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Session Goals

- Review and contextualize the TEval framework and associated tools and practices for enacting campus-wide change to implement high-quality teaching evaluation
- Connect with other change leaders on systemic approaches to transformative change in teaching evaluation and institutional change more broadly
- Advance the national dialog around teaching evaluation.
Overview of Session

- **Part I:** Explore approaches to effect systemic transformation of teaching evaluation, drawing on TEval initiative
- **Part II:** Explore opportunities and strategies for scaling across the US and internationally, building a broader community of transformation.
Who’s in the Room: A Quick Poll

Please go to the poll on Slido.com
Use event code 775835

Or use this QR code
The TEval Initiative

Overarching Goal: advance understanding of the institutional change processes that foster improved evaluation by studying the adoption and integration of new approaches at three universities.
The TEval Initiative

Using a **Networked Improvement Community Model** engaged in action research and continuous improvement

**Lead Collaborators**
- Gabriela Weaver
  *Univ of Massachusetts Amherst*
- Dea Follmer Greenhoot
  *Univ of Kansas*
- Noah Finkelstein
  *Univ of Colorado Boulder*
- Ann Austin
  *Michigan State University*
- Mark Graham
  *Yale University*

**External evaluation:**
*Yale University*
A Common Framework (and Tools)

- To advance an externalized and more comprehensive vision of inclusive & scholarly teaching
- To support gathering and organizing evidence from multiple sources

Multiple dimensions of teaching activity
(Articulated in a Rubric)

3 Sources of Evidence

Based on scholarship on peer review, scholarly teaching and its evaluation (e.g., Bernstein & Huber, 2006; Glassick et al., 1997; Hutchings, 1995; 1996; Lyde, Grieshaber, & Byrns, 2016)
Departments act as incubators to adapt, use and refine the rubric

A central unit provides scaffolding for this process

1. Adapt/Refine, Build Consensus
2. Identify Forms of Evidence
3. Develop Processes for Putting into Practice
4. Use/Test
Common Processes: A Systems Approach to Support Sustained Use & Institutionalization

- **Central Unit (TEval Central, CTE, etc..)**
  - Advocacy, advising, policy
  - Community, culture
  - Tools, practices, processes

- **Administration**
- **Campus-wide Stakeholders**
- **Department Teams**
The KU Context

KU’s longstanding evaluation policy requires **three sources** (student, peer, instructor) and a focus on **multiple dimensions of teaching**. The policy was not consistently implemented.

- **2009-2016**: Cross-disciplinary peer review triads, guidelines for peer review
- **2015-2016**: Development of Benchmarks rubric, department piloting
- **2017- present**: Teval collaboration NSF Grant-department incubators, tool development and refinement
- **2020-present**: Multiple new teaching-related university requirements (assessment, syllabi)
The KU Context: The Systems Approach

- 19 dept/school incubators
- HR integration into teaching faculty eval platform
- Student survey revised to align with Benchmarks
- Partnership with CLAS on new models for annual review
- Developing department case studies to create exemplars
- Working with administration to align multiple evaluation and assessment processes
The CU Context

Key Campus Stakeholder Groups

- Admin/Institutional
- TQF Central Team
- Individual academic units/depts

Administrative Discussions / Coordination

Stakeholder Meetings (campus, national)

Phase 1: Cultivate Interest
Phase 2: Form TQF DATs
Phase 3: Regular facilitated DAT meetings

Departmental Level Process
(near term, repeating with new cohorts)

Cross-dept mtgs (Super DATs)

Cross-stakeholder outcomes
(mid/long-term)

Cross-departmental alignment/sharing

Implement new practices
(within depts, w/ admin)

Revisit BFA awards to reflect new models

Better teaching

Improved JEDI

Repeating process with new colleges/cohorts

Segue to internal funding/ownership

Disseminate framework/process to other institutions
Current CU Participants:
42+ units and growing
3 Colleges (of 8)
> ½ of campus (in process)
  Business,
  Engineering
  A&S
Boulder Faculty Assembly
Deans & councils
Central Admin
Office of IT
Office of Data Analytics
Council of Undergrads

Teaching Quality Framework (TQF) Initiative, CU-Boulder
Illustrative Department Case Studies
Department Case Study: KU Linguistics (began 2019)

Starting Point
- Wanted more comprehensive system and more consistent peer review
- Robust teaching and assessment culture
- Very high research productivity
- Broad faculty buy-in and chair support

