

Complementing Student Evaluations with Additional Measures of Teaching: Supplemental Material

This supplemental material offers helpful background information and implementation guidance for those looking for additional support.

Scholarship on pedagogy strongly recommends that the use of SETs in evaluating teaching be supplemented by other methods of evaluation, but many academic workplaces struggle to implement a robust system of additional measures.

This section of the Toolkit has two different concerns, one with defining “effective teaching” and the other with identifying and implementing additional measures.

(1.) Defining “effective teaching.” The criteria that teaching be “effective” generally appears in the list of criteria for merit-based salary and documents specifying criteria for promotion and tenure. Ideally, these documents should be formative and summative.

Conversations about the definition of “effective teaching” need to happen in the spaces where these documents (criteria lists for merit-based and for promotion-based increases) are produced and evaluated. Here are some ways these conversations can take place:

- Promotion and Tenure committees can recommend departments to use [the Rollins College Peer Evaluation of Teaching site](#) to provide an account of what effective teaching looks like in their disciplines.
- Guidelines for promotion and tenure should be tuned to the ACS documents. This may require deliberation by faculty members and alterations to faculty handbooks.
- Annual evaluation procedures should also be tuned to the ACS documents.

(2.) Implementing additional teaching measures. Additional measures for assessing and evaluating “effective teaching” often need to be implemented at the departmental level. The steps below are tactical and related primarily to departmental implementation, however the steps below assume that a coordination team is also attending to change-management and communication/inclusion issues already noted above and that are considered best-practice for any systemic shift to stick.

Step 1: Identifying the documents that specify the mechanisms for evaluating teaching. These documents might include:

- Faculty Handbook
- Departmental Promotion and Tenure criteria
- Personnel procedures

Step 2: Amending the documents as needed. Stakeholders must follow university procedures for amending these documents to require additional measures of teaching and SETs. Communication is critical. Involve faculty in the process (whether responsible for recommending, or consulting on emerging approaches, or informed throughout the process) well before any change is complete. The type and timing of communication depends on the institution’s culture.

Step 3: Planning a workshop for departments tasked with imagining change or augmenting SETs: Stakeholders might need guidance in identifying and adopting additional measures. A workshop run by a campus Teaching and Learning Center using [the Toolkit material](#) would be an appropriate venue for these workshops. The workshop could be run by:

- An interested faculty member, identified by the Faculty Senate or academic leadership
- A faculty expert in evaluation
- An outside consultant facilitated by the ACS.

Include the registrar's office in the process.

Step 4: Attending the workshop: Executive-level academic leadership (such as the CAO) could sponsor a series of workshops for different groups of faculty with an interest or stake implementing additional measures:

- A workshop for interested faculty
- A workshop for members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee
- A workshop for Departmental Chairs or invested departmental representatives (perhaps each department could select a representative to report back on how to implement changes)
- A workshop for staff such as registrars who need to implement these changes

Step 5: Accountability for change: After the workshop, each department will need to implement the changes needed. This could take place:

- Through departmental meetings or other departmental-level decision making process
- Through another university body (such as the teaching center) which develops a new or alters the old SET and offers it to the department for adoption.

Resources needed:

- Funds to compensate someone to run the workshop
- Stipends to encourage faculty to attend the workshop
- Stipends for departments to adopt these changes
- Functional and available gathering space for the workshop

Potential obstacles:

- Insufficient compensation for faculty involvement
- Lack of campus leadership

Assessment: Consider a basic survey (see the [Sample Workshop Survey](#)).