Supplementary Teaching Evaluation in the  
College of Arts and Sciences  

Executive Summary

During the summer of 2004, chairs and directors of the College of Arts and Sciences were surveyed to determine how supplementary teaching evaluation was being implemented across the College. The responses of the 24 chairs and directors are summarized as follows.

1. The majority of units in the College of Arts and Sciences reported using at least one type of supplemental teaching evaluation procedure beyond the Student-Teacher Survey instrument. Of the 24 chairs and directors that responded, 19 (79%) reported using supplemental teaching evaluations. Among the five units that did not report the use of supplementary teaching evaluations, one reported that it had considered their use and one said that it was planning to implement them in the future. The unit rejected the idea because it was “reasonably satisfied” with the one in use by the College.

2. Units in the College of Arts and Sciences use a variety of supplemental evaluation procedures. The more common procedures include supplemental teaching narratives, classroom visitation of junior faculty, dossier submission, self-assessment by the instructor, consideration of “extra effort,” and the use of the student advisory committee.

3. To calculate total teaching evaluations scores, there is wide variety among the units in the weighting applied to the Student-Teacher Survey results. Units that reported using supplemental evaluation procedures weighted the Student-Teacher Survey from a low of 5 percent to a high of 80 percent. On average, units that used supplemental teaching evaluations reported relying on the Student-Teacher Survey for about half of the total teaching evaluation.

4. About one third of the units that use supplementary teaching evaluations have formalized their teaching evaluation procedure by putting it in writing.

5. Units report few unique challenges when evaluating teaching. The most commonly reported challenge is performing evaluations in the interdisciplinary units and in settings outside of the classroom (e.g., internships, directing theses and dissertations). Some units noted that there is some variety in types of classes that are taught within a unit (some are more popular) which makes comparison among faculty very difficult. Evaluating distance learning is also an issue of concern.

6. Most chairs and directors reported dissatisfaction with using the Student-Teacher Survey. Some chairs and directors objected to teaching evaluations in principle – suggesting that they are sometime no more than popularity contests that result in “easier” teaching. Some advocated abolishing the student evaluation practice in its current form while others suggested leaving the current system in place.

More detailed results are available in the appendix.
Supplementary Teaching Evaluation in the 
College of Arts and Sciences

Over the summer of 2004, chairs and directors of the College of Arts and Sciences were surveyed to determine how supplementary teaching evaluation was being implemented across the college. The responses of the 24 chairs and directors are summarized in the following sections.

1. The majority of units in the College of Arts and Sciences (79%) reported using at least one type of supplemental teaching evaluation procedure beyond the Student-Teacher Survey instrument.

The following units reported using at least one supplementary teaching evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropology</th>
<th>Modern Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classics and Letters</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film and Video Studies</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Exercise Sciences</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>School of Library Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Science</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>Women’s Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the five units that did not report the use of supplementary teaching evaluations, two reported that they had considered using them. One unit rejected the idea because it was “reasonably satisfied” with the one in use by the college. The second unit is relatively new but intends to include supplemental teaching evaluations in its policy.

2. Units in the College of Arts and Sciences use a variety of supplemental evaluation procedures. Verbatim responses are reported below in random order.

C1: We ask each faculty member to submit a lengthy narrative about each course--i.e. what they hoped to accomplish, what they actually accomplished, any special successes or failures, and special use of technology, etc. As part of this narrative, faculty members are asked to describe the nature of their writing assignments and any special efforts they made to improve the writing performance of their students. Some faculty members respond at length, some do a fairly cursory job. Committee A also visits at least one class of all junior faculty members. On a voluntary basis, all faculty members can submit syllabi, test questions, study guides, etc. We also interview each faculty member each year, and as part of that interview we talk about their teaching.

C2: We do in-class evaluations of all PhD students who stand-alone teach, all tenure track faculty, and all PhDs who teach by the class for us.

C3: Self-assessment by the instructor in the form of a narrative about teaching submitted with annual evaluation materials. We have a curriculum committee that reviews all core courses and all adjunct courses. We do look at committees served on, internships supervised, and other mentoring that faculty self-report. We also look professional development efforts,
responsiveness to departmental needs, and group internship supervision. We have a list of teaching activities that we look at each year at evaluation time, approved by the faculty in 1997.

