

# Report of SET Task Force

SENATE SESSION - SET TASK FORCE. MAY 12, 2023.

# Task Force Members

- ▶ Dennis Jackson (chair)
- ▶ Erika Kustra
- ▶ Pierre Boulos
- ▶ Jessica Raffoul
- ▶ Laura Chittle
- ▶ Jill Grant
- ▶ Nick Baker
- ▶ Marium Tolson-Murttty
- ▶ Beverly Jacobs
- ▶ Renée Wintermute
- ▶ Lorraine Chandler
- ▶ Edwin Tam (administrative lead)
- ▶ Cindy Wills (administrative support)
- ▶ Florencia Cristoffanini (research/analysis support)
- ▶ Maddy Blazer (research/analysis support)
- ▶ Dave Andrews\*
- ▶ Sirinart Ananoranich\*

\* Review capacity.

# Overview of Main Activities

- ▶ Development of Revised UCAPT Form
  - ▶ Primarily reflects new RTP/RPP criteria being developed by AAUs for tenure track and AAS personnel
  - ▶ Relates to survey - one potential input instrument
- ▶ Policy adjustments for greater clarity and to reflect proposed new instrument
- ▶ New Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPTs) survey development
- ▶ Recommendations for ongoing activities

# Revised UCAPT Form

- ▶ Current UCAPT evaluation form.
- ▶ Uses 7-point scale – mirrors current SET survey.
- ▶ Evaluation categories are prescriptive.
- ▶ Inconsistent format between sections
- ▶ Cannot be used effectively with new AAU RTP/RPP criteria that are significantly more comprehensive.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR  
UCAPT RATING AND EVALUATION FORM

**I. EVALUATION OF TEACHING ABILITY AND PERFORMANCE**

**List the RTP Committee's principal sources and bases of information for the evaluation below:**

[For example, for sources: personal observation, videos, AAU or other seminars, SET reports and other feedback, alumni surveys, clinical/field reports, and for information: teaching dossier, number and average size of courses evaluated, the number of different courses taught, the levels of instruction provided, the period of time in years covered by this evaluation, and a summary of the professor's teaching evaluation scores in relation to a profile of comparable evaluations from the Program. If the Optional UCAPT Teaching Dossier is provided, please refer to relevant contents specifically. Also, see Article 5:08 (c)(i)-(xiii) of the Collective Agreement.]

**I. A) The RTP Committee evaluates the candidate's teaching as follows:**

Use numeral symbols:      (7) Outstanding      (6) Very Good      (5) Good      (4) Adequate  
   (3) Poor      (2) Very Poor      (1) Extremely Poor      N/A (Not Applicable)

**Overall Assessment:**

- (a) Course Outlines \_\_\_\_\_
- (b) Organization of class \_\_\_\_\_
- (c) Preparation for classes \_\_\_\_\_
- (d) Clarity of communication \_\_\_\_\_
- (e) Ability to stimulate students' interest \_\_\_\_\_
- (f) Responsiveness to students' questions and suggestions \_\_\_\_\_
- (g) Quality of evaluation procedures \_\_\_\_\_
- (h) Quality of instructional materials \_\_\_\_\_

# Revised UCAPT Form

- ▶ Proposed revised UCAPT evaluation form.
- ▶ 7-point scale is eliminated.
- ▶ Evaluation categories will come from AAU RTP/RPP criteria categories.
- ▶ Consistent format.
- ▶ Provides greater opportunity for insightful commentary.

## I. EVALUATION OF TEACHING ABILITY AND PERFORMANCE

### A. Committee's Sources of Evidence

List the RTP/RPP Committee's principal sources and bases of information for the evaluation.

