

InDev Teaching Assessment Report

(Spring 2023-Fall 2023)

Overview

In Spring of 2023, the Senate tasked the Committee on Instructional Development (InDev) with conducting a review of teaching assessment to lay the groundwork for efforts to improve assessment and provide our students with the most effective instruction possible. The committee was not charged with providing specific recommendations for improving course evaluations/student evaluations of teaching per se. The following summary and three reports (on Student Evaluations of Teaching, Best Practices, and Relevant Policies) present our findings. We encourage readers to look them over carefully, to click through links where available, and to consider the report's implications.

Contents:

1. Summary	1
2. Consensus on Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs)	2
3. Consensus Best Practices and Emerging Solutions	7
4. Relevant Policies on Teaching Assessment	11
5. Appendix: Accreditation Requirements and Faculty Summative Evaluation Policies by College	15

InDev Teaching Assessment Review: Summary

Notes on Terminology

- **Teaching assessment** refers here to all processes used in the assessment of teaching, for both **formative** (developmental) and **summative** (tenure and promotion) purposes.
- **Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs)**, also known as “course evaluations” or “student evaluations,” refers here to conventional, largely quantitative, and ratings-based on end-of-course surveys that are used primarily for summative purposes. SETs should not be confused with **student assessment of teaching** more generally, which can take many forms, provide valuable information for both formative and summative purposes, and be gathered at any point during or after a specific course or a student’s progress through the University.

Major Conclusions

In relation to the consensus understanding around Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs):

- SETs do not measure teaching effectiveness, provide very poor measures of student learning, and likely lead to grade inflation and work deflation.
- SETs demonstrate systemic biases, including gender and racial biases and biases against non-native English speakers, and their use has been cited in lawsuits.
- SETs are influenced by factors such as discipline, modality, weather, and sugar intake.
- SET statistical data is frequently prone to misinterpretation and misuse in assessment.
- Teaching assessment at USC is dependent on the use of SET data, though this is ambiguously prescribed by policy, and USC’s accreditor cautions against over-reliance.

In relation to consensus Best Practices for Teaching Assessment:

- Student assessment of teaching should be valued, solicited at multiple points, and framed as feedback rather than instructor ratings.
- Peer assessment should integrate classroom observations by trained observers.
- Assessment should be holistic, incorporating peer, student, and self-assessment.
- Assessment should be evidence-based, efficient, and not prohibitively labor-intensive.
- Faculty should play a central role in assessment policies and processes.
- Assessment procedures should primarily serve formative purposes.
- The institution and its units should provide the necessary conditions and support for proper assessment and its use in faculty development.

Finally, many institutions, including peers and peer-aspirants, while still valuing student feedback on teaching, are rethinking their dependence on SETs, and are developing new policies and frameworks for teaching assessment around consensus best practices. Here at USC, the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) offers valuable resources that can be used to move towards the holistic assessment of teaching and to improve teaching effectiveness.

Consensus on Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs)

Overview

To better grasp the issues surrounding the specific and widely used form of student assessment of teaching (see the Summary's [notes on terminology](#)) commonly referred to as Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs), course evaluations, or student evaluations, InDev was tasked with reviewing the relevant literature and distilling our findings. We reviewed more than twenty sources, encompassing academic articles (including multiple meta-analyses), reporting in the higher education trade press, and discussion in professional publications. In doing so, we identified a strong consensus in the literature around several serious issues, including substantial evidence that:

- SETs do not, in fact, measure [teaching effectiveness or student learning](#) and may lead to grade inflation and work deflation;
- SET results demonstrate biases related to instructors' [identities](#), which negatively impact female-identifying instructors, instructors of color, and non-native English-speaking instructors;
- SET results demonstrate biases around several external factors and [course](#) variables, such as discipline, content type, and class size, which can impact evaluations; and
- There is a general lack of [statistically](#) sound design and interpretation of SETs.

The literature used to inform this report is provided [below](#).

Problems

Student Learning

- SETs provide poor measures of student learning as they measure students' satisfaction with the course and the instructor rather than teaching effectiveness.
 - SETs measure students' experiences in the classroom, which may be of interest but is not synonymous with effective teaching.
- Students do not necessarily learn more from instructors with higher SETs, as there is a correlation between SET scores and grade expectations.
- Grade inflation and work deflation can contribute to higher evaluations.

Identity-Related Biases

- SETs measure conformity to gender roles rather than teaching quality, with particularly negative effects for female-identifying instructors.

