- A moderate amount = 8
- A little = 6
- Blank = 1

Does your RTP committee review Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) faculty? Yes = 1 No = 12

Does review of student's evaluations for NTT faculty differ from the TT faculty? How?

No = 21

Yes = 3

- Different criteria based on the by-laws
- Only in that NTT colleagues tend to have higher teaching expectations/loads and lower service and scholarship expectations/loads (i.e., their jobs are different). But I am equally opposed to placing too much weight or emphasis on student evaluations for T/TT and NTT colleagues alike.
- As dept head I'm the only one in the dept who views the student evaluations for NTT faculty, while TT faculty evals are reviewed by the dept RTP as part of re-appointment and promotion decisions.

Peer Evaluations of Teaching

Do you utilize peer evaluations? Yes = 24 No = 0

Is the selection of peer evaluators covered in your Departmental by-laws? Yes = 16 No = 8

How are peer evaluators chosen in your department?

- Volunteers = 6
- Requested by faculty member being reviewed = 5
- Assigned by Departmental committee = 11
- Assigned by Department Head, Associate Department Head, or Coordinator = 6

Who performs peer evaluations in your department? (Mark all that apply)

- Department Head = 15
- Associate Department Heads or Program Coordinators = 11
- Faculty peers at same rank = 11
- Faculty peers at higher rank = 24
- Faculty from other departments = 3
- Instructional Designer = 1
- Walker Center = 7
- Other external evaluator = 2

**How often does your department normally conduct peer evaluations for individual faculty members?
(Mark all that apply)**

- By request = 7
- Once a year = 16
- Once every 2 years = 2
- Once every 3 years = 3
- Once before tenure = 11
- Once before promotion = 9

When and why, if ever, would an additional ad hoc peer evaluation be conducted for individual faculty members?

- Never
- If student evaluations are below average, a peer reviewer will be assigned to assist in determining the best course of action for helping the faculty member get on an improvement plan.
- N/A
- if students raise concerns, they are one tool a department head can use to assess the situation
- Individual faculty members can request a peer evaluation.
- By request of individual faculty member. Several faculty have had evaluations performed by Walker Center.
- If the faculty member requests it (when they are going up for promotion or tenure), if they are struggling with evaluations and want some feedback, when the department head requires it, because of problems with evaluations or when a student complains about the instructor.
- During a tenure-track faculty member's first two years, they must have one teaching observation by their mentor and an additional one by a member of the full-time, tenured faculty. After that, they must have at least one per year.
- Requests from individual faculty members. For instance, if they are going up for tenure/promotion and need another review. Or if faculty members complain about one of their reviews. One of our members noted that when this happens, the "department head will have others to review and sweep concerns under the rug." This is one reason why some of our colleagues have been reviewed by the Walker Center - when disputes have occurred.
- Insufficient number of faculty above rank within the department
- Junior TT faculty are reviewed by two senior faculty each year in the first three years of appointment. After the first three years, additional peer reviews may be initiated by the RTPC, the Head, or the faculty member.
- By request of the faculty or if there were evident concerns in the course such as if teaching evaluations were lower than normal.
- at the third year review
- Blank
- If received several concerns from students.
- No process for this. We have faculty who have been here 4 years and have had 16 peer evaluations. Our TT faculty have multiple evaluations each year. That was not a choice in the previous question.
- Obvious issues with teaching.

- I have conducted a classroom/Canvas visit upon receipt of student complaints, if of sufficient number and concern. I have been encouraging the faculty to establish a peer review of teaching for the purposes of formative feedback, not just the summative evaluations for RTP decisions. One program I'm trying to establish is called "Teaching Triangles."
- only in situations in which a faculty member has received a negative prognosis from the department RTP and the department head is seeking an outside perspective on the faculty members teaching performance
- I don't know that it would. This, it seems to me, to be the purview of the department head.
- By the faculty member's request, or if concerns have been identified during previous peer evaluations.
- One example: if concerns about classroom environment or pedagogy arose due to multiple student complaints/concerns.
- Since the department's faculty tend to have strong student evaluations, it is chiefly by request to gain a second set of eyes and ears on current teaching or assessment methods and gain the benefit of multiple teachers and their insights for continuous quality improvement and/or a challenging area/topic.

