

The following Motions and Documents were considered by the General Faculties Council at its Monday, October 30, 2017 meeting:

Agenda Title: **New Members**

CARRIED MOTION I: TO APPOINT [This motion may be proposed only by statutory members of GFC]:

The following undergraduate student representatives, to serve on GFC for terms commencing immediately and ending April 30, 2018:

Aleks Nakevski
Alberta School of Business

Brandon Yip
Alberta School of Business

Alizeh Ansari
Faculty of Education

Gohar Jamal
Faculty of Education

Amy Li
Faculty of Education

Daniel Atchison
Faculty of Engineering

Daniel Bilyk
Faculty of Engineering

Gaganpreet Jhajj
Faculty of Science

Marina Kirillovich
Faculty of Science

CARRIED MOTION II: TO RECEIVE [This motion may be proposed by any member of GFC]:

The following statutory faculty member/s who has been elected/re-elected by their Faculty, to serve on GFC for a term of office commencing immediately and ending June 30, 2020:

John Seubert
Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Final Item: 4

Agenda Title: Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research: Proposed Revisions to existing Supervision and Examinations policy

CARRIED MOTION: THAT General Faculties Council approve the proposed revisions to existing Supervision and Examinations policy, as recommended by the GFC Executive Committee and the GFC Academic Standards Committee, as submitted by the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research and as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect July 1, 2018.

Final Item: 7

Agenda Title: Report of the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) on Teaching and Learning and Teaching Evaluation and the Use of Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRI) as an Evaluation Tool

CARRIED MOTION: THAT General Faculties Council Receive the CLE Report on Teaching and Learning and Teaching Evaluation and the Use of the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRI) as an Evaluation Tool as set forth in Attachment 2, and Endorse the Recommendations of the Committee as set forth in Attachment 1, and as recommended by the GFC Executive Committee.

Final Item: 8

Agenda Title: Proposed Revisions to Standing Committee Terms of Reference GFC Campus Law Review Committee (CLRC) including a name change to GFC Student Conduct Policy Committee (SCPC)

CARRIED MOTION: THAT General Faculties Council approve the proposed changes to the GFC Campus Law Review Terms of Reference including a name change to GFC Student Conduct Policy Committee (SCPC) as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect upon approval.

Final Item: 9

Agenda Title: Proposed Revisions to Standing Committee Terms of Reference - GFC Facilities Development Committee (FDC)

CARRIED MOTION: THAT General Faculties Council approve the proposed changes to the GFC Facilities Development Committee Terms of Reference as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect upon approval.

Final Item: 10

Agenda Title: Changes to the Admission of Aboriginal Students Calendar Section and updates to Faculty sections

CARRIED MOTION: THAT THAT General Faculties Council approve the proposed changes to the calendar sections related to the admission of First Nations, Métis and Inuit students as set forth in Attachments 1 and 2, and as recommended by the GFC Academic Planning Committee and the GFC Academic Standards Committee, to take effect in 2018/19.

Final Item: 11

OUTLINE OF ISSUE
Action Item

Agenda Title: **Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research: Proposed revisions to existing Supervision and Examinations policy**

Motion: THAT General Faculties Council approve the proposed revisions to existing Supervision and Examinations policy, as recommended by the GFC Executive Committee and the GFC Academic Standards Committee, as submitted by the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research and as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect July 1, 2018.

Item

Action Requested	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation
Proposed by	Heather Zwicker, Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Presenter	Heather Zwicker, Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research Deborah Burshtyn, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

Details

Responsibility	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	The revisions are intended to clarify the policies, elaborate on procedures, and improve policies. The impact will be to have greater clarity for students, faculty and staff in the administration and conduct and outcomes of examinations in thesis-based programs.
The Impact of the Proposal is	<p>The conduct of graduate examinations holds extremely high stakes for individual students and presents significant reputational risk for the faculty, program and institution. A major revision the Supervision and Structure of Examining Committees in the Graduate Program Manual was approved by FGSR Council in May 2012. Subsequently in May 2013 the authority for approval of supervisors, supervisory committees, external examiners and examining committees was delegated to the disciplinary Faculty or department. The changes to the Calendar governing examinations encompassing both sets of changes was approved by FGSR Council October 2013 and first appeared in the 2014-2015 Calendar. A number of areas came to light that cause problems due to apparent contradictions, gaps and/or confusing language. The FSGR Policy Review Committee undertook a comprehensive review of the Supervision and Examination regulations. The resulting proposal addresses the organization and clarity of the policy as well as changes to policy. The significant policy changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The chair of doctoral examinations cannot be an examiner to remove issues of bias. • One supervisor of a supervisory team must meet the employment criteria of a UofA examiner. • Size limits for examination committees are set to prevent extraordinarily long examinations in light of current flexibility in supervisory committee composition and the need to fulfill examiner composition balance. • A revamped section on “Conduct of Thesis and Candidacy Exams” was added back to provide consistency across the academy. • Guidance was added to the outcome of “Conditional Pass” for

FINAL Item No. 7

	doctoral candidacy examinations to lessen the rates of students not meeting the conditions.
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	Revises Supervision and Examinations policy as found in the FGSR section of the Calendar.
Timeline/Implementation Date	Effective July 1, 2018. The changes will be published in the 2018-2019 Calendar.
Estimated Cost and funding source	n/a
Next Steps (ie.: Communications Plan, Implementation plans)	Upon final approval, an email will be sent to all members of FGSR Council that includes all Associate Deans Graduate and Graduate Coordinators of graduate programs, as well as the Graduate Program administrators. There will be internal communication to front end FGSR staff.
Supplementary Notes and context	The GFC Academic Standards Committee discussed the parameters of who can chair candidacy and doctoral examinations. Members discussed the role of the chair and how the proposed changes would preserve neutrality; the importance of having chairs with experience supervising graduate students; and having chairs from outside of the department to accommodate small departments. The committee also provided comments on the requirement of a student to withdraw if no supervisor was available.

Engagement and Routing (Include meeting dates)

Participation: (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity) <For further information see the link posted on the Governance Toolkit section Student Participation Protocol >	<u>Those who have been informed:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
	<u>Those who have been consulted:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean and Associate Deans, FGSR • FGSR Program Services staff • Graduate Program Administrators Council (GPAC) • Faculty Graduate Councils (or equivalents) • FGSR Council • Graduate Students Association (GSA)—represented on the PRC (below), also conducted wider consultation with graduate students
	<u>Those who are actively participating:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FGSR Policy Review Committee (PRC) • Brent Epperson, Graduate Ombudsperson (as a member of PRC) • Graduate Students Association (GSA)—(represented on PRC and FGSR Council) • Vice Dean, FGSR
Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)	FGSR Council, May 17, 2017, approved ASC-Subcommittee on Standards - June 1, 2017 (for discussion) GFC Academic Standards Committee - June 15, 2017 GFC Executive Committee - September 11, 2017 General Faculties Council - September 25, 2017
Final Approver	General Faculties Council

Alignment/Compliance

<p>Alignment with Guiding Documents</p>	<p>For the Public Good Sustain: GOAL: Sustain our people, our work, and the environment by attracting and stewarding the resources we need to deliver excellence to the benefit of all. 21. OBJECTIVE Encourage continuous improvement in administrative, governance, planning, and stewardship systems, procedures, and policies that enable students, faculty, staff, and the institution as a whole to achieve shared strategic goals. i. Strategy: Encourage transparency and improve communication across the university through clear consultation and decision-making processes, substantive and timely communication of information, and access to shared, reliable institutional data. ii. Strategy: Ensure that individual and institutional annual review processes align with and support key institutional strategic goals. iii. Strategy: Consolidate unit review and strategic planning processes, and where possible, align with accreditation processes, to ensure efficient assessment practices. iv. Strategy: Facilitate easy access to and use of university services and systems, reduce duplication and complexity, and encourage cross-institutional administrative and operational collaboration.</p>
<p>Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please <u>quote</u> legislation and include identifying section numbers)</p>	<p>1. Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA): “26(1) Subject to the authority of the board of Governors, a general faculties council is responsible for the academic affairs of the university [...] (3) A general faculties council may delegate any of its powers, duties and functions under this Act”</p> <p>2. GFC Academic Standard Committee – terms of reference “B. Admission and Transfer, Academic Standing, Marking and Grading, Term Work, Examinations, International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced Placement (AP) i. All proposals from the Faculties or the Administration related to admission and transfer, to the academic standing of students, to institutional marking and grading policies and/or procedures and to term work policies and procedures are submitted to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) (or delegate) who chairs the GFC Academic Standards Committee. ASC will consult as necessary with the Faculties and with other individuals and offices in its consideration of these proposals. “</p> <p>3. UAPPOL Academic Standing Policy: “All current academic standing regulations, including academic standing categories, University graduating standards and requirements for all individual programs will be those prescribed by Faculty Councils and GFC as set forth in the University Calendar.”</p> <p>4. UAPPOL Academic Standing Regulations Procedures: “All proposed new academic standing regulations and changes to existing academic standing regulations will be submitted by the Faculties or the Administration to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). Faculties</p>

FINAL Item No. 7

will also submit to the Provost and Vice President (Academic) any proposed changes to the use and/or computation of averages relating to academic standing, including promotion and graduation. If the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) determines the proposal to be in good order, the proposal will be introduced to the appropriate University governance process(es). In considering these proposals, governance bodies will consult as necessary with the Faculties and with other individuals and offices. Normally, changes become effective once they are approved by GFC or its delegate and are published in the University Calendar.”

5. GFC Executive Committee – terms of reference

“7. Examinations

“consider and make decisions on the reports of faculty councils as to the appointment of examiners and the conduct and results of examinations in the faculties”

“8. Agendas of General Faculties Council

GFC has delegated to the Executive Committee the authority to decide which items are placed on a GFC agenda, and the order in which those agenda items appear on each GFC agenda.

[...]

The role of the Executive Committee shall be to examine and debate the substance of reports or recommendations and to decide if an item is ready to be forwarded to the full governing body”

Attachments (each to be numbered 1 - <>)

1. Proposal for revision to existing Supervision and Examinations policy; changes to be reflected in the 2018-2019 Calendar (pages 1-25)

Prepared by: Janice Hurlburt, Graduate Governance and Policy Coordinator

2018-2019 University of Alberta Proposed Calendar Graduate Program Changes: Proposal from the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research regarding policy and process for Supervision and Examinations.

Current	Proposed
<p>Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research [...] Supervision and Examinations</p> <p>The minimum requirements for all graduate programs are set by the Council of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research of the University of Alberta. In this Calendar the minimum requirements acceptable are outlined under the respective headings. Students should note that the individual graduate program may impose additional requirements.</p> <p>Supervision and Supervisory Committees</p> <p>Departmental Regulations</p> <p>Departments are responsible for preparing a set of regulations and guidelines for supervisors and students. Guidelines should deal with the selection and functioning of supervisors and should outline the joint responsibilities of faculty members and graduate students. Avenues of appeal open to students who feel they are receiving unsatisfactory supervision should also be specified.</p> <p>Appointment of the Supervisor(s)</p> <p>Every student in a thesis-based program is required to have a supervisor. The department that admits a student to a thesis-based graduate program is responsible for providing supervision within a subject area in which it has competent supervisors, and in which the student has expressed an interest.</p> <p>Normally there is only one supervisor. Departments may consider the appointment of more than one supervisor for a student.</p> <p>Implicit in the admission process is the following: on the applicant's part, that there has been an indication of at</p>	<p>Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research [...] Supervision and Examinations</p> <p>The minimum requirements for all graduate programs are set by the Council of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research of the University of Alberta. In this Calendar the minimum requirements acceptable are outlined under the respective headings. Students should note that the individual graduate program may impose additional requirements.</p> <p>Supervision and Supervisory Committees</p> <p>Departmental Regulations and Responsibilities</p> <p>Departments are responsible for preparing a set of regulations and guidelines for supervisors and students. Guidelines should deal with the selection and functioning of supervisors and should outline the joint responsibilities of faculty members and graduate students. Options for students to pursue who believe they are receiving unsatisfactory supervision should also be specified.</p> <p>Appointment of the Supervisor(s)</p> <p>Every student in a thesis-based program is required to have a supervisor. The department that admits a student to a thesis-based graduate program is responsible for providing supervision within a subject area in which it has competent supervisors, and in which the student has expressed an interest.</p> <p>Normally there is only one supervisor. Departments may consider the appointment of more than one supervisor for a student.</p> <p>Implicit in the admission process is the following: on the applicant's part, that there has been an indication of at</p>

least a general area of interest and, preferably, provision of some form of proposal, particularly if the program is at the doctoral level; on the department's part, that the application has been reviewed, the area of interest examined, academic expectations and potential performance considered, and that the department accepts its obligation to provide appropriate supervision for the applicant in the specified subject area.

It is expected that every effort will be made to arrive at a mutually agreeable arrangement for supervision between the student and the department. Students are normally involved in the process for selecting their supervisor(s) although this process varies from program to program.

~~When the department is making arrangements for the appointment of supervisors, supervisory committees, and examining committees, or for the scheduling of meetings and examinations, the student shall be consulted and kept informed, but the student shall not be asked to conduct such organizational activities.~~

~~The authority for the appointment of supervisors, and final examining committees rests with the Dean of the department's Faculty, while the authority for the appointment of supervisory committees and doctoral candidacy examining committees rests with the department.~~ Such appointment decisions are final and nonappealable.

Article 7.02.1 of the Faculty Agreement lists the "supervision of graduate students" as a form of "participation in teaching programs". It is expected that a department will monitor and review the performance of supervisors.

Supervisors on Leave

It is the responsibility of supervisors to make adequate provision for supervision of their graduate students during their leave. Therefore, if a supervisor is to be absent from the University for a period exceeding two months, it is the supervisor's responsibility to nominate an adequate interim substitute ~~and~~ to inform the student and the department.

Supervisors planning to take a sabbatical should follow the requirements found in Appendix E of the Faculty Agreement with respect to adequate advance arrangements for graduate students while a supervisor is on sabbatical.

Eligibility for Appointment as Supervisor

least a general area of interest and, preferably, provision of some form of proposal, particularly if the program is at the doctoral level; on the department's part, that the application has been reviewed, the area of interest examined, academic expectations and potential performance considered, and that the department accepts its obligation to provide appropriate supervision for the applicant in the specified subject area.

It is expected that every effort will be made to arrive at a mutually agreeable arrangement for supervision between the student and the department. Students are normally involved in the process for selecting their supervisor(s) although this process varies from program to program.

[moved to Committee and Exam Sections]

The authority for the appointment of supervisors rests with the Dean of the department's Faculty. Such appointment decisions are final and non-appealable.

[the other statements have been moved to appropriate sections under Size and Composition of Examining Committees]

Article 7.02.1 of the Faculty Agreement lists the "supervision of graduate students" as a form of "participation in teaching programs". It is expected that a department will monitor and review the performance of supervisors.

Supervisors on Leave

It is the responsibility of supervisors to make adequate provision for supervision of their graduate students during their leave. Therefore, if a supervisor is to be absent from the University for a period exceeding two months, it is the supervisor's responsibility to nominate an adequate interim substitute ~~and~~ ~~to inform the student and the department~~ ~~in writing at the time the leave is approved.~~ ~~It is the supervisor's responsibility~~ ~~to inform the student and the department~~ ~~in writing at the time the leave is approved.~~ ~~or indicate the means by which supervision will be maintained.~~

Supervisors planning to take a sabbatical should follow the requirements found in Appendix E of the Faculty Agreement with respect to adequate advance arrangements for graduate students while a supervisor is on sabbatical.

Eligibility for Appointment as Supervisor

Each of the following criteria must be met by at least one of the supervisor(s):

1. be a tenured, tenure-track, or retired faculty member, or a Faculty Service Officer, of the University of Alberta (current or retired categories A1.1, A1.3, or current category C1.1, as defined in the University's Recruitment Policy (Appendix A) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff and Colleagues);
2. be active in the general subject area of the student's research;
3. demonstrate continuing scholarly or creative activity of an original nature; and
4. either hold a degree equivalent to or higher than that for which the student is a candidate, or have a demonstrated record of successfully supervising students for the degree.

If one of conditions (1)-(4) is not satisfied by any of the proposed supervisors, then a departmental justification (with the proposed supervisors' CV) is put forward to the Dean of the department's Faculty for approval.

For supervisors from outside the University of Alberta, working with a supervisor at the University of Alberta, there should be an indication of the means by which meaningful interaction can be maintained.

Time Line for the Appointment of Supervisors and Introductory Meetings

Ideally, the supervisor for a thesis-based student, both master's and doctoral, should be appointed as soon as the student arrives to begin their program of studies. If this is not possible, an interim academic advisor may be appointed by the department. Supervisor(s) must be appointed within the first 12 months of the student's program following the procedures approved by the Dean of the department's Faculty.