- Female-identifying instructors are more likely to receive lower evaluations than their male-identifying counterparts.
- Gender influences the aspects of teaching in which instructors are evaluated, with female-identifying instructors often evaluated on measures related to student-teaching interactions and male-identifying instructors often evaluated on measures related to knowledge and expertise.
- Gender biases reflect differently across disciplines, wherein instructors are more likely to receive negative evaluations if they are a gender minority within their discipline.
- While there is limited research on gender and sexuality bias in SETs outside of the male/female binary, LGBTQ+ instructors are generally evaluated lower than cisgender, heterosexual instructors.
- SET results reflect racial biases, wherein instructors of color are often evaluated more poorly than white instructors.
- Instructors from non-English-speaking backgrounds often receive lower evaluations than native English-speaking instructors.
- Biases related to instructors with intersectional identities are particularly pronounced.

Course-Related Biases

- Discipline has been found to impact SETs, with humanities disciplines often receiving the highest evaluations and the natural sciences disciplines receiving the lowest.
- Within disciplines, content and class size are associated with evaluation scores.
 - Quantitative courses often receive lower evaluations than qualitative courses.
 - Upper-level, discussion-based courses typically receive higher evaluations than larger introductory courses.
- External factors such as weather conditions and sugar intake before or during SET administration have been found to influence responses.

Statistical Misinterpretations

- SETs are often misused and misinterpreted statistically.
 - SET score numbers are labels, not values.
 - It is not statistically sound to average categorical variables.
 - SET score averages should not be compared with other scores, such as departmental averages, without knowing the distribution of scores.
- Response rates vary widely and can bias the results.
 - A small sample size may not represent the population as a whole.
 - There is no basis to assume that the response pattern of students who do not complete SETs would be similar to those who complete SETs.
 - Average SET scores in small classes are more greatly influenced by outliers and errors.

- Scaled ratings are often used to make “binary” decisions between effective and ineffective teaching.

References

- Adams, S., Bekker, S., Fan, Y., Gordon, T., Shepherd, L. J., Slavich, E., & Waters, D. (2022). Gender bias in student evaluations of teaching: ‘Punish[ing] those who fail to do their gender right.’ *Higher Education*, 83, 787-807. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00704-9>
- Berrett, D. (2014, September 18). *Scholars take aim at student evaluations’ ‘air of objectivity.’* The Chronicle of Higher Education. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/scholars-take-aim-at-student-evaluations-air-of-objectivity/>
- Braga, M., Paccagnella, M., & Pellizzari, M. (2014). Evaluating students’ evaluations of professors. *Economics of Education Review*, 41, 71-88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2014.04.002>
- Buser, W., Batz-Barbarich, B., & Hayter, J. K. (2022). Evaluation of women in economics: Evidence of gender bias following behavioral role violations. *Sex Roles*, 86, 695-710. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-022-01299-w>
- Chavas, K., & Mitchell, K. M. W. (2020). Exploring bias in student evaluations: Gender, race, and ethnicity. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 53(2), 270-274. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096519001744>
- Clayson, D. E. (2008). Student evaluations of teaching: Are they related to what students learn?: A meta-analysis and review of the literature. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(1), 16-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475308324086>
- Colón-Aguirre, M., Cooke, N., & Gibson, A. (2020). Racism and bias in student evaluations of teaching. *Proceedings of the Association of Library and Information Science Education Annual Conference: ALISE 2020*, 393. <https://hdl.handle.net/2142/108788>
- Fan, Y., Shepherd, L. J., Slavich, E., Waters, D., Stone, M., Abel, R., & Johnston, E. L. (2019). Gender and cultural bias in student evaluations: Why representation matters. *PLoS One*, 14(2), Article e0209749. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209749>
- Flaherty, C. (2016, January 10). *Bias against female instructors.* Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/01/11/new-analysis-offers-more-evidence-against-student-evaluations-teaching>
- Flaherty, C. (2017, May 9). *What are students rating when they rate instructors?* Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/05/10/study-student-ratings-instructors-dependent-discipline-quantitative-fields-are-most>