Comparing Student and Peer Evaluations

Have changes in the RTP committee's composition over the past 5-10 years altered the importance placed on student vs. peer evaluations in a faculty member's overall performance?

- No = 8
- Unsure = 2
- Yes = 3
 - o More weight is allocated to both
 - o Yes, the RTP committee takes seriously biases (racism, sexism, and homophobia) that research has shown exist in student evaluations.
 - o Observation forms have been updated, as have student evaluations. In prior years, more weight has been put on student evaluations, but now student and peer evaluations are considered more equal.

For tenure-track faculty member's performance evaluation, are student or peer evaluations considered more important?

	Student evaluations are more important	Both are equally important	Peer evaluations are more important	Blank
At annual re-appointment	7	5	10	2
At the mid-point (3 years) T&P reviews	5	6	11	2
During tenure decisions	4	6	12	2
During promotion decisions	4	6	12	2
It depends, please explain	1	4	0	19

It depends

- Again, this goes to the totality of the reviews. For instance, if a faculty member consistently has good peer evaluations but bad teaching evaluations or vice versa, the RTP discusses to determine our opinion/thoughts.
- The department head looks more at student evaluations, while the RTP committee looks at both equally. Still there is a lot of pressure on faculty to have high student evaluations.
- The RTP committee knows that students evaluation remain biased, uneven, and incomplete.
- If the student evaluations are quite detailed and constructive in their feedback, those will carry quite a bit of weight since the students interact more with the faculty member.
- External peer evaluations are used exclusively for T&P considerations.
- Since both forms can be biased, I try to weigh them equally. Our current department system of peer evaluations is too small, so I sometimes have to rely on the student comments more.
- Peer evaluations and student evaluations both have biases built in. There are a bunch of SETs to examine patterns, but only one or a few peer evaluations, so it's difficult to say which should hold sway.
- It really does depend on so many circumstances.

For non-tenure-track faculty member's performance evaluation, are student or peer evaluations considered more important?

	Student evaluations are more important	Both are equally important	Peer evaluations are more important	Blank
At annual re-appointment	4	4	4	0
During promotion decisions	5	4	3	0
It depends, please explain	1	1	0	10

It depends

- non TT faculty are not reviewed by the RTPC
- External peer evaluations are used exclusively for P considerations.
- We currently do not conduct peer evaluations of NTT faculty teaching.

- Same as above
- It really does depend on so many circumstances.

Do you take into account potential student biases (gender, race, ethnicity, disabilities) when weighing the importance of student evaluations compared to peer evaluations in the overall faculty review process?

- Never = 3
- Rarely = 2
- Some of the time = 4
- Most of the time = 6
- Every time = 8

How does the committee/ you resolve differences between student and peer evaluations?

- This is done on a case-by-case basis.
- Unknown
- Typically in a drawn-out fashion in which we all discuss the the feedback from both the students evaluations and the peer reviewer. If the student evaluations express constructive feedback and concerns, those will carry quite a bit of weight since the students interact with the faculty member far more frequently than the peer reviewer will.
- the issue hasn't arisen.
- The committee acknowledges that the differences exist and that biases shape student evaluations.
- Through discussion
- I'm not sure that we do this well. Different people on the committee see this differently.
- Our faculty generally has positive student evaluations; if there is some sort of negative trend, the faculty mentor and/or the department chair would discuss strategies and possibly have the faculty member meet with Walker Center.
- 5 Blank
- It depends. Also, each non-tenured, tenure track faculty member is reviewed by two senior faculty members each year.
- Via discussion, case-by-case basis
- Differences are addressed through extensive discussion based on holistic review of candidate's materials. As a committee, we take student evaluations into consideration against a backdrop of other signs of teaching effectiveness (or lack thereof). Does a colleague consistently come to meetings unprepared? Do multiple students indicate confusion resulting from a lack of instructor preparedness, course to course, semester to semester? If the answer to both questions is "yes," there might be something to the student comments.
- Through discussion, if warranted. Have not encountered this issue yet.
- They are completely different groups and it is not unusual to have differences in opinions expressed. Sometimes students believe content is over taught or not necessary. The faculty and department head must consider accreditation standards and what is necessary for licensure exam success, which students don't typically have insight into but peer evaluators do.