Every department must develop a list of topics that will be covered during the introductory meetings between a supervisor and a graduate student. These meetings should be held during the term in which a supervisor is first appointed. Topics likely to be listed include program requirements, academic integrity requirements, the role of the supervisor, the preferred means of communication, the availability or non-availability of funding, and scholarly practices and outputs.

Each of the following criteria must be met by at least one of the supervisor(s):

1. be a tenured, tenure-track, or retired faculty member, or a Faculty Service Officer, of the University of Alberta (current or retired categories A1.1, A1.3, or current category C1.1, as defined in the University's Recruitment Policy (Appendix A) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff and Colleagues);
2. be active in the general subject area of the student's research;
3. demonstrate continuing scholarly or creative activity of an original nature; and
4. either hold a degree equivalent to or higher than that for which the student is a candidate, or have a demonstrated record of successfully supervising students for the degree.

If one of conditions (2)-(4) is not satisfied by any of the proposed supervisors, then a departmental justification (with the proposed supervisors' CV) is put forward to the Dean of the department's Faculty for approval.

For supervisors from outside the University of Alberta, working with a supervisor at the University of Alberta, the means by which meaningful interaction can be maintained should be specified in writing to the student and the department.

Time Line for the Appointment of Supervisors

Ideally, the supervisor for a thesis-based student, both master's and doctoral, should be appointed as soon as the student arrives to begin their program of studies. If this is not possible, an interim academic advisor should be appointed by the department. Supervisor(s) must be appointed within the first 12 months of the student's program following the procedures approved by the Dean of the department's Faculty and submitted to FGSR.

Introductory Meetings

Every department must develop a list of topics that will be covered during the introductory meetings between a supervisor and a graduate student. These meetings should be held during the term in which a supervisor is first appointed. Topics likely to be listed include program requirements, academic integrity requirements, the role of the supervisor, the composition of the supervisory committee, the preferred means of communication, the availability of funding, and scholarly practices and outputs.

[Moved from just before The Roles and Structure of Examining Committees]

Resolving Conflicts in Supervisor-Student Relationships

The relationship between students and supervisors is normally close and long-lasting. At times, conflicts may arise between a student and the supervisor. In such cases, the first step **must** be to try to resolve the misunderstanding or conflict informally. This is more likely to be successful if attended to as early as possible. The supervisor and student should discuss the problem together. The supervisor should document the discussions and keep a record of any agreements made. This document should be shared with the student. In the event of a conflict that cannot be resolved, the graduate coordinator should be consulted as early as possible by the parties involved.

It is the responsibility of the graduate coordinator to arrange for consultation and mediation. The graduate coordinator or the parties involved may request advice and/or mediation assistance from their Faculty, the FGSR, and/or other appropriate services, such as the Student Ombudservice. The student and supervisors shall not be required to participate in informal resolution.

If informal resolution is unsuccessful or inappropriate and the graduate coordinator determines that the supervisor-student relationship is beyond repair, the department will attempt in good faith to work with the student to find alternative supervision within the department and inform the FGSR of these efforts in writing.

Where the supervisor has been providing funding to the student, the funding should continue for a period of at least 30 days from the date on which the graduate coordinator determines that the supervisor-student relationship is beyond repair.

If the best arrangements of the department and the FGSR fail to meet the expectations of the student, the student may choose to withdraw without prejudice. If the student refuses to accept the supervision provided, or if no supervision can be secured, then the student is not fulfilling the academic requirement of having a supervisor and may, on academic grounds, be required to withdraw.

Resolving Conflicts in Supervisor-Student Relationships

The relationship between students and supervisors is normally close and long-lasting. At times, conflicts may arise between a student and the supervisor. In such cases, the first step **should** be to try to resolve the misunderstanding or conflict informally. This is more likely to be successful if attended to as early as possible. The supervisor and student should discuss the problem together. The supervisor should document the discussions and keep a record of any agreements made. This document should be shared with the student. In the event of a conflict that cannot be resolved, the graduate coordinator should be consulted as early as possible by the parties involved.

It is the responsibility of the graduate coordinator to arrange for consultation and mediation. The graduate coordinator or the parties involved may request advice and/or mediation assistance from their Faculty, the FGSR, and/or other appropriate services such as the Student Ombudservice. The student and supervisors shall not be required to participate in informal resolution.

If informal resolution is unsuccessful or inappropriate and the graduate coordinator determines that the supervisor-student relationship is beyond repair, the department will attempt in good faith to work with the student to find alternative supervision within the department and inform the FGSR of these efforts in writing.

Where the supervisor has been providing funding to the student, the funding should continue for a period of at least 30 days from the date on which the graduate coordinator determines that the supervisor-student relationship is beyond repair.

If the best arrangements of the department and the FGSR fail to meet the expectations of the student, the student may choose to withdraw without prejudice. If the student refuses to accept the supervision provided, or if no supervision can be secured, then the student is not fulfilling the academic requirement of having a supervisor and may, on academic grounds, be required to withdraw.

Supervisory Committees

Thesis-based master's students

Every thesis-based master's student must have a supervisor. It is not a University requirement for master's students to have a supervisory committee; however, some graduate programs may require them. As ex-officio members of the master's final examining committee, departments should ensure that the members of the supervisory committee meet the eligibility criteria as examiners.

Doctoral students

Every doctoral student's program shall be under the direction of a supervisory committee approved by the department. A doctoral supervisory committee must have at least three members, and must include all the supervisors. As ex-officio members of the candidacy and the doctoral final examining committees, all members of the supervisory committee must meet the eligibility criteria for examiners.

[moved from below]

The supervisory committee is chaired by one of the supervisors.

Compliance with the [University of Alberta's Conflict Policy](#) - Conflict of Interest and Commitment, and Institutional Conflict - is mandatory.

The committee will arrange for the necessary examinations and for adjudication of the thesis. The committee shall have a formal regular meeting with the student at least once a year.

The department should ensure that the members of a supervisory committee are sufficiently competent and experienced to serve at the required level. In forming a

Supervisory Committees

Thesis-based master's students

It is not a University requirement for master's students to have a supervisory committee; however, some graduate programs require them. If required by the program, the supervisory committee members are ex-officio members of the master's final examining committee. Attention should be paid to the qualifications of the committee members as examiners to ensure the composition and size of the examination committee will be appropriate.

Doctoral students

Every doctoral student's program shall be under the direction of a supervisory committee approved by the department.

A doctoral supervisory committee must have at least three members, and must include all the supervisors.

The department should ensure that the members of a supervisory committee are sufficiently competent and experienced to serve at the required level. In forming a supervisory committee, the department should consider the rank and experience of the prospective members, their publications and other demonstrations of competence in the subject area or field of specialization, and the prospective members' experience in graduate supervision.

Attention should be paid to the qualifications of the committee members as examiners to ensure the composition of the examination committee will be appropriate as they are ex-officio members of doctoral examining committees.

The supervisory committee is chaired by one of the supervisors.

Compliance with the [University of Alberta's Conflict Policy](#) - Conflict of Interest and Commitment, and Institutional Conflict - is mandatory.

The supervisor is responsible for ensuring committee meetings are held and making arrangements. The committee shall have a formal regular meeting with the student at least once a year. The department should maintain a record of meetings that have occurred and when students who are not on an approved leave fail to respond to requests to schedule a committee meeting.

[Moved above]

supervisory committee, the department should consider the rank and experience of the prospective members, their publications and other demonstrations of competence in the subject area or field of specialization, and the prospective members' experience in graduate supervision.

For doctoral students, the department shall appoint the supervisory committee well in advance of the candidacy examination.

Resolving Conflicts in Supervisor-Student Relationships

The relationship between students and supervisors is normally close and long-lasting. At times, conflicts may arise between a student and the supervisor. In such cases, the first step must be to try to resolve the conflict or misunderstanding informally. This is more likely to be successful if attended to as early as possible. The supervisor and student should discuss the problem together. The supervisor should document the discussions and keep a record of any agreements made. In the event of a conflict the graduate coordinator should be notified as early as possible.

It is the responsibility of the graduate coordinator to arrange for consultation and mediation. The graduate coordinator or the parties involved may request advice and/or mediation assistance from their Faculty, the FGSR, and/or other appropriate services, such as the Student Ombudservice. The student and supervisors shall not be required to participate in informal resolution against their wishes if either party's behaviour towards the other warrants a complaint under the Code of Student Behaviour, the Discrimination and Harassment Policy, or other University policy.

If informal resolution is unsuccessful or inappropriate, and the graduate coordinator determines that the supervisor-student relationship is beyond repair, the department will attempt in good faith to work with the student to find alternative supervision within the department, and will keep the FGSR apprised of these efforts.

Where the supervisor has been providing funding to the student, the funding should continue for a period of at least 30 days from the date on which the graduate coordinator determines that the supervisor-student relationship is beyond repair.

If the best arrangements of the department and the FGSR fail to meet the expectations of the student, the student may choose to withdraw without prejudice. If the student refuses to accept the supervision provided, or if no

For doctoral students, the department shall appoint the supervisory committee well in advance of the candidacy examination.

[Moved above to just before Supervisory Committees]

supervision can be secured, then the student is not fulfilling the academic requirement of having a supervisor and may, on academic grounds, be required to withdraw.

The Structure of Examining Committees

Formal examining committees are required for thesis-based master's final examination, doctoral candidacy examinations, and doctoral final examinations. Members of these examining committees perform two functions: 1) they bring disciplinary knowledge and expertise to the assessment of the thesis, and 2) they ensure that the University's expectations are met regarding the conduct of the examination, adherence to all relevant policies, and the suitability of the thesis for the degree.

The Chair

Every examining committee must have a chair who is not a supervisor but is a member of the student's home department. The chair should have sufficient experience of graduate examinations to be able to allow the examination to be conducted in a fair manner, and is responsible for moderating the discussion and directing questions. It is the chair's responsibility to ensure that departmental and FGSR regulations relating to the final examination are followed. If the chair is not an examiner, then the chair does not vote.

The FGSR encourages, and for doctoral examinations strongly recommends, that committee chairs not be examiners.

Examiners

Examiners are full voting members of the examining committee. With the exception of the Dean, FGSR, the Dean of the department's Faculty, or a Pro Dean (Dean's representative), who may participate fully in the examination, persons other than the examiners may attend only with the prior approval of the Dean, FGSR, the Dean of the department's Faculty, or the chair of the examining committee. With the possible exception of the Pro Deans, all examiners must be either active in the general subject area of the student's research, or bring relevant expertise to the assessment of the thesis.

The Role and Structure of Examining Committees

Formal examining committees are required for thesis-based master's final examination, doctoral candidacy examinations, and doctoral final examinations. Members of these examining committees perform two functions: 1) they bring knowledge and expertise to the assessment of the thesis, and 2) they ensure that the University's expectations are met regarding the conduct of the examination, adherence to all relevant policies, and the suitability of the thesis for the degree.

The Chair

Every examining committee must have a chair who is not the supervisor and is a faculty member with experience supervising graduate students. The chair should have sufficient experience of graduate examinations to be able to allow the examination to be conducted in a fair manner. The chair is responsible for moderating the discussion and directing questions. It is the chair's responsibility to ensure that departmental and FGSR regulations relating to the final examination are followed. If the chair is not an examiner, then the chair does not vote.

The committee chair is not an examiner for doctoral examinations. See Size and Composition of Examining Committees for the requirements for each examination.

The chair should not have real or apparent conflict of interest with the student or any of the examiners.

Examiners

Examiners are full voting members of the examining committee. All examiners must be either active in the general subject area of the student's research or bring relevant expertise to the assessment of the thesis. [Deleted sentences already found under Attendance at Examinations, below]

Categories of Examiners and Eligibility

There are four types of examiners: ex-officio examiner, arm's length examiner, University of Alberta examiner and External examiner.

Arm's Length Examiners

An arm's length examiner must not be (or have been) a member of the supervisory committee, or have been connected with the thesis research in a significant way.

The examiner should not have been associated with the student, outside of usual contact in courses or other non-thesis activities within the University, nor be related to the student or supervisor(s).

Except in special circumstances (fully justified in writing to the Dean of the department's Faculty), an arm's length examiner should not be a close collaborator of the supervisor(s) within the last six years.

Arm's length examiners who have served on a student's candidacy examination committee do not lose their arm's length status as a result, and are eligible to serve as arm's length examiners on the student's doctoral final examination if the other conditions of being arm's length remain unchanged.

In the case of a doctoral final examination, the required External (i.e., the arm's length examiner from outside the University of Alberta) is, by definition, an arm's length examiner.

Every examining committee requires a minimum number of arm's length examiners: At least one for a master's final examination, at least two for a candidacy examination, and at least two for a doctoral final examination.

Compliance with the University of Alberta's Conflict Policy – Conflict of Interest and Commitment, and Institutional Conflict is mandatory.

Ex-Officio Examiners

The supervisor(s), and, for doctoral students, the other members of the student's supervisory committee, are ex-officio members of the examining committee.

Ex-officio Examiners

The supervisor(s) and, for doctoral students, the other members of the student's supervisory committee are ex-officio members of the examining committee.

By definition, no individual can be both an ex-officio and an arm's length examiner on the same examining committee.

Arm's Length Examiners

An arm's length examiner is knowledgeable in the field and comes fresh to the examination. They must not be (or have been) a member of the supervisory committee, or have been connected with the thesis research in a significant way. The examiner should not have been associated with the student, outside of usual contact in courses or other non-thesis activities within the University, nor be related to the student or supervisor(s).

The arm's length examiners should not be a former supervisor or student of the supervisor(s).

Except in special circumstances (fully justified in writing to the Dean of the department's Faculty), an arm's length examiner should not be an active collaborator of the supervisor(s) (see Conflict of Interest Guidelines, below).

Arm's length examiners who have served on a student's candidacy examination committee do not lose their arm's length status as a result, and are eligible to serve as arm's length examiners on the student's doctoral final examination if the other conditions of being arm's length remain unchanged.

External Examiner

An external examiner from outside the University of Alberta is required for doctoral thesis examinations. In addition to being an arm's length examiner this examiner must fulfill additional criteria as described under "Final Doctoral Examination ... Inviting the External Examiner or Reader" in the Calendar.

[Moved above]

[Moved from below]

[Restored from earlier Calendar wording and revised]

Minimum Membership Requirements for Examining Committees

At least half of the examiners on every examining committee must have a degree which is equivalent to, or higher than, the degree being examined.

At least half of the examiners on every examining committee must be tenured, tenure-track, or retired University of Alberta faculty members, or Faculty Service Officers, (current or retired categories A1.1, A1.3, or current category C1.1, as defined in the University of Alberta's Recruitment Policy (Appendix A) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff and Colleagues).

Minimum Size of an Examining Committee

By definition, no individual can be both an arm's length examiner and an ex-officio examiner on the same examining committee.

The minimum size of a master's final examining committee is three. This minimum size condition is automatically met except when the student has one supervisor, no supervisory committee, and there is only one arm's length examiner on the examining committee. In this case, the examining committee requires at least one more examiner.

University of Alberta Examiners

The University of Alberta examiner is a tenured, tenure-track, or retired University of Alberta faculty member, or Faculty Service Officer, (current or retired categories A1.1, A1.3, or current category C1.1, as defined in the University of Alberta's Recruitment Policy (Appendix A) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff and Colleagues).

Conflict of Interest Guidelines for Supervisory and Examination Committees

The key relationships are: the supervisor to the student; the supervisor to the other committee members; and the student to the committee members. There must be no conflict of interest in these relationships, as defined by the University of Alberta policy. Any personal or professional relationships that alter or affect this academic relationship may constitute a conflict of interest.

It is a best practice to request examiners and the chair declare any potential conflicts of interest prior to approval of the examination committee. Where potential conflicts-of-interest emerge, the matter may be referred to an Associate Dean at FGSR for advice on how to best manage unavoidable conflicts of interest.

Size and Composition of Examining Committees

For all examination committees, at least half of the examiners must have a degree equivalent to or higher than the degree being examined.

For all examination committees, at least half of the examiners must fulfill the criteria as a University of Alberta examiner as tenured, tenure-track, or retired University of Alberta faculty members, or Faculty Service Officers (see above under Categories of Examiners and Eligibility).

[Moved above under Categories of Examiners and Eligibility]

Master's Thesis Examination Committee

- The minimum size of a master's final examining committee is three examiners. The maximum size is five examiners.
- The ex-officio members of the committee are the supervisor(s) and the supervisory committee members if there is a committee.
- There must be one arm's length examiner.

[Moved here from The Appointment of the Supervisor(s)]

For doctoral candidacy and doctoral final examinations, the minimum size of the examining committee is five.

