

Faculty Assembly Minority Affairs Committee
January 2015 Minutes

1. Approve December minutes
 - a. Minutes approved
2. Planning workshop: Multiple Means of Evaluation? Identifying Best Practices
 - a. Review status of
 - i. President's Diversity Fund- Denise submitted application. Should know next week if funding is approved.
 - ii. Distribution of feedback email- sent to Faculty Assembly and AD/ASG. Need to send to schools and colleges.
 - iii. Date/time Doodle poll
 - b. Discuss logistics. Doodle poll changed to have a noon to 1pm option on Friday, April 3.
 - i. Room reservation/arrangement- can reserve at library but would be two or three separate spaces (elc and friends meeting room). Look into other spaces? Farrah will see if can find an education room. Faye will call auraria events.
 - ii. Marketing/promotion
 - c. Planning workshop agenda and discussion details
 - i. Ask Lando to look for articles, but need to refine list of what we need.
 - ii. How to organize? What organizing questions might kick off discussions, or small group discussions? Questions to encourage productive sharing of practices instead of the workshop focusing on complaints.
2. Promoting collaboration between faculty and students – First step to reach out to student groups. Update?
 - i. Ask Lynda Duran, student life coordinator, and EOP to come to future meeting after event this semester is complete. Issue tabled until late April, early May meeting. Carlos talked to EOP, international affairs, career center, CU Succeed, who want to be in loop with our events.

Faculty Assembly Minority Affairs Committee
February 2015 Minutes

1. Review minutes from January 2014 (attached)
 - A. One minor revision
2. Planning workshop: Multiple Means of Evaluation? : Identifying Best Practices
 - a. Finalize date/time & location details. Decided on Friday 4/3 from Noon-1pm
 - b. No campus room availability for midday Thursday. Farrah reserved LSC 1150
 - c. Action items: Faye and Chen look into other room availability and ask for room that can facilitate group work
 - d. Develop promotional materials – email/flyer, online registration form
 1. Email with graphic flyer. Action item: Denise will revise original save the date
 - e. Ordering Catering: Boxed lunch from gourmet to go
 - f. Room logistics- Need room that facilitates breaking up into group
 - g. Workshop agenda/logistics for asking participants "to select various modes of evaluation that they are interested in discussing to identify best practices"
 1. Registration form to include vegetarian, selection of topics.
Topics: 1) Administer FCQs to their class
2) Describe FCQ scores in self-evaluations
3) Interpret and analyze FCQ scores for evaluating others
4) Other suggestions/recommendations for best practices with FCQs
3. Discussion questions for each evaluation mode - next meetings
4. Other updates or announcements? None

Faculty Assembly Minority Affairs Committee
March 10, 2015 Minutes

Attendees: Denise Pan, Faye Caronan, Vera Gao, Farah Ibrahim, Chen Ji

- I. Review minutes from February meeting (attached)
 - A. Minutes approved
- II. Planning workshop: Multiple Means of Evaluation? : Identifying Best Practices
 - A. Distributing email/flyer – updates on distribution? Email flyer sent to AD/ASG, School of Ed, distributed to Faculty Assembly. Faye action item: send to CLAS newsletter. Chen action item: send to Business school
 - B. Review registered attendees
 1. Still small number of attendees. Farah action item: reach out to some registered attendees to ask what their particular interests are so we can tailor the workshop.
 - C. Develop timeline for pre-event activities and assign responsibilities to members
 1. ordering catering- Vera and Denise will take charge of ordering.
 2. sending reminder email to registered participants with link to literature review- Denise will follow through with this
 3. discussion prompts for each discussion group- Will reach out to registered attendees and develop prompts at next meeting
 - Administer FCQs in the classroom
 - Describe FCQ scores in self-evaluations
 - Interpret and analyze FCQ scores for evaluating others
 4. materials needed day of event? E.g. handouts, sign-in sheet, name tags, and other items?- Will repurpose materials from past events at library for workshop
 - D. Event day details
 1. identify event facilitator
 - A. Farah will facilitate
 2. Room setup?- Different tables for discussion groups, with prompts at tables according to attendees' registered interest. MAC members will serve as notetakers at each table.
 3. When should lunch be delivered and to who?- Lunch should be delivered at 11am. Farah will be contact person.
 4. When should MAC members arrive?- 11:30am
 - E. Post workshop
 1. Create report with findings and recommendations by the end of the semester. – Farah will draft the report
 2. Send report to interested individuals (see document on Dropbox), including Donna Sobel.
- III. Meeting dates for after event?
 - A. Tuesday, 4/14 10-11am, last meeting of semester. Will draft report of workshop.