- Flaherty, C. (2016, September 20). *Zero correlation between evaluations and learning*. Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/09/21/new-study-could-be-another-nail-coffin-validity-student-evaluations-teaching>
- Flaherty, C. (2018, May 21). *Teaching eval shake-up*. Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/05/22/most-institutions-say-they-value-teaching-how-they-assess-it-tells-different-story>
- Flaherty, C. (2021, February 16). *The skinny on teaching evals and bias*. Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/02/17/whats-really-going-respect-bias-and-teaching-evals>
- Freeman Jr., S., & Thorne, D. (2021, July 1). *A faculty evaluation manifesto to counteract bias*. Academe Blog. <https://academeblog.org/2021/07/01/a-faculty-evaluation-manifesto-to-counteract-bias/>
- Heffernan, T. (2021). Sexism, racism, prejudice, and bias: A literature review and synthesis of research surrounding student evaluations of courses and teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(1), 144-154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1888075>
- 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*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09400-w>
- Lawrence, J. W. (2018). Student evaluations of teaching are not valid. *Academe*, 104(3). <https://www.aaup.org/article/student-evaluations-teaching-are-not-valid>
- MacNell, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. N. (2015). What's in a name: Exposing gender bias in student ratings of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 40, 291-303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4>
- McPherson, M. A., Jewell, R. T., & Kim, M. (2009). What determines student evaluation scores? A random effects analysis of undergraduate economics classes. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 35, 37-51. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.eej.9050042>
- Melecio-Zambrano, L. (2023, January 20). *Teaching evaluations reflect – and may perpetuate – academia's gender biases*. Science. <https://www.science.org/content/article/teaching-evaluations-reflect-and-may-perpetuate-academia-s-gender-biases>
- Peterson, D. A. M., Biederman, L. A., Andersen, D., Ditonto, T. M., & Roe, K. (2019). Mitigating gender bias in student evaluations of teaching. *PLoS One*, 14(5), Article e0216241. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216241>
- Rodriguez, J. (2019). The weaponization of student evaluations of teaching: Bullying and the undermining of academic freedom. *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom*, 10, 1-16. <https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/rodriguez.pdf>

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. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313496870>

St. Olaf College. (n.d.). *Bias in course evaluations*. <https://wp.stolaf.edu/iea/bias-in-course-evaluations/>

Supiano, B. (2018, June 29). *A university overhauled its course evaluation to get better feedback. Here's what changed*. The Chronicle of Higher Education. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/a-university-overhauled-its-course-evaluation-to-get-better-feedback-heres-what-changed/>

Uttl, B., White, C. A., & Gonzalez, D. W. (2017). Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 54, 22-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.08.007>

Consensus Best Practices and Emerging Solutions

Overview

To provide a substantive basis for any eventual recommendations for revising current policy, criteria, and procedures around the assessment of teaching, InDev was tasked with identifying and reviewing statements of best practice.

We identified and reviewed six statements:

- The [American Association of University Professors'](#) (AAUP's) June 1975 "[Statement on Teaching Evaluation](#)."
- The [American Educational Research Association's](#) (AERA's), 2013 report, "[Rethinking Faculty Evaluation](#)."
- The [Association of Language Departments'](#) (ALD's) 1993 "[Statement of Good Practice: Teaching, Evaluation, and Scholarship](#)."
- The [American Sociological Association's](#) (ASA's) 2019 "[Statement on Student Evaluations of Teaching](#)." At its release, the statement was endorsed by more than twenty other disciplinary organizations.
- The [Association of American Universities'](#) (AAU's) 2017 essay, "[Aligning Practice to Policies: Changing the Culture to Recognize and Reward Teaching at Research Universities](#)," whose authors situate it "in the context of current national efforts to improve undergraduate STEM education."
- [New American Colleges and Universities'](#) (NACU's) 2018 monograph, [Refining the Paradigm: Faculty Models to Support Student Learning](#).

Drawing from and consolidating these statements, the working group has produced an inventory of [guiding principles](#) for the assessment of teaching, as well inventories of best practices in relation to the three types of assessment—[peer-](#), [student-](#), and [self-assessment](#)—and in relation to institutional and unit-level [policies and support](#) for the assessment of teaching.

In some places, examples from colleges and universities who have enacted or are enacting recommended practices are offered to complement and inform these findings. The working group considered peer and peer-aspirant institutions as well as institutions who have been leaders in modifying their approach to the assessment of teaching in response to the clear and overwhelming evidence of serious problems with the specific form of student assessment of teaching (see the Summary's [notes on terminology](#)) commonly referred to as Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs), course evaluations, or student evaluations. Where they might be most useful, links have been provided to relevant university websites.

Best Practices: Guiding Principles

- Faculty should play a central role in determining assessment policies (AAU, AAUP).
- Assessment should be primarily formative (used to inform the development of the teacher and to enhance instruction) rather than summative (AAUP, AERA, AAU, NACU, ALD).
- Assessment criteria should be evidence-based (AERA).
- The institution and units should provide the necessary conditions and support for proper assessment, including specifying their institutional commitment to teaching and setting clear expectations (AAUP, implemented at University of Massachusetts-Amherst and [University of Utah](#)).
- Multiple measures of assessment should be employed, including peer observations, reviews of teaching materials, and instructor self-reflections (AAUP, AERA, ALD, ASA, AAU; implemented at [University of Oregon](#), University of Southern California, UC Irvine, [UN Lincoln](#), University of Michigan, [UT-Knoxville](#), Ryerson University; new processes under review at [University of Massachusetts-Amherst](#), [University of Kansas](#), [University of Colorado-Boulder](#), University of Kentucky, Michigan State University, [University of Utah](#)).
- Because it can systematically disadvantage faculty from marginalized groups, which can be especially consequential for contingent faculty, [conventional, quantitative] Student Evaluations of Teaching should not be used as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness (ASA).
- Metrics for assessing teaching should be efficient and not prohibitively labor-intensive (AAU, NACU).