[Moved here from The Appointment of the Supervisor(s)]

- At least half of the examiners must hold a master's degree or higher (see above).
- At least half of the examiners must fulfill the criteria of University of Alberta examiner (see above)
- The chair is not the supervisor. The chair is a faculty member in the student's home department or with experience chairing master's examinations. The FGSR recommends that committee chairs not be examiners except in extenuating circumstances where any conflict of interest in this role be managed transparently for the student.

The authority for the appointment of final examining committees rests with the Dean of the department's Faculty [unless delegated to the department].

Doctoral Candidacy Examination Committee

- The minimum size of a doctoral candidacy committee is five examiners. The maximum size is seven examiners.
- The ex officio members of the committee are the supervisor(s) and the supervisory committee members.
- There must be two arm's length examiners.
- At least half or more of the examiners must hold a doctoral degree or higher (see above).
- At least half of the examiners must fulfill the criteria of University of Alberta examiner (see above)
- The chair is not an examiner. The chair is a faculty member in the student's home department or with experience chairing doctoral examinations

The authority for the appointment of doctoral candidacy examining committees rests with the department.

Doctoral Thesis Examination Committee

- The minimum size of a doctoral final examining committee is five examiners. The maximum size is seven examiners.
- The ex officio members of the committee are the supervisor(s) and the supervisory committee members.
- There must be two arm's length examiners, one of whom must be a reader or examiner external to the University
- At least half of the examiners must hold a doctoral degree or higher (see above).
- At least half of the examiners must fulfill the criteria of University of Alberta examiner (see above)
- The chair is not an examiner. The chair is a

[Moved here from The Appointment of the Supervisor(s)]

Conduct of Examinations

Common Examination Protocols

Attendance at Examinations: In the absence of unforeseen circumstances, it is essential that all examiners attend the entire examination. Attendance means participation in the examination either in person or via Teleconferencing (see below). The only exception allowed is the External Reader for a doctoral final examination, who participates by providing a detailed report and a list of questions.

If the department has warning that any member of the examining committee cannot attend the examination, the department should contact the Dean of the FGSR for advice. The situation will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, but it may be necessary that the examination be postponed and rescheduled, or the examiner be replaced.

Except for the Dean, FGSR, the Dean of the department's Faculty, or a Pro Dean (the representative of the Dean, FGSR), who may participate fully in the examination, persons other than the examiners may attend only with the approval of the Dean, FGSR, the Dean of the department's Faculty, or the chair of the committee.

Attendance and Responsibilities of a Pro Dean at Examinations: A Pro Dean is a full voting member when attending an examination. The Pro Dean's presence is in addition to the regular membership. Attendance of the Pro Dean may be at the request of a committee member, student, chair, graduate coordinator, the Dean of the department's Faculty, or the Dean, FGSR.

The Pro Dean's role is to ensure the proper conduct of the examination and will intercede actively to correct procedural problems. The Pro Dean has the power to adjourn an examination. If problems are encountered, the Pro Dean is asked to submit a brief report to the Dean, FGSR.

Teleconferencing Guidelines for Examinations: The term 'teleconferencing' is used here generically to include all forms of distance conference facilitation including telephone, video and electronic communication. Departments may wish to use teleconferencing for one or more of the examiners (including the External). It is recommended that no more than two participants use

faculty member in the student's home department or with experience chairing doctoral examinations.

The authority for the appointment of final examining committees rests with the Dean of the department's Faculty [unless delegated to the department].

Conduct of Examinations

Common Examination Protocols

Attendance at Examinations: In the absence of unforeseen circumstances, it is essential that all examiners attend the entire examination. Attendance means participation in the examination either in person or via Teleconferencing (see below). The only exception allowed is the External Reader for a doctoral final examination, who participates by providing a detailed report and a list of questions.

If the department has warning that any member of the examining committee cannot attend the examination, the department should contact the Dean of the FGSR for advice. The situation will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, but it may be necessary that the examination be postponed, or the examiner replaced.

The Dean, FGSR, the Dean of the department's Faculty, or a Pro Dean (the representative of the Dean, FGSR) may participate fully in the examination. Persons other than the examiners may attend only with the approval of the Dean, FGSR, the Dean of the department's Faculty, or the chair of the committee.

Responsibilities of a Pro Dean at Examinations: A Pro Dean is a full voting member when attending an examination. The Pro Dean's presence is in addition to the regular membership. Attendance of the Pro Dean may be at the request of a committee member, student, chair, graduate coordinator, the Dean of the department's Faculty, or the Dean, FGSR.

The Pro Dean's role is to ensure the proper conduct of the examination and will intercede actively to correct procedural problems. The Pro Dean has the power to adjourn an examination. If problems are encountered, the Pro Dean is asked to submit a brief report to the Dean, FGSR.

Teleconferencing Guidelines for Examinations: The term 'teleconferencing' is used here generically to include all forms of distance conference facilitation including telephone, video and synchronous electronic communication. Departments may wish to use teleconferencing for one or more of the examiners (including the External). No more than two participants use

teleconferencing. Teleconferencing may be used for master's or doctoral examinations. Examiners participating in examinations by this means are considered to be in attendance.

Students must attend their candidacy examinations in person. In exceptional circumstances, for the final examinations, students may participate by teleconferencing. It is recommended that if the student is the remote participant, no remote committee members be used.

Use of teleconferencing must be submitted for approval to the Dean of the department's Faculty at the time the examination committee is approved, following the Faculty's established procedures.

Timelines and Approval of the Examining Committee:

It is the responsibility of the department to nominate the members of the examining committee following the procedures established by the Dean of the department's Faculty using the Forms available on the FGSR website. The notice of final approval must be received by the FGSR at least two weeks in advance of the examination to be coded into the system.

Scheduling of Examinations: It is the responsibility of the supervisor(s) to ensure that:

1. proper arrangements are made for the student's examination,
2. the exam is scheduled and held in accordance with FGSR and departmental regulations,
3. committee members are informed of meetings and details of examinations
4. the student does not make these arrangements,
5. the student provides copies of the thesis (master's and doctoral final examination) to the examiners at least three weeks before the examination. Note that the External for a doctoral final examination must receive a copy of the thesis at least four weeks before the examination.

In the absence of the supervisor, the department's graduate coordinator or designate shall be responsible for these arrangements.

Changing an Examining Committee Member: Changes to the membership of the Examining Committee must occur following the procedures established by the Dean of the department's Faculty.

Language of Examinations: The language used to

may attend by teleconference. Teleconferencing may be used for master's or doctoral examinations. Examiners participating in examinations by this means are considered to be in attendance.

Students must attend their candidacy examinations in person. In exceptional circumstances, for the final examinations, students may participate by teleconferencing. It is recommended that if the student is the remote participant, no remote committee members be used.

Use of teleconferencing must be submitted for approval to the Dean of the department's Faculty at the time the examination committee is approved, following the Faculty's established procedures.

Timelines and Approval of the Examining Committee:

It is the responsibility of the department to nominate the members of the examining committee following the procedures established by the Dean of the department's Faculty using the Forms available on the FGSR website. The notice of final approval must be received by the FGSR at least two weeks in advance of the examination to be coded into the system.

Scheduling of Examinations: It is the responsibility of the supervisor(s) to ensure that:

1. proper arrangements are made for the student's examination,
2. the exam is scheduled and held in accordance with FGSR and departmental regulations,
3. committee members are informed of meetings and details of examinations
4. the student does not make these arrangements,
5. the student provides a copy of the thesis (master's and doctoral final examination) to the individual delegated by the program to distribute the thesis to the examiners (ex. chair of the examination, program administrator, supervisor). The supervisor is responsible for ensuring that all examiners receive the thesis in a timely way. All examiners for a doctoral final examination must receive a copy of the thesis at least four weeks before the examination.

In the absence of the supervisor, the department's graduate coordinator or designate shall be responsible for these arrangements.

Changing an Examining Committee Member: Changes to the membership of the Examining Committee must follow the procedures established by the Dean of the department's Faculty.

Language of Examinations: The language used to

conduct examinations shall be English, except where already approved by the FGSR Council. However, the examining committee may petition the Dean of the FGSR, and on receiving written approval, may conduct the examination in a language other than English.

Time Limit for Submission of Theses to FGSR:

Following completion of the final examination at which the thesis is passed or passed subject to revisions, the student shall make the appropriate revisions where necessary and submit the approved thesis to the FGSR within six months of the date of the final examination. Departments may impose earlier deadlines for submitting revisions.

If the thesis is not submitted to the FGSR within the six-month time limit, the student will be considered to have withdrawn from the program. After this time, the student must apply and be readmitted to the FGSR and register again before the thesis can be accepted. If the final examination is adjourned, the six-month time limit will take effect from the date of completion of the examination where the thesis was passed with or without revisions. In order to convocate, all thesis-based students must submit their thesis to the FGSR and have it approved before they can be cleared for convocation. The thesis cannot be approved without a valid student registration at the time of approval.

conduct examinations shall be English, except where already approved by the FGSR Council. However, the examining committee may petition the Dean of the FGSR, and on receiving written approval, may conduct the examination in a language other than English.

Time Limit for Submission of Theses to FGSR:

Following completion of the final examination at which the thesis is passed or passed subject to revisions, the student shall make any necessary revisions and submit the approved thesis to the FGSR within six months of the date of the final examination. Departments may impose earlier deadlines for submitting revisions.

If the thesis is not submitted to the FGSR within the six-month time limit, the student will be considered to have withdrawn from the program. After this time, the student must apply and be readmitted to the FGSR and register again before the thesis can be accepted. If the final examination is adjourned, the six-month time limit will take effect from the date of completion of the examination where the thesis was passed with or without revisions. In order to convocate, all thesis-based students must submit their thesis to the FGSR and have it approved before they can be cleared for convocation. The thesis cannot be approved without a valid student registration at the time of approval.

Conduct of Thesis and Candidacy Examinations

The following apply to all examinations. Matters specific to each type of examination are detailed in the sections that follow. Programs may have additional regulations in their program guidelines.

- The student may be required to give a presentation prior to the examination. The presentation may be public or only for the examining committee (and others approved to attend the examination—see Attendance at Doctoral Examinations, above).
- If a public seminar is held before the examination, typically the examiners do not ask questions until the examination itself begins.
- At the start of the examination the chair should review the procedures as detailed by the program's guidelines for the examination including the order of examiners, number of rounds of questions, the length of time allotted to each examiner and whether interjections by other examiners are permitted. Departmental examination procedures should have flexibility to adjust accordingly when there are large supervisory committees so as not to extend the questioning portion of the examination beyond a reasonable duration (2 hours for master's and 3 hours for doctoral examinations).
- The student may be asked to leave the room while the order of examiners is determined, and the student's

<p>Thesis Based Master’s Program Examination</p> <p>Decision of the Master’s Final Examining Committee: The decision of the examining committee will be based both on the content of the thesis and on the student’s ability to defend it. The final examination may result in one of the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjourned 	<p>academic record is reviewed by the supervisor for the committee. Typically the order of examiners is the External if applicable, the arm’s length examiners, the supervisory committee members, and then the supervisor. The Examiners may seek clarification at this time regarding exam procedures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If academic misconduct is suspected, an Associate Dean, FGSR should be consulted prior to the exam. • For thesis examinations the questioning should focus on establishing the quality of the thesis (or thesis substitute) and the student’s breadth and depth of understanding at a level appropriate to the degree qualification. Expectations for a Candidacy examination are detailed in the program’s guidelines. • When the questions have concluded, the chair should ask the student if they have any final comments they would like to add. <p>Deliberation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student is required to leave the room and will be asked to take their personal belongings including electronic devices with them. • The deliberations are confidential proceedings. The committee will agree on the report to be provided to the student with the outcome of the examination. • The examiners are asked to give their opinions on the quality of the thesis and the defense, or performance in the candidacy examination, in the same order as questioning occurred. All examiners must provide their opinion before a final decision is made. • The options of the outcomes from the vote are detailed for each type of examination. • If the outcome of the first vote does not result in a decision (eg. two of five examiners vote to fail), the chair will allow for further discussion and attempt to reach a decision. Only in cases where a decision cannot be reached in a reasonable time will the student be informed and matter referred to the Dean FGSR, who will determine the appropriate course of action. • The chair of the Examination Committee may sign the thesis examination form on behalf of an examiner who is participating from a remote location. <p>Thesis Based Master’s Program Examination</p> <p>Each department offering a thesis-based Master’s degree is required to establish detailed examination procedures for final examinations. These procedures must be made available publicly.</p> <p>Decision of the Master’s Final Examining Committee: The decision of the examining committee will be based both on the content of the thesis and on the student’s ability to defend it. The final examination may result in one of the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjourned
--	--

- Pass
- Pass subject to revisions
- Fail

There is no provision for a final examination to be “passed subject to major revisions”.

If the Examining Committee fails to reach a decision, the department will refer the matter to the Dean, FGSR, who will determine an appropriate course of action.

Adjourned: An adjourned examination is one that has been abandoned officially. A majority of examiners must agree to an outcome of Adjourned. The final examination should be adjourned in the following situations:

- The revisions to the thesis are sufficiently substantial that it will require further research or experimentation or major reworking of sections, or if the committee is so dissatisfied with the general presentation of the thesis that it will require a reconvening of the examining committee. In such circumstances the committee cannot pass the student, and must adjourn the examination.
- The committee is dissatisfied with the student’s oral presentation and defence of the thesis, even if the thesis itself is acceptable with or without minor revisions.
- Compelling, extraordinary circumstances such as a sudden medical emergency taking place during the examination.
- Discovery of possible offences under the Code of Student Behaviour after the examination has started.

If the examination is adjourned, the committee should:

- Specify in writing to the student, with as much precision as possible, the nature of the deficiencies and, in the case of revisions to the thesis, the extent of the revisions required. Where the oral defence is unsatisfactory, it may be necessary to arrange some discussion periods with the student prior to reconvening the examination.
- Decide upon a date to reconvene. If the date of the reconvened examination depends upon the completion of a research task or a series of discussions, it should be made clear which committee members will decide on the appropriate date to reconvene. This new examination must be held within six months of the initial examination.
- Make it clear to the student what will be required by way of approval before the examination is reconvened (e.g., approval of the committee chair or supervisor, approval of the entire committee, or of select members of the committee).
- Specify the supervision and assistance the student may expect from the committee members in meeting the necessary revisions.
- Advise the Dean, FGSR, in writing of the adjournment and the conditions.
- When the date is set for the adjourned final examination, the department will notify the FGSR. Normally a Pro Dean attends the examination.

- Pass
- Pass subject to revisions
- Fail

There is no provision for a final examination to be “passed subject to major revisions”.

If the Examining Committee fails to reach a decision, the department will refer the matter to the Dean, FGSR, who will determine an appropriate course of action.

Adjourned: An adjourned examination is one that has been abandoned officially. A majority of examiners must agree to an outcome of Adjourned. The final examination should be adjourned in the following situations:

- The revisions to the thesis are sufficiently substantial that it will require further research or experimentation or major reworking of sections, or if the committee is so dissatisfied with the general presentation of the thesis that it will require a reconvening of the examining committee. In such circumstances the committee cannot pass the student, and must adjourn the examination.
- The committee is dissatisfied with the student’s oral presentation and defence of the thesis, even if the thesis itself is acceptable with or without minor revisions.
- Compelling, extraordinary circumstances such as a sudden medical emergency taking place during the examination.
- Discovery of possible offences under the Code of Student Behaviour after the examination has started.

If the examination is adjourned, the committee should:

- Specify in writing to the student, with as much precision as possible, the nature of the deficiencies and, in the case of revisions to the thesis, the extent of the revisions required. Where the oral defence is unsatisfactory, it may be necessary to arrange some discussion periods with the student prior to reconvening the examination.
- Decide upon a date to reconvene. If the date of the reconvened examination depends upon the completion of a research task or a series of discussions, it should be made clear which committee members will decide on the appropriate date to reconvene. This new examination must be held within six months of the initial examination.
- Make it clear to the student what will be required by way of approval before the examination is reconvened (e.g., approval of the committee chair or supervisor, approval of the entire committee, or of select members of the committee).
- Specify the supervision and assistance the student may expect from the committee members in meeting the necessary revisions.
- Advise the Dean, FGSR, in writing of the adjournment and the conditions.
- When the date is set for the adjourned final examination, the department will notify the FGSR. Normally a Pro Dean attends the examination. **The Pro Dean should be included**

Pass: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Pass. If the student passes the examination, the department should submit a completed Thesis Approval/Program Completion form to the FGSR. If one of the examiners fails the student, that examiner does not have to sign this form.

Pass subject to revisions: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Pass subject to revisions. The student has satisfactorily defended the thesis but the revisions to the thesis **are sufficiently minor that it** will not require a reconvening of the examining committee.