*Sources of evidence could include but are not limited to teaching philosophy statements, EDI statements, teaching dossiers, colleague and student perceptions of and/or feedback on teaching, external reviewers' comments, contributions to teaching, educational material development, and educational leadership. **Student perceptions of teaching (SPT) results cannot be used as the sole source of information.***

*If a Teaching Dossier is provided, please refer to relevant contents specifically. See also WUFA Collective Agreement.*

### B. Committee's Evaluation based on Teaching Criteria

#### Position's Weighting for the Teaching Criteria (X%)

*Traditional weighting 40%, variations clarified in RTP Criteria or in position descriptions/letters.*

*Please insert the key Criterion/Indicators from your AAU.*

**INSERT your AAU RTP/RPP Teaching Criteria here:**

<b>Criterion/Indicator</b>	<b>Summary of Evidence Used in Evaluation</b>	<b>Committee Evaluation: Eg Unsatisfactory / Satisfactory / Good / Excellent</b>

If the unit criteria do not explicitly recognize and/or take into account EDI and Indigenization, or the unique and individualized contributions made by Black, Indigenous, and racialized faculty please see the WUFA Collective Agreement for guidance. *If applicable*, please explain how these aspects have been considered.

# Revised UCAPT Form

- ▶ Proposed revised UCAPT evaluation form.
- ▶ Rubric provided for guidance – can be modified to reflect AAU.
- ▶ Emphasis is to comprehensively review teaching, research, service.
- ▶ Provides greater opportunity for insightful commentary.

## C. Committee's Overall Evaluation of Teaching Ability and Performance

### Modify rubric to be appropriate for AAU

Evaluation Level	Description. These descriptions are only guidelines to understand the broad differences between evaluation levels. These descriptions are for illustration only, and not all may apply. AAU RTP/RPP committees may redefine this rubric as appropriate.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	The candidate has performed well below normal expectations as outlined in the teaching criteria. The teaching methods and approaches employed may be inappropriate or inadequate for the intend learning outcomes. The relationship the candidate has established with students is poor and is detracting from effectively teaching the expected content. The candidate has demonstrated little or no initiative to improve teaching through additional training and/or mentorship opportunities, nor have they acted on meaningful feedback.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The candidate has performed within the bounds of normal expectations as outlined in the teaching criteria. The teaching methods and approaches employed generally fulfil the intended learning outcomes. The candidate has a productive but not remarkable rapport with students. Lesser performance in one aspect (e.g., in class instruction) may be balanced by greater performance in another aspect related to teaching (e.g., student supervision). The candidate is aware of opportunities to improve teaching (e.g., workshops, etc.) but may have only participated in limited opportunities.
<b>Good</b>	The candidate has performed above normal expectations as outlined in the teaching criteria. The teaching methods and approaches employed fulfil the intended learning outcomes, and has stimulated the interest or enthusiasm of students and others. The candidate has a productive rapport with students. Lesser performance in one aspect (e.g., in class instruction) may be balanced by significantly greater performance in another aspect related to teaching (e.g., student supervision).
<b>Excellent</b>	The candidate has performed significantly above normal expectations as outlined in the teaching criteria. The teaching methods and approaches employed fulfil the intended learning outcomes, and has stimulated high levels of interest or enthusiasm by students and others. The candidate has a strong, productive rapport with students. The candidate may provide superior mentorship or assistance to students within the context of teaching.

Clearly state and comment on how the applicant has performed with respect to specific AAU RTP/RPP criteria.

# Changes to Policy and Bylaw

- ▶ Policy references to SET, 7-point rating system, and other legacy references removed.
- ▶ Remove correspondence key/guide for matching Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) and UCAPT Categories.

## Policy on Student Evaluations-Perceptions of Teaching (SPET) and Mandatory Administration of SPETs

(Senate-approved: March 17, 2004)

(Senate-amended: May 12, 2004, April 11, 2005, June 5, 2008, May 5, 2009, November 13, 2015, May 13, 2022)

The attached Student Perceptions Evaluation-of Teaching Form will be used for collecting information on students' views of instructors and courses.

### Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPT) Form

### The Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Form (This form will be printed back-to-back on one sheet)

#### Student Evaluation of Teaching Form

Course: \_\_\_\_\_ Section: \_\_\_ Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructions: Please note that the results of this evaluation will be available to the instructor only AFTER final course grades have been submitted.