Best Practices Around Three Key Types of Assessment

Peer Assessment

- Should generate an accurate factual description of what the individual does as a teacher. This could entail a portfolio and artifacts including syllabi, tests, materials, and methods employed in instruction (AERA, AAUP, ALD, NACU; implemented at [University of Southern California](#)).
- Should involve classroom observations by trained observers and/or colleagues (AERA, AAUP, ALD; implemented at [UGA](#), [UT Knoxville](#), [UM College Park](#)).
- Should emphasize qualitative measures and discursive formats (ALD).
- Should integrate peer and/or specialist mentorship and coaching (NACU; implemented at [UM College Park](#) and offered by [University of South Carolina's Center for Teaching Excellence](#)).

Student Assessment

- Should incorporate both surveys and interviews, ideally at midpoint of semester and/or at end of semester (AERA, AAUP; implemented at [UGA](#), UT Knoxville, Clemson, [U of Iowa](#), UM College Park, UNC-Chapel Hill, University of Utah, UVa).
- Should focus on evidence of student learning (AAUP).
- While a common instrument may be useful for assessing the institution, it should not be employed to assess individual instructors (AAUP).
- Questions should focus on student experiences, and the instruments should be framed as an opportunity for student feedback rather than an opportunity for formal ratings of teaching effectiveness (ASA; implemented at Augsburg University and UNC Asheville).
- Should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other or to a department average. As part of a holistic assessment, they can appropriately be used to document patterns in an instructor's feedback over time (ASA).
- If quantitative scores are reported, they should include distributions, sample sizes, and response rates for each question on the instrument. This provides an interpretive context for the scores (ASA).
- Evaluators (e.g., chairs, deans, hiring committees, tenure and promotion committees) should be trained in how to interpret and use student assessment as part of a holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness (ASA).

Self-Assessment

- Should incorporate the collection of evidence, systematic observation, analysis, and reflection, and decision-making about future lessons or courses (Implemented at [UGA](#)).
- Should provide instructor with a template, rubric, and/or checklist for self-assessment (Implemented at [UGA](#), [UT Knoxville](#)).

Best Practices Around Policies, Processes, and Support

- Criteria, procedures, and schedule for assessment should be specified, posted, and shared with relevant tenure and/or promotion and reappointment committees (AAUP, AAU).
- Units should establish a teaching committee (AAUP, AERA, ALD, ASA, AAU) that:
 - Keeps up on research related to teaching assessment.
 - Helps in developing and implementing review policies and procedures.
 - Trains faculty, including training in how to conduct evaluation and interpret results.
- Institutional support might include (AAU):
 - Providing teaching professional development funds as part of start-up packages.

- Sponsoring the participation in faculty learning communities.
 - Pairing expert teachers with those interested in improving their teaching, while providing course-load credit for both faculty members.
- Institutions should develop a non-punitive system of remediation for faculty, to be described in their faculty manual (NACU).

Relevant Policies on Teaching Assessment

Overview

To better understand the current state of teaching assessment at USC-Columbia and any factors shaping assessment, InDev was tasked with investigating relevant University policies around teaching assessment in the [Faculty Manual](#) and in [Academic Affairs Policies](#). These include, but are not limited to, policies related to the specific form of student assessment of teaching (see the Summary's [notes on terminology](#)) commonly referred to as Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs), course evaluations, or student evaluations. We also investigated accreditation requirements in relation to teaching assessment at the [University-level](#), examining the relevant standards published by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). While time did not permit a full accounting of college- and program-level policies around the assessment of teaching, we examined [college-level](#) accreditation requirements and policies in relation to teaching assessment and SETs.

University Policies on the Assessment of Teaching

University Policies on the Assessment of Teaching are expressed in the Faculty Manual and Academic Affairs policies. According to [UNIV 1.00](#), the “Policy on Policies,” the Faculty Manual serves as the “final authority” in the event of any inconsistency between the two.

Faculty Manual Policies

Under the heading of “Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure,” the [Faculty Manual](#) describes the “Evaluation of Teaching” (page 26):

Procedures for the evaluation of classroom teaching must require peer and student evaluation, conducted periodically throughout the faculty member’s tenure-track or tenured appointment at the university. A summary and evaluation of the faculty member’s classroom teaching, based on clearly specified criteria, must be included in the faculty member’s promotion and/or tenure file. This summary should give context to the student evaluation of the faculty member’s classroom teaching by noting, e.g., whether evaluations of a particular class historically have been low; in a multi-section course, how the faculty member’s evaluation scores compare with those in the other sections; or whether poor evaluation scores are correlated to a faculty member’s strict grading standards.

