



RUTGERS

University Senate
Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee
(FPAC)
December 2017

Charge A-1709 - Proposal to Improve Evaluation
of Teaching at Rutgers

Charge A-1709

- Proposal to Improve Evaluation of Teaching at Rutgers: Review the Proposal on a Program to Improve How Rutgers Evaluates Teaching as well as input received from the Senate's Instruction, Curricula and Advising Committee (ICAC, Charge A-1709, response due to Executive Committee by October 24, 2017), and make appropriate recommendations. Respond to Senate Executive Committee by November 20, 2017. [Issued September 2017]

A Proposal to Improve the Evaluation of Teaching at Rutgers University

- The proposal will provide two forms of evaluation of teaching: summative and formative. Summative evaluation has been defined as retrospective and is reviewed as part of a personnel decision (reappointment, promotion, or tenure). Formative evaluation is prospective and is designed to help faculty improve teaching.
- Revision of SIRS question
- Peer review of teaching
- Teaching Portfolio
- Frequency of review of instructors
- Individual school and departments will be required to produce an overall summary assessment rubric for each faculty member that will have at least three well- defined standards for good teaching.

Proposed Timeline for Implementation

- Each Chancellor will establish a Teaching Evaluation Council (TEC) chaired by the Provost or a Vice Chancellor. Proposals recommend these councils to be formed by October 15, 2017
- Each school will develop a *plan for the evaluation of teaching* by March 1, 2018.
- Each department within a school will be required to prepare a systematic plan for teaching evaluation, drawing on the assistance of their dean's office, their Chancellor's TEC and the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research (CTAAR).

Proposed Timeline for Implementation

- Deans will solicit teaching evaluation plans from each department, which will be due on or before March 1, 2018, and will approve or request modifications of those plans by April 1, 2018.
- The TECs will send a written report to the deans based on their review of the initial teaching evaluation plans by September 1, 2018.
- The new teaching evaluation plans will be used for the promotion process for AY2018-2019 beginning September 1, 2018

Timeline for implementation

- The current SIRS will remain in place through Fall 2018
- During the fall 2018 semester, the Student Instructional Ratings Survey will be revised as discussed above.
- In Spring 2019, the new SIRS will be used university-wide.

Previous reports AY2016-AY2017

- Response to Charge S-1510: Student Teaching Evaluations, and Best Practices in Evaluation of Teaching 2015 – April 2017 by ICAC
- Response to Charge S-1511: Personnel Consideration Related to Student Evaluations, and Best Practices in Evaluation of Teaching – April 2017 by FPAC

Review of the A Proposal to Improve the Evaluation of Teaching at Rutgers University

- ICAC
 - Questions used on the SIRS
 - How student evaluations are conducted
 - Rename of student evaluation survey
- FPAC
 - Recommendation not to use SIRS standard questions for personnel decisions
 - Recommendation for peer evaluation of teaching
- New Brunswick Faculty Council
 - SIRS: It should not be used in summative evaluations for rehiring, retention, or promotion; if used for formative evaluation, it needs to be corrected for its many biases.
- Newark Faculty Council
 - Recommending using the Law School's teaching evaluation process as an example for the developing the teaching evaluation rubric

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the University Senate recommends that:

1. Peer evaluation should be used for evaluation of teaching for the promotion and tenure process and for renewals of all tenure-track, non-tenure track, contingent, and part-time lecturer faculty.
2. Teaching evaluations should be coupled with professional development.
3. Instructors have the right to respond through a formal procedure to the evaluation of their teaching
4. The personnel forms be revised to remove the use of SIRS survey questions 9 and 10 and that the proposed two standard questions under the “Proposal to Improve Evaluation of Teaching at Rutgers” not be added.

5. End the use of SIRS survey questions 9 and 10 for personnel decisions for part time lecturer and all other contingent faculty, lecturers, or instructors employed by Rutgers University.
6. Departments establish specific criteria for peer in-class observation as well as training programs for peer reviewers.
7. CTAAR, or some other appropriate group, develop a basic template for teaching portfolios that could then be modified based on disciplinary/departmental differences.
8. If it is determined that PTLs must, as recommended in the Task Force report, also submit teaching portfolios, a separate basic template for PTLs be developed.

9. Rather than two “standard” questions, a meaningful core of four or five questions be developed as the basic Standard Instructional Rating Survey (SIRS). Student input should be included only as part of the development process and should not be used for personnel decisions.
10. Instructors and departments should be regularly reminded that they have the option to add questions that might be particularly relevant for that course or that department to the survey.
11. To increase completion rates and make the results more meaningful, schools and units should have instructors give students time in class to complete the SIRS on their own mobile devices.