Under expected activities, we have: 4 in-load courses a year (for tenure/tenure track—more for renewable as negotiated), at least 1 core course a year, intern supervision, advising, graded comprehensive exams, efforts to improve teaching, and quality of teaching.

Under extra effort, we have: new preparations, leading internship groups (if not required by job), more than one core class a year, directing theses, serving on theses and dissertation committees, response to departmental needs, response to departmental emergencies, teaching for other programs (slash listing), group advising sessions, teaching awards, consistently high student evaluations, directed readings, teaching consultations, pedagogical publications, honors classes, and OSLEP.

This list is not intended to be exhaustive, but to suggest things faculty might want to document as part of the evaluation process.

C4: We have faculty fill out a self evaluation of teaching on annual forms, collect syllabi, and arrange annual visits of Committee A members to classes taught by junior faculty.

C5: Teaching is defined as instruction in regularly scheduled classes, one-to-one instruction in independent studies, supervision of internships, mentoring activities, participation on thesis committees, participation on external doctoral committees, and design of instructional materials.

It is recognized that instruction in regularly scheduled classes includes (1) content expertise, (2) instructional delivery skills and characteristics, and (3) instructional design skills.

Faculty members are expected to develop their abilities in all three areas and to integrate and synthesize their contributions in such a manner as to maximize their ability to further the accomplishment of the goals and objectives of the unit.

Assessment

The following elements will be considered in assessing the level of performance in teaching.

1. Mastery of subject matter, as indicated by
   a. possession of a broad knowledge of the discipline and a thorough mastery of knowledge in the faculty member's own area(s) of specialization
   b. ability to relate theory and practice from other disciplines to the subject matter of the courses taught.

2. Curriculum development, as demonstrated through
   a. effective adaptation of existing courses to reflect advances within the field
   b. appropriate modification of existing courses to reflect changes in the unit's curriculum structure.
   c. new course creation to meet the unit's identified needs.

3. Course design, that evidences
   a. ability to organize course materials coherently
b. effectiveness in clearly defining objectives of a course
c. incorporation of research findings from the discipline
d. inclusion of appropriate materials from other disciplines
e. attention to cultural diversity in course content
f. incorporation of information technology into course content
g. ability to redesign instructional materials to incorporate innovative or creative teaching strategies.

4. Development of instructional materials, including
   a. textbooks or other authoring or editing of print media used by others in the discipline
   b. creation of software, such as programs or databases for instructional purposes
   c. other educational or instructional materials.

5. Delivery of instruction, demonstrating
   a. ability to present course materials logically and clearly
   b. adherence to defined objectives throughout the course
   c. ability to convey both abstract and concrete information
   d. ability to stimulate students to read widely, to think critically, and to analyze and synthesize information.
   e. enthusiasm for the subject(s) taught and ability to convey this enthusiasm to students.
   f. effective adoption of innovative or creative teaching strategies
   g. participation in the full range of delivery modes needed by the unit.

6. Mentoring of students, including
   a. advising
   b. accessibility to students outside of class hours
   c. generation of external support for students
   d. publication and presentation activities with students
   e. other assistance in the professional socialization of students
   f. assistance in professional placement.

Sources of evidence for teaching effectiveness

Sources of evidence include but are not limited to the following:
- student evaluations by means of questionnaires
- examples of student performance, such as student papers, theses, or published works
- letters from students
- student comments from course evaluations
- student papers accepted or published that were generated from work with faculty
- student participation in professional associations, workshops, and conferences
- amount of external funding to support students and number of students supported
- syllabi and related instructional materials, including revised syllabi for the same course
- course revisions submitted to the Curriculum Committee in accord with the unit's identified needs
- new courses proposed to the Curriculum Committee in accord with the unit's identified needs
- evidence of methods of assessment of students lecture materials
• evidence of incorporation of information technology into the content of the course
• evidence of incorporation of innovative or creative teaching strategies
• evidence of incorporation of cultural diversity into the content of the course
• evidence of incorporation of research findings from the discipline into the content of the course
• evidence of incorporation of materials from other disciplines into the content of the course
• formal peer evaluation of delivery of instruction
• videotapes of instructional activities
• documentation of advising, including number and range of students advised and formal program plans
• office hours and other methods of contact with students
• outside evaluations of teaching at other institutions, off-campus workshops, and institutes
• support of instructional activities through grants or contracts
• course schedules
• honors, awards, or special recognitions for teaching
• participation in faculty development activities
• certificates or licenses in an area of practice closely related to the instructional area
• invitations to teach or lecture in other schools and departments in areas of subject expertise evidence of assistance in professional placement.

