OUTLINE OF POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS

I. PEER REVIEW

[I was not sure about item C. I have a reference in my note to “best practices,” but I was unsure whether it related to peer review. MTS]

What recommendations or suggestions should the Council include in the report?

A. Limit mandatory peer review for faculty members whose student evaluations exceed a specified level

The Council could propose that mandatory peer review be limited if the circumstances indicate that the faculty member’s teaching is satisfactory. The Council could propose that such a faculty member be exempt from the requirement or that mandatory peer be limited in such a case to specified intervals—e.g., no more than one every three years.

B. Recommend a procedure for a faculty member to request peer review for teaching enhancement purposes (without the results becoming part of promotion file)

If the Council concludes that peer review can enhance teaching, then the Council should recommend that the University adopt a procedure allowing a faculty member to request a peer review without needing to be concerned about the impact of the evaluation on promotion and other interests.

C. Prepare a report on “best practices” in using peer review for teaching enhancement (only teaching enhancement or for both teaching enhancement and promotion assessment?)

The Council should prepare recommendations regarding “best practices” in using peer review for teaching enhancement.

II. TEACHING EVALUATIONS

What recommendations or suggestions should the Council include in the report?

A. APC and Welfare Council should work together to resolve issues relating to online evaluations

1. The APC has ownership of online teaching evaluation response rates, but the minutes reflect that the APC has on several occasions suggested that the Welfare Council and the APC form a joint subcommittee to deal with online evaluations. The Welfare Council should endorse doing so.

2. Furthermore, the APC has looked primarily at how to increase response rates rather than at the entire picture. A less piecemeal approach is needed.

B. Collect information relating to the use of teaching evaluation to determine whether they have a significant impact on faculty interests/welfare

1. The APC or a joint subcommittee should gather information relating to the use of teaching evaluations and how these uses affect faculty members of various ranks and responsibilities.

2. The APC or a joint subcommittee should consider whether the method of reporting teaching evaluation results in the promotion packet remains meaningful, given the significant decrease in submission of evaluations.
C. If impact is significant, consider proposing that the University make online submission compulsory

If teaching evaluations have a significant impact on the interests of some faculty members, the APC or a joint subcommittee should consider whether to recommend making submission by students compulsory (through creating a significant consequence for failure). If an existing policy prevents this, the APC or a joint subcommittee should explore how to get the policy changed.

D. If impact is significant but compulsory submission is not an option, provide faculty with “best practices” guidance

If making submission compulsory is not an option, the APC or a joint subcommittee should consider which previously-suggested means of increasing submission are most likely to increase the response rate without diminishing respect for the process. (The APC might be working on this now.)

E. If impact is significant, recommend changes or additions to the questions to make data collected more meaningful as feedback and as a reflection of the teacher’s effectiveness

1. If the questions are legislatively mandated, determine whether the mandate applies to the form as well as the content. If changes are severely restricted, determine steps for getting the policy changed.

2. Seek guidance from persons with expertise in the field as to how the ranked items could be more effectively framed. Propose changes to the appropriate body.