Other teaching functions and the weight to be given to them in evaluating teaching performance must be specified by unit criteria. These include, but are not limited to, advisement and mentoring of students and student organizations; creation of teaching materials, techniques or programs, supervision of PhD students; and supervision of research or independent study by undergraduate or masters-level students.

This language, then, requires only peer and student evaluation and the submission of contextualizing statements about student evaluation. While it requires that these evaluations occur periodically, the language does not specify that they must be conducted every semester for every class. While the examples provided for contextualizing statements suggest that student evaluation of teaching will be based on numerical scoring, this is not explicitly required. Finally, while the language provides a list of “teaching functions” other than the evaluation of classroom teaching that units may give weight to, it does not require units to include these in their criteria.

Under the heading of “Annual Performance Review, Tenure Progress Review, and Post-Tenure Review,” the Faculty Manual describes the “Minimum Unit Standards and Procedures” for each review process, while also asserting that the purpose of the attendant policies is to, “recognize and reward faculty for superior achievement, and to assure that each faculty member’s contribution to the university through teaching . . . is at a satisfactory level” (33).

For APR, the Manual states that, “the review on teaching must incorporate student evaluations,” and that “Peer evaluations will be included for non-tenured faculty” (34).

As one of the “Mandatory Provisions in Unit Post-Tenure Review Procedures,” the Manual requires the incorporation of annual performance reviews, as well as “an assessment of teaching based upon student and peer evaluations.” It goes on to state that “the unit post-tenure review report must assess the faculty member’s performance [in teaching] as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory” (36).

Academic Affairs Policies

Academic Affairs policies address only student evaluation of courses and speak to no other means of assessing teaching. The relevant policy is [ACAF 1.04](#), “Student Evaluation of Courses.”

ACAF 1.04, variously describes the role of student course evaluations as:

- “One component of the assessment of quality of course offerings.”
- “A means to monitor and continuously improve the quality of teaching by individual instructors and faculty and across academic units.”
- “A means of improving and monitoring teaching for the purposes of faculty evaluation processes and program assessment.”

ACAF 1.04 specifies that:

- “Each USC system campus shall have a comprehensive system of written student course evaluation for every course taught by the instructors on that campus, regardless of academic rank or tenure status of the instructor.”

- “Course evaluations are not required for courses in which there are fewer than five students enrolled” (1).
- “Campus-based procedures [must be developed] to implement this policy.”
- “Student course evaluations must be completed prior to the final examination period.”
- “Results of each course evaluation will be shared with the instructor, but only after the final grades for the evaluated course shall be submitted to the Registrar.”
- “The administrative head of each unit shall . . . retain a copy of the results of each course evaluation.”
- “Units must maintain records for all student course evaluations for each course to provide reports for individual faculty for various evaluation purposes including comparative summaries for aggregate reporting.”

University-Level Accreditor Policies on the Assessment of Teaching

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)

The 2020 edition of SACSCOC’s [Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation](#) includes Standard 6.3, on faculty appointment and evaluation. The standard:

- Requires that an accredited institution “publishes and implements policies regarding the . . . evaluation of faculty members, regardless of contract or tenure status.”
- Asserts that, “the concept of faculty evaluation encompasses a range of processes designed to assess the quality and effectiveness of . . . performance” and that “different types of faculty may be evaluated utilizing different procedures and perhaps on different expectations relative to teaching.”
- Notes that, “student course evaluations, when used in isolation, are often deemed to be insufficient as a means of faculty evaluation” (52).

Thus, there is no requirement by SACSCOC that explicitly states that “student course evaluations,” as we refer to them, must be included in the institutions’ evaluation of faculty. Instead, the statement requires the publication and implementation of policies.

College- and Program-Level SET Questions and Accreditation Requirements

We collected information from colleges across the Columbia and Palmetto College campuses and the Schools of Medicine on whether the college or school had programs accredited by an accrediting body or specialized professional association where SETs are required. We found the following:

- Most colleges have no specific accreditation requirements for SETs. However, SETs are incorporated into internal evaluations of program effectiveness.
- Only two programs reported extensive reporting requirements where SET data was required for specialized accreditation.

- In most instances, specialized accrediting bodies require programs to share their practices regarding how students are provided with opportunities to evaluate programs; however, explicit results of these evaluations are not required.