If the examining committee agrees to a "Pass subject to revisions" for the student, the chair of the examining committee must provide in writing, within five working days of the examination, to the **Dean, FGSR, the graduate coordinator and the student:**

- the reasons for this outcome,
- the details of the required revisions,
- the approval mechanism for meeting the requirement for revisions (e.g., approval of the examining committee chair or supervisor, or approval of the entire examining committee, or select members of the committee), and
- the supervision and assistance the student can expect to receive from committee members.

The student must make the revisions within six months of the date of the final examination. Once the required revisions have been made and approved, the department shall submit a completed Thesis Approval/Program Completion form to the FGSR indicating "pass subject to revisions". If one of the examiners fails the student that examiner does not have to sign the form. If the required revisions have not been made and approved by the end of the six months deadline, the **outcome of the examination is a Fail.**

Fail: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Fail. If the examination result is a Fail, no member of the examining committee signs the Thesis Approval/Completion form.

When the outcome is a Fail, the committee chair will provide the reasons for this decision to the department. The department will then provide this report, together with its recommendation for the student's program, to the Dean, FGSR, and to the student.

An Associate Dean, FGSR will normally arrange to meet with the student, the graduate coordinator, and others if needed, before acting upon any departmental recommendation that affects the student's academic

on all correspondence for the rescheduling of the examination.

Pass: **Pass is the decision given when the only revisions required are typographical or minor editorial changes.** All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Pass. If the student passes the examination, the department should submit a completed Thesis Approval/Program Completion form to the FGSR. If one of the examiners fails the student, that examiner does not have to sign this form.

Pass subject to revisions: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Pass subject to revisions. The student has satisfactorily defended the thesis but the revisions to the thesis it will not require a reconvening of the examining committee.

If the examining committee agrees to a "Pass subject to revisions" for the student, the chair of the examining committee must provide in writing, within five working days of the examination, to the **student, the graduate coordinator, and FGSR:**

- the reasons for this outcome,
- the details of the required revisions,
- the approval mechanism for meeting the requirement for revisions (e.g., approval of the examining committee chair or supervisor, or approval of the entire examining committee, or select members of the committee), and
- the supervision and assistance the student can expect to receive from committee members.

The student must make the revisions within six months of the date of the final examination. Once the required revisions have been made and approved, the department shall submit a completed Thesis Approval/Program Completion form to the FGSR indicating **the committee decision was** "pass subject to revisions". If one of the examiners fails the student that examiner does not have to sign the form. If the required revisions have not been made and approved by the end of the six months deadline, the **student will be required to withdraw.**

Fail: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Fail. If the examination result is a Fail, no member of the examining committee signs the Thesis Approval/Completion form.

When the outcome is a Fail, the committee chair will provide the reasons for this decision to the department. The department will then provide this report, together with its recommendation for the student's program, to the Dean, FGSR, and to the student.

An Associate Dean, FGSR will normally arrange to meet with the student, the graduate coordinator, and others if needed, before acting upon any departmental recommendation that affects the student's academic

standing.

Doctoral Candidacy Examination

Establishing Candidacy Examination Procedures: Each department offering a doctoral degree is responsible for establishing detailed examination policies and procedures for the candidacy examination. These documents should be publicly available.

The candidacy examination is an oral examination; some departments may also require that students take comprehensive written examinations prior to the candidacy examination, but such examinations do not form part of the candidacy examination itself.

For candidacy examinations, students must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the examining committee that they possess:

1. an adequate knowledge of the discipline and of the subject matter relevant to the thesis;
2. the ability to pursue and complete original research at an advanced level; and
3. the ability to meet any other requirements found in the department's published policy on candidacy examinations.

The candidacy examination must be held within three years of the commencement of the program in accordance with The Degree of PhD of the University Calendar. The candidacy examination must be passed no less than six months prior to taking the final examination.

Decision of the Candidacy Committee: The candidacy examination may result in one of the following outcomes:

- Adjourned
- Pass
- Conditional pass
- Fail and repeat the candidacy
- Fail with a recommendation to terminate the doctoral program or for a change of category to a master's program. If the Examining Committee fails to reach a decision, the department will refer the matter to the Dean, FGSR, who will determine an appropriate course of action.

Adjourned: A majority of examiners must agree to an outcome of Adjourned. The candidacy examination should be adjourned in the event of compelling, extraordinary circumstances such as a sudden medical emergency taking place during the examination or possible offences under the Code of Student Behaviour after the examination has started.

standing.

Doctoral Candidacy Examination

Establishing Candidacy Examination Procedures: Each department offering a doctoral degree is responsible for establishing detailed examination policies and procedures for the candidacy examination. These documents should be publicly available.

The candidacy examination is an oral examination; some departments may also require that students take comprehensive written examinations prior to the candidacy examination, but such examinations do not form part of the candidacy examination itself.

For candidacy examinations, students must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the examining committee that they possess:

1. an adequate knowledge of the discipline and of the subject matter relevant to the thesis;
2. the ability to pursue and complete original research at an advanced level; and
3. the ability to meet any other requirements found in the department's published policy on candidacy examinations.

The candidacy examination must be held within three years of the commencement of the program in accordance with The Degree of PhD of the University Calendar. The candidacy examination must be passed no less than six months prior to taking the final examination.

Decision of the Candidacy Committee: The candidacy examination may result in one of the following outcomes:

- Adjourned
- Pass
- Conditional pass
- Fail and repeat the candidacy
- Fail with a recommendation to terminate the doctoral program or for a change of category to a master's program. If the Examining Committee fails to reach a decision, the department will refer the matter to the Dean, FGSR, who will determine an appropriate course of action.

When the decision is Conditional Pass or Fail, chairs may refer to the decision process flowchart found on the FGSR website.

Adjourned: A majority of examiners must agree to an outcome of Adjourned. The candidacy examination should be adjourned in the event of compelling, extraordinary circumstances such as a sudden medical emergency taking place during the examination or possible offences under the Code of Student Behaviour after the examination has started.

Pass: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Pass. If the student passes the candidacy examination, the department should complete the Report of Completion of Candidacy Examination form and submit it to the FGSR.

Conditional Pass:

A majority of examiners must agree to an outcome of Conditional Pass. If the candidacy examining committee agrees to a conditional pass for the student, the chair of the examining committee will provide in writing within five working days to the Dean, FGSR, the graduate coordinator and the student:

- the reasons for this recommendation,
- the details of the conditions,
- the timeframe for the student to meet the conditions,
- the approval mechanism for meeting the conditions (e.g., approval of the committee chair or supervisor, or approval of the entire committee, or select members of the committee), and
- the supervision and assistance the student can be expected to receive from committee members

Conditions are subject to final approval by the Dean, FGSR. At the deadline specified for meeting the conditions, two outcomes are possible:

- All the conditions have been met. In this case, the department will complete the Report of Completion of Candidacy Examination form and submit it to the FGSR; or
- Some of the conditions have not been met. In this case, the outcome of the candidacy examination is a Fail, and the options below are available to the examining committee. Note that the options are different after a failed second candidacy examination.

Fail: If the candidacy examining committee agrees that the student has failed, the committee chair will provide the reasons for this recommendation to the department. The graduate coordinator will then provide this report, together with the department's recommendation for the student's program, to the Dean, FGSR, and to the student. For failed candidacy examinations, an Associate Dean, FGSR, normally arranges to meet with the student and

Pass: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Pass. If the student passes the candidacy examination, the department should complete the Report of Completion of Candidacy Examination form and submit it to the FGSR.

Conditional Pass:

A Conditional Pass is appropriate when the student has satisfied the committee in all but a very discrete area of deficiency that can be addressed through a reasonable requirement (e.g., coursework, literature review, upgrading of writing skills). Reworking of the entire candidacy proposal is not an acceptable condition and the examiners should consider the options available for a student that has failed the examination.

A majority of examiners must agree to an outcome of Conditional Pass. If the candidacy examining committee agrees to a conditional pass for the student, the chair of the examining committee will provide in writing within five working days to the Dean, FGSR, the graduate coordinator and the student:

- the reasons for this recommendation,
- the details of the conditions,
- the timeframe for the student to meet the conditions, but which should be no less than six weeks and no more than six months.
- the approval mechanism for meeting the conditions (e.g., approval of the committee chair or supervisor, or approval of the entire committee, or select members of the committee),
- the supervision and assistance the student can expect to receive from committee members

Conditions are subject to final approval by the Dean, FGSR. At the deadline specified for meeting the conditions, two outcomes are possible:

- All the conditions have been met. In this case, the department will complete the Report of Completion of Candidacy Examination form and submit it to the FGSR; or
- If the conditions are not met by the deadline, the outcome of the examination is a fail and the committee must be reconvened to make the recommendation as described in the following section.

Fail: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Fail.

others as required before acting upon any department recommendation.

The options available to the examining committee when the outcome of a student's candidacy exam is "Fail" are

- Repeat the Candidacy:

A majority of examiners must agree to an outcome of Fail and Repeat the Candidacy. If the student's first candidacy exam performance was inadequate but the student's performance and work completed to date indicate that the student has the potential to perform at the doctoral level, the examining committee should consider the possibility of recommending that the student be given an opportunity to repeat the candidacy exam. Normally, the composition of the examining committee does not change for the repeat candidacy exam.

If the recommendation of a repeat candidacy is formulated by the examining committee and approved by the FGSR, the student and graduate coordinator are to be notified in writing of the student's exam deficiencies by the chair of the examining committee. The second candidacy exam is to be scheduled no later than six months from the date of the first candidacy. In the event that the student fails the second candidacy, the examining committee shall recommend one of the following two options to the department:

- Change of Category to a Master's Program: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Fail and Change of Category to a Master's Program. This outcome should be considered if the student's candidacy examination performance was inadequate and the student's performance and work completed to date indicates that the student has the potential to complete a master's, but not a doctoral, program; or
- Termination of the Doctoral Program: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Fail and Terminate the Doctoral Program. If the student's performance was inadequate, and the work completed during the program is considered inadequate, then the examining committee should recommend termination of the student's program.

[moved from above]

The options available to the examining committee when the outcome of a student's candidacy exam is "Fail" are

- Repeat the Candidacy: Repeating the Candidacy is not an option after a second failed examination.

A majority of examiners must agree to an outcome of Fail and Repeat the Candidacy. If the student's first candidacy exam performance was inadequate but the student's performance and work completed to date indicate that the student has the potential to perform at the doctoral level, the examining committee should consider the possibility of recommending that the student be given an opportunity to repeat the candidacy exam. Normally, the composition of the examining committee does not change for the repeat candidacy exam.

If the recommendation of a repeat candidacy is formulated by the examining committee and approved by the FGSR, the student and graduate coordinator are to be notified in writing of the student's exam deficiencies by the chair of the examining committee. The second candidacy exam is to be scheduled no later than six months from the date of the first candidacy. In the event that the student fails the second candidacy, the examining committee shall recommend one of the following two options to the department:

- Change of Category to a Master's Program: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Fail and Change of Category to a Master's Program. This outcome should be considered if the student's candidacy examination performance was inadequate and the student's performance and work completed to date indicate that the student has the potential to complete a master's, but not a doctoral, program; or
- Termination of the Doctoral Program: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Fail and Terminate the Doctoral Program. If the student's performance was inadequate, and the work completed during the program is considered inadequate, then the examining committee should recommend termination of the student's program.

If the candidacy examining committee agrees that the student has failed, the committee chair will provide the reasons and the recommendation for the student's program to the department. The graduate coordinator will then provide this report, together with the department's recommendation for the student's program, to the Dean, FGSR, and to the student. For failed candidacy examinations, an Associate Dean, FGSR, normally arranges to meet with the student (and others as required) before acting upon any department recommendation.

Final Doctoral Examination

Each department offering a doctoral degree is required to establish detailed examination procedures for final examinations. These procedures must be made available publicly.

Preliminary Acceptance of the Thesis: Before the thesis is forwarded to the External, the supervisory committee members must declare in writing to the supervisor(s) either that the thesis is of adequate substance and quality to warrant that the student proceed to the final examination or that the thesis is unsatisfactory and the student should not be allowed to proceed to the final examination.

The purpose of this process is to ensure the thesis is vetted by the supervisor(s) and all supervisory committee members and to verify that it is of sufficient substance and quality to proceed to the final examination.

This process is critical to protect and uphold the reputation of the department and the University of Alberta for excellence in graduate programs. It is also critical to ensure that Externals and other additional members of the examining committee are not asked to invest time reading a thesis that is substandard.

Departments may choose to prepare a “Preliminary Acceptance of Thesis” signature sheet for their own records.

Attendance at Doctoral Examinations: Faculty members of the student’s home department as well as members of FGSR Council (or their alternates) have the right to attend doctoral examinations but should notify the chair of the examining committee. Other persons may attend the examination only with special permission of the Dean of the department’s Faculty, the Dean, FGSR, or the chair of the examining committee.

Except for a Dean or a Pro Dean who may participate fully in the examination, persons who are not members of the examining committee:

- may participate in the questioning only by permission of the chair of the committee, but
- are not permitted to participate in the discussion of the student’s performance and must withdraw before such discussion commences

Inviting the External Examiner or Reader: Every Final Doctoral Examining Committee must have an External i.e., an arm’s length examiner from outside the University of Alberta. The term External Examiner refers to an External **that** attends the examination; whereas the term External Reader refers to an External who provides a written evaluation of the thesis and questions to be asked during the examination. External Readers are deemed to be in attendance at the examination.

It is the responsibility of the department to recommend

Final Doctoral Examination

Each department offering a doctoral degree is required to establish detailed examination procedures for final examinations. These procedures must be made available publicly.

Preliminary Acceptance of the Thesis: Before the thesis is forwarded to the External, the supervisory committee members must declare in writing to the supervisor(s) either that the thesis is of adequate substance and quality to warrant that the student proceed to the final examination or that the thesis is unsatisfactory and the student should not be allowed to proceed to the final examination.

The purpose of this process is to ensure the thesis is vetted by the supervisor(s) and all supervisory committee members and to verify that it is of sufficient substance and quality to proceed to the final examination.

This process is critical to protect and uphold the reputation of the department and the University of Alberta for excellence in graduate programs. It is also critical to ensure that Externals and other additional members of the examining committee are not asked to invest time reading a thesis that is substandard.

Departments may choose to prepare a “Preliminary Acceptance of Thesis” signature sheet for their own records.

Attendance at Doctoral Examinations: Faculty members of the student’s home department as well as members of FGSR Council (or their alternates) have the right to attend doctoral examinations but should notify the chair of the examining committee. Other persons may attend the examination only with special permission of the Dean of the department’s Faculty, the Dean, FGSR, or the chair of the examining committee.

Except for a Dean or a Pro Dean who may participate fully in the examination, persons who are not members of the examining committee:

- may participate in the questioning only by permission of the chair of the committee, but
- are not permitted to participate in the discussion of the student’s performance and must withdraw before such discussion commences

Inviting the External Examiner or Reader: Every Final Doctoral Examining Committee must have an External i.e., an arm’s length examiner from outside the University of Alberta. The term External Examiner refers to an External **who** attends the examination; whereas the term External Reader refers to an External who provides a written evaluation of the thesis and questions to be asked during the examination. External Readers are deemed to be in attendance at the examination.

It is the responsibility of the department to recommend

an External Examiner or Reader and to submit the name to the Dean of the department's Faculty for approval. Normally, this should be done at least two months in advance of the examination date. The submission must follow the procedures established by the Dean of the department's Faculty.

The External:

- **Must** be a recognized authority in the specific field of research of the student's thesis;
- Will be experienced in evaluating doctoral area work; and
- Must be in a position to review the thesis objectively and to provide a critical analysis of the work and the presentation.

It is essential that the External not have an association with the student, the supervisor, or the department, within the last six years as this could hinder objective analysis. For example, a proposed External who has within the last six years been associated with the student as a research collaborator or coauthor would not be eligible. Also, a proposed External must not have had an association within the last six years with the doctoral student's supervisor (as a former student, supervisor, or close collaborator, for instance).

Under normal circumstances the same person will not be used as an External at the University of Alberta if that External has served in the same capacity in the same department at this University within the preceding two years; this does not preclude an External serving in another department.

Once the External has been approved an official letter of invitation is issued to the External by the department.

Approval of the Doctoral Final Examining Committee:

The department will recommend the names of all members of the final examining committee and forward them to the Dean of the department's Faculty, if decanal approval is required, following the procedures established by their Faculty.

External Readers: Do not attend the examination.

Instead, the External Reader is asked in the letter of invitation to prepare a written report consisting of:

- an evaluation of the scope, structure, methodology, and findings of the thesis,
- a list of minor errors (if any), and
- either a list of clear, direct, contextualized questions to be posed to the candidate during the examination, or a brief written commentary of the thesis which can be read to the candidate for response during the examination.

The External Reader must include a statement that the thesis falls into one of the following two categories:

- **Acceptable with minor or no revisions:** In this case, the External Reader submits the report to the Graduate

an External Examiner or Reader and to submit the name to the Dean of the department's Faculty for approval. Normally, this should be done at least two months in advance of the examination date. The submission must follow the procedures established by the Dean of the department's Faculty.

