

CETL-Support for Teaching, Learning, Tenure, and Promotion

Three related domains:

- Student-evaluations
- Peer-evaluations
- Self-evaluations

I. Student-evaluations must be kept in perspective.

- a. Our base instrument is small –two base questions— and can be enriched through the integration of questions that are formatively useful to the instructor. These data give the instructor something they can work with, and we work with faculty on dissecting responses and formulating solutions.
- b. The small N is a common but easily remedied problem; it’s all about establishing buy-in, value (among students), and providing a little time.
- c. Validity. It is critical to remember that SETs measure student *perceptions* of the quality of instruction and course quality.
 - i. A host of factors influence SETs, and they represent a pixel in what is actually a motion picture of teaching. Even among nationally-normed instruments, the general rule of thumb is that student ratings should count no more than 30%-50% of teaching evaluation.
- d. So, we can “make the most of student evaluations” within appropriate parameters, but they should not be used as *the* indicator of instructional effectiveness.
- e. It is possible and advisable to design and implement a “culture of engagement” that’s as easy as “how’s it going?” check-ins with students. CETL has the resources to assist faculty and departments with the integration of a host of efficient, high-impact learning and classroom assessment techniques

II. This brings us to peer-evaluations.

- a. One of the services CETL provides is peer-evaluation of instruction. Working in collaboration with instructors and department heads, we arrange and conduct class and instructional observations designed to provide informed evidence of instructional effort and effectiveness, and –importantly-- strategies to enhance the teaching and learning experience.
- b. Our efforts are research-based and consistently result in (1) immediate improvement in the learning experience, (2) student perceptions of it, (3) the integration of efficient (low-risk, high-yield) teaching strategies that make a difference and scale into other classes, and (4) enhanced student and faculty satisfaction. They also provide faculty and department heads with clear evidence of effort to improve student engagement, learning, and teaching.
- c. Some of the documentation, strategies, and forms governing POI (peer observation of instruction) and SGIDs (small group instructional development) are available on our website at <https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/cetl/peer-observation.htm>.

III. And this brings us to self-evaluation.

- a. The “informed loop” of faculty development in teaching and learning draws together evidence from student-evaluations, peer-evaluations, and self-evaluations to create a dynamic view of instructional effort and effectiveness.
- b. CETL provides the faculty development expertise essential to effective critical self-reflection, the articulation of meaningful teaching statements/philosophies, and a compelling dossier of evidence in pursuit of excellence in teaching and learning.

The important take-away is that faculty need to be given the opportunity to effectively represent their instructional effort and for it to be complemented, understood, and supported at multiple levels. This requires multiple forms of evidence. And CETL is here to help.