

TEACHING PORTFOLIOS

Guidance from the 2019 Beyond SETs Task Force Final Report

In April 2019, Provost Myers forwarded the final report of the Faculty Senate's Beyond SETs Task Force to the Deans, asked them to propagate the report to Department Chairs and faculty, and instructed academic units to implement the task force's recommendations. This document summarizes the task force's recommendations and provides examples of methods for building teaching portfolios.

DEFINED PORTFOLIOS WITH CONSTRAINED SET USE

To implement the new approach, teaching units are instructed to adopt in their bylaws a customized portfolio approach to evaluation of teaching on a recurring basis for all faculty in the teaching unit, particularly for purposes of tenure, promotion, multi-year appointment, and award decisions. Portfolios should include measures of peer, student, and self-assessment selected from the menu below or devised by individual units. The interlinked measures that comprise a portfolio are meant to be viewed holistically, with SETs customarily weighted for no more than 50 percent of the portfolio.

Units are discouraged from using algorithms that reduce a portfolio to a single score. "Faculty may demonstrate teaching excellence through a variety of ways," according to the Faculty Manual (p. 37)—portfolios should preserve and highlight that variety.

The task force also suggests that units modify the recommended approach for contexts where it may be less practicable, such as annual merit reviews, one-year reappointments, adjunct contract renewals, and online teaching. Relevant subsets of faculty (such as adjuncts or online instructors) should be involved in designing such modifications. Some units are considering switching to a post-tenure cycle of merit reviews every three years instead of annually, in which case the recommended approach below may also be applicable for merit reviews.

As stated in the Faculty Manual, teaching includes both classroom teaching and engagement with students outside the classroom through mentoring, advising, supervision of capstones and theses, and related activities. Beyond self-assessment, methods for assessing teaching outside the classroom are currently underdeveloped; the task force encourages innovation across campus to fill that gap.

WHAT GOES INTO A PORTFOLIO?

The portfolio approach to evaluating teaching, in line with reform efforts at other universities, attenuates some of the problems associated with SETs (see "Background" section below) while turning assessment of faculty performance into a cooperative process aimed at continual improvement of teaching rather than a numerically-based, backward-looking test.

CTRL is developing training and expert resources to support portfolio-related activities.

I. Menu of Items “Beyond SETs”

When applying for reappointment, tenure, or promotion (tenure line faculty); appointment to a multi-year contract¹ or promotion (term faculty); or teaching awards (tenure line and term), faculty should submit a teaching portfolio containing at least one item from each of the five categories that follow, or a comparable list of items adapted by units as appropriate to their disciplines and stated in their bylaws. Page limits (TBD by units) are strongly recommended for portfolios.

- A. **Teaching statement** (as currently required in Files for Action - comprehensive narrative): reflect on performance of courses (what worked, what actions to change/improve, etc.) and address achievements, including engagement with students beyond the classroom and any new curricular initiatives
- B. **Self-assessment of pedagogical activities**
 1. **Annotated syllabus**: describe your design and innovation, especially new courses, revisions
 2. **Professional development** related to teaching, including CTRL events attended
 3. **Examples of feedback** to students such as comments on their work
 4. **Written self-evaluation of video** of teaching a class: video need not be submitted
 5. **Written self-evaluation of teaching outside the classroom**
- C. **Peer (faculty) assessment of teaching**
 1. **Peer classroom observation** and follow up conversation, at least twice before each major review: Reviewers from inside or outside the teaching unit, selected by chair in consultation with faculty member. Use unit-developed template or rubric. (CTRL has examples.) Faculty member writes reflection in response (half-page maximum). (Pilot with senior faculty.)
 2. **Peer observation of classroom video** by one or more colleagues and follow up conversation, at least twice before each major review: Reviewers, templates/rubrics, and response as above. Video need not be submitted.
 3. **Review of course materials** and report by appropriate standing or ad hoc committee at teaching unit level designated by the chair: Materials to include syllabi, course assignments, lecture notes, or other materials chosen by faculty member to convey pedagogical approach and quality.
- D. **Student assessment of teaching**
 1. **Student observer committee report**: CTRL and School of Education train a group of students, perhaps drawn from Peer Advisors, to observe classes. Faculty member receives the report and may respond. (Pilot with senior faculty.)
 2. **Focus group** of faculty member’s students led by colleague or CTRL instructional staff, followed by report using unit-developed template or rubric. At least twice before each major review. Response as above.
 3. **Narrative portions of SETs**: If any narratives are submitted for a course, all narratives from that course must be included. Reviewers are encouraged to weigh numerical scores in light of any expressions of bias related to physical characteristics and the like. Faculty are encouraged to respond constructively to

¹ A portfolio would be required only for the individual’s first multi-year contract and not for multi-year renewals.

issues raised in the narrative comments with ideas or steps for addressing valid student concerns.