Faculty Assembly Minority Affairs

September 18, 2015 Minutes

Attendees: Faye Caronan, Vera Gao, Farah Ibrahim, Chen Ji, Andrea Velasquez, Pamela Medina-Gutierrez

- Review April meeting minutes
 - Approved
- Comments for new Faculty Assembly bylaws? Please send feedback before 10/6.
- Discuss possible action items for the year
 - Climate survey? What were the results? If the climate survey was meant to address how majority population students feel marginalized in class how should minority faculty proceed? What are the best practices?
 - Chen points out that our responsibility as stated in bylaws is to support a diverse faculty or examine policies that affect diverse faculty.
 - What is the university doing to support diverse faculty who teach socially sensitive issues? Is there adequate programming?
 - Action item: We need to find out if diverse faculty are more likely to teach sensitive issues and ask what kind of support they need.

Faculty Assembly Minority Affairs

October 16, 2015 Minutes

Attendees: Faye Caronan, Carlos Realí, Peter Stoltzman, Chen Ji, Andrea Velasquez

1. Welcome Peter Stoltzman, CAM
2. Review September meeting minutes
 - a. Approved
3. Any comments for new Faculty Assembly bylaws? None.
4. Discuss possible action items for the year
 - a. Minority faculty hiring? How to attract or prioritize minority hiring?
 - b. Collaborate with EOP office, global education office? Information to faculty because these offices can support faculty.
 - c. What is the university doing to support diverse faculty who teach socially sensitive issues? Is there adequate programming?
 - d. Connections with minority students in DPS?
5. Move next meeting?

Faculty Assembly Ethnic Diversity Affairs Committee

December 11th, 2015 Minutes

Attendees: Carlos Realí, Peter Stoltzman, Farah Ibrahim, Vera Gao

1. Three present member approved the October minutes. Peter volunteered to take the minutes.
2. Farah reported on with the Ethnic Diversity Faculty Focus Group research. She is looking for funding, and planning to pursue IRB approval in December 2015.
 - a. Are members of the committee willing to run Focus Groups? Three members present agreed that they would be willing to assist with running the focus groups.
 - b. Goals: identify recommendations regarding how CU can provide a more supportive environment for ethnically diverse faculty?

Farah also shared that she met a faculty member from UNC—Betty Cardona at a training held at UCD. Dr. Cardona shared her interest in collaborating on the research on identifying the needs of ethnically diverse faculty after hearing about the EDAC project. She has expressed an Interest in running a parallel research project at UNC. If these two projects are successful Farah and Betty are considering a potential national research project.

This research project is currently a joint project with the CU Denver Faculty Council EMAC, and Dr. Viesca is working on the project with Farah and Vera. Farah noted that some of the issues identified by the EDAC members in October are being incorporated into the questions for the focus groups, e.g., (a) questions about ethnically diverse faculty hiring? How to attract or prioritize hiring of ethnically diverse faculty, (b) is faculty getting support from other units on campus such as EOP and the global education offices? (c) identify efforts by the university to support diverse faculty who teach socially sensitive subjects? Is there adequate programming on campus to address socially sensitive issues?

3. EDAC Members brainstormed on ideas generated in the October meeting for events or projects, these included:
 - i. Identify key variables to support ethnically diverse faculty—field of study/research, college-sponsored social activities (activities/events, are faculty attending, does the activity/event promote social interaction?)
 - ii. Examples of large events:
 1. Diversity event in Stapleton in 2014
 2. Diversity conference in 2015 Spring on Auraria campus
4. Next meeting will be held n February 19, 2016.
5. Adjournment at 11:00 a.m.