C6: Individual faculty members may use the following items for self evaluation or to assess goal attainment:

Please read carefully and answer all using the following scale:

(1) poor (2) fair (3) good (4) very good (5) excellent

1. Your instructor has a thorough and up-to-date knowledge of course material.
2. Your instructor has shown proficiency in the planning, organization and presentation of information.
3. Your instructor has the ability to stimulate participation, thought, and inquiry by students.
4. Your instructor has been available to answer questions and assist you outside of class time.
5. Your instructor has the ability to clearly communicate and explain course information
6. Your instructor has clearly explained course expectations.
7. Your instructor is approachable and communicates with students in a productive manner.
8. Your instructor has shown a willingness to assist students who are having difficulty mastering course concepts and content
9. Course exams consistently tested material presented in class lectures, class assignments, and assigned readings.
10. Your instructor has used innovative teaching methods to enhance learning
11. When appropriate, your instructor has used technology (such as computer assisted teaching) to enhance student learning

The following is from our approved evaluation policy. Evaluation of teaching performance is based upon indicators such as:
A. Self-evaluation of each class instructed using designated departmental format, when applicable.

B. Peer evaluation by members of Committee A or another faculty member designated by Committee A. Peer review will be conducted for one class per semester for non-tenured faculty and one class per year for tenured faculty.

C. Student evaluations from all classes and student comments in the form of committee interviews or written statements, such as may occur from exit reviews. Student evaluations serve as only one component of evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

D. Evaluation of advising based on data gathered by means of a departmental form completed by undergraduate and graduate students. Advising evaluation forms are distributed to students by a departmental secretary when they complete advising appointments. All students are requested to complete forms and return them to a collection box in the office.

E. Examination of course syllabi and other supportive documents submitted by the faculty member for review.

F. Other activities that should be considered (in evaluation of teaching) include mentoring and supervision of thesis and dissertation research and writing, independent study, directed readings, field experiences, and internships; creativity in information delivery; use of advanced pedagogy; development of new courses; and development of microcomputer applications.

When a faculty member anticipates a heavy load in this area, Committee A can agree to in-load these activities for a semester. If there is an unexpectedly heavy load of supervision of thesis or dissertation research, Directed Reading, Independent Study, etc., an addendum can be added to the evaluation to reflect a negotiated change in % allocated to the teaching load. This will require a Committee A and faculty member signature. Faculty have the option of submitting a summary statement about the outcomes, time spent in supervision, etc. of thesis and dissertation research, directed reading and independent study activities so that these can be considered during annual evaluation.

C7: Individual faculty members select the supplemental evaluation procedures they wish to use.

C8: Faculty members often submit samples of syllabi, handouts, exams, student essays, and URL's for web sites when used. Some professors have opted to use IDEA surveys. Faculty members also write a self-evaluative narrative each year. Junior faculty members are observed by a colleague each year.

C9: We consider the design of courses, the currency of required texts and other assigned reading/reference materials; how tests are designed, the assigning grades, the mentoring and supervision of graduate students, including the number of students directed and committees on which one serves, the number of students receiving graduate degrees, the type of mentoring activities involved with these activities, and the instructor’s teaching load, the complexity of course being evaluated, the number of class preparations during the semester, and the number of initial course offerings. In addition, we consider number of students taught.
For the annual evaluation teaching score, we begin with the assumption that everyone is “very good.” For those whose teaching evaluations are exceptionally good we move them into the outstanding category and for those whose teaching evaluations are exceptionally bad we move them into a lower category. We don’t try to differentiate among the majority of the faculty whose teaching evaluations are in the middle.

Also, other things equal, for those who teach an exceptionally large number of students we move them into the outstanding category; we do the same for those who are exceptionally involved in the supervision of graduate students. We try to avoid placing a lot of weight on the teaching evaluations except to identify people who are on the extremes. We perform annual peer observations of the junior faculty (senior faculty observe junior faculty). While these observations are mainly for the purpose of building tenure cases, we consider these observations when we do annual evaluations of teaching. They help to put a face on the more objective data.

C10: We solicit material from faculty with the following: "Course information for classes you taught during 2003 (number of students, syllabi, handouts, exams, etc.), and any other relevant information (advising, thesis and doctoral supervision, etc.). If you would like Committee A to review the comments on your teaching evaluations, please include those with your course information."