- I privilege the professional judgment and assessment of trained and experienced colleagues over student evaluations, unless/until a clear pattern of legitimate and persistent students concerns emerge.
- Conversations with the faculty member.
- through conversation with the Faculty, their peer evaluators and through class observation
- Your question above implies that peer evaluations are free of such bias, which isn't true. In answer to this question, I try to conduct my own classroom visit.
- Look for patterns. Talk to the faculty member. I don't lose much sleep over it.
- Self-observation and discussion with the faculty member.
- Has not really happened.

To what degree do you agree with the statement:

It is important to have consistent policies and procedures for the treatment/consideration of student and peer evaluations in the RTP evaluation process _____.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Blank
Within each College	3	0	0	7	13	2
Within each department	4	1	3	8	7	2
Across the University	6	0	4	7	6	2

What guidance, if any, would you like from UTC Administrators or Faculty Senate on the use of student and peer evaluations in making annual re-appointments and RTP decisions?

- Student evaluations can be popularity contest...easier faculty sometimes get better ratings. However, I think considering comments provides much insight. I currently do peer review of every faculty member in my department.
- Are there issues that have resulted in non-reappointment or non-tenure? I have not heard of any instances at UTC where student/peer evaluations are the make/break for re-appointment and RTP decisions. Please share data.
- Because of the inherent biases built into both for POC and women, I would use them only for developmental purposes and not for determination of tenure, promotion or raises.
- I would like a system where student comments are not seen by everybody. Some of them are very hurtful towards the faculty member and may bias the reviewers. The Administration and Faculty Senate can promote a Peer Review of Teaching system across departments to provide more feedback to faculty. Do not remove the Objectives part of the EDO process: all professionals should be expected to set annual goals for continuous improvement, even specific teaching goals.
- I think it is important to limit the emphasis placed on student evaluations of faculty teaching and bring UTC in line with the current research that seriously question the efficacy of these tools.
- What I do not want from UTC Administrators or the Faculty Senate are stronger requirements that departments utilize problematic and sometimes abusive student evaluations.

- If you delegate the responsibility of reviews to the department heads, you should provide training and resources and then trust that they will complete appropriately.
- Take the time to review a sampling of each department's evaluations and quality of feedback and if a department head is not providing quality feedback/review, then call them out and hold them accountable in remediation.
- While we don't believe we as a department need "guidance," it is feasible that many departments do. What's needed are standards that are well understood and universally applied. It would be reassuring to know that student evaluations are balanced against peer review across the institution, for example, and that a holistic assessment is made which does not privilege student evaluations over other indicators of faculty performance.
- Approve revised departmental by-laws in a timely manner.
- Members of RTP noted that student evaluations need to be overhauled due to noted biases against women and people of color. Additionally, often student evaluations are not useful due to the fact that they are based on factors outside of teaching including, but not limited to, bias, non-instructional factors, the grade made by the student. With regard to peer evaluations, members of RTP noted that there needs to be a mechanism where critical/constructive evaluation is given and improvement is recognized in peer evaluations. New faculty cannot improve with no guidance. They also noted that teaching styles among faculty are different and sometimes subjective feedback about these teaching styles may not be beneficial.
- Each department might have a yearly workshop/visitor to discuss the role that bias plays in evaluations.
- It would be nice if peer evaluations were viewed with equal weight as student evaluations. Also, we only review people's teaching until they have tenure or are promoted. When they go up for full professor, we only use peer evaluations the year they go up, so that tenured faculty hardly ever have a peer evaluation, even though they should.
- Since student evaluations are unreliable, that should be taken into consideration. Either adjust the student evaluation process to make it more reliable or greatly reduce the impact.
- The committee would like to see clear recognition on the part of the administration of the fact that student evaluations consistently suffer from a range of biases that severely undermine their ability to be used as a fair assessment of faculty performance.
- I think myself and several, maybe all, of the RTP committee members would very much like to be presented with the best available data regarding bias in course evaluations, so that we could better assess "how much" such bias impacts course evaluations.
- only if there is a repeated pattern of issues and/or problems.
- If it is deemed necessary to develop verbiage around this, keep it broad. There are so many contingencies that require flexibility due to the varying nature of feedback from the students. Teaching freshmen vs. teaching graduate students can yield far different types of feedback. Also, the nature of the course material and the course requirement (whether elective or required and who is it required for, etc.) all play a pivotal role. Also, each college will have its own curricular requirements. Also, given that these decisions are made of committees with at minimum of 3 people (frequently far more), have to go through the department head, a central college RTP committee, etc. means that much of this stuff is getting numerous eyes on it and the vetting is quite thorough.