Multiple Means of Evaluation? Identifying Best Practices with FCQ's
University of Colorado, Faculty Assembly Minorities Affairs Committee (MAC)

Report (2014-15)

Prepared by

Farah A. Ibrahim, PhD, LP (CO)

Professor, School of Education and Human Development

MAC Committee Members (2014-15)

Denise Pan, Chair, Auraria Library

Faye Caronan Chen, Secretary, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Ji Chen, School of Business

Vera Gao, Auraria Library

Farah Ibrahim, School of Education and Human Development

Carlos Reali, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Multiple Means of Evaluation? Identifying Best Practices with FCQ

The University of Colorado Denver (CU Denver), Faculty Assembly Minority Affairs Committee (MAC) is charged with making recommendations on hiring, support, and retention of diverse faculty at the university. To facilitate diverse faculty, the MAC committee focused on identifying faculty assumptions and ideas about multiple means of evaluation and best practices with FCQ's in 2014-15. The MAC Event on *Multiple Means of Evaluation? Identifying Best Practices with FCQ's* (Faculty and Course Questionnaire) was held on April 3, 2015. This workshop was a follow-up on last year's MAC event, *Reconsidering FCQs* (<http://tinyurl.com/ReconsiderFCQ>), which involved quantitative analysis of FCQ data for CU Denver faculty. The results based on 18,205 courses, with a minimum of 10 students, showed that culturally diverse faculty FCQ's were approximately 0.15-0.25 points lower on a six-point scale.

These results are consistent with research on teaching evaluations of faculty who are members of non-dominant and diverse cultural groups (Andersen & Smith, 2007; Gilroy, 2007; Reid, 2010; Smith, 2007; Smith & Hawkins, 2011). The MAC report on *Reconsidering FCQs* (2013-14) included recommendations to address the situation, however, it is unclear to date, if any of these recommendations have been adopted. This year, MAC members wanted to follow-up on the recommendations made by faculty and administrators at last year's workshop to review best practices with FCQs. The workshop was designed to get input from faculty at CU Denver, to assess and incorporate their perspective on appropriate means of evaluation for

teaching, and what they think are best practices in administering FCQs, and using the data derived from this evaluation.

Event Location and Participants

The event was held at the Lawrence Street Center, Room 1150, and attended by 19 individuals who had preregistered for the event, and three additional participants, who came to the event, but had not preregistered; the total number of attendees was 22. Faculty, and staff, and some students from CU Denver attended the event, they represented the following academic units: Anthropology, Computer Science, Engineering and Applied Sciences, Psychology, Mathematics, School of Business, School of Education and Human Development, School of Public Affairs, Institutional Research, Office of Undergraduate Experience, and Student Government. The following members of the MAC assisted with facilitation discussion in small groups: Faye Caronan Chen, Ji Chen, Vera Gao, Farah Ibrahim, Denise Pan, and Carlos Reali.

Workshop Focus

All preregistered participants received sample questions to explore the issue of best practices in teaching evaluations: These included:

- (a) Administering FCQs in the classroom
 - (a.1) How can we improve response rates (face-to-face and online courses)?
 - (a.2) How do you encourage students to provide constructive and positive feedback?
 - (a.3) Other concerns, questions?
- (b) Describing FCQ scores in self-evaluations

- (b.1) What aspects of FCQ report do you highlight in your self-evaluation?
 - (b.2) What information do you provide about the course and students?
 - (b.3) Other ideas?
- (c) Interpreting and analyzing FCQ scores for evaluating others
- (c.1) What do you think are important factors that should be considered?
 - (c.2) Is there additional training and mentoring available for evaluators at CU Denver?
 - (c.3) Other suggestions?

They were also sent the following links to facilitate review of best practices nationally:

<http://www.celt.iastate.edu/teaching-resources/document-your-teaching/student-evaluation-of-teaching/>

<http://www.crlt.umich.edu/evaluation/decision>

<http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/student-evaluations/#tips>

More background information on FCQs are available at

<http://library.auraria.edu/services/faculty/fcq>

Results

The discussion of the three main questions generated meaningful results, although, all responses to all three questions seemed to blend together to a certain extent, although, they address different aspects of administration, self-report by faculty, and evaluation by others. Majority of the faculty attending the workshop were junior faculty hoping to achieve tenure at CU Denver, or graduate students who were teaching undergraduates and hoping to move into an academic career. The results are presented in Tables I, II, and III. The first question generated the greatest amount of input from the attendees. Several useful recommendations were provided for all three questions.