We also inquired into how SETs fit within the college's/department's evaluations of faculty. Key findings include:

- Little to no standardization of SET questions across colleges and, in some cases, across departments within a college.
- Most colleges administer SETs using Class Climate. However, to comply with the needs of specialized accreditation agencies, the School of Medicine - Greenville uses Oasis and the College of Nursing uses REDCap in addition to Class Climate to administer SETs.

These findings raise questions about the use of SETs for inter-departmental or cross-college comparisons. They also suggest that accreditation requirements will complicate the use of a single system for administering SETs.

Specifics on the reporting requirements regarding SETs, including SET questions and accreditation reporting requirements, are contained in Appendix A.

APPENDIX

Accreditation Requirements and Faculty Summative Evaluation Policies by College (*Updated Fall 2023*)

College of Arts and Sciences

- None of the units reported accreditation mandates for either course or faculty evaluations except for a unit report developed by the department in Chemistry for the American Chemical Society (ACS). The ACS requires that the unit (department) report peer observations of teaching in its 5th year review. Course evaluations (SETs) are not required.

Darla Moore School of Business (DMSB)

- The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) does not consider course or faculty evaluations for the initial accreditation or review processes. No evaluation-related data are required.

College of Education

- The Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs (CACREP) requires programs to submit evidence related to the process of course/faculty evaluations. Specifically, CACREP-accredited programs require:
 - Written procedures for administering student evaluations of faculty that are available to the counselor education program faculty.
 - Regular, systematic opportunities for students to formally evaluate counselor education program faculty.
 - Regular, systematic opportunities for students to formally evaluate practicum and internship supervisors.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) does not require course/faculty evaluations as part of its accreditation reporting requirements.

College of Engineering and Computing

The Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) requires that engineering and computing programs have and use a continuous improvement process in Criterion 4, specifically:

Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement.

“The program must regularly use appropriate, documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which the student outcomes are being attained. The results of these evaluations must be systematically utilized as input for the program’s continuous improvement actions. Other available information may also be used to assist in the continuous improvement of the program.”

ABET is not prescriptive of the assessment instruments and each of CEC's ten undergraduate engineering programs are assessed and accredited separately. However, course evaluations are typically included in course portfolios, which are used in annual course and curriculum review processes at the department level.

College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management

- Neither Sports and Entertainment Management nor Retail has a special "accrediting body" or "association" that reviews their programs.
- For Hospitality Management, the Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration (ACPHA) requests an overview of the data. The APCHA Standard, and our response from our most recent self-study is contained below:

STANDARD ELEMENT VI f.

"Mechanisms are in place and regularly utilized for evaluating full and part-time faculty effectiveness and effectiveness in career and academic advisement."

- Describe the mechanisms in place for evaluating teaching effectiveness and the frequency by which they occur.
- Describe the mechanisms used to evaluate effectiveness of faculty in career and academic advisement and the frequency by which they occur.

The online course evaluation process is administered at the university level but in close contact with the College of HRSM Associate Dean for Academic Programs (Karen Edwards). The University requires student evaluation of teaching effectiveness occur in every course, each semester. The HRSM Course Assessment is completed online during the last 10 days of each semester with a minimum participation goal of 70%.

Students complete the evaluation via a link they receive in Blackboard. Students are notified by email the link is open, and they get a reminder every three days until it is completed. Please refer to Supplemental Documents 6.7 Online Course Evaluation Instrument. Every Spring, when faculty complete their annual review process, faculty are required to submit 3 key data points in these teaching evaluations within their reviews.

In addition to the online course evaluation that is completed by the students, annual peer review of teaching is required by the College of HRSM. Our faculty is not responsible for academic advisement at the undergraduate level. We have an advisement/student service department that handles all student advisement. Students cannot register for classes until they have seen an academic advisor. Career advisement is done on an informal and as-needed basis for students by all members of the faculty. Faculty is not currently evaluated on this criterion. There is a central student Career Center that is provided by the University for all students to use.

College of Information and Communications

- For the iSchool, the MLIS degree is accredited by the American Library Association. USC student course evaluations and our own internal exit survey data (administered through advising) are used as evidence related to three ALA Standards:
 - Standard II: Curriculum
 - Standard III: Faculty
 - Standard IV: Students
- The School of Journalism and Mass Communication does not include student evals for the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC) for the Bachelor of Arts programs in Journalism and Mass Communication. Student assessment is done during the site visit interviews with students and is based on comments from alumni, internship hosts, and employers. Faculty reputations on campus are other tools for evaluating quality of instruction. Another measure is the assessment standard based on specific professional competencies and learning outcomes, and faculty standard that expects faculty to be evaluated and reviewed annually at the School level.

