

Task Force to Enhance Learning & Teaching (TFELT) Proposal

June 4, 2021

Table of Contents

Tripartite Charge	3
Executive Summary	3
Part One: Multi-Measures System to Evaluate Teaching	5
Comprehensive Multi-Measures System to Evaluate Teaching	6
Timeline for Incremental Implementation	8
Workload Impact of Proposed System	9
Student Feedback for Use in the Review of Teaching	11
Summative Student Feedback for Faculty Review	11
Developing a New Student Feedback Survey Instrument	11
Using Student Feedback Data for Summative Teaching Evaluation	12
Developing Student Awareness & Training Resources for Improving Student Feedback	17
Developing Instructor Awareness & Training Resources for Using Student Feedback	18
Student Feedback: Informal and Formative	18
Peer Review of Teaching	22
Summative Peer Review of Teaching	22
Formative Peer Review of Teaching	27
Teaching Self-Reflection	28
Structure of Annual Self-Reflection	29
Supplemental Teaching Improvement Plan	31
Holistic Tool for Teaching Effectiveness	31
Timing and Frequency by Faculty Year	32
Data Streams	32
Year 1 and Year 2 for New Faculty	32
Year 3 for 3rd-Year Faculty	33
Year 4 and Year 5 for Advancing Faculty	33
Every 5 Years for Post Tenure and NTT Professors of 5+ Years of Teaching	33
Training Materials & Support	34
Part Two: System of Supports and Rewards	35

Merit-Based Awards for Effective Teaching	35
Non Monetary Awards for Inclusive and Effective Teaching	37
Part Three: Evaluating the System of Evaluation and Recognition	38
Indirect Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness	38
Direct Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness	38
Timeline for Gathering Direct Evidence	39
Infrastructure and Professional Development	39
Oversight Committee	40
References	42

Tripartite Charge

To enhance learning and encourage teaching excellence, the Office of the Provost together with Faculty Council, convenes this campus-level faculty-led Task Force to Enhance Learning and Teaching (TFELT). The Teaching for Learning Center (T4LC) will serve as a resource to this group, which will have three main goals.

1. To propose a campus-wide multi-measure approach to the evaluation of teaching
2. To propose a system to support, recognize, and incentivize teaching excellence
3. To establish a plan to measure the long-term impacts of these changes on student learning and success

Visit the TFELT website for the link to the [full charge](#).

Executive Summary

Teaching is an essential component of the work faculty do and is key to students' success and retention. Despite its importance, there is wide disagreement, skepticism, and mistrust about how teaching should be evaluated, particularly at research institutions (Wieman, 2015). Student ratings of teaching tend to comprise the main or only form of data used to evaluate teaching despite concerns about how these data are flawed, biased, often unrelated to actual effectiveness, and unable to identify substantive areas for improvement (Wieman, 2015). A variety of educational and professional associations, including the American Sociological Association (2019), American Educational Research Association (2014), American Association of University Professors (n.d.), and Association of American Universities (n.d.) have all released reports or statements related to concerns about current teaching evaluation strategies and suggestions for more effective approaches. These reports collectively call for the need to use evidence-based criteria, to incorporate multiple forms of data related to teaching, and to build structures of support for faculty development and rewards of good teaching.

The University of Missouri convened a teaching scholarship taskforce in 2013, that was tasked with four teaching-related objectives, including providing guidance about the criteria for evaluating teaching in promotion, tenure, merit, and annual evaluations. The taskforce also recommended principles related to the formative and summative evaluation of teaching, including the recommended instructor reflection of student feedback data, peer evaluations, and self-evaluations, the consideration of student feedback over time, and the use of all of these data in the P&T process. They also recommended that chairs, faculty, and administrators "should be educated about the proper use and interpretation of student evaluations in summative processes" (p. 7). Peer reviews of teaching were particularly endorsed, as was the use of a campus-level guidelines related to guidance and rubrics for these reviews. This work was furthered five years later by an Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC, 2018) taskforce for the UM system, which concluded that teaching should be valued and rewarded, should use multiple strategies or sources of data, and that student ratings should be improved to account for sources of bias related to gender, race, years of experience, discipline, course size, course content, and timing of the

evaluation. To date, these recommendations have not resulted in a change in university-wide practices.

Building on these previous efforts, the Office of the Provost charged Faculty Council with the task of convening a 12-person campus faculty-led task force, TFELT, related to teaching effectiveness and stipulated that our recommendations should include both formative and summative evaluation recommendations. Faculty Council’s Chair made recommendations as to the taskforce’s membership, which drew from as many colleges or schools on campus as possible and also drew upon scholars with expertise in teaching, learning, measurement, assessment, college students, and higher education. TFELT was asked to “seek input from all constituents including but not limited to students, graduate teaching assistants and instructors, faculty, department chairs, associate deans and deans.” TFELT was charged with reviewing past task force documents, the MU strategic plan, the intercampus faculty council report referenced above, as well as developing recommendations that draw upon student feedback, peer assessment, and self-assessment data in alignment with the research on measuring teaching effectiveness, all of which we have done. Our efforts at seeking collaborative input and engagement over the past two years were recognized by MU Faculty Council in March 2021, with the awarding of their Group Shared Governance Award.

While the Office of the Provost has the ultimate authority in determining the directives contained within the P&T Call document regarding required evidence related to teaching and the materials and data sources required for inclusion for the purposes of tenure and promotion, we hope that the collective efforts of faculty and other stakeholders over the past two intensive years—as well as from previous task forces before us representing nearly a decade of work related to this topic—will be utilized and incorporated. We truly believe that these recommendations will enhance teaching by offering faculty meaningful and evidence-based feedback on how they can improve their teaching, which directly relates to student success outcomes. New systems and strategies take time to learn so we are also proposing a phased approach to implementing these recommendations, offering corresponding sources of support for each of the recommendations offered, and suggestions for how effective teaching might be rewarded and incentivized.

Our campus community engagement work, review of the literature, and search of promising and evidence-based practices at other institutions led us to create a new model, the *Dimensions of Inclusive and Effective Teaching* that has specific elements that we believe should be captured across multiple data sources, including:

1. a new student feedback survey instrument,
2. a structured peer review process, and
3. a reflective self-assessment of teaching.

We also note that while our recommendations might feel new and extensive, they are also in many ways more effective ways of implementing current practices. Making these measures of effective teaching rigorous, valid, and trustworthy will increase their likelihood of being helpful in improving teaching and in informing tenure, promotion, and annual review processes. Our report also describes how the evaluation of teaching might be permanently subsumed by the Faculty Council committee for Academic Affairs so that ongoing assessment of the elements

described in this plan can be fully integrated *and* modified where needed and appropriate, and in ways that align with evidence-based practices and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Part One: Multi-Measures System to Evaluate Teaching

Evaluating effective and inclusive teaching is a complex endeavor. No single data stream provides sufficient evidence alone (Appling et al., 2001). For example, properly constructed student feedback provides unique learner insights in the classroom and is helpful for formative processes (Spooren et al., 2013), but it does not provide sufficient insight into other vital aspects of course structure and learning objectives. Similarly, peer feedback and self-reflection are all necessary but insufficient means of measuring effective and inclusive teaching. Furthermore, multiple measures provide a check against arbitrary promotion and tenure decisions by keeping leadership accountable for the way in which they make decisions. Affirming the scholarly literature and MU's *Teaching Scholarship Task Force Report* (2014), the Provost tasked TFELT to create a multi-measure system that would "contribute to a balanced data set" and to "limit the number of acceptable measures" to ensure consistency across all units.

TFELT developed an evidence-based and comprehensive system to evaluate teaching effectiveness using multiple measures to serve University of Missouri educators for both **formative** and **summative** purposes. (Formative purposes are solely intended to assist an educator in professional development. Summative purposes are for both professional development and departmental supervision.) The multi-measures system proposed here uses information from student feedback, peer review, and self-reflection to offer a triangulation of data, and provide necessary contextualization of data. MU's new definition and teaching dimensions were established December 2019, so that a common set of standards could be used across our university. We describe the dimensions below.

Welcoming and Collaborative means that the instructor welcomes and actively includes all students and perspectives in the learning environment. Students in the course collaborate with the instructor and other students. Key terms for this dimension include: Inclusive, Interactive, Dialogue, Creative, Relationships, Respectful.
Sources: Brookfield (2002), Brown et al. (2005), Deslauriers et al. (2019), and Paris (2012)

Relevant and Engaging means that the instructor helps students discover the relevance of the subject matter to their lives and future professions. The instructor engages students in active learning to produce authentic and creative works. Key terms for this dimension include: Active Learning, Collaborative, Modeling Disciplinary Process, Metacognition, Culturally knowledgeable.
Sources: Freeman et al. (2014), Harris and Bacon (2019), and Weimer (2013).

Empowering and Supportive means that the instructor invites students to set and reach their learning goals. The instructor supports student success through giving constructive feedback, mentoring, advising, and guiding students while listening and responding to student needs. Key terms for this dimension include: Professional, Encouraging, Inspiring student action, Approachable
Sources: Ames (1990) and Cavanagh (2016).

Structured and Intentional means that the instructor plans the course well, describes the course clearly, and aligns learning objectives, learning activities, and assessment. The instructor clearly communicates these expectations and what students need to do to meet them. Key terms for this dimension include: Clear Communication, Outcome based, High Standards, Accessible, Scaffolded

Sources: Ambrose et al. (2010) and Sousa (2011).

TFELT recognizes that what appears in the Promotion and Tenure Call document as the criteria for promotion, as well as what appears in individual departmental bylaws as criteria for both annual reviews and salary increases, is not within TFELT's jurisdiction. TFELT also recognizes that the university's evaluative requirements will influence the way people and departments use the guidance that TFELT offers in this set of recommendations. Therefore, TFELT recommends that those requirements align as much as possible with the definition, dimensions, resources, and protocols that TFELT has built, so as to fully promote and support a culture of effective and inclusive teaching and learning at MU.

Comprehensive Multi-Measures System to Evaluate Teaching

During TFELT community engagement sessions conducted to gain campus input regarding the task force's charge, many participants expressed fear, weariness, strain, and stress related to workload concerns and cumulative fatigue. Thus, it is clear that any recommended teaching evaluation system must be user-friendly, streamlined, and optimized for efficiency. Due to COVID-19 and social justice issues in our community, as well as the time needed to learn and adapt these new measures of teaching effectiveness, TFELT recommends incremental implementation of the multi-measures system. We acknowledge the difficulties of the present moment, but also realize that classes continue to be taught and faculty continue to be evaluated and promoted and thus this work remains timely. Below, we recommend a timeline with periods of piloting to acclimate academic units and individuals to new processes and tools. Participation in the pilots ought to be determined according to the department chair's discretion, in consultation with the college/school dean. If the recommendations here are approved by our provost, deans and chairs will need to set expectations for faculty to attend training and utilize the asynchronous training materials available starting Fall 2021, which would be open to all units regardless of prior participation in a pilot. These preparations will set the stage for this transformative system for evaluating inclusive and effective teaching to function optimally.