Table I: Summary Results for Question 1: Administer FCQs' in the Classroom

Improve Response Rates	Encourage Students to Provide Constructive Feedback	Other Issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Require students to provide feedback ▪ If students have a mobile device, faculty can provide time for responding to FCQ in class ▪ Mention in the syllabus that feedback on the course, and instructor would help improve instruction ▪ Flexibility in timing when FCQs are collected, not all CU-Denver courses follow the 15 week schedule ▪ Response rates differ for face-to-face courses vs., online courses-require feedback on course and instructor before releasing grade ▪ Provide computers for online FCQ administration in face-to-face classes ▪ Administer FCQ at the end of semester, instead of two or three weeks before the course ends ▪ Make FCQs course-specific 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Faculty model appropriate feedback skills and behavior ▪ Use videos to demonstrate meaningful feedback ▪ Include information and examples about productive feedback in the syllabus ▪ Provide training sessions ▪ Use exemplary students in each class to encourage others to participate ▪ “Fun” courses get better ratings ▪ Faculty needs to be humanistic and holistic ▪ Create and inclusive community in the classroom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Check with students mid-semester on satisfaction with the course, and instructor’s teaching style ▪ Different schools have different evaluation practices ▪ Cultural differences have an effect on evaluations. Students with hierarchical and patriarchal values-downgrade diverse and women faculty ▪ First generation college students may not be comfortable communicating with faculty ▪ Getting RTP evaluation committees to consider multiple means to evaluate teaching ▪ Difference in response between undergraduate and graduate students ▪ Faculty needs to be better informed regarding FCQ results, statistical comparisons, different rates, trends and other aspects of the FCQ report ▪ What is the value assigned to FCQ’s for

		<p>retention, promotion, and tenure?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does gender and diverse group membership affect FCQs?
--	--	--

Table II: Results for Question II: Describe FCQ Scores in Self-Evaluations

What Aspects of FCQS do you highlight in your self-evaluation	What Other Information Do You Provide about the Course and Students	Other Ideas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide charts/graphs to show improvement based on student feedback from FCQs ▪ Include mid-term evaluation results, along with final FCQ information ▪ Include peer evaluations, using “peer review instruments” listed among best practices* ▪ Add questions to the FCQ form, e.g., “is this an elective or a required course?” Or, “are you interested in this subject?” ▪ Present information about your subject, teaching methods used to access students, understanding learning styles, and matching teaching methods to learning styles ▪ Present your course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide mean/median GPA of the course along with FCQ scores ▪ Provide demographic profile of your course enrollment, especially, when you have local, national, and international students, along with gender diversity, and possible impact on your evaluation based on published research ▪ Evaluate your college/school multiple sources of information for teaching versus other colleges/schools ▪ Present the value of different aspects of your teaching portfolio, and your contributions to teaching and scholarship at CU-Denver ▪ Provide information on how you model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In describing your teaching evaluations, try not to be too defensive, e.g., “do not state that diverse and female faculty get lower FCQs” ▪ Present information on cultural differences, lack of understanding of plagiarism, cheating, note that you are seeking consultation with the Office of International Students, and Faculty Development Center ▪ Develop a support group with peers at the same developmental stage (tenure or clinical faculty) to discuss teaching and feedback methods ▪ Consider getting feedback using written and/or drawings (stick figures) to evaluate how they feel in your

<p>and instructor evaluation from a strength perspective, focus on facts, e.g., required or elective strategies you used to teach effectively</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Share information on training you participated in to teach effectively 	<p>professional, constructive feedback practices in your teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Share information on what you state in your syllabus about providing productive and constructive feedback to students 	<p>class</p>
--	---	--------------

* <http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/resources/peer/instruments/index.html>

Table III: Question III Results: Interpreting and Analyzing FCQ Scores for Evaluating Others

What Do You Think are Important Factors that Should be Considered?	Is There Training Available for RTP Evaluation Committees	Other Suggestions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All aspects of the teaching portfolio needs to be evaluated, possibly weights should be assigned to each area to ensure a fair evaluation ▪ Recognize innovative teaching modes going beyond textbooks, and give due credit to faculty who use innovations to make learning meaningful for the students based on developmental stage of students, subject matter (dance, art), information age technology (digital media), etc. ▪ Faculty who are able to develop learning communities (empowering and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CU Denver has Skill Soft Training for individuals who serve on search committees, people serving on RTP committees need to get training to evaluate peers on teaching ▪ Training must be provided to analyze and evaluate FCQ scores, and the complete profile must be considered not just two numbers, course mean/median and Instructor mean/median score ▪ Mentoring to serve on RTP Committees, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that RTP Committee members have education and training on understanding statistical information ▪ Check how different colleges and schools prepare faculty for RTP committees and innovative methods used to weigh each aspect of the teaching portfolio (Clarity of syllabi, FCQs, courses developed, programs developed, certificate programs developed, teaching and collaborating with multiple programs, mentoring students, thesis and dissertations