School of Law

- The American Bar Association is the Law School's accrediting body. Every ten years, the Law School submits information about its teaching in advance of an evaluation team site visit. The information submitted includes responses to the following question:
49. Standard 403(b) and Interpretation 403-1.
 - (a) Describe how the Law School ensures the teaching effectiveness of full-time faculty. (e.g., a faculty committee on effective teaching, class visits, institutional review of student evaluations, and other efforts).
 - (b) Describe how the Law School ensures the teaching effectiveness of adjunct/non-full-time faculty. (e.g., class visits; institutional review of student evaluations; the Law School's orientation, guidance, monitoring, and evaluation of adjuncts; and other efforts).
 - (c) Describe the training or support that is provided to ensure effective teaching by full-time and adjunct/non-full-time faculty in distance education courses.

To supplement our response to Question 49, we must include the following:

- Student evaluations of faculty for the two most recently completed academic years.
- Our internal process for collecting this data.

School of Medicine - Columbia

- Accrediting bodies for the MD, the Rehabilitation Counseling, and the Nurse Anesthesia programs expect that students are evaluating courses and instructors are being evaluated, but do not request specific information be sent to them.
- The accrediting body for the Genetic Counseling program expects faculty/instructor and course evaluations for both didactic and clinical courses in the forms of data representations (e.g., charts) along with written reports.

School of Medicine - Greenville

- The accrediting body for the MD expects that students are evaluating courses and instructors are being evaluated but does not request specific information be sent to them.

School of Music

- The National Association of Schools of Music Accrediting body (NASM) does not consider faculty or student evaluations in the course of program review.

College of Nursing

The evaluation and reporting requirements for the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) accreditation are extensive. Specifically, standards III and IV address teaching, course, and program evaluation requirements. The requirements for each standard, explanation, and the College of Nursing's (CON) response to each standard are outlined below:

- **STANDARD III: PROGRAM QUALITY: CURRICULUM AND TEACHING-LEARNING PRACTICES**

“The curriculum is developed in accordance with the program’s mission, goals, and expected student outcomes. The curriculum reflects professional nursing standards and guidelines and the needs and expectations of the community of interest. Teaching-learning practices are congruent with expected student outcomes. The environment for teaching-learning fosters achievement of expected student outcomes.”

Explanation: *Faculty use data from faculty and student evaluation of teaching-learning practices to inform decisions that facilitate the achievement of student outcomes. Such evaluation activities may be formal or informal, formative or summative. The curriculum is regularly evaluated by faculty and revised as appropriate.*

Program Response: CON faculty use data from faculty and student evaluation of teaching-learning practices to inform decisions that facilitate the achievement of student outcomes. Faculty use a combination of formal, informal, and summative evaluation activities to revise and improve teaching-learning practices according to the AACN Essentials across all programs, including the BSN, MSN/CGS, and DNP programs as follows:

Formal

Course Evaluations – students are asked 13 Likert-scaled questions on the student’s interest of the subject matter, and overall understanding of concepts and principles introduced in the course; students’ perceptions of student encouragement to participate in learning activities, the uniqueness of content as it relates to the justification for the course to be offered as an independent entity’, students’ perceptions of their growth and understanding of the professional role in nursing after completing the course requirements. Other evaluation items seek feedback on the presence of class discussions, audio-visual aids, and/or handouts in relation to their appropriate integration in the course. Further, the student is asked to evaluate the course as appropriate for their current level of nursing.

Teacher Evaluations – students are asked questions at the completion of the course on the clarity of instructional objectives, the method by which the final grade would be determined, the clarity of attendance policies, differences between course attendance policy and University attendance policy (if applicable), timeliness of feedback on assignments from the teacher, the regularity with which the teacher met with the class as scheduled, and the perception of reasonably allotted office hours per week. Additionally, evaluation items explore the perception of the teacher outside the classroom, and the distractibility of course websites, Blackboard®, or other internet resources on the learning experience in the course. Other evaluation items investigated the student’s perception of the ability to interact with the students and the teacher in the course. Evaluation items inquired about the promptness of feedback in the course, the technology support, access to library resources, and library support services.

Furthermore, teacher evaluation items pursue the students’ perceptions of instructor preparedness, the instructor’s use of teaching methods which enhanced understanding of content, the instructor’s knowledge in the teaching area, the student’s perception of the teacher’s ability to interpret abstract ideas and theories while enabling the student to express individual ideas, helpful responses from the teacher, the teacher’s ability to encourage independent thinking and learning and finally, the teacher’s sensitivity to individual learning needs and the overall student perception of the instructor’s teaching ability.

Faculty evaluations - Faculty are evaluated on teaching ability/performance according to a three-part process.

Part A. Self-assessment - the faculty evaluates his/her own teaching.

Part B. Peer Assessment - the faculty will then seek a peer evaluation.