The External:

- **Will** be a recognized authority in the specific field of research of the student's thesis;
- Will be experienced in evaluating doctoral area work; and
- Must be in a position to review the thesis objectively and to provide a critical analysis of the work and the presentation.

It is essential that the External not have an association with the student, the supervisor, or the department within the last six years as this could hinder objective analysis. For example, a proposed External who has within the last six years been associated with the student as a research collaborator or coauthor would not be eligible. Also, a proposed External must not have had an association within the last six years with the doctoral student's supervisor (as a former student, supervisor, or close collaborator, for instance).

Under normal circumstances the same person will not be used as an External at the University of Alberta if that External has served in the same capacity in the same department at this University within the preceding two years; this does not preclude an External serving in another department.

Once the External has been approved an official letter of invitation is issued to the External by the department.

Approval of the Doctoral Final Examining Committee:

The department will recommend the names of all members of the final examining committee and forward them to the Dean of the department's Faculty, if decanal approval is required, following the procedures established by their Faculty.

External Readers: Do not attend the examination.

Instead, the External Reader is asked in the letter of invitation to prepare a written report consisting of:

- an evaluation of the scope, structure, methodology, and findings of the thesis,
- a list of minor errors (if any), and
- either a list of clear, direct, contextualized questions to be posed to the candidate during the examination, or a brief written commentary of the thesis which can be read to the candidate for response during the examination.

The External Reader must include a statement that the thesis falls into one of the following two categories:

- **Acceptable with minor or no revisions:** In this case, the External Reader submits the report to the Graduate

Coordinator at least one week before the examination. If the External Reader considers the thesis to be of a calibre worthy of consideration for an award, the External Reader comments on this in the written evaluation; or

- **Unacceptable without major revisions:** In this case, the External Reader contacts the Dean of the FGSR immediately by email as the examination may need to be postponed.

The questions or commentary will be made available to the student for the first time during the examination and the committee will evaluate the student's answers as part of the examination.

External Examiners: Attend the examination in person. In the letter of invitation, the External Examiner is requested to prepare and send to the Graduate Coordinator, at least one week in advance of the examination, an evaluation of the thesis placing it temporarily in one of the following categories:

- the thesis is acceptable with minor or no revisions,
- the External Examiner wishes to reserve judgment until after the examination, or
- the thesis is unacceptable without major revisions.

In the first two cases, the External Examiner is asked to provide a brief written commentary (approximately two to three pages) on the structure, methodology, quality, significance and findings of the thesis for the reference of both the student and supervisor. The commentary should not be given to the student prior to the examination. If the thesis is judged by the External Examiner to fall into the "Unacceptable" category, then the External Examiner is asked to contact the Dean of the FGSR immediately, since the final examination may **have** to be postponed.

The Examination: The examining committee should conduct a final examination, based largely on the thesis. The graduate coordinator should ensure that the chair of the examining committee, the student, and all examiners have a final copy of the thesis at the examination. The student should make a brief presentation about the thesis. The most time should be allotted to the arm's length examiners, including the External Examiner, while the least time is allocated to the supervisor(s). No final decision should be made without each examiner having given an opinion.

Decision of the Doctoral Final Examining Committee: The decision of the examining committee will be based both on the content of the thesis and on the student's ability to defend it. The final examination may result in one of the following outcomes:

- Adjourned
- Pass
- Pass subject to revisions

Coordinator at least one week before the examination. If the External Reader considers the thesis to be of a calibre worthy of consideration for an award, the External Reader comments on this in the written evaluation; or

- **Unacceptable without major revisions:** In this case, the External Reader contacts the Dean of the FGSR immediately by email as the examination may need to be postponed.

The questions or commentary will be made available to the student for the first time during the examination and the committee will evaluate the student's answers as part of the examination.

External Examiners: Attend the examination in person. In the letter of invitation, the External Examiner is requested to prepare and send to the Graduate Coordinator, at least one week in advance of the examination, an evaluation of the thesis placing it temporarily in one of the following categories:

- the thesis is acceptable with minor or no revisions,
- the External Examiner wishes to reserve judgment until after the examination, or
- the thesis is unacceptable without major revisions.

In the first two cases, the External Examiner is asked to provide a brief written commentary (approximately two to three pages) on the structure, methodology, quality, significance and findings of the thesis for the reference of both the student and supervisor. The commentary should not be given to the student prior to the examination. If the thesis is judged by the External Examiner to fall into the "Unacceptable" category, then the External Examiner is asked to contact the Dean of the FGSR immediately, since the final examination may **need** to be postponed.

The Examination: The examining committee should conduct a final examination, based largely on the thesis. The graduate coordinator should ensure that the chair of the examining committee, the student, and all examiners have a final copy of the thesis at the examination. The student should make a brief presentation about the thesis. The most time should be allotted to the arm's length examiners, including the External Examiner, while the least time is allocated to the supervisor(s). No final decision should be made without each examiner having given an opinion.

Decision of the Doctoral Final Examining Committee: The decision of the examining committee will be based both on the content of the thesis and on the student's ability to defend it. The final examination may result in one of the following outcomes:

- Adjourned
- Pass
- Pass subject to revisions

• Fail

There is no provision for a final examination to be “passed subject to major revisions”.

If the Examining Committee fails to reach a decision, the department will refer the matter to the Dean, FGSR, who will determine an appropriate course of action.

Adjourned: An adjourned examination is one that has been abandoned officially. A majority of examiners must agree to an outcome of Adjourned. The final examination should be adjourned in the following situations:

- The revisions to the thesis are sufficiently substantial that it will require further research or experimentation or major reworking of sections, or if the committee is so dissatisfied with the general presentation of the thesis that it will require a reconvening of the examining committee. In such circumstances the committee cannot pass the student, and must adjourn the examination.
- The committee is dissatisfied with the student’s oral presentation and defence of the thesis, even if the thesis itself is acceptable with or without minor revisions.
- Compelling, extraordinary circumstances such as a sudden medical emergency taking place during the examination.
- Discovery of possible offences under the Code of Student Behaviour after the examination has started.

If the examination is adjourned, the committee should:

- Specify in writing to the student, with as much precision as possible, the nature of the deficiencies and, in the case of revisions to the thesis, the extent of the revisions required. Where the oral defence is unsatisfactory, it may be necessary to arrange some discussion periods with the student prior to reconvening the examination.
- Decide upon a date to reconvene. If the date of the reconvened examination depends upon the completion of a research task or a series of discussions, it should be made clear which committee members will decide on the appropriate date to reconvene. The final date set for reconvening shall be no later than six months from the date of the examination. This new examination must be held within six months of the initial examination.
- Make it clear to the student what will be required by way of approval before the examination is reconvened (e.g., approval of the committee chair or supervisor, approval of the entire committee, or of select members of the committee).
- Specify the supervision and assistance the student may expect from the committee members in meeting the necessary revisions.
- Advise the Dean of the department’s Faculty following the procedures established for this purpose.
- Advise the FGSR in writing of the adjournment and the conditions.
- When the date is set for the adjourned final examination,

• Fail

There is no provision for a final examination to be “passed subject to major revisions”.

If the Examining Committee fails to reach a decision, the department will refer the matter to the Dean, FGSR, who will determine an appropriate course of action.

Adjourned: An adjourned examination is one that has been abandoned officially. A majority of examiners must agree to an outcome of Adjourned. The final examination should be adjourned in the following situations:

- The revisions to the thesis are sufficiently substantial that it will require further research or experimentation or major reworking of sections, or if the committee is so dissatisfied with the general presentation of the thesis that it will require a reconvening of the examining committee. In such circumstances the committee cannot pass the student, and must adjourn the examination.
- The committee is dissatisfied with the student’s oral presentation and defence of the thesis, even if the thesis itself is acceptable with or without minor revisions.
- Compelling, extraordinary circumstances such as a sudden medical emergency taking place during the examination.
- Discovery of possible offences under the Code of Student Behaviour after the examination has started.

If the examination is adjourned, the committee should:

- Specify in writing to the student, with as much precision as possible, the nature of the deficiencies and, in the case of revisions to the thesis, the extent of the revisions required. Where the oral defence is unsatisfactory, it may be necessary to arrange some discussion periods with the student prior to reconvening the examination.
- Decide upon a date to reconvene. If the date of the reconvened examination depends upon the completion of a research task or a series of discussions, it should be made clear which committee members will decide on the appropriate date to reconvene. The final date set for reconvening shall be no later than six months from the date of the examination. This new examination must be held within six months of the initial examination.
- Make it clear to the student what will be required by way of approval before the examination is reconvened (e.g., approval of the committee chair or supervisor, approval of the entire committee, or of select members of the committee).
- Specify the supervision and assistance the student may expect from the committee members in meeting the necessary revisions.
- Advise the Dean of the department’s Faculty following the procedures established for this purpose.
- Advise the FGSR in writing of the adjournment and the conditions.
- When the date is set for the adjourned final examination,

the department will notify the Dean of the department's Faculty and the FGSR. Normally a Pro Dean attends the examination.

Pass:

All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Pass. If the student passes the examination, the department should submit a completed Thesis Approval/Program Completion form to the FGSR. If one of the examiners fails the student, that examiner does not have to sign this form.

Pass Subject to Revisions: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Pass Subject to Revisions. The student has satisfactorily defended the thesis but the revisions to the thesis are sufficiently minor that it will not require a reconvening of the examining committee. If the examining committee agrees to a "Pass subject to revisions" for the student, the chair of the examining committee must provide in writing, within five working days of the examination, to the Dean, FGSR, the graduate coordinator and the student.

- the reasons for this outcome,
- the details of the required revisions,
- the approval mechanism for meeting the requirement for revisions (e.g., approval of the examining committee chair or supervisor, or approval of the entire examining committee, or select members of the committee), and
- the supervision and assistance the student can expect to receive from committee members.

The student must make the revisions within six months of the date of the final examination. Once the required revisions have been made and approved, the department shall submit a completed Thesis Approval/Program Completion form to the FGSR indicating "pass subject to revisions". If one of the examiners fails the student that examiner does not have to sign the form. If the required revisions have not been made and approved by the end of the six months deadline, the outcome of the examination is a Fail.

Fail: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Fail. If the examination result is a Fail, no member of the examining committee signs the Thesis Approval/Completion form.

When the outcome is a Fail, the committee chair will provide the reasons for this decision to the graduate coordinator. The department will then provide this report, together with its recommendation for the student's program, to the Dean of the department's

the department will notify the Dean of the department's Faculty and the FGSR. Normally a Pro Dean attends the examination.

Pass: Pass is the decision given when the only revisions required are typographical or minor editorial changes. All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Pass. If the student passes the examination, the department should submit a completed Thesis Approval/Program Completion form to the FGSR. If one of the examiners fails the student, that examiner does not have to sign this form.

Pass Subject to Revisions: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Pass Subject to Revisions. The student has satisfactorily defended the thesis but the revisions to the thesis it will not require a reconvening of the examining committee. If the examining committee agrees to a "Pass subject to revisions" for the student, the chair of the examining committee must provide in writing, within five working days of the examination, to the student, the graduate coordinator, and FGSR:

- the reasons for this outcome,
- the details of the required revisions,
- the approval mechanism for meeting the requirement for revisions (e.g., approval of the examining committee chair or supervisor, or approval of the entire examining committee, or select members of the committee), and
- the supervision and assistance the student can expect to receive from committee members.
- A date for the revisions to be resubmitted, as negotiated with the student, but which should be no less than six weeks and no more than six months.

The student must make the revisions within six months of the date of the final examination. Once the required revisions have been made and approved, the department shall submit a completed Thesis Approval/Program Completion form to the FGSR indicating the committee decision was "pass subject to revisions". If one of the examiners fails the student that examiner does not have to sign the form. If the required revisions have not been made and approved by the end of the six months deadline, the student will be required to withdraw.

Fail: All or all but one of the examiners must agree to an outcome of Fail. If the examination result is a Fail, no member of the examining committee signs the Thesis Approval/Completion form.

When the outcome is a Fail, the committee chair will provide the reasons for this decision to the graduate coordinator. The department will then provide this report, together with its recommendation for the student's program, to the Dean of the department's

<p>Faculty, the FGSR, and to the student. An Associate Dean, FGSR will normally arrange to meet with the student and with the graduate coordinator before acting upon any department recommendation that affects the student's academic standing.</p>	<p>Faculty, the FGSR, and to the student. An Associate Dean, FGSR will normally arrange to meet with the student and with the graduate coordinator before acting upon any department recommendation that affects the student's academic standing.</p>
<p>Justification: The conduct of graduate examinations holds extremely high stakes for individual students and presents significant reputational risk for the faculty, program and institution. A major revision the Supervision and Structure of Examining Committees in the Graduate Program Manual was approved by FGSR Council in May 2012. Subsequently in May 2013 the authority for approval of supervisors, supervisory committees, external examiners and examining committees was delegated to the disciplinary department/Faculty of the program and the change to the Calendar governing examinations was approved by FGSR Council October 2013 appearing in the 2014-2015 Calendar. A number of areas have come to light that have caused problems due to apparent contradictions, gaps and/or confusing language. The revisions are not intended to significantly alter the policies governing examinations but to clarify the policies, elaborate on procedures, and update graduate level examination procedures given changes to practices and technologies.</p> <p>Approved: FGSR Council, May 17, 2017</p>	

OUTLINE OF ISSUE
Action Item

Agenda Title: Report of the GFC Committee on Learning Environment on Teaching and Learning and Teaching Evaluation and the Use of the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRI) as an Evaluation Tool

Motion: THAT General Faculties Council Receive the CLE Report on Teaching and Learning and Teaching Evaluation and the Use of the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRI) as an Evaluation Tool as set forth in Attachment 2, and Endorse the Recommendations of the Committee as set forth in Attachment 1, and as recommended by the GFC Executive Committee.

Item

Action Requested	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Endorse <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Receive
Proposed by	Sarah Forgie, Chair, Committee on the Learning Environment
Presenter	Sarah Forgie, Chair, Committee on the Learning Environment and Principal Investigator Norma Nocente, Co-Investigator L Francisco Vargas M, Research Coordinator Rebecca Best-Bertwistle, Research Assistant

Details

Responsibility	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	The GFC Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) was requested by GFC to report on research into the use of student rating mechanisms of instruction in university courses. This report fulfills this request.
The Impact of the Proposal is	
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	N/A
Timeline/Implementation Date	N/A
Estimated Cost and funding source	
Next Steps (ie.: Communications Plan, Implementation plans)	Final report will be forwarded to General Faculties Council for discussion. Recommendations arising from the report will inform the work of the Committee on the Learning Environment over the next year.
Supplementary Notes and context	On May 30, 2016, General Faculties Council passed the following motion: THAT the General Faculties Council, on the recommendation of the GFC Executive Committee, request that the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment report by 30 April 2017, on research into the use of student rating mechanisms of instruction in university courses. This will be informed by a critical review of the University of Alberta's existing Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRIs) and their use for assessment and evaluation of teaching as well as a broad review of possible methods of multifaceted assessment and evaluation of teaching. The ultimate objective will be to satisfy the Institutional Strategic Plan: For the Public Good strategy to: Provide robust supports, tools, and training to develop and assess teaching quality, using

FINAL Item No. 8

	qualitative and quantitative criteria that are fair, equitable, non-discriminatory and meaningful across disciplines.
--	---

Engagement and Routing (Include meeting dates)

<p>Participation: (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)</p> <p><For further information see the link posted on the Governance Toolkit section Student Participation Protocol></p>	<p><u><i>Those who have been informed:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provost and Vice-President (Academic) • Vice-Provost Council • Deans' Council • Chairs' Council • GFC Executive Committee • General Faculties Council
	<p><u><i>Those who have been consulted:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFC Committee on the Learning Environment • GFC Executive Committee
	<p><u><i>Those who are actively participating:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFC Committee on the Learning Environment • Sarah Forgie, Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives) and Principal Investigator • Norma Nocente, Co-Investigator • L Francisco Vargas M, Research Coordinator • Rebecca Best-Bertwistle, Research Assistant • GFC Executive Committee • General Faculties Council
<p>Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)</p>	<p>GFC Committee on the Learning Environment – April 2017 GFC Executive Committee – September 11, 2017 General Faculties Council – September 25, 2017, October 30, 2017</p>
<p>Final Approver</p>	<p>General Faculties Council</p>

Alignment/Compliance

<p>Alignment with Guiding Documents</p>	<p><i>For the Public Good</i></p> <p>GOAL: EXCEL as individuals, and together, sustain a culture that fosters and champions distinction and distinctiveness in teaching, learning, research, and service.</p> <p>OBJECTIVE 14: Inspire, model, and support excellence in teaching and learning.</p> <p>Strategy iii: Provide robust supports, tools, and training to develop and assess teaching quality, using qualitative and quantitative criteria that are fair, equitable, and meaningful across disciplines.</p>
<p>Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please <u>quote</u> legislation and include identifying section numbers)</p>	<p>1. Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA): The <i>PSLA</i> gives GFC responsibility, subject to the authority of the Board of Governors, over academic affairs (Section 26(1)).</p> <p>2. General Faculties Council Terms of Reference (3. Mandate of the Committee) “The issues which remain with GFC or which would be referred by a Standing Committee of GFC would generally be in the nature of the following:</p>

- High level strategic and stewardship policy issues or matters of significant risk to the University”

3. GFC Executive Committee Terms of Reference (3. Mandate of the Committee)

“5. Agendas of General Faculty Council

GFC has delegated to the Executive Committee the authority to decide which items are placed on a GFC Agenda, and the order in which those agenda items appear on each GFC agenda.