As colleges adopt the new multi-measures system, they may discover that they wish to establish a "signature," additional standard for effective and inclusive teaching. For example, a college may value experiential learning to the extent that it is pervasive throughout their curricula and programs. As such, they may wish to have a specific and well-defined standard that describes hallmarks of quality for experiential teaching and learning. Each college should be empowered to establish one additional standard that reflects their teaching/learning mission, values, and signature practice. TFELT recommends that each dean's office conduct a collaborative process with the faculty to determine if establishing an additional standard is desirable. If so, a collaborative process to determine the standard and observable teaching behaviors and materials pertaining to the standard should be developed and implemented over a reasonable period of time.

Holistic System, Using Multiple Measures



Timeline for Incremental Implementation

	2021			2022			2023			2024
	SPR	SS	FALL	SPR	SS	FALL	SPR	SS	FALL	SPR
STUDENT FEEDBACK										
Design Team Begins Work	■									
Pilot Instrument				■						
University-Wide Launch						■				
PEER REVIEW										
Limited Pilot (Paper)	■									
Limited Pilot (Electronic)				■						
Broad Pilot (Electronic)							■			
Training Offered via T4LC							■	■	■	■
University-Wide Launch										■
SELF REFLECTION										
Limited Pilot (Paper)	■									
Develop Training Content		■								
Training Offered via T4LC			■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
University-Wide Launch			■							
HOLISTIC TOOL										
Limited Pilot (Paper)						■				
Training Offered via T4LC									■	■
University-Wide Launch										■

Note: Gold-colored cells indicate timing of university-wide launch for each tool.

Workload Impact of Proposed System

Throughout TFELT's work to engage the MU campus community as we developed our recommendations for a new Multi-Measure System to Evaluate Teaching, we heard workload concerns from a variety of stakeholders. Some of these workload concerns came from faculty who piloted the peer review tools; some came from administrators (chairs/deans) as they learned about the new evaluation system. In response to these concerns, we continually revised our proposed processes and tools to be as streamlined as possible. As TFELT is proposing a set of teaching evaluation with multiple measures, there are workload implications of this new and improved system. We summarize those impacts here.

Student Feedback Survey Instrument. The new Student Feedback Survey Instrument will replace the current Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) instrument. The implementation of this new feedback instrument should have no workload impact on faculty or administrators. However, TFELT is also recommending that more data be reported from this new instrument and that data trends be analyzed over time. Initially, faculty and administrators may need to spend time to learn and understand this new reporting. The Assessment Resource Center (ARC) and T4LC could support this process, and the workload impact will be minimal and should occur only one time when the new feedback system is launched.

Peer Review. TFELT is recommending that a new rubric be used to guide summative peer reviews. Currently, campus has no specific guidance for how summative peer reviews are conducted. The workload impact of using this new rubric on faculty having their teaching evaluated is minimal, as TFELT estimates the summative peer review process will take the same time as currently reported by units on campus. [This chart](#) compares the estimated workload, and is based on information gathered from the deans' offices and other MU sources. It is a partial survey, but illuminating nonetheless.

The use of this rubric will have a workload impact on faculty conducting reviews, particularly at the beginning when the system is first implemented. At this time, faculty conducting reviews will need to participate in training provided by T4LC to understand the new tool and process. This training and other preparations to use this new tool have not been designed yet, so it is difficult to estimate the amount of time it will take. Every effort will be made to keep the training as succinct as possible.

Additionally, the summative peer review recommended by TFELT does not require a separate evaluation letter as currently required by campus for promotion dossiers. Instead, prose writing are made directly on the form. This represents a potential time savings with the new form.

Campus currently requires a number of summative peer reviews for promotion dossiers. TFELT is not recommending an increase in the number of these reviews.

TFELT is recommending that faculty who are post-tenure/promotion receive one summative peer review every five years. This would be a new workload requirement resulting from TFELT recommendations.

Additionally, TFELT is recommending that new faculty (Assistant Professors/Assistant Teaching Professors) participate in a formative peer review during their first years at MU. This will help new faculty establish an effective teaching program at MU. This would be a new workload requirement resulting from TFELT recommendations.

Overall, the new system for Peer Reviews should have minimal impact on administrators. Summative peer reviews are currently conducted by departments for faculty promotion processes, and administrators often manage those processes. There may be a small number of additional peer reviews occurring (e.g., formative peer reviews for new faculty) that will add to administrative workload.

Self-Reflection. TFELT is recommending that a new Self-Reflection tool be completed by all faculty annually. This is a new workload requirement of our recommendations.

This Self-Reflection tool will be completed in the MyVita system at the time of annual review. Thus, it will be integrated in other annual review processes. TFELT expects that it will take faculty approximately 30-45 minutes to complete this review. Administrators and personnel committees will need to review these self-reflections as part of annual review and that will add a small amount of administrative workload.

When completing the Self-Reflection in subsequent years (i.e., after the first year), many fields will automatically populate with previous year's data for easy updating. This will reduce the time required to complete the Self-Reflection each year.

Currently, for promotion dossiers, campus requires several narrative components addressing teaching. These include a teaching philosophy, a discussion of trends in student evaluation of teaching trends over time, use of instructional technology, notable teaching accomplishments, overview of publications related to teaching, and involvement in campus-wide teaching activities. The Self-Reflection will address these issues as part of annual review process. Thus, the Self-Reflection will be useful (and will save time) when faculty complete promotion dossiers.

Direct Evidence of Student Learning. In the third section of this report, recommendations are made that MU ought to collect, analyze, and reflect upon indirect and direct evidence of student learning in order to make data-driven modifications to curriculum, course design, and instructional practices to maximize student learning and success for all learners. TFELT recognizes that depending on a number of factors, individuals and academic units may experience a range of workload impacts with regard to activities with direct evidence of student learning, in particular. For example, if instructors have course goals, course-level student learning objectives/outcomes, and regularly conduct learning assessment techniques to discover the extent to which students achieve competency for course-level learning objectives, they will not experience a workload increase. However, for instructors who do not currently articulate course goals, or student learning objectives/outcomes, they would need to invest time and effort to create them. Support from the Teaching for Learning Center, and the Office of eLearning Instructional Design staff has been and will remain available.

Student Feedback for Use in the Review of Teaching

Summative Student Feedback for Faculty Review

Student feedback on teaching has most typically been collected using end-of-term student evaluations of teaching (SET) surveys. TFELT has identified three primary sets of needs for improving the ways in which student feedback on teaching is conducted and used to evaluate teaching:

1. *Development of a new student feedback survey instrument* that aligns with the four identified Dimensions of Effective and Inclusive Teaching and better implements best practices for maximizing the usefulness of student feedback and mitigating the potential effects of implicit biases.
2. *Development of new, more specific guidelines* for the collection, reporting and evaluation of student feedback data, including quantitative student ratings and qualitative open-response student comments, as well as recommendations for improving current resources for collecting and reporting this data.
3. *Development of student awareness and training resources for improving student feedback response rates and the quality of feedback*, in the form of a series of student-produced short videos to be disseminated through MU courses, internet platforms and social media.

The recommendations summarized below are the product of evidence-based best practices from relevant scholarship in the area and feedback collected from the MU community. For a more complete rationale of the following recommendations, please refer to [“Recommendations for Improved Collection, Reporting and Application of Quantitative Student Feedback Data for Summative Teaching Evaluation.”](#)

Developing a New Student Feedback Survey Instrument

After conducting qualitative content analysis of the question items currently on MU’s most widely used SET form, the Student Feedback Working Group concluded that the current instrument is incomplete in its coverage of the four identified Dimensions of Effective and Inclusive Teaching. In particular, the dimensions of *Welcoming and Collaborative* and *Empowering and Supportive* teaching, both of which are important to broader support of IDE teaching goals as well as broader support for student success and retention, were both significantly under-represented in the instrument. Referencing Gibbs (1995), the UM IFC Report (2018, p. 5) recognizes that “creating a shared definition is an essential first step in evaluating quality teaching.” As such, the working group concluded that alignment between the newly developed definition and dimensions and a student feedback survey instrument was vital. In addition, working group discussions and community engagement conversations identified several questions that fall outside the reasonable capacity of typical students to be able to assess in a meaningful way, and other questions that actually confuse students and/or provide a disincentive to answer.

Based on these results, TFELT developed a proposal for designing a new student feedback instrument that would align with peer review and self-reflection components regarding the four identified Dimensions of Effective and Inclusive Teaching. This new instrument would also implement best practices for maximizing the usefulness of student feedback and mitigating the potential effects of implicit biases through (a) question design focusing on student learning opportunities and experiences and (b) statistical analyses addressing potential negative biases that may emerge in the data. This instrument is being developed and will be tested by a design team led by two Faculty Fellows appointed by the Provost's Office, aiming to determine reliability and validity of the instrument through sound survey design methodology and pilot testing. See this summary of [Design Team efforts](#) to date.

Using Student Feedback Data for Summative Teaching Evaluation

TFELT's early community engagement efforts, along with an examination of the research literature on the use of student feedback data for summative teaching assessment, led to a number of important conclusions:

- The use of a single point of data – the global teaching effectiveness rating – as the sole variable for examining student responses to teaching oversimplifies student feedback in ways that ignore potentially valuable and important additional data from the instrument on the constructs relevant to Effective and Inclusive Teaching.
- The use of item means rather than response distributions lead to a less accurate, less meaningful picture of student feedback, and lends itself to a system of comparing faculty in terms of student feedback rating averages that the research literature widely identifies as problematic.
- Enabling faculty to provide richer, more robust data reports on student feedback ratings – especially comparisons between different classes and longitudinal trends – can both provide a more complete picture of student responses to teaching as well as help faculty identify actionable areas for growth and improvement.

Following our charge, TFELT recommends a re-envisioning of student summative feedback used for evaluative purposes to support faculty's growth as university instructors.

Improved Reporting of Student Feedback Data: Relevant Constructs

The research literature on student feedback surveys establishes that the use of a single, global effectiveness number in isolation is problematic (Beran and Rokosh, 2009; Boysen, et al. 2014; Fischer and Hanze, 2019; Kreitzer & Sweet-Cushman, 2021; Smith & Hawkins, 2011). In addition, student surveys responding to teaching provide student perceptions of their experiences in a class with a teacher, *not* actual measures of teaching (Abrami, 2001; Arreola, 2004; Kreitzer & Sweet-Cushman, 2021; Linse, 2017).

