



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712

*Office of the Chairman
Department of English
(512) 471-4991*

12 October 1982

MEMORANDUM

To: Department of English Senate [Bertelsen, Bowden, Cable, Carver, Duban, Duncan, Faigley, Farrell, Friedman, Ghose, Hairston, Hinojosa, Jolliffe, Kruppa, Lesser, Lidoff, Megaw, Renwick, Ruszkiewicz, Sipiara, Skaggs, Stott, Wevill, Whitbread]

From: Joseph J. Moldenhauer, Chairman

Subject: Senate Meeting

This is a reminder that the Department of English Senate will meet at 3:00 p.m. on Friday, October 15 in Parlin 201.

AGENDA

1. Announcements by the Chair
2. Report on lecturer recruitment for 1982-83
3. Minors for English Majors
4. Senate project (Farrell)
5. Calendar of Senate activities, 1982-83

JJM:psw

Enclosure: Material on Peer Evaluation distributed to Senate members during October 1981.

Proposal Outline:

Program of Teaching Evaluation of Tenure-Seeking Faculty

I. Purpose

To monitor the teaching effectiveness and to aid in the development of teaching skills of tenure-seeking faculty.

II. Staff

- 1 Consultant (assigned to each instructor): to give counseling and to visit and evaluate classes.
- 2 Evaluator: to visit and evaluate classes as an "outside" observer.
- 3 Teaching Effectiveness Committee (TEC): to co-ordinate the program.
Comprised of the Program Chairman, the Undergraduate Adviser, and one member of the EC, and one Teaching Consultant.

III. Modes of Evaluation

- 1 CIS (Course-Instructor Surveys) and other types of questionnaires
- 2 Visits to classes
- 3 Interviews of classes in the instructor's absence
- 4 Reports: confidential written evaluations addressed to the EC

IV. Timetable for Each Instructor

First year

- Temporary Consultant appointed (informal conferences; Visits if requested)
- All courses evaluated by CIS; results not to be released against the instructor's wishes)

Second year

- Regular Consultant appointed
- 2 CIS released to the EC
- 1 class Visit by Consultant (no Report)

Third year

- 2 CIS released to the EC
- 1 joint class Visit by Consultant and an ("outside") Evaluator
- 1 joint Report by Consultant and Evaluator

Fourth year

- 3 CIS released to the EC
- 2 separate class Visits; 1 by the Consultant, 1 by an Evaluator
- 1 class Interview by Consultant
- 2 Reports (one each by Consultant and Evaluator)

Fifth year

- 4 CIS released to the EC
- 3 class Visits (one each by the Consultant and two Evaluators)
- 2 class Interviews (by the Consultant and one of the Evaluators in each)
- 3 Reports (one each by the Consultant and two Evaluators)

Sixth year

- as with tenured faculty; other arrangements as needed.

V. Guidelines

- 1 The TEC will request the EC's approval in the appointing of Consultants and Evaluators, and will provide the EC with Reports according to the timetable.
- 2 The instructor will have the right to approve the appointment of, or to request changes in, Consultants and Evaluators.
- 3 Reports should be regarded in the same light as confidential evaluations of an instructor's publications. Reports may include digests of and commentaries upon CIS evaluations, as well as commentaries upon the instructor's teaching aims and methods, course materials, etc.
- 4 Class Visits will never be unannounced.

VI. Understandings

- 1 The timetable lists the minimum requirements. Additional evaluations may be volunteered or requested as needed.
- 2 The appointment of Consultants and Evaluators can be flexible, according to fields of interest, teaching styles, and availability.
- 3 The Consultant should keep a record to ensure adherence to the timetable.
- 4 It is expected that after a Consultant visits a class there will be a conference to discuss the instructor's methods and the Consultant's critiques.
- 5 Service as a Consultant or Evaluator should be considered a committee assignments and should be listed in the Annual Report.
- 6 It is understood that the Consultant in most cases will probably take a sympathetic position towards the instructor and will help the EC to appreciate the instructor's teaching strengths. The Reports of the Consultant will be complemented by those of the Evaluator, who will serve more as an "outside" observer.
- 7 To avoid placing sudden burden on participants, this program should be phased in gradually.

VII. Illustrations of time required by Consultants and Evaluators

Time required is estimated as follows:

<u>code</u>		<u>time required</u>
V	class Visit	1 hour
I	class Interview	1 hour
C	conference w/ instructor	1 hour
R	writing of EC Report	1 hour

- 1 Consultant appointed to one instructor:

2nd year:	2 hours	(V,C)
3rd year:	3	(V,C,R)
4th year:	4	(V,C,I,R)
5th year:	5	(V,C, 2I, R)

For Consultants appointed to several instructors, add the above hours according to the instructors' places on the timetable. For example, a Consultant appointed to 4 instructors in their second through fifth years respectively would spend 14 hours that year, or 7 each semester.