The results may be used by:

STUDENTS for aid in course selection;

INSTRUCTORS for feedback on teaching;

ADMINISTRATORS for decisions on career advancement for instructors and for program planning.

Please complete the evaluation form honestly and seriously!

Please respond to the statements below for your instructor and then for the course, bearing in mind that there are wide variations in class size and subject matter at the University of Windsor. (If the statement is not applicable in this course, please mark the "NA" column.)

<u>A. The instructor...</u>	<u>extremely poor</u>	<u>very poor</u>	<u>poor</u>	<u>adequate</u>	<u>good</u>	<u>very good</u>	<u>outstanding</u>	<u>NA</u>
<u>1. presented material in an organized, well-planned manner</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>2. used instructional time well</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>3. explained content clearly with appropriate use of examples</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>4. was a clear and effective speaker</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>5. communicated enthusiasm and interest in the course material</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>

# Changes to Policy and Bylaw

- ▶ Improved clarity.
- ▶ More comprehensive.

## Bylaw 23:

8

3.1.1 A candidate for renewal of contract must have competent teaching ability as demonstrated by such instruments as student evaluations, sample course outlines, a UCAPT teaching dossier, and other evidence as provided by the candidate, **including Indigenous ways of knowing**. The required statement by the AAU Head must contain a detailed assessment of the candidate's commitment to and ability in teaching.

3.1.2 While the ~~measure~~ **evaluation of** teaching performance may be based ~~primarily~~ **partially on the information provided** from Senate-approved student ~~evaluations~~ **perceptions of teaching**, it must be supplemented by an evaluation by the AAU Renewal, Tenure and Promotion Committee and a report from the AAU Head that do not rely solely on student ~~evaluations~~ **perceptions of teaching**. The AAU Head's report will be derived from the candidate's performance review and will comment explicitly on the following points: [...]



# Research and Data Gathering

- ▶ Survey of teaching personnel
  - ▶ Fall 2020
- ▶ Survey of students
  - ▶ Winter 2022
- ▶ Summary Research Report on issues of bias and validity with SETs
  - ▶ Winter 2021
  - ▶ Updated 2023

# Development of Revised Survey

10

- ▶ Chair hosted a focus group of select faculty members from Senate, representing all faculties, including sessional members
  - ▶ Fall 2022
- ▶ Met twice with Senate Student Caucus
  - ▶ Fall 2022 and Winter 2023
- ▶ Two pilots using revised instrument
  - ▶ Student Think-Aloud review of questions Nov 2022
  - ▶ Initial, limited pilot December 2022
  - ▶ Larger pilot April 2023
- ▶ Continued analysis of feedback from faculty and students

# Draft SPT Survey



**Instructor Delivery – 6 Questions**



**Grading Expectations & Feedback – 6 Questions**



**Positive Learning Environment – 6 Questions**



**Facilitation of Learning – 4 Questions**



**Workload & Difficulty – 3 Questions**



**Student Motivation – 4 Questions**



**Global Questions – 3 Questions**



**Student Learning Questions – 5 Questions**













# Student Learning Questions

33	My understanding of this subject compared to the beginning of the course is...	Not much different	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Greatly enhanced
34	I learned something in this course that is valuable.	Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree
35	The instructor helped me see how the knowledge and skills I was gaining in this course relate to my program.	Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree
36	To what extent do you believe that skills you acquired in this course will transfer to future courses or activities?	Not at all	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Very great extent
37	How confident are you that you can communicate what you learned in this class to others?	Not very confident	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Very confident

# Recommendations

- ▶ Following approval, establish a **Steering Group** to monitor SPT use and review issues as they develop.
  - ▶ Review potential for bias as SPTs are rolled out.
  - ▶ Establish process for removing SPTs that are inappropriate.
  - ▶ Review and suggest best practices for SPTs, including developing guidelines.
  - ▶ Develop guidelines for interpreting SPT results, including how to provide feedback based on broad categories (e.g., Course Organization) as well as individual items.
  - ▶ Examine process for instructors who would like to include additional questions.
  - ▶ Review and recommend best practices for timelier implementation of SPT and quicker turnaround of SPT results.
  - ▶ Review and recommend best practices for encouraging greater student participation in survey, such as using QR codes for easier access, and potential incentives for students to participate.
- ▶ Establish **continuous improvement approach** – survey and related processes should be reviewed intermittently and modified as necessary to serve student and faculty feedback needs.