E. **SET scores** with new constraints and improvements as per II below

II. Constrained and Improved Use of SETs

Teaching units shall not use SETs as the sole or predominant indicator of faculty effectiveness. Their guidelines for applying integrative and holistic judgment to portfolio reviews should include maximum proportions for SET scores to count within the teaching portfolio, customarily up to a ceiling of 50%. When individual faculty receive very low SET scores consistently over time (the “fire alarm” scenario), other components of the individual’s portfolio may provide clues to diagnosing and addressing the problems. In addition, the following practices are strongly recommended:

- a. Report median scores, frequency distributions, and highest/lowest scores, rather than means (averages).²
- b. Develop standards for what is a meaningful deviation from the unit and school median scores. Small deviations shall not be held to be significant.
- c. Use SETs primarily to assess improvement over time by faculty on same course, not to compare faculty to one another individually.
- d. Take into account course characteristics (e.g., disciplinary field, class size, required/elective, lower division/upper division, etc.) when interpreting scores.
- e. Note new course preps; use AU innovation exemption policy to drop SETs in advance.
- f. Eliminate lowest student score from each course to avoid the potential “one irate student” phenomenon that gives outliers undue influence. (Number of scores dropped may vary by class size.)
- g. To increase response rate, return to policy of mandatory use of class time³; online evaluation period should begin by default during the penultimate class and extend until the exam time for absent students or those without portable devices, and the evaluation period can be adjusted by faculty member.
- h. Provide text for faculty to read aloud or summarize explaining the purpose of SETs (modeled on WCL script, see Appendix).
- i. Work with Registrar to delay grade availability to students who do not complete SETs, i.e. those who complete SETs see their submitted grade by date X, other students by date Y. Even a minor delay could increase response rates.⁴ Reframe as early access to grades for those who complete SETs, using incentive rather than punishment approach, in part to set a more positive tone at the moment of SET completion.

² This is because the scale of potential answers associated with each SET question (the numbers 1-7 or 1-5) represents an ordinal ranking in which any particular number, like 5 or 6, and intervals between numbers, may mean different things to different respondents. By contrast, cardinal numbers are open to less interpretation because they correspond with a real phenomenon and a recognized metric, like age in years, income in dollars, or distance in miles or kilometers. The mean (average) is typically used to measure the midpoint of a series of cardinal numbers, and therefore not appropriate for SETs reports. The median is most appropriate for measuring the midpoint of answers on an ordinal scale.

³ "Dissatisfied students are more likely to use out-of-class time to complete the assessment" - Mitchell, Ojmarrh, and Morales, “The Effect of Switching to Mandatory Online Course Assessments on Response Rates and Course Ratings,” *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 43, no. 4 (May 19, 2018): 629–39, 630.

⁴ From Johns Hopkins University student evaluations instructions to faculty: “students will also not be able to view their course grades in SIS [student information system] prior to submitting all of their course evaluations; therefore, your cooperation in this regard is important. Do not tell students their grades in your courses. Your students will get their course grades through SIS after all of their course evaluations have been completed. If you post course grades in Blackboard, please be sure that the relevant column in your grade book is ‘hidden’ so it is not released to students.”

- j. Continue to make SETs available to chairs, deans, and appropriate committees to identify faculty who need additional support or mentoring, as well as for merit and award processes.

III. Adaptation for Other Processes

As noted, the portfolio would be assembled as part of any major faculty action; it is not meant to be a routine, annual exercise. Therefore, units should develop modified processes for annual merit review, reappointment of term faculty on one-year contracts, and adjunct contract renewals.

BACKGROUND

Survey-based student evaluations of teaching are imperfect, especially as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness in performance evaluations. Overreliance on SETs fails to provide a full picture of learning in the classroom. Some studies have shown that SETs correlate with student learning; other studies show they do not.

The literature also suggests that bias can be present based on faculty race, gender, age, accent, and other characteristics. No systematic mathematical formula has been proposed to correct for bias because it can be situational: students in gender studies and students in physics may penalize instructors for different apparent characteristics. Bias most affects instructors from underrepresented groups.

Other unwanted factors also can affect SET scores. For example, early morning courses, large class sizes, required courses, difficult courses, new courses, and new methods can all lower scores. Faculty who try to help students learn about racism, sexism, and other forms of discrimination may encounter antipathy, another risk to scores.

Alongside the apparent problems of bias, SETs may have distorting effects on instructors' behavior. Fear of being 'penalized' by students may discourage innovations in the classroom or induce instructors to enforce rules and deadlines less firmly. And research suggests that heavily weighted SETs can create incentives for grade inflation.