2 Evaluator appointed to one instructor:

3rd year:	2 hours	{V,R}
4th year:	2	{V,R}
5th year:	3	{V,I,R}

For multiple appointments, add accordingly.

VIII. Benefit to the EC

Under this program the EC would receive, during the first five years of each instructor's probationary period,

11 CIS

6 written Reports based on 6 class Visits and 3 class Interviews
(2 Reports by the instructor's Consultant, 3 by outside
evaluators, and 1 joint Report).

To Senate
in Sept
+ letter by
Ms. Keach
regarding



Mar 17 24 1980
+ memo 14 April 81

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712

Department of English
(512) 471-2291

(proposed)

A PROPOSAL FOR "FIFTH-YEAR EVALUATION" OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Operation

A committee of three is set up for each faculty member to be evaluated (less than 10 annually). One of the three should be familiar with the most advanced subject taught by the individual; another should be strongly committed to superior teaching in lower division courses; the third, chairing the committee, should be a senior faculty member accepted by both the EC and the individual to be evaluated.

Each committee member visits one class-meeting in each of three different courses taught by the faculty member; these are solo visits, not team visits, so that nine different class-meetings in all are visited. Each of the three visitors/evaluators also examines other evidence of teaching ability in the individual's file or now offered for consideration. After the visits and the examination of other evidence, they meet as a committee, briefly, to share general impressions and to plan the interviews with the different classes.

Toward the end of the semester (last week, next-to-last, antepenult) they visit, as a group now, each of the three classes. The instructor introduces them and leaves, allowing them an informal, 30-45 minute interview of the class. All members of the committee ask questions--the chair should not dominate nor indeed appear to be the committee chair at all--and the style should be low-pressure, informal, pleasant. Minority and individual student views should be encouraged, but students should also be allowed to attempt correction of what they regard as biased or overstated or simply inaccurate comments by other students, whether favorable or unfavorable to the instructor. The interview should begin with a brief explanation: all three have visited, but three class meetings are too narrow a base for a fair judgment, and an interview covering their impressions over most of the semester seems fairer; there are several evaluators, because otherwise the teacher would be judged from just one view of what a good English teacher should do, and that one view might be biased; *and an interview seemed useful as a supplement to the standard ratings filled out by individual students because here students could correct each other; also, no paper to feed into a computer and no long wait afterwards for the Real Truth.

After completing the three interviews, the committee composes and submits to the EC a report on the teacher, comprising

- (a) the individual's characteristics as a teacher (i.e., a description), and, in the committee's view, strengths and weaknesses (an evaluation), as evidenced in all the three classes together;
- (b) shorter but similar descriptive and evaluative remarks on performance in each of the three courses visited;
- (c) a brief but carefully considered estimate of the individual's future promise as a teacher, and the kind of teaching assignments most likely to exploit present talents or develop other talents of the individual as a teacher taking part in the programs of the Department, College, or University; and
- (d) any reservations the committee may have on its own judgments, because of internal differences of judgment or weighting (a formal minority report should also be possible), special circumstances making judgment difficult, a change in committee membership, an atypical student situation, a personal crisis in the life of the individual evaluated, and so forth). (A fully-

Objectives

- (1) To make better evaluations (fairer, more thorough),
- (2) in such a way as to convince members of a decanal ad hoc committee on promotion that our judgments on teaching effectiveness are reliable; also,
- (3) in such a way as to protect the candidate for promotion from irresponsible, individually biased, or narrowly based judgments by either students or peers; and
- (4) to do these things without taking all of the Department's time or imposing a huge burden of additional paperwork on us.

Questions

(1) Only for fifth-year evaluations? No, it obviously could be helpful later, when an Assoc. Prof. is to be promoted to full Professor; and it could be used at other times, or for other purposes. Normally, though, it would be used the year before a decision had to be made: thus "fifth-year evaluation." Since it involves a not inconsiderable amount of time and energy, it should be employed only on special occasion for a limited number of department members, not regularly for all.

(2) Couldn't a single person conduct a deeper interview with a class? Yes, but the instructor would then be at the mercy of a single sensitivity, a single philosophy about "good teaching," perhaps a single view of what matters in "English." And the students would not have the reassurance that there was no single Party Line. And the single interviewer, however fair and clever, would be deprived of the timely help of colleagues who by leaping in to interrupt or to follow up more closely, can vary the subject or the intensity in a perfectly natural way.