TFELT therefore recommends:

1. Both instructors under review and those reviewing instructors should consider student feedback data as indexical of students' perceptions of their experiences with an instructor, *not* as a measure of actual teaching effectiveness or student learning.
2. Student feedback data from the new instrument:
When student feedback data from the new survey instrument is available, data reports for merit reviews, tenure and promotion should include the means and distributions of the four teaching dimension constructs, as well as, if not replacing, a global teaching effectiveness rating for each course section. With the eventual phase-out of the present MU student feedback survey instrument, faculty reviewers should consider the data on the four dimensions of Inclusive and Effective Teaching to be the primary quantitative data from student feedback used for reviewing instructors. The presence of any global teaching effectiveness rating (in the event that one is retained in the newly designed instrument) should be interpreted as potentially descriptively useful to identify patterns in student perceptions, but of secondary importance to the data on the dimensions in the overall evaluation due to its limited probative value.
3. Student feedback data from the present instrument: Until the new instrument is available, TFELT recommends that the status quo for reporting student feedback data via the existing numerical chart should be maintained until such time as a transition to the new instrument and system can be made without placing an undue burden on instructors already in the process of review (e.g., pre-tenure faculty). However, instructors should be able to elect the option of providing additional representations of student feedback data in order to craft a richer and more helpful interpretive narrative for the quantitative data. This might include, for instance, reports on existing constructs in the current instrument (e.g., Course Content and Structure; Teaching Delivery; Learning Environment; Assessment), as well as graphical representations that illuminate the data (e.g., longitudinal changes over time).

Improved Reporting of Student Feedback Data: Better Statistics Use

The research literature is also clear and consistent on the need to report statistical information such as distributions, standard deviations and confidence intervals to determine a true understanding of the range of scores and variations in the data (Abrami, 2001; Boysen, et al. 2014; Franklin, 2001; Theall & Franklin, 2001). Similarly, reports of student feedback data should “examine the distribution of scores across the entire scale, as well as the mean” (Linse, 2017, p. 101).

We therefore recommend:

4. The additional statistical detail of distributions, standard deviations and confidence intervals should be provided to faculty when receiving end-of-semester student feedback results.
5. A new template or reporting system for reporting these more robust data should be constructed for submission to departments, tenure and promotion committees, and administrators for use in the faculty review process. This new reporting mechanism should replace the current numerical chart for listing teaching effectiveness means for each section.
6. Faculty reviewers should consider the ranges of student responses across the scale as more meaningful than the mean score and take the impact of outlier respondents into account.

The current mechanism for reporting quantitative student feedback data in dossiers also makes it difficult to easily identify and understand changes in results for the same course over time, which can be quite instructive in identifying patterns of consistency as well as anomalous course sections or semesters that should be treated as such (Linse, 2017).

Thus, TFELT recommends:

7. Student feedback data submitted for use in the faculty review process should include graphical representation of longitudinal results for repeated sections of a course within the period of review, in addition to a more traditional numerical chart that lists results for individual course sections.
8. Digital resources for constructing longitudinal trend charts and other customizable data reports should be provided to faculty by the institution.
9. Faculty reviewers should consider patterns of change, growth and development in student feedback data over time as having greater probative value than isolated low data points, particularly those earlier in an instructor's teaching career.

Since members of the faculty have a wide range of comfort and skill with statistics, TFELT asks that the Design Team for the new instrument provide a one-page User's Guide on how to read the new student feedback reports.

Improved Reporting of Student Feedback Data: End Faculty Comparisons

The research literature is also clear that one of the single most common misuses of student feedback data for teaching assessment is the use of means to compare the quality of teaching between faculty. Kreitzer and Sweet-Cushman (2021) put the matter bluntly: “*Student evaluations are not designed to be used as a comparative metric across faculty* (p. 6, emphasis added). Not only does this practice potentially worsen the risk of negative impacts due to implicit bias based on instructor identity categories, but “such bias can also negatively impact any faculty member who is seen as different by students and faculty evaluators” (Linse, 2017, p. 102).

TFELT therefore recommends:

10. The requirement of faculty and departments submitting mean effectiveness scores for categories of classes within an academic unit should be discontinued, and that comparing quantitative student feedback data results between faculty members by evaluators for the purposes of merit review.
11. In place of comparative means, academic units establish benchmark developmental goals for student feedback results across the career lifespan of instructors, with the aim of observing change and improvement over time.
12. To answer the question, “*how do we know if student feedback results meet or exceed expectations?*”, we recommend replacing comparative means with baseline assumptions regarding effective results to be applied regardless of academic unit:
 - “Faculty with most of their ratings distributed across scores of 3.5–5 on a 5-point scale . . . are doing well, even if they have a few stray scores in the lower ratings” (Linse, 2017, p. 96);
 - “Faculty members with a normal [i.e., bell-shaped curve] distribution of scores or a distribution with the peak below the midpoint of the scale likely have an instructional issue (or issues) that need attention” (Linse, 2017, p. 96);
 - The primary goal to meet the expectations of Effective and Inclusive Teaching is, therefore, *not* to achieve “above average” ratings but to demonstrate growth and improvement over time to the point of consistently achieving results above the midpoint of the scale (occasional outliers notwithstanding).

Improving Institutional Management of Student Feedback Data

These recommendations will fundamentally transform the way that instructors and administrators alike work with student feedback data. While potentially powerful, transformative changes that can improve teaching at MU, the onus should not be placed on individual instructors to navigate these changes without institutional supports. TFELT recommends the following institutional actions to facilitate the implementation of these recommendations:

13. Given both the need to easily manage digital data and the realities of student feedback surveys in increasing numbers of online courses as well as large-enrollment courses, we recommend that the administration of student feedback surveys should transition to a completely online mode, if not immediately, then by the implementation of the new survey instrument.
14. The collection and management of student feedback data should be conducted externally and separate from instructors and their departments. At present, while the Assessment Resource Center (ARC) is responsible for primary administration, collection and management of student feedback data, departments and individual instructors are currently involved in the distribution and collection of paper survey forms that their students complete and submit. With the transition of student feedback surveys to a completely online format, this process should and will be discontinued.
15. The University of Missouri should provide institutional data collection and reporting resources to facilitate more robust statistical reporting for MU instructors and academic units. All statistical data from student feedback surveys should be collected and maintained by the university within an online reporting system that enables faculty, academic units and administrators to access standard reports generated for annual merit, tenure and promotion reviews, as well as customizable reporting (including graphical representations of survey results for specific dimensions, as well as longitudinal trends over time) that can assist instructors in developing the kinds of specific charts and reports on results that can enhance their self-reflective narrative on student feedback. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics and the Assessment Resource Center (ARC) may be the best offices to oversee this data collection and management system.
16. Any commonly required forms or templates for reporting student feedback data, particularly in dossiers for tenure or promotion, should enable MU instructors to report data accordingly with available data reporting tools. Dossier requirements should include relevant connections to institutional student feedback data management resources, with the intent of helping instructors easily create, access and export their data reports into the relevant digital dossier documents.

Note: TFELT submitted recommendations to the Provost's Office regarding the use of open-response student comments in the summative evaluation process. Based on the research in this

area, these recommendations both advocate for not including open-response student comments as a matter of course in all summative faculty reviews and provide specific procedural recommendations for how best to utilize this qualitative data in exceptional cases when warranted.

Developing Student Awareness & Training Resources for Improving Student Feedback

The relevant research literature is clear on the importance of taking proactive steps to encourage greater response rates to student feedback surveys as well as specific guidance on what constitutes helpful, actionable feedback to improve teaching. Inspired by an award-winning and similar effort by the University of California – Merced, TFELT approved a student-led project which will produce a series of student-produced short videos to be disseminated through MU courses, internet platforms and social media. These videos will provide instruction from a student perspective in the following three areas:

- The importance of student feedback surveys for faculty review and improvement of teaching
- How to provide meaningful, actionable feedback to educators to improve teaching
- Implicit bias: why it poses problems, and how to be mindful of potential bias in responses

The student team is proceeding with assistance from expert faculty in digital video production as well as the TFELT support team. Scripts for the videos are being reviewed, and production of the videos is on-going in April and May 2021. Completed videos should be ready for distribution for Fall 2021.

Administrators and academic units should work with faculty to develop strategies for promoting student completion of student feedback surveys. TFELT makes the following recommendations, which were mostly suggested by MU students who attended TFELT community engagement focus groups:

17. Whenever possible, online student feedback surveys should be administered during class sessions in the case of in-person and synchronous online classes, and prominently announced on course Canvas sites with a clearly defined time frame for completion in the case of asynchronous online classes.
18. Clear guidelines for effective and ethical administration of student feedback surveys must be communicated to instructors and shared with students before surveys are completed. These may include (but are not necessarily limited to):
 - a. Instructors must provide students with adequate time to complete feedback surveys (at least twenty minutes during a class session in the case of in-person and synchronous online courses)
 - b. Instructors may not be present during the administration of student feedback surveys;

- c. Instructors may not communicate any request or quid pro quo for favorable student feedback responses or negative consequences for unfavorable student feedback responses;
 - d. Instructors will not have access to student feedback survey results until after course grades are reported at the end of the semester.
 - e. Administrators should identify other incentives each semester for students who complete the surveys that are not connected to courses. For example, enter students into a lottery for choice housing, choice parking spots, free or reduced cost sporting event tickets, etc.
19. Students should have seamless access to student feedback surveys from Canvas course sites to make accessing the surveys more convenient.
20. Instructors should be provided with resources and professional development opportunities for learning how to implement strategies for encouraging student feedback survey participation (e.g., communicating to students that the results are taken seriously by the instructor, and are used to improve teaching in the course).

Developing Instructor Awareness & Training Resources for Using Student Feedback

Given the scope and depth of possible changes to the collection, reporting and use of quantitative student feedback data, the university should provide support for professional development resources and opportunities. Academic units should encourage instructors to take advantage of these resources and opportunities in order to learn about such strategies as:

- How to access and use any newly developed data management and reporting resources the university develops or adopts,
- How to read survey results and interpret student feedback data,
- How to use student feedback data to construct an effective interpretive narrative, and
- How to use student feedback data as an opportunity for formative self-assessment of teaching aimed at continuing improvement.

Student Feedback: Informal and Formative

In addition to improving the way summative student feedback is collected, TFELT recommends the consideration of feedback options that can be used informally and formatively during or at the end of a course. Brief descriptions of a few of the most accessible approaches are below. With each instrument or method, the Teaching for Learning Center (T4LC) would offer to assist instructors with reviewing, interpreting and responding to findings. Important to note is that the list that follows contains a range of options; faculty are

welcome to implement them, opt out, and/or generate their own ideas and measures for collecting formative student feedback data that is useful and meaningful for them.

Who's in Class. This first instrument, a survey, is distinguished from the other instruments in that it does not collect student feedback on teaching and learning specifically. Instead, it gathers information about students that provides the context in which feedback can be understood. The goal of this survey is “to help instructors learn more about their students at the beginning of their courses, create plans for inclusion in partnership with a center for teaching and learning, and implement inclusive teaching practices” (Addy, Dube, & Mitchell, 2020). Instructors can deploy this anonymous and voluntary survey online before and during the first week of their course in order to collect data about the diverse learners who have enrolled. A few examples of yes/no survey items include the following:

- I am over 25 years of age;
- I have a laptop or desktop computer that I can use for class work;
- I have a disability, either invisible or visible;
- I am a “quiet” student, meaning that I re-energize from having time alone;
- I have dependents that I take care of outside of school; and
- I am a first-generation student.