<p>inclusive) should be recognized for using collaborative strategies to enhance learning and student satisfaction</p>	<p>in the SEHD, each year the dean and associate dean address the RTP committee on guidelines for evaluating peers</p>	<p>supervised, etc.)</p>
--	--	--------------------------

Discussion

The issues identified and recommendations made by the participants provide several guidelines for mentoring junior faculty for achieving tenure as it relates to effectiveness of teaching. Teaching activities include several important variables that define the career path of an academic. It is critical that faculty and evaluators consider teaching activities in a holistic manner, and consider the depth and breadth of the teaching portfolio (Marsh & Roche, 1997; University of Colorado, <http://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009>; University of Michigan <http://www.crlt.umich.edu/tstrategies/guidelines>);). Further assigning weights to aspects of teaching activities as reflected in institutional policy (<http://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009>) would reduce confusion about aspects of teaching that are valued and rewarded. Marsh and Roche (1997) cite several researchers who have noted that teaching is a complex and multidimensional activity, teaching evaluation instruments need to be designed reflect all aspects of the complexity that teaching represents.

The University of Colorado policy on multiple means of evaluation of teaching provides the following criteria in Appendix A: A representative, but not exhaustive list of suggestions for components to be used in the evaluation of

teaching*:

- Course syllabi and examinations
- Student evaluations as reported on Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQ's) or a similar, campus-approved system and forms
- Grade distributions
- Instructional materials
- Scholarly research and publication on teaching
- Self-evaluation or report
- Student examination performance
- Student mid-term evaluations
- Evidence of risk taking to enhance learning
- Curriculum development that enhances learning
- Willingness to take training in teaching effectiveness and new technology
- Evidence of engagement in the online environment
- Alumni opinions within 2-5 years of graduation
- Peer assessments
- Professional awards related to the education process
- Grants in support of teaching and learning
- Student focus groups

*<http://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009>

Administer FCQs in the Classroom

The recommendations provided by the participants in the workshop resonated with several best practices, specifically, grade distributions, self-evaluation, student GPA in the course, peer assessments, curriculum development to enhance learning, training on teaching effectiveness, online engagement, evidence of risk taking and using innovative strategies (Table I, II, and III). Regarding University of Colorado guidelines on focus groups and follow-up with alumni, we recommend schools and colleges should conduct student focus groups, and follow-up with graduates to get an evaluation 3-5 years post-graduation, to reduce implications of bias. These recommendations and CU Denver guidelines resonate with best practices for teaching evaluation in the research literature (Iowa State University <http://www.celt.iastate.edu/teaching-resources/document-your-teaching/student->

[evaluation-of-teaching/effective-practice/#analysis](#); University of Michigan, <http://www.crlt.umich.edu/tstrategies/guidelines>; Vanderbilt University, <http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/student-evaluations/#tips>).

Describe FCQ Scores in Self-Evaluations

Several of the recommendations by participants on presenting FCQ information for evaluation are useful, and identified as best practices, e.g., presenting improvements in graphs, such as educating students on how the feedback would be used in improving the course and instructor effectiveness, developing course-specific evaluations, model constructive feedback strategies, creating learning communities, using innovative strategies for teaching, doing mid-term evaluations, and using data from both mid-term and final FCQ's administered by the university. However, what was missing from the discussion was the faculty members' satisfaction with the university, issues such stress of the tenure process, lack of collegiality or mentoring, university environment, internal and external stressors, which are addressed in the research literature (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005; Boyer, Altbach, & Whitlaw, 1994; Matier, 1990). To enhance teaching ability of junior faculty of color, and to reduce excessive stress, especially pertaining to evaluation and success at an academic institution, it is important to provide positive and strength-based mentoring, and support for teaching, and research activities, educate new and junior faculty about all the resources available on campus, and encourage connecting with peer faculty at own and other institutions.