Part C. Faculty are evaluated by his/her supervisor in the form of a summary where teaching is one of four portions (teaching, research/scholarship, practice/service, engagement) in the overall faculty evaluation.

Informal

Optional mid-term evaluations completed by students and delivered directly to the Director of Distributed learning.

Summative -

- **STANDARD IV: PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS: ASSESSMENT AND ACHIEVEMENT OF PROGRAM OUTCOMES**

“The program is effective in fulfilling its mission and goals as evidenced by achieving expected program outcomes. Program outcomes include student outcomes, faculty outcomes, and other outcomes identified by the program. Data on program effectiveness are used to foster ongoing program.”

Explanation: *The program (baccalaureate, master’s, DNP, and/or post-graduate APRN certificate) uses a systematic process to obtain relevant data to determine program effectiveness. The process:*

- *is written, is ongoing, and exists to determine achievement of program outcomes;*
- *is comprehensive (i.e., includes completion, licensure, certification, and employment rates, as required by the U.S. Department of Education; faculty outcomes; and other program outcomes);*
- *identifies which quantitative and/or qualitative data are collected to assess achievement of the program outcomes;*
- *includes timelines for data collection, review of expected and actual outcomes, and analysis; and*
- *is periodically reviewed and revised as appropriate.*

Program Response: The CON is committed to systematic program assessments and collects program outcomes regarding completion, licensure, certification, and employment rates; and student, alumni, and employer satisfaction and collects the following data:

- Data regarding graduation rates, NCLEX first-time pass rates, and national certification pass rates are collected annually. All students are asked to complete an exit survey upon program completion.

The Palmetto College

The accreditor for the Associate in Science (AS) in Business is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) requests that the Palmetto College report on the following:

- The process whereby students provide evaluations of faculty and the results of those evaluations.
- The process used to evaluate faculty.

PC reports the results of the annual peer reviews of faculty to ACBSP.

College of Pharmacy

- Not directly requested, but the course and instructor evaluations are used as part of the overall assessment plan for the college required for accreditation. in the overall assessment plan (which links to standard 24 ... and in guidance lists “revisions to curriculum based on assessment data from Student course evaluations included.” In addition, under 17a although it isn’t specific for the standard in the guidance it does list under 17a ... “factors that have been found to contribute to student success including ... and peer evaluation of faculty teaching is listed (which I similarly likely the evaluation of teaching from students also). Similarly, in 19d – Evaluation of faculty, again although not in the standard in the guidance it does have “assessment of faculty members’ abilities commonly involves the following factors ... teaching abilities, communication skills and effectiveness related to student learning.
- Lastly, although this is an internal process, there is the teaching award which has a measure for student-teacher evaluations.

Arnold School of Public Health

The ASPH is accredited by the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH). Course evaluations are included in its list of measures to evaluate institutional effectiveness. Instructors record in with Teaching Assistants (TAs) can opt for a separate evaluation of TA teaching by students using a distinct Teaching Assistant Evaluation form. Various programs within the ASPH are accredited by specialized accrediting bodies where the results from course evaluations are shared. These instances are listed below:

The allied health programs i.e., Communication Sciences & Disorders (COMD), Exercise Science (EXSC), Physical Therapy (PHYT), Athletic Training (ATEP), and the MHA degree in Health Services Policy and Management have specialized program accreditation requirements where course evaluations are reported as follows:

- The Athletic Training program (ATEP) is accredited by The Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE), where course evaluations are included as part of the program's assessment plan to show effectiveness in teaching and instruction.

- The Communications Disorders program (COMD) is accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation (CAA). The program uses aggregated course evaluation information in its compilation of instructor effectiveness scores, and other key metrics for evidence of effective instruction.
- In its most recent self-study for its accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education (CAHME). The Health Services Policy and Management (MHA) degree submitted course evaluations along with other sets of information in response to Standard III.D. 1. *The program will evaluate its curriculum, teaching and learning methods, assessment methods, and program Faculty effectiveness and use the results for continuous quality improvement of the teaching and learning environment.*
- For the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) degree, course evaluations are documented in numerous standards for the accreditor of the Commission on Accreditation in Physical therapy Education (CAPTE), including faculty details.

STANDARD 2B3: The collective core, associated, and clinical education faculty meet program and curricular needs.

STANDARD 4E: Formal evaluation of each core faculty member occurs in a member and timeline consistent with applicable institutional policy. The evaluation results in an organized faculty development plan that is linked to the assessment of the individual core faculty member and to program improvement.

STANDARD 4F: Regular evaluation of associated faculty occurs and results in a plan to address identified needs.

College of Social Work

Accreditor does not collect student course evaluations or faculty evaluations.