There are also short answer questions that prompt students to share about their racial/ethnic background, gender identity, English language proficiency, other social identities, and expectations for inclusivity, for example. The answers to these and other questions can shed light on the student feedback captured by other instruments. As an illustration, consider mid-term or end-of-term student feedback that suggests that, despite the instructor's best intentions, the workload was too much or that there were too many group activities. With the context provided by *Who's in Class*, the instructor might connect this feedback to the fact that there were several learners with dependents who needed more support to complete their work. Or, perhaps the course had many “quiet” students who found the frequent group work to be draining. By facilitating a connection between students' feedback and learner characteristics, *Who's in Class* can empower instructors to design future courses more effectively.

MoCAT. Currently, the use of the MoCAT mid-semester course student feedback survey is supported by the MU Assessment Resource Center and encouraged by the MU Teaching for Learning Center. The MoCAT survey can be deployed at any point during the semester, and it comes in different forms for different types of courses. For example, instructors of online/hybrid courses can administer a form with questions about technology. In addition, there are forms customized for art/music/theater, labs, seminars, standard lectures, and writing intensive courses. Student responses are anonymous, aggregated, and provided only to the instructor who launches it.

At this time, TFELT recommends that MU change the default setting for MoCAT so that it shifts from being an “opt in” feedback mechanism to an “opt out” feedback mechanism. Faculty and instructors can opt out for any reason, and they should do so if they do not intend to review and reflect on the student feedback gathered through MoCAT. To create a positive culture for students and faculty in assessment, we should only collect feedback which we genuinely expect to make actionable. Instructors may opt out for a range of reasons, including

that they implement a different formative feedback mechanism that is helpful for the courses they teach.

Importantly, as soon as it is practicable, the Teaching for Learning Center and MU's ARC should work together to revise MoCAT so that it aligns with the new definition and dimensions for inclusive and effective teaching. This redesign work should be conducted while informed of the work that the Design Team for the summative student feedback instrument is doing. To promote student feedback in MoCAT, MU should explore an integration with Canvas.

Small Group Analysis. Another recommended option for collecting formative student feedback is small group analysis, also called small group feedback sessions or small group instructional diagnosis. This is a method employed mid-semester to gather qualitative data from students. University teaching centers such as the ones at Yale, Vanderbilt, Northwestern, Seattle University, and the University of Pittsburgh, among others, offer this service. Although there are variations in the approach, it generally involves someone other than the course instructor interviewing students about their learning experience. This interview data is then aggregated and provided to the instructor, who can then modify the remainder of the course as desired or needed.

At Vanderbilt's Center for Teaching, small group analysis (SGA) involves two stages: (1) data gathering by a teaching consultant and (2) a follow up consultation with the instructor. According to their training manual, the teaching consultant visits the instructor's class for about twenty minutes, usually at the end of the class session. The instructor then leaves the room, and the assessment begins as follows: Students are asked to get in small groups of 2-5, depending on the number of students in the class. Each group works together to complete a brief questionnaire. The consultant then leads the whole class in a discussion of their responses, asking clarifying questions, identifying areas of consensus and disagreement among the students, and eliciting further feedback as students consider each other's input. After the SGA, the consultant compiles the feedback into a typed report, capturing students' quotes verbatim, categorizing them thematically, and assuring student anonymity. (Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching, n.d.)

The questions posed to students might pertain to identifying the course objectives, describing what aspects of the course are helpful, and considering what modifications to the course might improve their learning. Afterwards, the teaching consultant meets with the instructor, and together they, "interpret student comments, identify successes and areas for improvement, and plan a course of action to make use of the student feedback" (Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching, n.d.). It is recommended that instructors share the SGA results with their students in order to explain what they intend to change, what they do not plan to change (and why), and to clarify any issues as needed.

Student Assessment of their Learning Gains. An informal survey that can be administered at the end of courses is the Student Assessment of their Learning Gains instrument (SALG). This survey asks students to assess and report on their own learning. It is useful for instructors who may want to review this informal end-of-course feedback in order to consider redesigning the course for future semesters. Although instructors can customize this survey to fit their own learning environments, the SALG focuses on five overarching questions. From the SALG website, they are follows:

- How much did the following aspects of the course help you in your learning? (Examples might include class and lab activities, assessments, particular learning methods, and resources.)
- As a result of your work in this class, what gains did you make in your understanding of each of the following? (Instructors insert those concepts that they consider most important.)
- As a result of your work in this class, what gains did you make in the following skills? (A sample of skills includes the ability to make quantitative estimates, finding trends in data, or writing technical texts.)
- As a result of your work in this class, what gains did you make in the following? (The sub-items address attitudinal issues such as enthusiasm for the course or subject area.)
- As a result of your work in this class, what gains did you make in integrating the following? (The sub-items address how the students integrated information.)

Course instructors can access, customize, and deploy the SALG by creating an account on this [website](#). Evidence for its reliability and validity can also be [reviewed](#).

Students as Partners. There are several approaches to engaging students more actively in providing feedback to instructors; one is *Students as Partners* (Cook-Sather et al., 2014). One such an approach is to employ undergraduate students as “course consultants” to attend classes in which they are not enrolled in order to share their perspectives with instructors. These pedagogical partnerships between students and faculty have the potential to strengthen student learning and growth by fostering democratic and inclusive dialogue and dynamics (Cook-Sather et al., 2019). Typically, one student consultant might be paired with one instructor over the course of an entire semester. Cook-Sather et al. (2019) describe the work of student consultants as including one visiting session of their faculty partner’s courses each week, taking detailed observation notes, and meeting with their partners weekly to analyze, affirm, and--where appropriate--making suggestions for revising pedagogical approaches.

As in the approach described above, the MU T4LC would support these partnerships by meeting regularly with student consultants to help them think through their observations, analyses, and potential feedback to instructors. Outcomes of these pedagogical partnerships have included improvements in faculty teaching as well as an increase in students’ confidence and understanding of learning. Essential to the implementation of a *Students as Partners* program would be a focus on offering student consultant positions to diverse learners, especially those who may belong to underrepresented and historically marginalized groups. To implement such a program, the MU Teaching for Learning Center could collaborate with the MU Center for Academic Success & Excellence as well as the Career Center.

Peer Review of Teaching

Peer review of teaching is an important process in improving student learning (Bernstein et al., 2000; Dennin et al., 2017; Thomas et al., 2014). Previous MU campus (Teaching Scholarship Task Force, 2014) and UM System (University of Missouri Intercampus Faculty Council, 2018) committees have specifically highlighted the importance of both summative and formative peer teaching reviews. This section outlines recommendations regarding both summative and formative peer reviews of teaching.

Summative Peer Review of Teaching

TFELT provides a structured system for summative peer review that aligns to the four identified Dimensions of Effective and Inclusive Teaching. The recommendations summarized below are the product of evidence-based best practices and feedback from the MU community. Each component was discussed, reviewed, piloted, and further revised to make the process streamlined and robust. The Summative Peer Review Rubric, described below is a living document, which should be reviewed and modified as current understanding on best practices and campus needs change.¹

It is worth repeating from the introduction of this report that TFELT is making recommendations about the various ways that the campus can support teaching effectiveness which include new guidelines for peer review, below. TFELT's job is not to dictate how such recommendations, if approved, will be incorporated into the university's evaluative structures, such as the promotion and tenure call document and departmental bylaws.

With regard to perceived workload, in our many community engagement sessions, TFELT heard colleagues express concern about the workload that the emerging process seemed to entail, especially with the Summative Peer Review of Teaching. Colleagues in Faculty Council also shared this concern. As such, in late May, TFELT significantly reduced the length of the Summative Peer Review Rubric. The tools and processes will streamline the work, remove potential guess work about what to observe and evaluate, and ultimately result in an efficient new system that could take less time than some colleges and schools are currently investing.

Summative Peer Review of Teaching Rubric & Process. To provide more structure, consistency, and support for peer reviews, TFELT designed a Summative Peer Review Rubric.² This rubric was created using a combination of literature on evidence-based teaching practices, similar instruments from peer institutions, and priorities for effective, inclusive teaching which

¹ In the section on the responsibilities of the Oversight Committee (Part 3), we explicitly recommend that this committee be empowered to collect feedback on the system and all tools. For example, if an item is consistently marked as *Not Observed* for a significant number of reviews in the pilot years, the OC could consider removing or revising it. If some aspect of the System appears to need modification, the committee ought to consult the Office of the Provost for approval and next steps.

² It is widely accepted in educational research on teaching evaluation that formal observation protocols such as rubrics are excellent tools for assessing instruction and identifying areas for on-going professional development. In 2013, AERA published a report recommending the adoption of such protocols for peer review.

are especially important to MU.³ The criteria included in the rubric were aligned to the four Dimensions of Effective and Inclusive Teaching to ensure that faculty are evaluated on strategies that align with campus and evidence-based priorities. While a separate letter is no longer requested, for those who appreciate writing and reading prose, the new form welcomes the same prose writing in the open field text boxes.

The Summative Peer Review Rubric is a tool used as part of the peer review protocol. The protocol is a three-step process:

1. Orientation
 - Reviewer and Reviewee get acquainted
 - Discuss course goals, design, and students
 - Discuss peer review process
 - Arrange dates for observations and debrief
2. Observation
 - Guided by the Summative Peer Review Rubric
 - Observes instruction (online, classroom, clinical, etc.)
 - Review course materials (Canvas page, syllabus, assignments, exams, etc.)
3. Debrief
 - Discuss observations and completed rubric
 - Clarify gaps and answer questions
 - Finalize portfolio following debrief. Send a copy to the reviewee and supervisor.

Recommendations on the Administration of Summative Peer Reviews. In addition to the Summative Peer Review process and rubric, TFELT proposes the following:

1. Each academic unit should have a policy on the timing and number of peer reviews of teaching expected for promotion of both tenure and non-tenure track faculty. The policy should align with expectations in the current Call Letters including detailing the timing (multiple years) and distribution (multiple courses, if applicable). We recommend academic units do not require summative peer reviews of teaching during years 1-2, as a faculty member is acclimating to their new role.

For example, the table below summarizes the peer teaching reviews requested in the 2021-2022 Call Letters:

	Tenure Track	Non-tenure Track
For Associate	2-4	Up to 8
For Full	2-4	Up to 8

³ TFELT is confident in the content validity of the rubric. The Oversight Committee could test the instrument to ensure statistical validity.

To meet that requirement, a department may establish expectations based on teaching responsibilities, as follows:

% Teaching	# of Summative Peer Reviews in Dossier	
	Promotion to Associate	Promotion to Full
< or = 40%	3	2
41-55%	4	2
56-79%	5	3
>79%	6	4

2. Additionally, we recommend a campus policy where faculty may receive one peer teaching review (summative) over the required amount. All but one of the peer reviews that are completed should be included in the dossier. Which review, if any, is excluded is left up to the faculty member.
3. After promotion to Associate, we recommend the number of required peer reviews of teaching be one summative and one formative every five years for both tenure and non-tenure track faculty for the rest of their career. This requirement would help ensure continued teaching development and proficiency over the entire time that a faculty member is teaching at MU. More frequent or additional summative peer reviews may be necessary for additional promotion decisions.
4. Summative peer reviewers will be assigned at the start of the academic year.