And here is what we say in our criteria that gets sent to the Dean's office and faculty: "In the area of teaching, we took into account course evaluations, that is, the mean scores, percentiles, and the comments on those questions that addressed the quality of teaching when made available. Other evidence of teaching quality insofar as it was available (e.g., course materials) was also considered and given considerable weight.

Another factor that we took into account was working on, and, in particular, completion of dissertations and theses. Quality advising at both the graduate and undergraduate level was considered. We also noted whether the individual was teaching a course for the first time, had received a teaching grant, or had done other "teaching-related work" (e.g., participating in teaching seminars or innovative use of information technology). Another factor taken into account was large classes because they often pose special problems.

C11: Untenured faculty members’ classes are visited each semester by senior faculty. Each faculty member is asked to maintain a file of teaching materials for each course, accessible by other faculty, and especially Committee A. These materials are used in annual evaluation process.

C12: The Chair and Committee A collect and read course syllabi, senior faculty visit a number of classes taught by untenured faculty each spring, and the Chair reads the student evaluation summaries on all courses each term and examines grading of all courses each term.

C13: For Adjuncts: Class visits, evaluations of course materials, interviews with select students.

C14: Our faculty members write self-evaluations of their performance in each course.

C15: Peer review of teaching, evaluation of syllabi.

C16: The annual teaching evaluation has three components: student evaluation data, peer evaluation by Committee A, and non-class involvement. A small number occasionally use Dee Fink’s IDEA evaluation.
C17: Peer evaluations, but they are not really considered important.

C18: Faculty prepares a statement on teaching, research and service along with submitting a mini-CV and CV.

C19: We make active use of the student advisory committee and it reports to us on what is working and what needs work.

3. To calculate total teaching evaluations scores, there is wide variety among the units in the weighting applied to the Student-Teacher Survey results.

Units that reported using supplemental evaluation procedures weighted the Student-Teacher Survey from a low of 5 percent to a high of 80 percent. On average, units that used supplemental teaching evaluations reported relying on the Student-Teacher Survey for about 49 percent of the total teaching evaluation. Verbatim comments from chairs and directors are provided below:

C1: I would say we use the numbers only to find the statistical outliers. Occasionally, someone is off the charts, either positively or negatively, and the numerical evidence helps us identify potential problems. I personally read through many of the students' comments: while most comments are not all that helpful, certain patterns sometimes do emerge.

C5: We employ a truly holistic, full-dossier approach to evaluation in all areas of faculty responsibility. Assigning a percentage to any component would be very artificial.

C6: Standardized, so it varies among Committee A members

C8: 50??% is the base but it can be adjusted a great deal based on the supplementary materials mentioned above.

C10: We try not to quantify these sorts of things, since they are not quantifiable.

C14: This is a very unscientific estimate and one that probably varies from one Committee A to another.

4. Most units have not formalized their teaching evaluation procedure in writing.

C1: No, we are working on doing so now, but it is an issue I approach with a great deal of trepidation.

C2: No, all of the instructors/professors who will get in-class visits know that this will happen because they get the email that assigns tenured faculty members to evaluate specific tenure-track, etc. faculty members. The policy itself, however, is not in writing.

C3: Yes

C4: No!

C5: Yes
C6: No, overall procedure has been standardized (see above), but the specific weight that is given to STE's has not been standardized

C7: Yes

C8: Basically yes. We list suggested materials for inclusion but it is up to the faculty to decide.

C9: No

C10: Not in any official document but (we do hand out criteria each year).

C11: Yes, the department's document, "Evaluation of Faculty Performance in Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities," specifies this.

C12: No, but we temper student evaluations taking into consideration the degree of challenge for courses taught and with the input we receive each spring when we visit untenured faculty classrooms.

C13: Not yet, but we will.

C14: No, it is formalized in the sense that (almost) everyone routinely provides these self evaluations. The use we make of these is not formalized.

C15: We indicate STE's, peer-review, and review of syllabi as methods of evaluation in our criteria for tenure, promotion, and evaluation but do not designate percentages.

C16: Yes

C17: Yes, but Committee A has flexibility in interpreting the scores.