On the other hand, AU is an institution where student satisfaction and student voices are valued. Eliminating SETs altogether might produce an unwanted decline in allocation of faculty effort and responsiveness to students, given pressures in other areas. It would also remove a useful feedback tool for course improvement and for identifying faculty who need additional mentoring or support. Many faculty and administrators find that a sustained pattern of very high scores or very low scores is a meaningful and valuable signal. And other forms of evaluation, such as peer observation, are not free of potential bias.

Because the SETs are an imperfect instrument, whose incentives can work for and against the teaching mission and the mission of fostering diversity and inclusion, some universities are adopting new models that decenter SETs. The University of Oregon is switching from numerical to qualitative SETs and faculty reflections on teaching as part of a broader evaluative method. The University of Southern California removed SETs from high-stakes performance evaluation decisions altogether. Instead, faculty receive SET scores and narratives for their own use and describe in teaching reflection statements how they used student feedback for improvement. Peer classroom observation and internal peer review of course materials, design, and assignments, along with instructors' teaching reflection statements, are used in performance evaluation for tenure and

promotion. USC administrators also may consult SETs to identify faculty who do “an outstanding job at engaging students, faculty who may need some support in that area of their teaching, or problematic behaviors in the classroom that require further inquiry.”⁵ But they do not use them in promotion and tenure decisions. The University of Washington, after faculty of color met with the provost to discuss the problem of bias, adopted a portfolio approach that includes SETs but is more defined than AU’s current general instructions in the Faculty Manual (p. 37) that evaluation of teaching performance “must extend beyond student evaluations of teaching.”

Peer review is a feature of all of these reformed systems, in keeping with the standard of peer review applied to evaluating a faculty member’s scholarship. Reflective practice is another distinctive feature of most reforms, with an emphasis on supporting improvements in teaching and sharing teaching wisdom among colleagues.

ANALYSIS

The Beyond SETs Task Force was established by the Faculty Senate to (1) address concerns about over-reliance on, and inappropriate interpretation of, Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) surveys at American University; and (2) help teaching units more effectively implement the Faculty Manual’s requirement that measures of teaching “extend beyond student evaluations of teaching” (p. 37). In order to fulfill its charge, the task force undertook a literature review, explored current trends in practice at other universities, and assessed three options against goal-based criteria.

The final report incorporated feedback from a town hall attended by 60 faculty members on November 28, 2018, email comments from faculty who could not attend the town hall, and input from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the full Faculty Senate at its January, February, and March meetings, 2019.

The final report of the task force was sent to Deans in April 2019 and is available upon request from the AU Faculty Senate.

Acknowledgments

The Task Force thanks the following AU faculty who have provided feedback at various stages of the development of this proposal:

Tony Ahrens
Sarah Irvine Belson
Ibram Kendi
Laura Langbein
Jordanna Matlon
Malini Ranganathan
David Vine
Lily Wong

⁵ Colleen Flaherty, “Teaching Eval Shake-Up,” *Inside Higher Ed*, May 22, 2018.

Appendix: Washington College of Law student evaluations procedure yielding 80% response rate.

Step 1: Notify students one class in advance that they should bring a WiFi-enabled device to the next class.

Step 2: Reserve approximately 15 minutes to conduct the survey, preferably at the start of class.

Step 3: Have students open MyWCL and locate the appropriate course link on their home page (each faculty member will have an independent link.) Read the Statement to Students:

At the AU Washington College of Law, student evaluations are a critical component in our assessment of faculty members and courses. They affect salaries, promotions and retention. They are instrumental in curricular decisions including the scheduling of courses and the sequencing of courses from one semester to the next. They are reviewed by the Dean, Academic Deans, and faculty committees evaluating full-time and adjunct faculty. They are NOT made available to professors until final grades are submitted and there is no method by which faculty or administrators can identify the author of a response. We ask that you please take time to fill out the evaluation carefully. A separate evaluation link must be completed for each professor if the class you are taking has more than one professor. **Please note that a rating of “5” is positive and “1” is negative.** Responses are not transmitted until the submit button at the bottom of the evaluation is selected. Responses cannot be saved, nor can they be edited, reassigned or retracted after submission.

Step 4: Depart the classroom while students are completing the evaluations.

Step 5: Send an all-class email message later that day or evening asking any students who have not yet completed the evaluation to do so ASAP.

Step 6: Monitor response rates on your MyWCL home page. If response rates appear to be far short of the 80% response goal, prompt students to finalize. Academic Affairs can reopen course evaluations on a subsequent date (prior to exams) if necessary.