For faculty needing a Summative Peer Review in the upcoming year, peer reviewers should be assigned by October 1.

Instructors should not recruit their own reviewer. Given the diversity of resources in academic units across campus, we do not recommend a campus-wide system for assigning peer reviewers. Instead, academic units should create specific criteria on how peer reviewers are assigned based on the needs of the unit. Here are some options on who could set these assignments:

- Department chair
- Director of Undergraduate Studies and/or Director of Graduate Studies
- Promotion and Tenure committee
- A new or existing education-related committee

We recommend one of the following strategies be used to prevent personal conflict from influencing the review process:

- Person or committee recommends two reviewers and the instructor picks one.
- Person or committee recommends two reviewers and those two reviewers work together as a team to review the instructor, as is done currently in Textile and Apparel Management.
- Instructor being reviewed has the option to submit a confidential recommend/oppose list of potential faculty members that they are willing to or not willing to have review them.

Academic units should consider the vulnerable position of junior faculty when forming their criteria. Junior faculty can have fresh insight on inclusive, effective teaching, which makes them ideal peer reviewers, but demands on their time and the hierarchy of the tenure and promotion system can mean increased risks. Other considerations for assigning peer reviews are outlined in [this article on Peer Review of Teaching \(Bandy, 2015\)](#).

5. Peer reviewers will use the proposed processes and tools and undergo training offered through the MU Teaching for Learning Center.
 - a. Training will orient peer reviewers to the process and rubric, elaborate on evidence that support each of the observed teaching standards, and discuss strategies for reducing implicit and systemic bias.
 - b. External peer reviewers—reviewers from campuses other than MU— are optional and should be limited to 1 peer review per promotion.

Evidence shows that when peer reviews are based solely on classroom observations, as is traditionally done at MU, interrater reliability is low. Training, however, improves the consistency of the peer review process (Murray, 1995). Additionally, lack of training may mean new faculty feel ill prepared to conduct peer reviews (Fletcher, 2018). Providing training can provide both resources and skills that, ultimately, reduce time-on-task and improve outcomes.

6. The Office of the Provost could maintain a list of trained faculty reviewers who are known for their teaching excellence and mentoring capabilities and are available for outside reviews (i.e., reviewers from MU whose appointments are in departments outside of the department in which a faculty member is being reviewed).

Here are recommendations for this pool of reviewers:

- a. To assist in reviewer assignments, outside reviewers will be categorized by areas of experience including:
 - Modality (online, hybrid, lab, clinical, etc.)
 - Course size (large lecture, small discussion, etc.)
 - Content area (social sciences, humanities, STEM, etc.)
- b. Academic units will decide their requirements with respect to the number and nature of outside reviews, but TFELT *highly encourages* at least one

outside review for each assistant-level faculty member. The outside reviewer will focus on teaching strategies instead of content, providing a perspective that reviewers from within the department may or may not provide.

- c. Members of this pool of outside reviewers will be compensated for their extra efforts either through a per-course stipend (see the UM System Office of eLearning Faculty Peer Review Corps), significant service recognition, and/or teaching release or additional supports (e.g., teaching assistants, graders, reduced class size, etc.).
 - d. Fiscal support for these outside reviews should come from central administration and/or the Colleges; costs should not be deferred to departments.
 - e. This pool of outside reviewers will not be associated directly with the MU Teaching for Learning Center, nor will staff in the Center conduct summative peer reviews of teaching.
7. Peer reviewers should receive financial compensation for this important and time-consuming work. While most faculty are eligible to review courses, realistically, not all faculty will either because of interest or experience. This puts a disproportionate expectation on those who are trained and willing to lead this important process.

One model to consider is the compensation system currently used by the UM Office of eLearning in their Quality Course Review process. In this system, a reviewer earns \$100 for each course credit hour (e.g., a 3-credit course would be \$300). This system is logical, as higher-credit courses will have more materials and interactions to review, and thus will require additional time.

Alternatively, a faculty member may decide in consultation with their department chair to conduct peer reviews as part of their service. In that case, they would not receive financial compensation.

8. We recommend the only required artifact of the Summative Peer Review process is the completed rubric, which includes space for prose writing on observations, comments, and examples. A copy of this rubric should be provided to both the instructor and chair. Additional artifacts, such as a letter, notes, and other instruments may be submitted at the discretion of the instructor being reviewed.

This system should be phased in to allow time for training and orientation to the system. Ideally, promotion and tenure call documents and dossier preparation guidelines should be adjusted annually to preserve the peer evaluations already completed by faculty in the promotion pipeline.

TFELT has explored digital management options for the peer review system. We recommend using a system that is able to 1) manage peer review assignments, 2) house an online version of the Peer Evaluation Rubric, 3) provide outputs, including longitudinal data, of the peer

review process, 4) provide secure access, and 5) export information, if needed, to myVITA for Annual Review Reports and P&T dossiers.

Formative Peer Review of Teaching

In addition to a Summative Peer Review process, TFELT is proposing Formative Peer Review of Inclusive and Effective Teaching, a confidential process that focuses on professional development and mentoring. It is not used for evaluation but instead is an opportunity for an instructor to discuss facilitating student learning, course goals and challenges, and to learn from a peer.

At present, formative peer review opportunities do not occur regularly at MU. Yet, formative peer reviews provide a rich opportunity for both the observed and the observer to learn new strategies and engage in conversations that reach beyond the boundaries of a single class. Formative peer review allows faculty to receive meaningful feedback from a colleague and implement change before the summative peer review process. As such, the formative peer review process TFELT is recommending reflects the summative peer review process and is intended to boost an educators' effectiveness in the same academic term.

Formative Peer Review Checklist & Process. The Formative Peer Review Checklist lists the same criteria as the Summative Peer Review Rubric (see section 1.B.1 for details) but does not rate faculty on their performance on the criteria or assess if the faculty member is engaging in the listed practices. Instead, we recommend the checklist be used to confirm that each of the criterion were discussed or demonstrated at some point during the formative peer review process. Using this checklist, the reviewer can highlight strengths and also discuss areas for improvement. Since this checklist was created using criteria that align to the four MU Dimensions of Effective and Inclusive Teaching, its use will focus the formative peer review conversation on practices that are instructional priorities at MU.

The Formative Peer Review Checklist is a tool used as part of the formative peer review protocol. The protocol is a three-step process:

1. Orientation
 - Reviewer and Reviewee get acquainted
 - Discuss course goals, design, and students
 - Use the checklist or 4 Dimensions of Effective and Inclusive Teaching to identify areas of focus
 - Discuss peer review process
 - Arrange dates for observations and debrief
2. Observation
 - Guided by the Formative Peer Review Checklist
 - Observe instruction (online, classroom, clinical, etc.)
 - Review course materials (Canvas page, syllabus, assignments, exams, etc.)
3. Debrief
 - Discuss observations and checklist
 - Clarify gaps and answer questions
 - Brainstorm future goals and resources available to meet those goals

- Finalize portfolio following debrief. Send a copy to the reviewee.

Recommendations on the Administration of Formative Peer Reviews. TFELT [has recommendations](#) with respect to timing, assignment, and number of Formative Peer Reviews. We recommend formative peer reviews be confidential, unless the reviewee decides to share. We also recommend that formative peer reviews be the *only* type of peer review conducted during years 1 and 2 of a new faculty appointment. This gives a faculty member time to settle into their courses, become aware of campus resources, and improve their instruction before their first summative peer review in year 3. In cases where a faculty member's employment is following an accelerated path (e.g. fewer years on the tenure track), a modified timeline could be established by the department.

So far, our recommendations have focused on peer reviews of full-time faculty, however all instructors at MU should be encouraged to engage in this process. While creating a system for deciding the timing, number, and reviewers for faculty peer reviews, we recommend academic units also outline how they are going to provide regular formative and/or summative peer reviews for their graduate, adjunct, and staff instructors.

Teaching Self-Reflection

Reflecting on one's classroom and pedagogy is a cornerstone of learner-centered teaching (Blumberg, 2016), and is thus essential in ensuring inclusive and effective teaching. As such, TFELT recommends that all university educators participate in an annual teaching self-reflection, grounded in goal setting and the university's dimensions of inclusive and effective teaching. The self-reflection complements student and peer feedback by providing a space in which educators can both contextualize feedback and identify the ways in which their teaching is intentional. Integrated with the existing annual review process, educators would reflect on their evolving teaching philosophy, prior goals, student feedback, inclusive teaching, course objectives, activities and assessments, and one dimension of effective teaching. Based on internal and campus-wide pilots and subsequent revisions, the [current version of the self-reflection](#) takes approximately 30 minutes to complete. (For instructors without course-level learning objectives, the process would be longer, as these objectives are needed. The T4LC can assist educators in writing these objectives so that they are clear and measurable.) Observations captured during annual self-reflection can also be utilized by instructors when preparing their materials for promotion applications.

Establishing Priorities. The sub-committee on teaching self-reflection established a series of guiding priorities prior to the development of the first draft of this tool.

1. **Efficient.** Mindful of the many constraints on faculty time, the committee wanted to ensure that the self-reflection provided an elegant means of contemplating one's pedagogy. Through three pilots (detailed later), the committee streamlined the reflection from an original 90-minute completion time to an estimated 30 minutes for most educators.

2. **Substantive.** Tied to efficiency, the committee sought to ensure all reflection prompts related to significant and meaningful aspects of teaching, including considerations of objectives, assessments, alignment, feedback, dimensions, and practical course goals.
3. **Balanced.** The committee wanted to ensure that the elements above (objectives, assessments, alignment, feedback, dimensions, and goals) were equally weighted across the reflection.
4. **Useful.** The committee did not want faculty to feel the reflection was “yet another box to tick.” Rather, the committee designed the reflection to be practically helpful for all educators, regardless of career stage.

Piloting the Teaching Self-Reflection. The committee conducted three consecutive pilots of the teaching self-reflection, including an internal pilot, TFELT pilot, and campus-wide pilot. Each pilot included a series of debrief questions to gather feedback related to clarity, suggestions, and completion time. The timelines and subsequent changes for each pilot are below.

- **Pilot 1.** Internal team pilot (November - December 2020)
 - *Changes:* Collapsed redundant questions. No longer require participants to reflect on each dimension of inclusive and effective teaching.
- **Pilot 2.** TFELT and interested parties (January - February, March 2021)
 - *Changes:* Create branches for unique questions for chosen dimension, reducing time required for completion.
- **Pilot 3.** Campus wide (February - March 2021)
 - *Changes:* Convert branches to display question-types, which enables participants to move back and forth in the survey. Make all primary question-types required fields.

Structure of Annual Self-Reflection

Information and Teaching Context. The educator identifies themselves and provides any needed context on their teaching.

Questions include:

- Courses being reflecting upon
- Mentoring and/or advising duties
- Matters related to teaching load

Teaching Philosophy. The educator reflects on their evolving teaching philosophy.