C18: Yes

5. Units report few unique challenges when evaluating teaching.

The most commonly reported challenge is performing evaluations in the interdisciplinary units and in settings outside of the classroom (e.g., internships, directing theses and dissertations). Some units noted that there is some variety in types of classes that are taught within a unit (some are more popular) which makes comparison among faculty very difficult. Evaluating distance learning is also an issue of concern. Verbatim responses are provided below.

C1: I think all units face more or less the same difficulties--i.e. how do you make use of a hopelessly flawed instrument, one that cannot discern between the teaching of a quiet, reflective, thoughtful scholar who the students find boring and some showman or showwoman who dresses up like King George III or Joan d'Arc, puts on a dog and pony act, and is loved by students.

C2: I doubt that we face any unique challenges.
C3: It is hard to assess your colleagues when they teach in other areas than your own. As we are interdisciplinary, this is a challenge. Also, too much looking/suggesting raises cries of academic freedom.

C4: Many of the students in our service courses wish they were elsewhere.

C5: The unit’s extensive involvement in distance education introduces additional variables into the evaluation process.

C6: Until the recent revision of our T/P/E guidelines, mentoring and supervision of thesis and dissertation research and writing, independent study, directed readings, field experiences, and supervision of internships were not quantified in teaching workload. They were performed in addition to a 2/2 course load.

C7: None that I can think of.

C8: I’m not sure any are unique. We have upper-division courses that mix majors and non-majors who have almost no background in our discipline which presents problems in both teaching and assessment—but so do other units.

C9: I doubt this is very unique but it is a problem we have to deal with. We are blessed in that everyone in the department is at least a pretty decent teacher. This makes it hard to differentiate among the faculty when assigning annual evaluation teaching scores. Hence, the system mentioned above where we start with “very good” and then raise people above this category if something about their teaching merits special consideration (very high teaching evaluations, taught a lot of students, or supervised a lot of graduate students). Fortunately, we have not recently had to adjust people downward. But our scoring system is a lot like gymnastics judging in that we only use a small part of the scale and anyone not scoring at the top ends up feeling slighted.

C10: Nothing special. To provide quality teaching evaluations requires considerable resources. We do the best we can with the resources we have available.

C11: I don’t think there is anything terribly unique; we face the same problems that many departments have. Faculty have different perspectives about what constitutes effective teaching and about the goals of courses. It is often difficult to achieve a consensus in assessing teaching, either in the course of peer reviews or surveys of course materials.

C12: It’s apples and oranges. Some of our offerings are larger, general education courses that are much more challenging to teach. By contrast, senior faculty, for the most part, have settled into more advanced courses that are smaller and populated by people who want to be there (have elected them). In this comparison, some of the younger faculty members appear less effective. As I indicated above, senior faculty and the Chair visit a number of classes of each untenured faculty each Spring. This is a chore since, at present, we have more untenured than tenured faculty.

C13: An unconventional, interdisciplinary program.

C14: I think we face much the same issues as many other departments. Personally I think I know good teaching when I see it but I’m convinced there’s no way to quantify it. In any case,
what's good practice for one teacher may be very poor for another. I also have serious questions as to whether teaching improves or deteriorates because of evaluations - probably not an avenue we want to investigate!

C15: As an interdisciplinary program, our faculty members teach in the humanities and social sciences. Disciplinary differences must be taken into consideration.

C16: Documenting non-class and mentoring activities

C17: We focus too much on the College (and Departmental) percentages, ignoring everything else.

C18: Sometimes students do not adapt easily to international instructors and vice versa.

C19: Because we are an interdisciplinary program and not a department, we have many faculty teaching who are in other departments and who teach in our unit as an overload, so it is not their primary “job.” We also have adjuncts who tend to be very professional but not full time.

C20: Since we are a program rather than a department, teaching of courses that support our major is done and evaluated in departments. The few courses that are taught under the unit’s rubric are primarily taken by our majors and are relatively small, i.e., around 10 students, and we get lots of informal feedback.

C21: Finding evaluation methods other than the standard CAS form.

C22: Most of our teaching is scheduled by the other department in which our faculty members are appointed. Also, our faculty members are housed in those other departments. Finally, it is difficult to develop a standard evaluation tool, as our faculty members are evaluated jointly by both units, and the units vary in how they evaluate teaching. We have developed a habit of deferring to the evaluation criteria of each discipline.

C23: Perhaps most relevant is the lack of any "norming" data contained on the current CAS evaluation. once there were questions concerning the student’s expected grade, student's overall GPA, and year in school which can all play a role in interpreting the scores.