When ordering items, the GFC Executive Committee will be mindful of any matters that are of particular concern to students during March and April so that the student leaders who bring those items forward are able to address these items at GFC before their terms end. (EXEC 06 NOV 2006)

[...]

With respect to recommendations from other bodies and other GFC committees, however, the role of the Executive Committee shall be to examine and debate the substance of reports or recommendations and to decide if an item is ready to be forwarded to the full governing body. The Executive Committee may decide to refer a proposal back to the originating body, to refer the proposal to another body or individual for study or review, or to take other action in order to ready a proposal for consideration by General Faculties Council. When the GFC Executive Committee forwards a proposal to GFC, it shall make a recommendation that GFC endorse; endorse with suggested amendments; not endorse; or forward the proposal with no comment.”

4. GFC Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) Terms of Reference (3.Mandate of the Committee):

“The Committee on the Learning Environment is a standing committee of the General Faculties Council that promotes an optimal learning environment in alignment with guiding documents of the University of Alberta.

The Committee on the Learning Environment is responsible for making recommendations concerning policy matters and action matters with respect to the following:

[...]

b) To review and, as necessary, recommend to the GFC Academic Planning Committee and GFC Executive Committee as relates to the development and implementation of policies on teaching, learning, teaching evaluation, and recognition for teaching that promote the University Academic Plan.

c) To develop policies that promote ongoing assessment of teaching and learning through all Faculties and units.

d) To nurture the development of innovative and creative teaching practices.

e) To encourage the sharing and discussion of evidence about effective teaching and learning.

f) To encourage the sharing and discussion of evidence about effective teaching, learning, and the services.

g) To promote projects with relevant internal and external bodies that

offer unique teaching and learning opportunities that would benefit the university community.

h) To consider any matter deemed by the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment to be within the purview of its general responsibility.

**5. GFC policy 111 Teaching and Learning and Teaching Evaluation
“111.2 Teaching Evaluation**

1. Evaluation of teaching at the University of Alberta serves two purposes:

- a. Summative – Evaluation provides a review and overview of an instructor’s teaching that is an essential element in promotion and tenure decisions. In its summative form, teaching evaluation forms a basis for rewarding excellence, as well as the basis for withholding reward.
- b. Formative – Evaluation provides helpful feedback to teachers by identifying teaching strengths and weaknesses and, in so doing, giving guidance for the improvement or refinement of teaching skills.

2. Evaluation of teaching must be multifaceted. Multifaceted evaluation shall include the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction set out in Section 111.3 and other methods of assessing teaching designed within individual Faculties to respond to the particular conditions of that Faculty. Such assessments shall include one or more of the following: input from administrators, peers, self, undergraduate and graduate students, and alumni.

3. Recognizing that the evaluation of teaching at the University shall be multifaceted, Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) decisions concerning tenure, promotion or unsatisfactory teaching performance must be based on more than one indicator of the adequacy of teaching.

4. Assessment of teaching involving input from administrators, peers, self, alumni, or undergraduate and graduate students in addition to the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction should occur annually prior to tenure. For continuing faculty (ie, Categories A1.1, A1.5 and A1.6), such assessment will occur at least triennially.

5. The University shall continue to support University Teaching Services in its education programming which is focused on the development and improvement of teaching and learning and its efforts to enhance research in university teaching.

111.3 Universal Student Ratings of Instruction

In recognition of the University’s commitment to teaching, the General Faculties Council endorses a system of Universal Student Ratings of Instruction. This system, however, is only one part of the multi-faceted approach described in Section 111.2.

The Universal Student Ratings of Instruction are administered electronically via a system known as the eUSRI system.

The Universal Student Ratings of Instruction are designed to provide a minimal university-wide base of information on student ratings to the

FINAL Item No. 8

	<p>parties listed in this Section. With this purpose in mind, the General Faculties Council adopts the following policies:</p> <p>A. All Faculties will ensure that evaluation of all instructors and courses will take place each time a course is offered. The term ‘instructors’ is meant to include tenured professors, tenure-track professors, sessional instructors, clinical instructors, field supervisors and graduate teaching assistants with responsibilities for courses. [...]</p> <p>D. The anonymity of student responses to the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction is of fundamental importance in maintaining student confidentiality and encouraging the free expression of views. Under normal circumstances, the anonymity of students will be protected. Universal Student Ratings of Instruction offer an avenue of feedback, including feedback critical of instructors. [...]</p> <p>G. The numerical summaries for the ten Universal Student Ratings of Instruction questions will be reported to the instructor, the Chair, Director or Dean and students. [...]</p> <p>I. All results given out to students, Chairs, Directors and Deans will have the following cautionary preface: Student questionnaires form an important part of evaluating teaching effectiveness but cannot be taken alone as a complete assessment of an instructor or course. Factors other than an instructor’s teaching ability may influence ratings. These factors include class size, class level, Faculty, time in class, required versus optional course, grade expectations, student GPA, gender, race, ethnicity, age of both students and instructors. [...]</p> <p>J. Nothing in this section will prevent instructors from seeking other means of feedback from students during the term.”</p> <p>The full GFC Policy 111 Teaching and Learning and Teaching Evaluation is available at: http://www.gfcpolicymanual.ualberta.ca/111TeachingandLearningandTeach.aspx</p> <p>5. University of Alberta Faculty Agreement July 2006 (incorporating June 2007 and July 2008 amendments) “13.06 The standards for evaluation of teaching performance shall be broadly based, including course content, course design and performance in the classroom. Such evaluation may take into account information such as statistical summaries of responses to student questionnaires, comprehensive reviews of student commentary; reviews by peers, reviews by administrative officials and reviews of teaching dossiers and other materials provided by the staff member.”</p>
--	---

Attachments (each to be numbered 1 - <>)

1. Attachment 1 – Recommendations from GFC Committee on Learning Environment (2 pages)
2. Attachment 2 - Summary Report of the Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Alberta (96 pages)

Prepared by: Sarah Forgie, Chair of CLE with the assistance of University Governance

Recommendations from the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment on Teaching Evaluation and the Use of the Universal Student ratings of Instruction (USRI) as an Evaluation Tool

With General Faculties Council approval, the Committee on the Learning Environment would like to continue our work examining teacher assessment and evaluation. We believe that “Robust supports, tools, and training to assess teaching quality, using qualitative and quantitative criteria that are fair, equitable, and meaningful across disciplines” is an attainable goal towards fulfilling Objective 13 in For the Public Good: “To inspire, model, and support excellence in teaching and learning.”

We plan to use the following recommendations in our work plan:

- 1) Re-examine the overall goals of teaching assessment and evaluation at the U of A ensuring that these goals:
 - a. Provide the instructor with feedback to improve their teaching (formative assessment)
 - b. Provide administrators with evidence of effective teaching for merit, promotion and tenure decisions (summative evaluation).
- 2) Consult with the Faculties and the literature in order to define qualities and measures of effective teaching and ensure that there is a clear link between these qualities and measures.
- 3) Examine GFC Policy 111. “Teaching and Learning and Teaching Evaluation” and transition this policy to UAPPOL. In the process, we will:
 - a. Examine how decisions regarding promotion and tenure can be based on multiple indicators of effective teaching, including course based evaluations and more broadly on other teaching related duties.
 - b. Support consistent interpretation of multiple indicators of effective teaching across the University.
 - c. Separate instructor feedback for improvement of teaching (formative assessment) and administrative evidence of effective teaching for merit, promotion and tenure decisions (summative evaluation) in both policy and practice.
 - d. Develop guidelines for the timing, depth and frequency of summative evaluations.
- 4) Create a suite of assessment and evaluation tools and supports (for both faculty and administrators) with definitions, examples and specific strategies. In developing these resources we will:
 - a. Investigate methods for instructors to use feedback to improve their teaching and recommend opportunities for teaching development, support and training.
 - b. Investigate methods and tools to support administrators in using a variety of assessment and evaluation strategies and recommend opportunities for training.
- 5) Ensure student input is included in teaching evaluation. In our re-examination of the current methods in which student ratings are collected, we will consider:
 - a. Using student input for both feedback to improve teaching and for feedback in promotion and tenure decisions (formative assessment and summative evaluation), but separating these two purposes in both policy and practice.
 - b. Examining when student evaluations should not be used by FEC for merit, promotion or tenure decisions.
 - c. Shifting the emphasis of some of the student rating questions from teacher to student, looking at participation and learning in addition to instruction.
 - d. Increasing the flexibility of the student rating instrument to apply to multiple teaching contexts (including various class sizes and levels) and unique needs within Faculties.
 - e. Creating options within the student rating tool that allow the instructor to contextualize their course.
 - f. Examining qualitative student comments and methods to optimize their use in teaching evaluation.
 - g. Continued investigations into bias and student ratings.
 - h. Standardizing methods to optimize response rates and quality of comments with the electronic student ratings.



- i. Providing all students (including those with accommodation requirements or those who have withdrawn from a course) with a fair opportunity to provide feedback.

Summary Report of the Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Alberta

Prepared by:

Sarah Forgie, Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives) and CLE Chair
Norma Nocente, Associate Director, CTL
L. Francisco Vargas M., Senior Research Coordinator, CTL
Anita Parker, Research Assistant, CTL
Carol Brown, Educational Developer, CTL
Rebecca Best-Bertwistle, Research Assistant, CTL

April 2017

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Method	2
2.1. Student Ratings of Instruction	2
2.2. Evaluation of Teaching at University of Alberta	3
2.3. Multifaceted Evaluation	3
3. Findings	3
3.1. Student Ratings of Instruction	3
Information from University of Alberta reports and documents	3
Review of the literature	4
Information from other universities	6
3.2. Evaluation of Teaching at University of Alberta	6
Information from interviews with department chairs	6
3.3. Multifaceted Evaluation	7
Approaches to multifaceted evaluation	8
4. Conclusion	9
5. References	10
6. Appendices	12

1. Introduction

The University of Alberta is committed to excellence in teaching. Its institutional strategic plan, *For the Public Good*, pledges to “inspire, model, and support excellence in teaching and learning” (University of Alberta, 2016, p. 21). Evaluation of teaching plays an important role in upholding this commitment by shaping the quality of instruction being offered to students. Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRI) questionnaires can provide *formative evaluation*, revealing areas of strength or shortcomings related to aspects of teaching, such as planning, organization, communication, and assessment.

Teaching evaluations also affect the careers of instructors at the University of Alberta, since USRI results are used as *summative evaluation* for faculty annual review, as well as tenure and promotion. This dual purpose of USRIs (summative and formative) is often contentious, because of their perceived weight with Faculty Evaluation Committees (FEC). Consequently, in May 2016 the Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) was tasked by the General Faculties Council (GFC) to report on research into tools for evaluation of teaching by students in university courses. This was to include a critical review of the USRI, as well as an overview of possible multifaceted evaluation methods, ultimately intending to satisfy the University’s institutional strategic plan to “provide robust supports, tools, and training to develop and assess teaching quality, using qualitative and quantitative criteria that are fair, equitable, and meaningful across disciplines” (University of Alberta, 2016, p. 21).

CLE approached their investigation with three questions:

1. What does the research have to say about student ratings of instruction?
2. How are the USRIs and other tools used in the evaluation of teaching at the University of Alberta?
3. What are some approaches for multifaceted evaluation of teaching?

The purpose of this report is to address these questions and provide CLE and GFC with information to guide future decisions on the USRI instrument and multifaceted evaluation of teaching at the University of Alberta.

2. Method

Data for this report were obtained from multiple sources. We reviewed 81 articles relating to the three questions above, beginning with literature referenced in the 2009 CLE report *Evaluation of Teaching at the U of A* (Kanuka et al. 2009), which led us to more recent articles (see [Appendix A](#)). We researched evaluation processes by other universities, reviewed University of Alberta reports and documents, and conducted interviews with University of Alberta department chairs (see a full report of interviews with department chairs in [Appendix B](#)).

2.1. Student Ratings of Instruction

Investigation of question 1, what research has to say about student ratings of instruction, included a review of reports and documents, which provided background information about the history and current status of teaching evaluation at University of Alberta. These included:

- *Report from the sub-committee on evaluation of alternate-delivery courses* (Erkut & Kreber, 2002);

- *Evaluation of teaching at the U of A* (Kanuka, Marentette, Braga, Campbell, Harvey, Holte, Nychka, Precht, Read, Skappak, & Varnhagen, 2009);
- *AASUA position statement on USRIs* (Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta [AASUA], 2012);
- *Report of the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment subcommittee on the status of the USRIs* (Andrews, Chelen, Connor, Kostiuk, Kwong See, & Milner, 2013);
- *Report of the Renaissance Committee* (Cheeseman, MacLaren, Carey, Glanfield, Liu, McFarlane, Cahill, Garneau, Supernant, & Szeman, 2013); and
- *GFC policy manual*. (General Faculties Council, n.d.).

For this report, Test Scoring & Questionnaire Services (TSQS) at University of Alberta conducted descriptive analyses that generated gender-specific USRI scores using data from the academic years 2011/12 to 2015/16. TSQS also participated in an unstructured interview about the validity, reliability, and use of USRIs at the University of Alberta.

2.2. Evaluation of Teaching at University of Alberta

Investigation of question 2, how USRIs and other tools are used at University of Alberta, included short, semi-structured interviews with department chairs (or their equivalents in non-departmental faculties). These interviews were 35-40 minutes, audio recorded, and used an interview protocol pre-approved by CLE with questions about their experiences evaluating teaching (see [Appendix C](#)). Interview participants were also given two sample USRI case studies representing real teaching scores and were asked to interpret the scores within the context of their department (see [Appendix D](#)). They were asked to reflect on both score sets as if both instructors were teaching different sections of the same course. All potential interview participants were emailed directly with information about the study, including a research letter of invitation, and were encouraged to contact any member of the research team if they had questions or concerns. Data was collected from January to March 2017.

2.3. Multifaceted Evaluation

Information sources for question 3, approaches to multifaceted evaluation, included:

- University of Alberta reports and documents (listed above);
- *Multifaceted summative evaluation of teaching*, a symposium held in May 2015 at Centre of Teaching and Learning (CTL), University of Alberta;
- *University of Alberta peer review of teaching* (Gibson, n.d.); and
- Interviews with department chairs.

3. Findings

3.1. Student Ratings of Instruction

Information from University of Alberta reports and documents

The 2009 CLE report outlined a number of recommendations related to the USRI instrument and to teaching evaluation more generally, as well as GFC policy (Kanuka et al., 2009). This report reviewed literature from up to 2008 and selected 35 articles providing insights

on the following themes: validity; bias; whether students can effectively measure quality teaching; the need for effective tools; correlations between grades and ratings; the impact of evaluation on quality teaching; and the evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion.

In 2012, the 2009 CLE report was revisited, and the resulting 2013 CLE report, *Report of the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment subcommittee on the status of the USRIs*, put forward four recommendations, including that the purpose of USRIs needs to be clearly identified, and that GFC policy needs updating. It was also suggested that a “working group be struck to determine how to promote consistent interpretation and implementation of policy” (Andrews et al., 2013).

In 2013, the Renaissance Committee, ratified by the AASUA and the Governors of the University of Alberta, addressed aspects of the terms and conditions of work performed at the University of Alberta. Their report detailed a number of concerns and made specific recommendations related to the evaluation of teaching, including USRIs (Cheeseman et al., 2013). The committee recommended that the University of Alberta design a set of questions on the USRI that evaluate the effectiveness of teaching. There is no evidence to indicate that any of the recommendations from the 2009 CLE, 2013 CLE, or 2013 Renaissance Committee reports were pursued. See [Appendix E](#) for a table summarizing the positions and recommendations related to USRIs in University of Alberta policy, documents, and reports.

“I’m not entirely happy with the question set, I don’t think anybody is, it’s been forever. I’ve been on committees for years on this campus and this just keeps coming up so, it’s a flawed system so you have to sort of filter it and understand” (Department Chair).