Student Feedback. The educator reflects on and contextualizes any student feedback received.

Inclusive Teaching. The educator reflects on any one of the following elements related to inclusive teaching:

- What support do you need for supporting inclusivity in your course(s)?
- In what specific ways are you practicing inclusive teaching?
- What elements of inclusive teaching would you like to try for your upcoming course(s)?

Included within these prompts are hyperlinked resources to clarify inclusive teaching concepts and activities.

Course Learning Objectives. The educator lists their course learning objectives for the course upon which they are reflecting. Included in this prompt are hyperlinked resources to clarify crafting course objectives.

Aligning Assessments and Activities to Your Objectives.

Last Year's Teaching Goals

The educator identifies and reflects upon teaching goals set for the prior year and the degree to which goals were successful. In subsequent years of reflection, this prompt could be auto populated from the prior year's reflection.

Select Your Dimension

The educator selects one of four dimensions of inclusive and effective teaching: Welcoming and Collaborative, Empowering and Supportive, Structured and Intentional, Relevant and Engaging Instruction. In subsequent reflections, educators will be asked to select a different dimension from the year prior.

Reflecting on One Dimension

The educator responds to a series of prompts on the elements of the teaching dimension they chose. For example, if an educator chose the "Structured and Intentional" dimension, they receive prompts listed the behaviors identified in each of the elements of that dimension (e.g., behaviors on lesson presentation). With each element, educators are asked:

- To what extent do these elements relate to my teaching?
- Which elements would I like to learn more about?

Goals and Changes to My Teaching

The educator reviews their reflection and identifies "at least one goal and/or change" they have planned for their teaching in the coming year. These responses will auto populate in next year's reflection.

Within all prompts throughout the self-reflection, educators have opportunities to upload supporting documentation to better contextualize their responses.

Supplemental Teaching Improvement Plan

As a complement to the teaching self-reflection, the committee developed a Teaching Improvement Plan (TIP) that units may use to help facilitate an even more formative reflection process. The TIP pulls from several elements of the self-reflection noted above, with the addition of providing further prompts on asset-based teaching and exploring student learning bottlenecks. The Teaching Improvement Plan can be accessed here and may be used and adapted by academic units by request. The TIP is not required but provided as a tool for interested programs. Since the TIP is a tool for formative reflection, if desired, the Teaching for Learning Center can facilitate a collaborative process for a variety of alternatives.

Holistic Tool for Teaching Effectiveness

A new holistic tool has been conceptualized for individuals and committees responsible for evaluating faculty and instructors for summative purposes: contract renewal, promotion, and tenure (Gilman et al., 2018). It will offer a streamlined and convenient way to consider and integrate evidence of teaching effectiveness drawing from three primary data streams above (student feedback, peer review, and self-reflection). Inspired by the literature and models from peer institutions, TFELT has mapped its key standards for each of the four dimensions for effective and inclusive teaching to produce this helpful “meta” tool (Dennin et al., 2017). Integrating the three sources of data into one tool in this way provides added reassurance that all forms of data will be considered for evaluative purposes, whereas some currently fear that student feedback data are used exclusively or predominantly. Rather than take any one source of data out of context, this holistic tool offers depth of understanding across data sources so that the collective findings can be considered in connection with one another. Faculty will be able to draw upon the various data sources to triangulate findings, provide any missing context needed to interpret the data, and provide evidence of the dimensions within the effective and inclusive teaching model.

TFELT recommends a digital platform for this Holistic Tool, so that each of the three data streams can feed it as an overlay in myVITA. In May, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (OIEA) received mappings for the Holistic Tool to help them conceive of the data architecture and produce a scope of work. OIEA has many priority system-wide projects, so project resources and timeline will need to be reviewed. When adopted, evaluators reviewing data score the holistic tool on a developmental continuum: not met, developing, proficient, and expert. TFELT discourages the use of holistic scores being used by committees, Chairs, colleges, or the university/system to rank or compare instructors/faculty members.

TFELT recommends rolling out the Holistic Tool as an option for academic units to use non-digitally at any time, and then digitally when it becomes available from 2022 - 2023. TFELT recommends that the Holistic Tool be adopted university-wide in the Spring 2024. As needed, the Oversight Committee (described in Part Three of this report) may contact the Office of the Provost if it wishes to recommend that an adjustment to the timeline is advisable.

Timing and Frequency by Faculty Year

This section will assist faculty and departments in planning for the support and evaluation of inclusive and effective teaching. It describes how student feedback, peer reviews, self-reflection, professional development, and the holistic tool can be used on an annual basis through the cycle of faculty work at the Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor levels.

Data Streams

Four data streams contribute to the development of inclusive and effective teaching at the University of Missouri throughout a faculty member's career. Whether new or veteran, the following streams inform a faculty member's teaching development and annual review.

1. Student Feedback
2. Peer Reviews
3. Professional Development Opportunities
4. Teaching Self-Reflection

As part of the annual review, faculty leadership (e.g., department chairs) can combine these four data streams into the future Holistic Tool. The processes and rationale for the ways in which academic leadership uses these data streams for each year are below.

Year 1 and Year 2 for New Faculty

Process. Years 1 and 2 guide new faculty into the iterative and reflective process of being an MU educator. Formative peer review processes work hand-in-hand with professional development opportunities provided across campus. Teaching reflections provide opportunities for new faculty members to craft teaching goals for upcoming courses. In time, these data would inform the holistic tool, with the focus on early career professional development and growth. The Student Feedback committee determined that the observable patterns across the career lifespan of the educator is preferred over single-point measures (e.g., assessed by an overall mean). Given the limited timespan available for Year 1 and Year 2 educators, TFELT recommends that student feedback not be included for the purposes of annual review. However, we do recommend that student feedback be discussed and reflected upon between the faculty member and the chair. The Teaching for Learning Center will offer consultations to help faculty members to contextualize the information, and can serve as a sounding board for modified teaching approaches, as desired/needed. Thus, TFELT recommends that formative peer reviews of teaching, engagement with professional development in teaching, and the teaching self-reflection be used for the annual review process for new faculty.

Rationale

- **Onboards new faculty** to become participatory members of a culture of teaching and learning.

- **Introduces new faculty** to interpreting, reflecting upon, and taking action with student feedback for one's instructional approaches.
- **Emphasizes professional development** through formative teaching review processes and involvement in teaching development workshops and support systems.
- **Prepares faculty** for upcoming summative reviews in Year 3.

Year 3 for 3rd-Year Faculty

Process. In Year 3, the summative peer review process commences. To help with third year review, we recommend two summative peer reviews in Year 3. Faculty members continue to submit their teaching self-reflections. When the holistic tool becomes available, it now provides a clear way to integrate the information on each criterion to arrive at a rating on the continuum: Not Met, Developing, Proficient, and Expert. These data streams inform a 3rd year review.

Rationale

- **Transitions faculty members** into the formative and summative feedback processes in subsequent years.
- **Provides ongoing teaching reflection** grounded in student and peer review feedback.
- **Enables faculty to build dossier materials** with multiple data streams, all of which can contribute to the promotion and tenure process.

Year 4 and Year 5 for Advancing Faculty

Process. Years 4 and 5 mirror Year 3 with student feedback and annual teaching self-reflections. At least one summative peer review conducted during this time, with the final number of peer reviews conducted to be determined by what is needed for promotion of the faculty member. (Actual numbers needed during this time may vary for different reasons.) The data from these processes produce a combined score on the forthcoming holistic tool. These materials contribute both toward annual review processes and tenure and promotion decisions.

Rationale

- **Prepares faculty members** to have robust data and information to present for tenure and promotion processes.
- **Continues to provide a process of self-reflection** so educators ground their teaching on the dimensions of inclusive and effective teaching at MU.
- **Tenure and promotion are grounded in inclusive and effective teaching** on par with research.

Every 5 Years for Post Tenure and NTT Professors of 5+ Years of Teaching

Process. Post tenure and long-standing NTT faculty members continue to use student feedback and have peer reviews, with at least one formative and one summative peer review on teaching every five years. Additional peer reviews may be necessary if faculty intend to apply for promotions or awards. Faculty continue to submit annual teaching reflections and set goals for their instruction. Faculty leadership scores these materials on the holistic tool for annual review purposes.

Rationale

- **Requires veteran faculty to continue to develop as educators** and to be reviewed on that development through formative and summative processes.
- **Encourages veteran faculty to take advantage of ongoing professional development** opportunities through the Teaching for Learning Center and other campus departments.
- **Cultivates a campus culture of inclusive and effective teaching** regardless of faculty rank or experience.
- **Assumes that veteran faculty with distinction in teaching** would be conducting reviews for their peers as service.

Currently in higher education, many faculty members arrive to teaching positions without necessarily having received any professional development experiences for teaching and learning. As such, instructors new to teaching who are *not yet meeting* the MU standards for inclusive and effective teaching ought to invest time and effort in growing their competencies. In subsequent years, if their evaluations show that they have been *developing* or have achieved *proficiency*, the earlier *not met* indication should not be held against them.

Training Materials & Support

The comprehensive system using multiple measures to evaluate teaching will be a significant shift of practice for most academic units. All stakeholders will need training and support as they are introduced to the new processes, protocols, and instruments. Also, these training materials and sessions will offer an opportunity to define and provide examples for each of the standards. As such, TFELT recommends that training materials be developed for both in-person and online training/development opportunities. The T4LC would like to work with part-time Faculty Fellows to help produce materials in the following areas:

- A. Introducing the holistic tool to streamline multiple sets of data on teaching and learning
- B. Scoring the holistic tool in a fair and transparent manner
- C. Introducing the peer review summative process and rubric
- D. How to conduct a fair and transparent summative peer review
- E. How to prepare for your summative peer review
- F. Introducing the peer review formative process and checklist
- G. What to expect with formative peer review
- H. An overview of recommended methods for collecting formative student feedback, as well as specific suggestions for implementing each option

- I. How to interpret summative student feedback at the end of a learning experience/course
- J. Introducing the self-reflection form
- K. Collecting and curating your teaching and learning artifacts in advance of summative review
- L. How to reflect on your teaching for summative review
- M. Developing your teaching improvement plan
- N. Mentoring/managing colleagues via the teaching improvement plan
- O. Programs on campus to grow as an effective and inclusive educator

These user guides, videos, infographics, podcasts, and other training resources would be didactic in their approach. However, the final item, O, would be informational.

TFELT expects that the Office of the Provost would determine that some of the training sessions would be mandatory for certain roles such as Chairs and Peer Reviewers, and some would be optional and encouraged for most faculty. Training materials and sessions ought to be succinct, practical, and interactive, such that, even if someone opts to participate in an asynchronous experience, questions and discussion would be welcomed and facilitated.

Part Two: System of Supports and Rewards

For the second part of the charge, TFELT envisions a set of rewards and supports for effective teaching. Also, we encourage all teaching awards committees to review the TFELT definition and dimensions and consider aligning their awards to them, in part or as a whole.