Process
- Faculty team of T/TT and teaching faculty
- Adapted Benchmarks rubric & peer review protocol
- Identified evidence forms
- Used faculty meetings to build consensus
- Developed version for GTAs, w/their input
- Implemented, collected data, refined

Current Status
- Peer review cycle & process
  - Every other year pre-tenure, every 3 after).
  - Rubric and PR protocol as a guide.
- Rubric for P&T rating and dept teaching narrative
- Rubric for GTA eval
- Sustained through leadership changes and faculty departures
Department Case Study: KU Chemical and Petroleum Engineering (began 2018)

Starting Point
- Large # of pre-tenure faculty.
- Began with formative peer review triads in new faculty mentoring committee
- Led by a small champion group
- 2 faculty were active in prior cross-dept peer triads (2009-2016)

Process
- Adapted rubric to fit department/discipline
- Used peer review triads to develop & test process, build buy-in
- 2 Disruptors:
  - Dept chair change in 2020
  - New student rating tool (old heuristics didn’t apply)

Current Status
- ALL faculty in triads, organized around course sequences. Generate report for a teaching evaluation committee.
- Rubric, PR protocol for Triad interactions, P&T and annual eval
- Aligned w/other dept processes (assessment)
- $100K AAU dept demonstration award
Department Case Study: CU Boulder
German & Slavic Languages & Literatures

Starting Point
- dept wanted to move beyond SETs in annual merit eval
- held dept listening session before engaging
- action team built on existing evaluation committee
- chair on action team

Process
- updated peer obs w/ guide & process
- annual peer observations used in merit & RPT
- built self-reflection into annual merit
- adapted TQF framework into a rubric for annual merit
- paused work when they finished rubric

Current Status
- shift to top-down college-wide initiative
- change in chair
- 3 committee members retained (all teaching track)
- working to define / emphasize inclusive teaching in the dept
- adapting their merit rubric for RPT

SET = student evaluations of teaching; RPT = reappointment, promotion, & tenure
additional CU Boulder resources http://bit.ly/3ILaDTv
Department Case Study: CU Boulder
Mechanical Engineering

Starting Point
- two consistent champions
- team always included member of dept eval committee
- supportive chair
- broad goal for improving teaching evaluation
- RPT perceived as easier to change than merit

Process
- updated peer obs w/ guide & process
- new guide for student letters
- classroom interview guide
- optional teaching statement guide
- updated faculty mentoring program

Current Status
- shift to college-wide initiative
- chair turnover; new chair is champion
- supporting peer observations by paying observers $
- Workshop series for faculty going up for RPT; focus on writing & reviewing statements
- Rubric for RTP

RPT = reappointment, promotion, & tenure

additional CU Boulder resources http://bit.ly/3ILaDTv
Breakout Discussions

1. What key drivers are you seeing in these case studies?
2. How are the approaches varying across departmental or institutional contexts?
3. What do you find most useful from these examples in relation to your context?
Timeline of Teaching Evaluation Efforts

- **2017**: TEval funded by NSF
- **2018**: NASEM Teaching Eval Convening
- **2019**: NASEM Teaching Eval National Dialogue
- **2021**: AAU Announces Teaching Evaluation Competition (funded early 2022)
- **2022**: HHMI Announces 106 IE3 Institutions (47 in Challenge Area 1)
- **2023**: TEval National KE Summit

Major Events:
- TEval, AAU, BOSE/NASEM, and ASCN join work as “TEC”
- AAU Announces Teaching Evaluation Competition (funded early 2022)
Goal:
Explore how to leverage the combined experience and efforts of the nationwide community of scholars who have been engaged in reforming teaching evaluation through more holistic, multisource methods.

Teaching Evaluation Summit

June 7-9, 2023
HHMI Headquarters
Teaching Evaluation Summit Stats

- 22 universities and colleges
- 6 national organizations
- 12 US states
- 3 Canadian Provinces
- 40 hours to collaborate
Teaching Evaluation Summit Outcomes: Possibilities that were discussed

- A network or “center” for Evolving Postsecondary Teaching Evaluation to Advance Student Learning
- A set of shared values or charter aligned with reformed teaching evaluation
- A marketing campaign to promote equitable and effective teaching evaluation
- Networked improvement communities to accelerate change
- A community of practice to curate and advance research and data on reformed teaching evaluation
Discussion

1. What excites or interests you about the national possibilities?
2. What additional ideas do you have?
3. Would you like to get involved (or suggest others)?
   Please let us know in this form:

or https://tinyurl.com/TeachingEval2023
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THANK YOU

Much more at TEval.net