Review of the literature

In our review of articles referenced in the 2009 CLE report, as well as articles published thereafter, we organized literature relating to student ratings of instruction into two categories – biases and validity (see [Appendix A](#)).

Biases. We divided the biases category into sub-categories of gender, instructor characteristics, the correlation between grades and ratings, nonresponse, and non-instructional factors.

- *Gender.* The literature in this category is extensive and conflicted. Numerous articles in this subcategory report gender differences or no differences in student evaluations of teaching. For example, Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark (2016) concluded that student ratings are “biased against female instructors by an amount that is large and statistically significant.” On the other hand, Wright and Jenkins-Guarieri (2012) conducted a meta-analysis of 193 studies and concluded that student evaluations appear to be free from gender bias. The University of Alberta TSQS conducted descriptive analyses and the results showed there is no apparent difference between scores for males ($N = 18576$, $Mdn = 4.53$) and females ($N = 13679$, $Mdn = 4.57$) for statement 211 (“overall the instructor was excellent”).
- *Instructor characteristics.* Article findings in this sub-category, seven articles total, were that: instructor personality positively correlates with student evaluations (Clayson, 2013;

Kim & MacCann, 2016); instructor physical attractiveness positively correlates with student evaluations on RateMyProfessor.com (Felton, Mitchell, & Stinson, 2004); instructor age negatively correlates with student evaluations on RateMyProfessor.com (Stonebraker & Stone, 2015) and instructor age impacts negatively on perceptions of teachers and anticipated rapport in the classroom based on photographs (Wilson, Beyer, & Monteiro, 2014); instructor position (limited term lecturer versus full time faculty) does affect student evaluations (Cho & Otani, 2014); and instructor rank (i.e. achievement of tenure) does not affect student evaluations (Cheng, 2015).

"But of course you've heard this one before as well, sometimes it's a popularity contest in that you have some individuals who just because of their personality and the way they do things just appeal to the students" (Department Chair).

- *Correlation between grades and ratings.* Most literature, seven articles in this sub-category, reported that students receiving higher grades tended to provide more favourable evaluations of teaching. Cho, Baek, and Cho (2015) found this to be true in their research study and suggested that it might be a psychological "gift" from the student to the instructor. However, two articles suggested otherwise, such as an analysis of 50,000 courses by Centra (2003) that debunked the correlation between expected grades and student evaluations.
- *Nonresponse.* Nonresponse bias occurs when students choose not to participate in an evaluation of teaching, and the missing data may cause skewed results. Three articles in this sub-category reported that nonresponse bias does influence student evaluations of teaching. For example, Macfadyen, Dawson, Prest, and Gasevic (2016) uncovered that "respondent pools do not fully represent the distribution of students in courses." No articles suggested otherwise.
- *Non-instructional.* Non-instructional bias occurs when circumstances beyond the control of an instructor – such as class type, time, size, and semester – influence student evaluation of teaching. The four articles in this sub-category varied in their investigations and conclusions. For example, Nargundkar and Shrikhande (2014) studied numerous factors and concluded that the combined impact was statistically significant; Reardon, Leierer, and Lee (2014) determined that class schedule does not affect ratings.

"...somebody has to teach the broccoli course, right? Not everybody gets to teach dessert, and especially when you get into courses which are, by design or intent or both, more heavily directed towards application, then you are forced to give more critical feedback and that tends to be unpopular" (Department Chair).

It should be noted that GFC Policy 111.3 (I) also recognizes student bias may impact the evaluation of an instructor.

Validity. Validity refers to the extent that an instrument or procedure measures what it intends to measure, and the extendibility of the results to other situations. Literature within this category equally supports opposing viewpoints as to whether or not student evaluations of teaching are valid measures of teaching quality; whether or not students have the knowledge, skills, or motivation to measure teaching quality. For example, Grammatikopoulos, Linardakis,

Gregoriadis, and Oikonomidis (2015) found an instrument used in the Greek higher education system to be valid, whereas Lama, Arias, Mendoza, and Manahan (2015) stated that students at an Australian university completed surveys without diligence. A meta-analysis by Uttl, White, and Gonzalez (2016) re-analyzed meta-analytic data from Cohen (1981) and concluded that student evaluations of teaching did not indicate teaching quality. Marsh and Roche (1997) found that student evaluations correlated with those of peers and trained evaluators, whereas Uijtdehaage and O'Neal (2015) reported that students mindlessly evaluated a fictitious instructor, even when a photograph was provided. During this project, our research team was not able to find information on the validity of the USRI instrument at the University of Alberta¹.

Related to validity is the impact of student evaluations on teaching quality. In our review of the literature, five articles were divided as to whether or not results from student evaluations had a positive impact on teaching quality. For example, Makondo and Ndebele (2014) reported that lecturers perceive student feedback as valuable for building their teaching skills, yet Stein, Spiller, Harris, Deaker, and Kennedy (2013) argued that evaluation data is not being used effectively for professional development. In a 2011 survey of 564 academic staff at the University of Alberta, 69.2% of respondents agreed that *qualitative comments* on USRIs helped improve the quality of their teaching; 49.5% stated that the USRI's *quantitative scores* were not helpful in this regard (AASUA, 2012).

Information from other universities

The general consensus that student input should be sought related to their experience with course instruction and the learning environment is evident in the practices of institutions other than the University of Alberta. For example, in 2015 Stanford University introduced a new end-of-term course evaluation instrument that included nine required items and additional customizable, open- or closed-ended questions ([Stanford University VPTL, n.d.](#)).

Some institutions use multiple instruments to seek insight on students' perceptions of teaching and learning, as well as the broader context of the student experience. For example, both University of Oxford and University of Sydney have recently adopted "The Student Barometer", which includes the learning experience, living experience, support services, and other areas ([I-graduate, n.d.](#)). This measure is administered once per year and aims to "track and compare the decision-making, expectations, perceptions and intentions of students from application to graduation" (University of Sydney, 2016a, para. 2). The University of Oxford also employs department-specific evaluation mechanisms, as well as the "National Student Survey" for undergraduate students in the last year of their program ([Ipsos MORI, n.d.](#); University of Oxford, 2015, p. 7).

University of Sydney uses a "Student Experience Survey" for undergraduate students in their first and final year of their program, as well as a mandatory online "Unit of Study Survey (USS)" with eight required items (six quantitative, two open response) and up to four faculty-specific quantitative items and one faculty-specific open response item ([University of Sydney, 2016b](#)). Each faculty can also have up to four USS versions to allow customization of

¹ TSQS measures the reliability of the USRI by comparing medians to the previous academic years.

the survey for different contexts (University of Sydney, 2016c). Taken together, the examples provided here highlight that other institutions value student feedback on the teaching and learning environment and are making efforts to update and improve the instruments they utilize to obtain this feedback.

In summary for question 1, what research has to say about student ratings of instruction, we conclude that the topic of survey tools is prevalent in the literature, often around the concerns of biases or validity. It is evident that universities globally value student feedback and are working to implement high-quality instruments. University of Alberta reports and documents have historically addressed the USRI, making recommendations for the instrument and University policy; however, there is no indication suggestions made in these reports have had any traction.

3.2. Evaluation of Teaching at University of Alberta

Information from interviews with department chairs

Interview participants from all faculties other than Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry (FOMD) reported using USRI scores and comments to evaluate teaching; only a portion of FOMD participants reported using this tool. Department chairs revealed that, although they try to consider all the USRI statements, they focus primarily on USRI statement 221 (“overall the instructor was excellent”), and statement 25 (“overall the quality of the course content was excellent”) as indicators of effective teaching.

Most participants stated that they approach the interpretation of USRI results with a contextual attitude, indicating that USRIs should be understood in light of instructor characteristics and non-instructional elements.

Participants identified several issues with using USRIs exclusively to evaluate teaching, which aligned with our review of the literature, such as biases with gender,

“To be perfectly honest, in the abstract I don't know what I would say. Without knowing the circumstances, if one of those instructors is in her or his first year of teaching, and the other was an experienced professor, I think that interpretation is dramatically different than if they're both experienced professors or if they're both new professors. I can say, if we look at the overall averages they're both scoring in the lower percentile, and that sort of data, but to be perfectly honest that means very little to me because I think that understanding a person's position is crucial to being able to read any of these numbers” (Department Chair commenting on sample USRIs).

“That question set doesn't serve the diversity and the kind of pedagogy we have now, and really needs fixing. I think there needs to be a conversation about what this is going to look like over time. I also think the University has to take very seriously the concerns that equity seeking groups have about what happens in teaching evaluations. What happens to women? What happens to visible minority? What happens to people that are perceived to have strong accents? And I think there's a huge responsibility on chairs and people on FEC to really be educated in how much you can extrapolate from USRI” (Department Chairs).

instructor characteristics, and non-instructional factors. Most department chairs voiced their need for additional supports to better evaluate teaching. Although some recommended possible alternatives to supplement USRI scores, they still expressed hope that the institution would provide solutions for their concerns.

Participants also raised the issue of using USRIs for purposes of tenure and promotion. The 2009 CLE report mentioned this concern, and our review of the literature included seven

articles concerning the use of student surveys for summative purposes, and misinterpretation of their results leading to incorrect conclusions.

In summary for question 2, 'how USRIs and other tools are used at University of Alberta', we conclude that participants from all faculties other than FOMD consistently use USRIs scores and comments to evaluate teaching. Department chairs focus on one or two statements as a barometer of effective teaching, and although most approach interpretation of results with a contextual attitude, they also recognize issues with the USRI that are consistent with our review of the literature, specifically perceived issues of bias, validity, and concerns about potential misinterpretations of student survey results for the summative purposes of tenure and promotion.

3.3. Multifaceted Evaluation

According to Lyde, Grieshaber, & Byrns (2016), a comprehensive system of teaching evaluation is necessary due to the limitations of student surveys and the complex nature of teaching performance. In our review of articles referenced in the 2009 CLE report, as well as more recently, ten articles recognized the need for instruments that are of high psychometric quality, and also that evaluations should include multiple sources of information, such as surveys, peer evaluations, self-evaluations, focus groups, and more.

Reference to multifaceted evaluation is found in University of Alberta documents and reports discussed earlier. The 2009 CLE report commented that an imprecise definition of teaching excellence in section 111.1 of the GFC policy exacerbates the lack of guidance provided to individual faculties for multifaceted evaluation (Kanuka et al., 2009, pp. 21-22). The 2013 CLE report recommended the creation of a resource to guide faculties with "possibilities and/or examples" of multifaceted evaluation (Andrews et al., 2013).

In May 2015, the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) hosted a symposium entitled [Multifaceted Summative Evaluation of Teaching](#), wherein some recommendations for best practice were brought forward. Key points included:

- University of Alberta policy needs to include a clear definition of teaching excellence, including a specific set of criteria of effective teaching that can be used for purposes of evaluation; these criteria should be shared with faculty, instructors and students.
- Both formative and summative evaluation of teaching should be multifaceted, collecting multiple sources of evidence at multiple times annually.
- A multifaceted teaching evaluation plan should be developed to supplement University policy, including definitions, examples, evaluation procedures, and specific strategies for training and support.

Approaches to multifaceted evaluation

The 2013 Renaissance Committee report highlighted the importance of rigorous, multifaceted evaluation, which was described as information "collected through a variety of methods and assessed at multiple points in time" (Cheeseman et al., 2013, p. 7, 69). "The array can include student ratings of courses, a teaching dossier, peer observations, external reviews of content, reflection of the teacher (self-assessment), administrator reviews of content and course observation, review of published work on teaching Scholarship, and evidence supporting

the reputation of the teacher in the field(s) of instruction, within and without the University” (Cheeseman et al., p. 70). See [Appendix E](#) for a table summarizing the positions and recommendations related to multifaceted evaluation in University of Alberta policy, documents, and reports.

Peer review of teaching. Gibson (n.d.), author of [University of Alberta Peer Review of Teaching](#) (an online article provided as a resource for the 2015 CTL symposium), defined peer review of teaching as “informed collegial assessment of faculty teaching for either fostering improvement or making personnel decisions” and stated that both formative and summative methods were required for comprehensive teaching evaluation (para 5). Gibson explained that while quantitative student questionnaires provide information about day-to-day classroom interaction, peer review can broaden this to aspects, such as “course content, academic rigor and appropriateness of objectives and topics;... subject matter expertise; instructional materials and methods; and, assessment and grading” (para 3). Gibson outlined six phases of summative peer review and provided eighteen appendices of practical resources, such as sample observation tools and reports.

Teaching dossiers (portfolios). A teaching dossier serves “to facilitate the presentation of a faculty member’s teaching achievements and major strengths for self-assessment and interpretation by others” (Day, Robberecht & Roed, 1996, p. 1). They are a cumulative record of one’s teaching activities and often include: “(a) a statement regarding the faculty member’s teaching philosophy, goals, and strategies; (b) a description of teaching (planning, preparing, and teaching courses; assessing student learning; and giving feedback); (c) an evaluation of teaching accomplishments; and (d) suggestions regarding possible changes for future teaching” (Day et al., 1996, p. 1). Teaching dossiers require instructors to gather multiple sources of evidence and define the value of their scholarship in teaching (Cheeseman et al., 2013). Related to summative evaluation of teaching, the 2013 Renaissance Committee report recommended that “a teaching dossier, following CTL standards, should be part of all tenure and promotion packages” (Cheeseman et al., 2013, p. 70). A document from the [University of Sydney](#) provides a comprehensive list of data sources instructors may include in a dossier.

Interviews with department chairs. Participants indicated having already implemented some approaches for multi-faceted evaluation of teaching. In-class peer observation was the most commonly used additional source of information, followed by annual instructor pedagogical self-reflections. Some departments chairs have also implemented yearly faculty audits, in which a small portion of their professoriate teaching is evaluated in a more comprehensive way, and using a variety of supplementary sources of information. Participants indicated, however, that they mostly obtain these extra resources on a voluntary basis (only when professors agree to provide them), and even when they do obtain these resources, not all of them bring this information to FEC.

“I don’t think that’s very useful by itself, it’s incomplete. I’d feel uncomfortable judging somebody’s fate just based on that. I’m not saying it’s wrong but it’s only one piece. It’s one piece of understanding, and we take teaching seriously. It’s not just a bunch of simple numbers pouring at us. We don’t just look at you’re above this number or below this number, and we’re done. We’re looking at you much more carefully than that, but it’s a good start” (Department Chairs).

They voiced their need for additional institutional supports to better evaluate teaching with a multi-faceted approach, and they hope the institution will provide a solution.

In summary for question 3, approaches to multifaceted evaluation, we conclude that: there are numerous potential evaluative methods in addition to student surveys; multifaceted evaluation is encouraged by several University reports and documents and literature in general, as well as mandated by University policy; yet this has not yet translated into its consistent or formal implementation across faculties en masse.

4. Conclusion

The purpose of this report is to support CLE with their investigation into student ratings of instruction, the use of USRIs and other evaluation tools at the University of Alberta, and approaches for multifaceted evaluation of teaching.

Question 1, what does the research have to say about student ratings of instruction?

Research around student ratings of instruction primarily point to concerns about biases and validity of survey tools and results. The perspective that student feedback is valuable to help ensure high-quality teaching environments, yet that survey tools are imperfect and limited for a comprehensive evaluation of teaching, is shared by universities globally.

Question 2, how are the USRIs and other tools used in the evaluation of teaching at the University of Alberta?

Semi-structured interviews with department chairs revealed that USRIs are the primary source of teaching evaluation information for all faculties except FOMD. Specifically, most department chairs indicated that they start with only one or two statements but they do their best to contextualize the numerical results. Some department chairs expressed concerns around biases, validity, and the potential for misinterpretation of USRI results for summative purposes of promotion and tenure decisions.

Question 3, what are some approaches for multifaceted evaluation of teaching?

Multifaceted evaluation is supported by the literature and is also mandated by GFC policy. However, impeding its University-wide adoption and consistency is a lack of support and time for those responsible for conducting such robust, comprehensive evaluations of teaching. Moving forward, systematic and purposeful evaluation of teaching can only materialize if there are realistic and tangible expectations, and supports (documents, workshops, etc.).

5. References

These are the references used in the preparation of this report, not including our review of the literature. For the latter, see [Appendix G](#).