The changes that TFELT proposes related to the evaluation of teaching are substantial and will have a direct impact on students' academic success, persistence, and graduation rates at MU. We also hope that faculty see the benefits of these changes to their own teaching through improved strategies and evidence-based practices. This deep focus on teaching is helpful not only for MU's mission and strategic planning, but also in anticipation of the integration of teaching measures for broader purposes. The AAU, for example, has been actively searching for independently verifiable measures of teaching effectiveness that it can include in its membership criteria. Building structures of support to reward and enhance teaching now, in anticipation of those changes, will be helpful if AAU membership remains an institutional priority. We hope that institutional funds will be provided to support teaching through incentives, awards, professional development, and ongoing assessment. This might be an area that advancement can focus on within its efforts as well.

Merit-Based Awards for Effective Teaching

TFELT recommends a merit-based awards program for inclusive and effective teaching that uses the three forms of evaluation (Student Feedback, Peer Review, Self-Reflection) to provide an overall one (★) to five (★★★★★) Star Rating for effective teaching. Using this program and holistic tool described above, College & Departmental leadership determine star ratings each year, ensuring an average 3-star rating to balance the award formula below.

Merit-Based Award Formula. TFELT recommends an *additional* allocation within the Dean or Provost’s budget for merit-based awards for teaching excellence. Stars set the foundation for the merit-based awards for inclusive and effective teaching. As Colleges & Departments learn the amount of funding available for a given academic year, they then calculate the funding amount per star and weight each star with the proportion of teaching relative to other duties. Yearly merit-based awards for effective teaching would be determined by the following formula:

$$\text{Award} = \text{Number of Stars Awarded} \times \% \text{ of Teaching} \times \text{Amount Allocated per Star}$$

Educators given 1-2 stars may use the funds for professional development, whereas educators awarded 3+ stars will have funds as a direct payout.

Table 1. Hypothetical Example of Merit-Based Award for Effective Teaching

Total Departmental Funds Available for Awards: \$20,000
 Amount Per Star: \$1,666.67
 Average Stars (Required): 3
 Total Stars Awarded: 24

Educator	Stars (1-5)	% of Teaching	Multiplier	Award Amount
Smith	1	40%	0.4	\$ 666.67
Duncan	3	40%	1.2	\$ 2,000.00
Green	3	40%	1.2	\$ 2,000.00
Hernandez	5	40%	2	\$ 3,333.33
Jones	4	80%	3.2	\$ 5,333.33
Williams	2	80%	1.6	\$ 2,666.67
Davis	2	40%	0.8	\$ 1,333.33
Miller	4	40%	1.6	\$ 2,666.67

Benefits of the Merit-Based Awards for Effective Teaching

- A. Ensures transparent rewarding for inclusive and effective teaching across all full-time faculty, including tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track. Takes into account the various teaching duties across faculty roles and weights accordingly.

- B. Informed by multiple forms of evidence-based data and translatable to an overall rating (i.e., stars) for teaching effectiveness.
- C. Flexible regardless of the award funding available. Challenging funding years may be stabilized by donors. In addition, funding could be adapted to conference travel or other indirect means (e.g., leave times). The star rating acts as an additional incentive and provides guidance for other recognitions.

Non-Monetary Awards for Inclusive and Effective Teaching

In addition to Merit-Based Awards, TFELT recommends additional, non-monetary awards and recognitions for inclusive and effective teaching. These recognitions are grounded in the Four Dimensions of Inclusive and Effective Teaching: Welcoming and Collaborative; Relevant and Engaging; Empowering and Supportive; and Structured and Intentional:

- *Most Welcoming and Collaborative Educator*: This educator is expert at creating a productive and inclusive learning environment.
- *Most Relevant and Engaging Classroom*: This educator is expert at guiding students to make connections between the course and their diverse lived experiences and goals.
- *Most Empowering and Supportive Educator*: This educator is expert in supporting student learning and success through effective communication and meaningful feedback.
- *Most Structured and Intentional Professor*: This educator is expert with course organization, including effective and inclusive learning activities that are aligned with assessments and articulated learning objectives.

These awards could be determined through a nomination process and selection committee at the College level. If preferred, Colleges may use the Holistic Tool (when it becomes available) as a means of determining which educators receive their nomination. In addition, faculty involved in peer review processes may nominate educators for the recognitions. TFELT recommends that a separate group facilitates and announces the university-wide nominations and awards.

In time, as more and more MU educators garner these awards, a new category could emerge for those MU educators who receive *all* four of the awards in the above list. This achievement would be called: Excellence in Evidence-Based Teaching Award. As budgets may permit in the future, or if a philanthropic opportunity arises, this (named/unnamed) honor could carry a cash prize.

Award winners could be announced at the annual Celebration of Teaching and would be invited to participate in panel discussions or other formats on Inclusive and Effective Teaching.

As mentioned above, there are many existing teaching awards across MU. At the discretion of the committees responsible for the award criteria, TFELT recommends that they review the new definition and dimensions for effective and inclusive teaching, and consider aligning with them, in part or as a whole.

Part Three: Evaluating the System of Evaluation and Recognition

The third part of the charge calls for an assessment process to evaluate how well the new system functions. Is teaching quality high at MU? Are students learning what we are teaching? What is our evidence? TFELT recommends the establishment of an oversight committee to carry out the following necessary functions and answer these important questions:

- to make data requests to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics
- to conduct the assessment process at regular annual intervals
- to gather input on how pilots are impacting workload
- to accept feedback on specific tools and/or how the system is functioning
- to contact the Office of the Provost when action to modify the system or a specific tool is desired

Indirect Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Beginning Spring 2024, with university-wide implementation, aggregate data from the Holistic Tools will establish baseline rates on a developmental scale (from not met, developing, proficient, to expert) by each of the four teaching dimensions at the university level.⁴ The data can also be sorted by college, school, and department. This information is actionable for all academic units and auxiliary units offering mentoring and professional development to MU faculty and instructors. Each year, the data would be graphed so that we can ascertain if a trend toward improvement across the teaching dimensions is being achieved. These data are indirect evidence of improvements for student learning. The application of evidence-based teaching is a strong proxy for the improvement of student learning (Wieman, 2015).

Also, three key student success metrics provide additional indirect evidence of teaching effectiveness and student learning. Currently, MU tracks DFWI, retention, and degree completion rates. The assessment plan would analyze these data vis-a-vis the Holistic Tool trend data to examine if a relationship exists whereas teaching proficiencies improve, DFWI rates decrease, retention increases, and time to degree is optimized and stabilized.

Direct Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

For direct evidence of student learning, educational assessment processes at the program and course levels show what student learning gains are occurring. Analyses of how faculty close student learning achievement gaps over time through the iteration of instructional and curricular design and teaching will provide direct evidence and illuminate how certain teaching

⁴ By aggregate data, we mean high-level data acquired by combining individual-level data. In the process of producing the aggregate data reports, a de-identification process would be used to remove individual personal identities.

interventions lead to improved student learning (American Educational Research Association, 2014).

Timeline for Gathering Direct Evidence

TFELT recommends the following initial steps:

- Beginning fall 2021 - fall 2022, all academic units/faculty are encouraged to write course-level goals and course-level student learning objectives/outcomes for their courses.⁵
- By spring 2023, require course-level goals and course-level student learning objectives/outcomes for every course offered at MU.
- By spring 2023, all course-level goals ought to be mapped to Program-level learning objectives (PLOs).
 - For programs with PLOs, TFELT recommends that units review them to ensure that they are measurable and clear, in 2021-2022. In this way, the educational assessment process can be conducted effectively.
 - Programs lacking measurable PLOs should prioritize creating them in 2021-2022.
- By fall 2024 - fall 2025, all programs are conducting teaching, learning, assessment processes that collect course-level student learning objective/outcome data to provide evidence that course goals are being achieved, and programmatic level objectives are being served.
- By fall 2024 - fall 2025, instructors of courses can show how their data collection process for student learning at the course-level informs their instructional decisions and planning for the next offering of that course.

Once departments and instructors have this kind of educational assessment information about student learning, they can reflect on their chosen teaching methods with greater understanding of its efficacy. Oftentimes, faculty decide to approach instruction, assignments, and assessments differently when they see that students are not successful (not meeting expectations for the course) with the current designs/approaches. Then, more information is gathered when new designs are implemented to check on student learning. This cyclical teaching, learning, and assessment cycle is on-going and iterative.

Infrastructure and Professional Development

TFELT recognizes that support is needed for academic units to conduct regular cyclical educational assessment at the course and program level for both undergraduate and graduate programs. Programs that have special accreditation and are in good standing with the accreditor for providing evidence of student learning can serve as models to help other units. However, in

⁵ Terminology for learning objectives and outcomes varies from department to department. Here with learning objectives, we mean a specific and measurable outcome or performance expected after a learning period (class session or course).

order to manage, implement, and oversee a new and unified assessment process, MU ought to consider creating a centralized and organized unit committed to this work. Many institutions that do this well have committed offices and staff for student learning assessment. As a stop gap measure, resources for increased staffing in Institutional Research, the Teaching for Learning Center, the Office of eLearning, and/or embedded in Colleges/Schools could be pursued.

Given the timeline, it may be prudent to have units do a minimum level of professional development on assessment and student learning outcomes. When faculty have little exposure or experience with educational assessment, they may not know what it refers to, and how it can meaningfully inform teaching and learning. It would be difficult to implement this in a meaningful way if training is not simultaneously provided and attended to with sincere attention.

Oversight Committee

Under the new campus committee reform plan, which takes effect August 1, 2021, action was taken to ensure that a body responsible for conducting on-going evaluation of the effectiveness of the TFELT recommendations after implementation. Quoting page 12 of the plan, we note that within MU's governance structure, Academic Affairs is now empowered to convene an appropriate entity/sub-committee for this important work.

Task Force to Enhance Learning and Teaching (TFELT)

This task force will continue its work. When it submits its final report (likely in 2021), it will be dissolved. If similar work should continue in the future, the Academic Affairs Committee can supervise an appropriate entity.

It would be advisable for this entity within Academic Affairs to have representatives from Faculty Affairs, Institutional Research, Office of eLearning, and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics so that varied perspectives and appropriate expertise are brought to bear. A dissemination plan of the evaluative findings to various stakeholder groups needs to be crafted. Some institutions tie incentive payments (salary bonuses) for faculty with teaching loads to the collective achievements in teaching and learning. MU might consider such tactics.

As mentioned above, this oversight committee should also be tasked with collecting workload data during the optional, pilot semesters. If the committee finds that the original TFELT workload estimates were inaccurate, and the processes take significantly more time than is reasonable, the committee should contact the Office of the Provost to discuss and propose possible changes.

Finally, this oversight committee should be the group responsible for receiving general feedback on the effectiveness of the overall system, and its specific tools. The committee should be empowered to request review and testing of any and all materials for quality purposes.