- If there were guidelines for dealing with disparities between student and peer evaluations, that would be helpful.

Research has shown that professors who are women, people of color, or with disabilities receive less positive evaluations on average than other professors. Were you previously aware of this research on bias?

Yes = 10

Missing = 2

Please provide any additional comments you or your committee have related to the consideration of teaching evaluations in the faculty performance management process.

- We take teaching very seriously. It is the most important part of what we do at UTC. Our committee, since I joined it, has also put a great deal of stock into the feedback of the students and the peer evaluator. We have recommended intervention when necessary. If the survey here is being driven by what is happening in a particular department, then the best course of action may be to provide targeted development on the use of student and peer evaluations on teaching to the faculty and department head where this issue is a concern.
- Student evaluations are HIGHLY unreliable and should only be used to provide information about POTENTIAL issues that require further, more reliable data. we grossly overuse them
- Due to aforementioned problems with student evaluations, we have developed a system that looks at the faculty member holistically. There should be a change in how the university talks to students about evaluations. The repeated attempts to enforce filling out course evaluations shows that the university still considers these to be a major factor in the evaluation of faculty performance.
- Use teaching evaluations primarily during the first years of appointment so it's primarily a tool for improvement.
- Peer evaluations are important and should be taken seriously, used consistently, and be free from bias. An evaluation instrument, appropriate for the discipline and teaching assignments, might be helpful. Such instruments should be developed and adopted by the department faculty, if used.
- Many serving on our RTPC recall heightened consciousness around the issue of bias in student evaluations. It was regularly featured in the Chronicle, data revealing bias was being circulated nationally, and the college held discussions on the matter. Since the institution has done little to address bias in student evaluations in the intervening years—with the obvious exception of revising evaluation questions—we see this survey as a step in the right direction.
- Recognition of non-tenure track faculty promotion by-laws that require external peer review and/or committee review need to be recognized and supported (timelines, service recognition, etc.).
- I think UTC ought to consider abolishing student evaluations or reforming them completely. Far too few students complete them, and some are so abusive, racist, sexists, ageist, etc. that they constitute a potential lawsuit. I have colleagues who never should have been exposed to the

content of certain student evaluations by their own employer. Surely there is a way to reform this system, or at least weed out abusive evaluations before they are sent to faculty members.

- UTC needs a clearer mission statement. Excellence in teaching should be a priority, but I don't see that messaged across campus. Indeed, my own department by-laws just state "established reputation as a good teacher" as the requirement for tenure and promotion. Evidence of excellent teaching includes, but is not limited to, above average student evaluations and positive peer evaluations.
- Teaching evaluations provide a data point that needs to be considered within the context of the faculty member's entire body of work. Biases are significant. Small response rates. Bipolarity of responses. Flaming. It's a really bad means of assessment that I really only consider when there is a negative outlier (average of 3 or 4) vs. other faculty teaching similar courses.