# The Task Force Original Mandate

20

## Summary Points:

- Review the existing Student Evaluation of Teaching questionnaire
- Identify areas for improvement based on research into best practices.
- Propose changes where they require institutional approvals;
- Develop, test, and implement changes where viable under current bylaw and policy;
- Consider possible changes to policy;
- Provide advisory support for a well-documented and systematically evaluated pilot project; and
- Implement a flexible, extensible online system comparable to those in use at an increasing number of institutions.
- **Obtain feedback from students, and to give students a voice.**

# Pilot Surveys

- ▶ Fall 2022: **66** questions plus demographics
  - ▶ 46 Instructor/Course questions
  - ▶ 14 Learning questions
  - ▶ 3 Global questions
  - ▶ 3 *a priori* motivation questions
- ▶ Winter 2023: **48** questions plus demographics
  - ▶ 32 Instructor/Course questions
  - ▶ 5 Motivation questions
  - ▶ 3 Global questions
  - ▶ 8 Learning questions

Median completion time for pilot 2 was 7 minutes, 75% took less than 10 minutes and 86% took less than 15 minutes.

# Two Surveys of Teaching Personnel and Students

- ▶ Overall students are more positive toward SETs
- ▶ A plurality of faculty wanted the name to change away from SET
- ▶ Faculty felt SETs should only be used for feedback/improvement purposes
  - ▶ Students echoed this, but also did not want critical feedback to be ignored.
- ▶ Both groups were asked what they wished to rate or be rated on with surprising agreement.
- ▶ Students noted *some* anomalies in the administration of SETs
  - ▶ Instructor remaining in the room and/or handling SETs themselves.

# Other Questions Asked on Revised SPT

23

## ▶ **Motivation Questions**

- ▶ *When I enrolled in this course I was... (not/very interested in content)*

## ▶ **Global Questions**

- ▶ *The overall quality of instruction in this course was (poor/excellent)*

## ▶ **Learning Questions**

- ▶ *My understanding of this subject compared to the beginning of the course is... (not changed/greatly enhanced)*

# Developing a Revised Student Perception of Teaching (SPT)

24

- ▶ **Respect for students\***
  - ▶ *The instructor treated students...(Disrespectfully/Respectfully)*
- ▶ **Lecture ability of instructor**
  - ▶ *The instructor was able to communicate complex ideas clearly*
- ▶ **Accessibility/approachability of instructor\***
  - ▶ *The instructor displayed interest in students' learning*
- ▶ **Instructor preparedness\***
  - ▶ *For each class, the instructor was...(poorly/well prepared)*
- ▶ **Organization of course\***
  - ▶ *The course assignments helped me understand course material*
- ▶ **Instructor enthusiasm\***
  - ▶ *The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content*

Categories represent an overlap between what students indicated they would like to provide feedback on and what they indicated they felt confident they could provide feedback on. Asterisks (\*) denote categories faculty said they would most like feedback on.



# Overall Comments on Revised SPT

25

- ▶ Most questions are on a semantic differential scale to encourage more careful reading of items, as well as other survey advantages.
  - ▶ *Instructions for assignments were...Confusing or unclear/Very clear*
- ▶ Aiming to have 20 or fewer course/instructor questions
- ▶ Retain global, learning, and motivation questions
- ▶ Retain more extensive demographics until proper bias analyses can be performed
- ▶ Current proposed SPT based on:
  - ▶ Feedback from faculty and students (including think aloud exercise)
  - ▶ Analysis of limited but helpful data
  - ▶ Examination of item wording