Submitted by,

Cassandra Harper Morris
Brian Houston
Tori Mondelli

on behalf of the **Task Force to Enhance Learning & Teaching**

TFELT Member	College/School	TFELT Member	College/School
Casandra Harper Morris, Co-chair	Education	Dale Fitch	Health Professions
Brian Houston, Co-chair	A&S	Charlie Nilon	CAFNR
Nicole Monnier	A&S	Rachel Harper	Honors
Sarah Diem	Education	Arthur Jago	Business (Emeritus)
Anne Alexander	Law	Rosalie Metro	Education
Gina Oliver	Nursing	Alexandria Lewis	Health Professions
Roger Fales	Engineering	Graham McCaulley	HES
Tamara Hancock	Vet Med	John Middleton	Vet Med
Kellie Stanfield	Journalism	Marjorie Dorimé-Williams	Education
Chris Prestigiacomio	Business	Amy Lannin	Education
Beth Whitaker	Education	---	---
<p>TFELT Support Team: Tori Mondelli (Administrative Lead), Jonathan Cisco (Sub-committee Lead), Lydia Bentley (Design Team Liaison), Steve Klien (A&S, Sub-committee Lead), Bethany Stone (A&S, Sub-committee lead), Ransford Pinto (former member and College of Education graduate student), and Rachel Koch (undergraduate student and Student Lead)</p>			
<p>Former members: David Schulz (A&S), Diedre Wipke Tevis (Nursing), Clark Peters (HES), and Bruce Barrett (CAFNR)</p> <p>Special Assistance during COVID-19: Monique Luisi (Journalism)</p> <p>Liaisons to Faculty Council: Clark Peters (HES), Michelle Teti (briefly) (Health Professions), Graham McCaulley (HES), and John Middleton (Vet Med)</p>			

References

- Abrami, P. C. (2001). Improving judgements about teaching effectiveness using teacher rating forms. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 109, 59–87.
- Addy, T. M., Dube D., and Mitchell, K. A. (2020). *A Collaborative Course Tool for Advancing Inclusive Teaching Efforts* [Conference presentation]. 2020 POD Network Conference.
- Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., & Norman, M. K. (2010). *How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching*. John Wiley & Sons.
- American Association of University Professors (n.d.). *Statement on Teaching Evaluation*. <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-teaching-evaluation>
- American Educational Research Association. (2014). *Rethinking faculty evaluation: AERA report and recommendations on evaluating education research, scholarship, and teaching in postsecondary education* [Policy brief]. Author. https://www.aera.net/Portals/38/docs/Education_Research_and_Research_Policy/RethinkingFacultyEval_R4.pdf
- American Sociological Association (2019). *Statement on student evaluations of teaching*. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa_statement_on_student_evaluations_of_teaching_feb132020.pdf
- Ames, C. (1990). Motivation: What teachers need to know. *Teachers College Record*, 91, 409-472.
- Appling, S. E., Naumann, P. L., & Berk, R. A. (2001). Using a faculty evaluation triad to achieve evidence-based teaching. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 22(5), 247.
- Arreola, R. A. (2007). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system* (3rd ed.). Anker.
- Association of American Universities (n.d.). *Framework for systemic change in undergraduate STEM teaching and learning*. https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/STEM%20Scholarship/AAU_Framework.pdf
- Bandy, J. (2015). *Peer Review of Teaching*. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. Retrieved May 21, 2020 from <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/peer-review-of-teaching/>
- Beran, T. N., & Rokosh, J.L. (2009). The consequential validity of student ratings: What do instructors really think? *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 55(4), 497–511.

- Bernstein, D.J., Jonson, J., & Smith, K. (2000). An examination of the implementation of peer review of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 83, 73-86.
- Blumberg, P. (2016). How critical reflection benefits faculty as they implement learner-centered teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 144, 87-97.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boysen, G.A., Kelly, T.J., Raesly, H.N., & Casner, R.W. (2014). The (mis)interpretation of teaching evaluations by college faculty and administrators. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(6), 641-656.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2002). Using the lenses of critically reflective teaching in the community college classroom. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 118, 31-38. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.61>.
- Brown, A. R., Morning, C., & Watkins, C. (2005). Influence of African American engineering student perceptions of campus climate on graduation rates. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(2), 263-271.
- Cavanagh, S. (2016). *The spark of learning: Energizing the college classroom with the science of emotion*. West Virginia University Press.
- Centra, J. A. (1978). Using student assessments to improve performance and vitality. In W. R. Kirschling (Ed.), *Evaluating faculty performance and vitality* (pp. 31-49). Jossey-Bass.
- Clayson, D. E. (2009). Student evaluations of teaching: Are they related to what students learn? A meta-analysis and review of the literature. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 31(1), 16-29.
- Cook-Sather, A., Bahti, M., & Ntem, A. (2019). *Pedagogical partnerships: a how-to guide for faculty, students, and academic developers in higher education* (Online Edition). Elon University Center for Engaged Learning. Retrieved from <https://www.centerforengagedlearning.org/books/pedagogical-partnerships/>
- Cook-Sather, A., Bovill C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in learning and teaching: A guide for faculty*. Jossey-Bass.
- Dennin, M., Schultz, Z., Feig, A., Finkelstein, N., Greenhoot, A. F., Hildreth, M., Leibovich, A., Martin, J.D., Moldwin, M., O'Dowd, D., K., Posey, L. A., Smith, T. L., Miller, E. R. (2017). Aligning practice to policies: Changing the culture to recognize and reward

- teaching at research universities. *CBE - Life Sciences Education*, 16(4), es5.
<https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.17-02-0032>
- Deslauriers, L., McCarty, L. S., Miller, K., Callaghan, K., & Kestin, G. (2019). Measuring actual learning versus feeling of learning in response to being actively engaged in the classroom. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(39), 19251–19257.
- Fischer, E., & Hänze, M. (2019). Bias hypotheses under scrutiny: Investigating the validity of student assessment of university teaching by means of external observer ratings. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(5), 772–786.
- Fletcher, J.A. (2018). Peer observation of teaching: A practical tool in higher education. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 32(1), 51-64.
- Franklin, J. (2001). Interpreting the numbers: Using a narrative to help others read student evaluations of your teaching accurately. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 87, 59–87.
- Freeman, S., Eddy, S.L., McDonough, M., Smith, M.K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M.P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(23), 8410-8415.
- Gibbs, G. (1995). *Assessing student-centered courses*. Oxford Brookes University.
- Gilman, R.A., Hensel, N., Salomon, D.A., & Wilhite, S.C. (2018). Refining the paradigm: Holistic evaluation of faculty to support faculty and student learning. *The New American Colleges and Universities*. https://nacu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/NACU_REFINING-THE-PARADIGM_READER.pdf
- Hamermesh, D. S., & Parker, A. (2005). Beauty in the classroom: Instructors' pulchritude and putative pedagogical productivity. *Economics of Education Review*, 24(4), 369–376.
- Harris, N. & Bacon, C. E. W. (2019). Developing cognitive skills through active learning: A systematic review of health care professions. *Athletic Training Education Journal*, 14(2), 135-148. <https://doi.org/10.4085/1402135>.
- Hativa, N. (2013a). *Student ratings of instruction: A practical approach to designing, operating, and reporting*. Oron Publications.
- Hativa, N. (2013b). *Student ratings of instruction: Recognizing effective teaching*. Oron Publications.

- Kreitzer, R.J., & Sweet-Cushman, J. (2021). Evaluating student evaluations of teaching: A review of measurement and equity bias in SETs and recommendations for ethical reform. *Journal of Academic Ethics*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09400-w>
- Linse, A.R. (2017). Interpreting and using student ratings data: Guidance for faculty serving as administrators and on evaluation committees. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 54, 94-106.
- Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(5), 707-754.
- Marsh, H. W., & Dunkin, M. J. (1992). Students' evaluations of university teaching: A multidimensional perspective. In C. J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*: Vol. 8 (pp. 143-233). Agathon.
- Miles, P., & House, D. (2015). The tail wagging the dog: An overdue examination of student teaching evaluations. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(2), 116-126.
- Mitchell, K. M.W., & Martin, J. (2018). Gender bias in student evaluations. *Political Science & Politics*, 51(3), 648-652.
- Morgan, H. K., Purkiss, J. A., Porter, A. C., Lypson, M. L., Santen, S. A., Christner, J. G., Grum, C., & Hammoud, M. M. (2016). Student evaluation of faculty physicians: Gender differences in teaching evaluations. *Journal of Women's Health*, 25(5), 453-456.
- Murray J.P. (1995). *Successful faculty development and evaluation: The complete teaching portfolio*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (No. 8). George Washington University.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93-97.
- Smith, B. P., & Hawkins, B. (2011). Examining student evaluations of black college faculty: Does race matter? *The Journal of Negro Education*, 80(2), 149- 162.
- Smith, B. P., & Johnson-Bailey, J. (2011/2012). Implications for non-white women in the academy. *The Negro Educational Review*, 62-63(1-4), 115-140.

- Smith, R.A. (2012). Benefits of using SoTL in picking and choosing pedagogy. In B. M. Schwartz & R. A. R. Gurung (Eds.), *Evidence-based teaching for higher education* (7-22). American Psychological Association.
- Sousa, D. A. (2011). *How the brain learns* (4th ed.). Corwin.
- Spooren, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2013). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(4), 598–642.
- Student Assessment of their Learning Gains (SALG). (n.d.). <https://salgsite.net/about>.
- Teaching Scholarship Task Force (2014). *Teaching Scholarship Task Force Report*. University of Missouri-Columbia.
- Theall, M. & Franklin, J. (2001). Looking for bias in all the wrong places: A search for truth or a witch hunt in student ratings of instruction? *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 109, 45–56.
- Thomas, S., Chie, Q. T., Abraham, M., Raj, S. J. & Beh, L. (2014). A qualitative review of the literature on peer review of teaching in higher education: An application of the SWOT framework. *Review of Educational Research* 84,112-159.
- University of Missouri Intercampus Faculty Council (2018, June 18). *Evaluating classroom-based, online, blended and laboratory teaching interactions* [Task Force Report]. University of Missouri System.
- University of Oregon (20 Apr. 2018). Senate Task Force for Teaching Evaluation. “Proposed UO Peer Review of Teaching Framework.” *Revising UO’s Teaching Evaluations*, provost.uoregon.edu/sites/provost1.uoregon.edu/files/proposed_peer_review_framework_4.20.18.pdf.
- University of Southern California, Center for Excellence in Teaching. (n.d.) Peer Review & Evaluation. cet.usc.edu/resources/instructor-course-evaluation/.
- Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. (n.d.). *Mid-semester feedback through small group analysis*. <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/services/individual/small-group-analysis/>
- Wang, Z., Tsai, C, & McFarling, P. (2017, September 18). Evaluation of University of Missouri’s instruction and course evaluation (Report). University of Missouri: Assessment Resource Center. <https://arc.missouri.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Evaluation-Report-of-ICE-Final-Dr-Wang.pdf>

Weimer, M. (2013). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. Jossey-Bass.

Wieman, C. (2015). A better way to evaluate undergraduate teaching. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, 47(1), 6-15.