Interpreting and analyzing FCQ Scores for Evaluating Others

The primary anxiety and stress regarding FCQs' is the issue of how the information will be used in annual review, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) decisions, for junior faculty of color, and women (Gmelch, Lovrich, & Wilkie, 1986; O'Meara, 2002; Rice, Sorcinelli & Austin, 2000). This question came up several times during the workshop, and we would be remiss if we did not address it. The recommendations in Table III address how faculty would like this concern addressed, specifically, they noted that evaluators should understand statistical information, should possibly have training to evaluate peers, along with an emphasis on giving credit for innovative teaching methods, consider a faculty members overall contributions to teaching, such as new courses developed, grants to enhance teaching, scholarship of teaching, and creating learning communities to enhance student learning and satisfaction, and not focus on the mean score for course and instructor rating.

The pressure on faculty at a Research I University, such as CU Denver is to also publish or perish. O'Meara (2002) notes that Ernest Boyer's (1990) suggestion that the definition of scholarship used in promotion policies be changed, to include teaching, discovering, integrating, and applying knowledge. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) report that 62% of chief academic officers of four-year institutions used Boyer's recommendations to consider faculty roles and rewards. Several advocates have recommended assessing teaching, and service as scholarship, essentially rewarding multiple forms of scholarship within academic reward systems (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Hutchings & Shulman, 1999; O'Meara). We believe that acknowledging faculty contributions to teaching and service as

scholarship would make teaching central in an academic institution, and also result in greater attention to inclusive and positive teaching strategies, enhancing student learning, and satisfaction. MAC recommends that CU Denver administrators, department heads, and faculty consider implementing recommendations offered by faculty at the workshop, and the research literature to lower stress, and anxiety, among junior faculty, enhance satisfaction with the educational institution, and ensure that best practices are in use to promote faculty retention and promotion at CU Denver.

References

Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing

faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(7), 803-830

doi: 10.1007/s11162-004-6226-6

Anderson, K. J., & Smith, G. (2005). Students preconceptions of

professors: Benefits and barriers according to ethnicity and gender.

Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 27(2), 184-201.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for

the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. L., Altbach, P. G., and Whitlaw, M. (1994). *The Academic profession: An*

international perspective. Princeton, NJ. Carnegie Foundation for the

Advancement of Teaching.

Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching. *Student Evaluation of Teaching:*

Guidelines and Recommendations for Effective Practice. Ames, IA: Iowa State

University. Retrieved from:

<http://www.celt.iastate.edu/teaching-resources/document-your-teaching/student-evaluation-of-teaching/effective-practice/#analysis>

Center for Research on Learning and Teaching. *Student Evaluations*. Ann Arbor, MI:

University of Michigan. Retrieved from:

<http://www.crlt.umich.edu/tstrategies/guidelines>;

Center for Teaching. *Student evaluations*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University

retrieved from: [http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/student-](http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/student-evaluations/#tips)

[evaluations/#tips](http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/student-evaluations/#tips)).

- Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gilroy, M. (2007). Bias in student evaluations of faculty? *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*, 17, 26-27.
- Gmelch, W. H., Lovrich, N. P., & Wilkie, P. K. (1986). Dimensions of stress among university faculty: Factor analysis results from a national study. *Research in Higher Education*, 24, 266-286.
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. S. (1999). Scholarship of teaching. *Change*, 31(5), 11-15.
- Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making teaching evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1187-1197.
- Matier, M. W. (1990). Retaining faculty: A tale of two campuses. *Research in Higher Education* 31(1): 30--60.
- O'Meara, K. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as Scholarship. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(1), 57-80.
- Reid, L. D. (2010). The role of perceived race and gender in the evaluation of college teaching on RateMyProfessors.com. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 3(3), 137-152.
- Rice, E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers*

for a new generation. New Pathways Working Paper Series, Inquiry No. 7.

Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Smith B. P. (2007). Student ratings of teaching effectiveness: An analysis of end-of-course faculty evaluations. *College Student Journal*. 41(4), 788-800.

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.

University of Michigan. Retrieved from

<http://www.crlt.umich.edu/tstrategies/guidelines>.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.). *Developing new and junior faculty*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning (Vol. 50, pp. 27-37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.