C24: None.

6. Most chairs and directors reported dissatisfaction with using the Student-Teacher Survey.

Some chairs and directors objected to teaching evaluations in principle – suggesting that they are sometime no more than popularity contests that result in “easier” teaching. The following verbatim recommendations were made to improve how teaching is evaluated in the college:

C1: I would advocate abolishing the student evaluations in their current form and let each unit decide how it wants to evaluate teaching. If some units believe in the kind of numerical data these forms generate, then let them have at it. Other units can make use of any and all of the alternatives listed above.

C2: Fix the Student-Teacher Survey instrument so that it allows the students to evaluate the teachers in a way that is statistically meaningful. Once that is done, we could consider some
other things, but without a solid base that suggests what the consumers in the classroom are thinking, any other efforts are not so useful.

C3: Somehow assessing outcomes better, and then really holding faculty accountable for the outcomes. I don’t think the current student evaluation process is sufficient or effective.

C4: I think that the current student evaluations are the best and most efficient way.

2. Processing of summer evaluations.
3. Expert review, revision, and redesign of the course evaluation form to facilitate effective formative and summative evaluation.

C6: Conduct evaluations at a time other than the last 2 weeks of a semester

C7: None

C8: I see it as a local issue--more appropriately decided at the department level; however, exchanging ideas across the college is useful. We can take up what fits in our departmental context and leave that which does not.

C9: I recommend that the College not obsess over the evaluation of teaching. The method we use now is fairly unobtrusive and its costs are pretty much in line with the returns for doing it (which are not much). Putting a lot more effort into evaluating teaching (more work for the faculty being evaluated and a lot more work for those doing the evaluating) would surely not be worth the extra effort. The faculty’s time and my time can be much better spent doing other things unless it can be shown there are great rewards for more stringent teaching evaluation methods.

C10: None. Teaching evaluations should remain a department matter and not a college matter. It is essential that those departments who are managing evolutions (in particular teaching evolutions) reasonably well not be required to alter their procedure. Don't try to fix what isn't broken because it may be broken some place else.

C11: I would abolish the obligation to use the student evaluations. They consume an enormous amount of time, they often are misconstrued as signs of effective teaching when they probably indicate something quite different, and they almost always demoralize instructors.

C12: I have no unique insights here. It seems to me that much is being done. We are certainly making an effort in our unit.

C13: None.

C14: I would recommend that the statistical evaluations or summaries of the evaluations be abandoned. The raw data has a chance to be beneficial, these analyses have little merit in my opinion.

C15: There should be less reliance on STE's. There is a tendency for some faculty to make courses less demanding in order to receive higher teaching evaluations.

C16: None.
C17: Make the student evaluations more informative so that they can be really used to improve teaching and get rid of the percentages. These percentages are designed so that we will always have winner and losers no matter how much we improve teaching or fail to improve it; at the institutional level they are meaningless. We also aggregate across classes in computing these percentages that have very little in common. The information that we get is confounded with a number of variables that are never identified. Yes, they measure the popularity of the teacher, but I am not sure that they measure much more than that. It is not that measuring popularity is bad, but is not really very informative.

The evaluations are also distorted when we turn an average of say 3 (good) from the students to a very low college percentage that say that the faculty member is horrible. Also, there is a tendency to game these percentages, e.g., leaving out difficult material; you do not want to make your class very hard. We have good teachers who are often “forced” to bring down their expectations of their students and make the classes easier. We may in long run be damaging the University’s reputation by “forcing” faculty to keep the classes “simple.” What is important is what our students know when they graduate.

C18: An analysis of if and how gender and age affect evaluations might be valuable.

C19: Besides just numbers and scores, I think insisting on written comments is important too. A summary of written comments means a lot. Attached here are the written comments for my last class in June. These tell me as a professor more than mere numbers ever can.

Written comments, for instance, can help bring up, for instance, how many students actually become majors because they are inspired by their professor, something that happens a lot for us!

C20: None.

C21: None.

C22: None.

C23: None.

C24: I appreciate that you are working on this very complex issue and think some of the recommendations listed above are quite helpful. One suggestion I might offer that is appropriate for certain disciplines, is to evaluate “cultural competence” in teaching. This of course is vital to disciplines like social work, psychology, sociology, human relations etc. Of course cultural competence could be evaluated by in-house instruments in the relevant disciplines.