(3) Spring or Fall term, in the 5th year? For someone teaching three classes with three preparations, one term could be enough--whichever seemed most appropriate. Some fifth-year candidates for tenure may be teaching a graduate course and have enough TLC for doctoral committees to be teaching only two courses; here, a selection of three different courses--definitely including the graduate course--would be appropriate, even though the committee would have to spread its work over two terms. In some instances, the committee may wish to use the two-term option even though the candidate is teaching three different courses in one semester: they may wish to pick up an experimental offering, or a second-time-around course, or a course in which the instructor can be compared with a large number of other instructors. The committee chair, in consultation with the candidate, should be able to work this out without calling a special meeting of the committee.

(4) How much time is involved, for a member of such a committee? Rough estimate: 9 hours, perhaps less. 3 class visits: 3 hrs. 1 hr. examining other evidence. 1 hr. or less on committee meeting to exchange first views and plan interviews. 3 interviews of 30-45 mins.: 1½ hrs-2¼ hrs. 1 hr.-1¼ hrs., report. Total, 7½-9 hours. Add 2 hrs. for SuperEGO conscientiousness, max. 11 hrs./ committee member.

(5) Is it suggested that we put all our eggs in this basket, for tenure candidates? No. The all-but-totality majority opinion of those who have studied the evaluation of teaching effectiveness is that a pluralistic approach is the least worst. Those subject to evaluations should be encouraged to submit whatever evidence they regard as telling. Members charged with the heavy responsibility for passing judgment would also be well advised to consider other kinds of evidence. An "informal interview" can go wrong, a trio of interviewers can produce not a summary enlivened by their differences but deadened into a Lowest Common Denominator. The evaluative instrument proposed here is neither sufficient by itself nor proof against subversion or ineptitude in application. But it does seem to offer some striking possibilities of improvement when compared with the kinds of evaluation we are now employing.

Wadlington

revised draft 3/4/81

Proposal Outline:

Program of Teaching Evaluation of Tenure-Seeking Faculty

I. Purposes and Rationale

To monitor the teaching effectiveness and to aid in the development of teaching skills of tenure-seeking faculty.
[Rationale to be provided here.]

II. Staff

1. Evaluator: to visit and evaluate classes.
2. Teaching Effectiveness Committee (TEC): a sub-committee of the EC to co-ordinate the program. Comprised of the Program Chairman, the Undergraduate Adviser, and one member of the EC.

III. Modes of Evaluation

1. CIS (Course-Instructor Surveys) and other types of questionnaires.
2. Visits to classes.
3. Interviews of classes in the instructor's absence.
4. Reports: confidential written evaluations addressed to the EC.

IV. Timetable for each Instructor and Assistant Professor

First year

The EC urges that all courses be evaluated by CIS. Results released at the instructor's option.

Second year

The EC urges that all courses be evaluated by CIS. Minimum of two CIS released to EC.

Third year

The EC urges that all courses be evaluated by CIS. Minimum of two CIS released to EC. One class visit and report by an evaluator.

Fourth year

The EC urges that all courses be evaluated by CIS. Minimum of three CIS released to EC. One class visit and report by an evaluator.

Fifth year

The EC urges that all courses be evaluated by CIS. Minimum of four CIS released to EC. Two class visits and reports by two evaluators. One or two class interviews. Visits and interviews made separately or jointly by the evaluators; reports made separately.

Sixth year

As with tenured faculty, the EC urges that courses be regularly evaluated; other arrangements as needed.

V. Guidelines

1. Instructors may request that an evaluator other than one regularly assigned to monitor that instructor serve as a consultant to advise on the improvement of teaching. The results of a consultant's class visits and the substance of conferences between consultant and instructor will be confidential to them alone.

2. The TEC will request the EC's approval in appointing evaluators.

3. The instructor will have the right to request changes in evaluators.
4. Reports should be regarded in the same light as confidential evaluations of an instructor's publications. Reports may include digests of and commentaries upon CIS evaluations, and should include commentaries upon the instructor's teaching aims and methods, course materials, papers and exams, reading list, etc.
5. Normally, class visits will be announced, unless the instructor requests otherwise.
6. An effort will be made by the fifth year to visit classes at all levels taught by the instructor.
7. Additional evaluations may be volunteered or requested as needed. Such evaluations may be granted or denied by the TEC, in consultation with the evaluator concerned.
8. Requests for modification in the evaluation format will also be considered by the TEC.
9. The appointment of evaluators can be flexible, according to fields of interest, teaching styles, and availability.
10. Service as an evaluator or consultant is a committee assignment and should be listed in the Annual Report.
11. To avoid placing sudden burdens on participants, this program will be phased in gradually; details will be worked out by the TEC, subject to EC approval.