Andrews, N., Chelen, D., Connor, B., Kostiuk, L., Kwong See, S., & Milner, R. (2013, June 5). *Report of the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment subcommittee on the status of the USRIs*. Retrieved from

- <http://www.governance.ualberta.ca/en/GeneralFacultiesCouncil/CommitteeontheLearningEnvironm/~media/Governance/Documents/GO05/LEA/13-14/Reports/Item-5-USRI-Subcommittee-Final-Report-June-2013-FINAL.pdf>
- Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta (AASUA). (2012). *AASUA position statement on URSIs*. Retrieved from http://www.aasua.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/AASUA_Position_Statement_on_USRIs.pdf
- Centre for Teaching and Learning. (2015). *Multifaceted summative evaluation of teaching symposium*. Retrieved from <https://www.ualberta.ca/centre-for-teaching-and-learning/events/symposium-series/past-symposia/multifaceted-summative-evaluation-teaching>
- Cheeseman, C., MacLaren, I., Carey, J., Glanfield, F., Liu, L., McFarlane, L., Cahill, J. C., Garneau, T., Supernant, K., & Szeman, I. (2013, December 9). *Report of the Renaissance Committee*. Retrieved from <http://www.renaissance.ualberta.ca/>
- Day, R., Robberecht, P., & Roed, B. (1996). *Teaching dossier: A guide*. Retrieved from: <https://d1pbog36rugm0t.cloudfront.net/~media/ualberta/centre-for-teaching-and-learning/instructional-resources/teaching-dossier/teachingdossierguide-1.pdf>
- Erkut, E. & Kreber, C. (2002). *Report from the sub-committee on evaluation of alternate-delivery courses: Continuing discussion*. General Faculties Council Teaching and Learning Committee. Retrieved from https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KpLMK5kN4r6Mp_BSEoYiZ1xOrbdI9shhScBDAC2NPdI/edit
- General Faculties Council. (n.d.). *GFC policy manual*. Retrieved from <http://www.gfcpolicymanual.ualberta.ca/>
- Gibson, S. (n.d.). *University of Alberta peer review of teaching*. Retrieved from <https://www.ualberta.ca/centre-for-teaching-and-learning/events/symposium-series/past-symposia/multifaceted-summative-evaluation-teaching/peer-review-of-teaching>
- I-graduate. (n.d.). *The student barometer*. Retrieved from <https://www.i-graduate.org/services/student-barometer/>
- Ipsos MORI. (n.d.). *National student survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.thestudentsurvey.com/>
- Kanuka, H., Marentette, P., Braga, J., Campbell, K., Harvey, S., Holte, R., Nychka, J., Precht, D., Read, D., Skappak, C., & Varnhagen, C. (2009, January 9). *Evaluation of teaching at the U of A: Report of the sub-committee of the Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE)*. Retrieved from <https://www.ualberta.ca/~media/ualberta/centre-for-teaching-and-learning/symposium/evaluating-teaching-2009/symposiumevaluating-teaching-at-the-u-of-a-taskforce-report.pdf>
- Lyde, A. R., Grieshaber, D. C., Byrns, G. (2016). Faculty teaching performance: Perceptions of a multi-source method for evaluation (MME). *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 16(3), 82-94. doi: 10.14434/josotl.v16i3.18145
- Stanford University Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning (VPTL). (n.d.). *Standard Course Evaluation Questions*. Retrieved from: <https://vptl.stanford.edu/teaching-learning/teaching-practices/evaluation-feedback/stanford-new-course-evaluations/standard>

University of Alberta. (2016). *For the public good: Institutional strategic plan 2016-2021*.

Retrieved from <https://www.ualberta.ca/strategic-plan>

University of Sydney. (n.d.). Teaching insight: Possible data sources to draw on when providing evidence about your teaching. Retrieved from

http://sydney.edu.au/education-portfolio/ei/programs/teaching_insights/pdf/insight7_evidence.pdf

University of Sydney. (2016a). *Student Barometer (SB/IB)*. Retrieved from:

<http://sydney.edu.au/education-portfolio/ei/studentbarometer/>

University of Sydney. (2016b). *Student Experience Survey (SES)*. Retrieved from:

<http://sydney.edu.au/education-portfolio/ei/ses/>

University of Sydney. (2016c). *Unit of Study Survey (USS)*. Retrieved from:

<http://sydney.edu.au/education-portfolio/ei/USS/default.htm>

University of Oxford. (2015). *Procedures for the Annual Monitoring of Courses*. Retrieved from:

<https://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/edc/qa/pamc/>

6. Appendices

- [Appendix A: Table of Reviewed Literature](#)
- [Appendix B: Summary of Interviews with Department Chairs](#)
- [Appendix C: Interview Questions](#)
- [Appendix D: Sample USRI Case Studies](#)
- [Appendix E: Summary of Positions and Recommendations Related to USRIs in University of Alberta Policy, Documents, and Reports](#)
- [Appendix F: Summary of Positions and Recommendations Related to Multifaceted Evaluation in University of Alberta Policy, Documents, and Reports](#)
- [Appendix G: References of Reviewed Literature](#)
- [Appendix H: Abstracts for Reviewed Literature](#)
- [Appendix I: Recommendations Related to Evaluation of Teaching from the 2013 Renaissance Committee Report](#)

Appendix A: Table of Reviewed Literature

This table contains literature referenced in the 2009 CLE report, as well as more recent articles relating to the evaluation of teaching. Due to varied research methodologies, measures, and results, definitive comparisons and conclusions from the literature is not be possible; however, the depth and breadth of the articles can provide a general idea about current academic perspectives. Black font indicates literature cited in the 2009 CLE report; **green font** indicates more recent articles. Brief summarizing points from each article are provided.

Click on the links to move directly to each bookmarked section. For abridged abstracts, see [Appendix H](#). For a complete reference list, see [Appendix G](#).

[Biases](#)

- [Gender](#)
- [Instructor characteristics](#)
- [Correlation between grades and ratings](#)
- [Nonresponse](#)
- [Non-instructional](#)
- [Other](#)

[Validity](#)

[Impact on Teaching Quality](#)

[Evaluating Faculty for Tenure and Promotion](#)

[Multifaceted Evaluation](#)

Biases

This category is divided into sub-categories of gender, instructor characteristics, correlation between grades and ratings, nonresponse, and non-instructional. Also, an “other” category includes articles that focused on multiple biasing factors, biasing factors that do not fit into any other category, or biases in general.

Biases, Gender. Most literature, seven articles in this sub-category, reported that an instructor’s gender does influence student evaluations of teaching; however, two articles suggest otherwise.	
Gender influences student ratings	Gender does not influence student ratings
<p>Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark (2016): ratings are biased against female instructors by an amount that is large and statistically significant</p> <p>Gehrt, Louie, & Osland (2015): female students evaluated female lower-ranked faculty most favorably; male students evaluations were more favorable for lower ranked male faculty, but they did not degrade higher ranked female faculty</p> <p>Huebner & Magel (2015): variances of the class average responses between male and female faculty were higher for male faculty</p> <p>Laube, Massoni, Sprague, & Ferber (2007): the inconsistency on the question of whether student evaluations are gendered is itself an artifact of the way that quantitative measures can mask underlying gender bias</p> <p>MacNell, Driscoll, & Hunt (2015): students rate males significantly higher than females</p> <p>Miles & House (2015): lower ratings for female instructors teaching larger required classes</p> <p>Wilson, Beyer, & Monteiro (2014): lower ratings for older instructors, but more so for females than males</p>	<p>Centra & Gaubatz (2000): only small same-gender preferences found, particularly with females</p> <p>Smith, Yoo, Farr, Salmon, & Miller (2007): male and female students rated female instructors more highly; effect was small but significant due to sample size</p> <p>Wright & Jenkins-Guarieri (2012): SETs appear to be valid and free from gender bias</p>

Biases, Instructor characteristics (appearance, personality, age, and/or rank). Article findings in this sub-category, seven articles total, were that: instructor personality positively correlates with student evaluations; instructor physical attractiveness positively correlates with student evaluations; instructor age negatively correlates with student evaluations; instructor rank does affect student evaluations; and instructor rank does not affect student evaluations.

Instructor characteristics influence student ratings	Instructor characteristics do not influence student ratings
<p>Cho & Otani (2014): students give higher ratings for limited-term lecturers versus full-time faculty</p> <p>Clayson (2013): students' first perceptions of an instructor's personality are significantly related to ratings at the end of the semester</p> <p>Felton, Mitchell, & Stinson (2004): students give attractively-rated professors higher quality and easiness scores</p> <p>Kim & MacCann (2016): students' expressed educational satisfaction was related to perceptions of instructor personality</p> <p>Stonebraker & Stone (2015): age has a negative impact on student ratings of faculty members; begins around mid-forties; offset by attractiveness</p> <p>Wilson, Beyer, & Monteiro (2014): lower ratings for older instructors, but more so for females than males</p>	<p>Cheng (2015): tenure does not have a significant impact on student ratings of teaching performance</p>

Biases, Correlation between grades and ratings. Most literature, seven articles in this sub-category, reported that students receiving higher grades tend to provide more favourable evaluations of teaching; however, two articles suggest otherwise.

There is a correlation between higher grades and higher ratings	There is not a correlation between higher grades and higher ratings
<p>Backer (2012): some students punish academics for failing grades with low ratings</p> <p>Blackhart, Peruche, DeWall, & Joiner (2006): higher ratings given to instructors who give higher grades, and also to graduate teaching assistant rank</p> <p>Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark (2016): ratings are more sensitive to students' grade expectations than they are to teaching effectiveness</p> <p>Cho, Baek, & Cho (2015): students with better grades than their expected grades provide a psychological "gift" to their teachers by giving higher ratings</p> <p>Greenwald & Gillmore (1997): the grades-ratings correlation is due to an unwanted influence of instructors' grading leniency; there are 5 theories of the grades-ratings correlation</p> <p>Maurer (2006): cognitive dissonance may be a theory to explain the grades-ratings correlation</p> <p>Miles & House (2015): higher expected grades may lead to higher ratings</p>	<p>Centra (2003): expected grades generally do not affect student evaluations</p> <p>Gump (2007): questions the validity of research done on the leniency hypothesis</p>

Biases, Nonresponse. Nonresponse bias occurs when students choose not to participate in evaluation of teaching, and the missing data may cause skewed results. Three articles in this sub-category reported that nonresponse bias does influence student evaluations of teaching. No articles suggested otherwise.

Nonresponse bias influences student ratings	Nonresponse bias does not influence student ratings
<p>Kuwaiti, AlQuraan, & Subbarayalu (2016): ratings are affected by class size and response rate</p> <p>Macfadyen, Dawson, Prest, & Gasevic (2016): ratings affected by who is completing the surveys</p> <p>Reisenwitz (2015): there are significant differences between those who complete online student evaluations and those who do not</p>	<p>No articles found.</p>

Biases, Non-Instructional. Non-instructional bias occurs when circumstances beyond the control of an instructor, such as class type, time, size, and semester, influence student evaluation of teaching. The four articles in this sub-category varied in their investigations and conclusions.

Non-instructional factors influence student ratings	Non-instructional factors do not influence student ratings
<p>Kuwaiti, AlQuraan, & Subbarayalu (2016): ratings are affected by class size and response rate</p> <p>Nargundkar & Shrikhande (2014): combined impact of all the noninstructional factors studied is statistically significant</p> <p>Royal & Stockdale (2015): students give lower ratings to instructors of quantitative methods subjects</p>	<p>Reardon, Leierer, & Lee (2014): class schedule does not affect ratings</p>

Biases, Other. This sub-category includes literature that focused on multiple biasing factors, biasing factors that do not fit into any other category, or biases in general.

The factors influence student ratings

Blackhart, Peruche, DeWall, & Joiner (2006): varying results for investigation if class size, class level, instructor gender, number of publications (faculty instructors), average grade given by the instructor, and instructor rank predicted teaching evaluation ratings

Keeley, English, Irons, & Henslee (2013): found halo and ceiling/floor effects to be present and persistent; (Halo effect occurs when a positive rating on one aspect of the SET influences the other aspects. Ceiling and floor effects are issues when the SET instrument scale is limited.)

Merritt (2012): covers biases in general, including race minority

Pounder (2007): identifies and organizes factors influencing SET scores

Zumbach & Funke (2014): students' mood affects ratings

Validity

Literature within this category equally supports opposing viewpoints as to whether or not student evaluations of teaching are valid measures of teaching quality, whether or not students have the knowledge, skills, or motivation to measure teaching quality.

Student Evaluations are (Mostly) Valid Measures of Teaching; Students are able to measure aspects of teaching quality	Student Evaluations are not/may not be Valid Measures of Teaching; Students may not be able to measure teaching quality
<p>Al-Eidan, Baig, Magzoub, & Omair (2016): the faculty evaluation tool was found to be reliable, but validity has to be interpreted with caution because of low response</p> <p>Bedggood & Donovan (2012): student satisfaction does not equal teaching quality; both student satisfaction and student learning are relevant measures</p> <p>Chen & Hoshower (2003): student motivation to participate in SET affects ratings</p> <p>Cohen (1981): student ratings are a valid measure of teaching effectiveness; this is the paper included in a meta-analysis by Uttl et al. (2016)</p> <p>Dolmans, Janssen-Noordman, & Wolfhagen (2006): students can distinguish excellent and poor teaching quality</p> <p>Ginns, Prosser, & Barrie (2007): the SET tool studied supports quality assurance and improvement processes at the university</p> <p>Grammatikopoulos, Linardakis, Gregoriadis, & Oikonomidis (2015): provides evidence of a valid SET instrument; evaluating test validity is a continuous process, not a one-time event</p> <p>Khong (2014): SET is a valid instrument in evaluating teaching effectiveness</p>	<p>Brown, Wood, Ogden, & Maltby (2014): students' satisfaction rating is context dependent; objective quality and subjective satisfaction are different things and should be assessed accordingly</p> <p>Chonko, Tanner, & Davis (2002): students focus more on qualities that make a course appealing, not learning</p> <p>d'Apollonia & Abrami (1997): student ratings are moderately valid; however, they are affected by administrative, instructor, and course characteristics</p> <p>Dodeen (2013): validity of SET is questionable</p> <p>Grayson (2015): questions student's ability to give accurate ratings</p> <p>Greenwald (1997): student rating measures have validity concerns</p> <p>Lama, Arias, Mendoza, & Manahan (2015): lack of student diligence when rating instructors raises validity concerns</p> <p>Martin, Dennehy, & Morgan (2013): validity of SET is questioned; student focus groups suggested as an alternative</p> <p>Morley (2012): student evaluations in this study were generally unreliable</p>

--	--

Validity, continued

Student Evaluations are (Mostly) Valid Measures of Teaching; Students are able to measure aspects of teaching quality	Student Evaluations are not/may not be Valid Measures of Teaching; Students may not be able to measure teaching quality
<p>Marsh & Roche (1997): evaluations are relatively valid and unaffected by hypothesized biases; student ratings correlate with those of peer evaluators and trained evaluators</p> <p>McKeachie (1997): student ratings are valid but affected by contextual variables such as grading leniency</p> <p>Nargundkar & Shrikhande (2012): an instrument that was validated 20 years ago is still valid</p> <p>Socha (2013): a SET instrument was found to have overall good reliability and validity with relatively few biases</p> <p>Wright & Jenkins-Guarieri (2012): SETs appear to be valid and free from gender bias</p>	<p>Rantanen (2013): reliability of SET is questionable; multiple feedbacks required</p> <p>Spooren, Brockx, & Mortelmans (2013): the utility and validity of SET is questionable</p> <p>Uttl, White, & Gonzalez (2016): SETs do not indicate teaching quality, meta-analysis</p> <p>Uijtdehaage & O’Neal (2015): many students rate instructors mindlessly</p>

Impact on Teaching Quality

The five articles in this category are divided as to whether or not results from student evaluations of teaching have a positive impact on teaching quality.

Evaluation results may have an impact on teaching quality	Evaluation results may not have an impact on teaching quality
<p>Curwood, Tomitsch, Thomson, & Hendry (2015): provide an example of support for academics' learning from SETs</p> <p>Makondo & Ndebele (2014): SETs are beneficial for improving teaching quality</p>	<p>Asassfeh, Al-Ebous, Khwaileh, & Al-Zoubi (2014): students' perceptions include lack of impact of evaluations on teaching behaviors</p> <p>Campbell & Bozeman (2008): questions the effect student evaluations have on teaching quality</p> <p>Stein, Spiller, Harris, Deaker, & Kennedy (2013): there are gaps in the way academics engage with student evaluation</p>

Evaluating Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

Literature in this category includes seven more recent articles (2012 onward) that express concern about the use of evaluation results for summative purposes, misinterpretation of results leading to incorrect conclusions.

Support for use of student evaluations for tenure and promotion decisions	Concerns related to the use of student evaluations for tenure and promotion decisions
<p>Fraile & Bosch-Morell (2015): present a reliable approach to SET interpretation</p>	<p>Boysen (2015): faculty and administrators can over-interpret small variations</p> <p>Boysen, Raesly, & Casner (2014): ratings are misinterpreted by faculty and administrators</p> <p>Jackson & Jackson (2015): concerns with use of SETs for summative purposes</p> <p>Jones, Gaffney-Rhys, & Jones (2015): presents issues if decision-makers use SET results summatively</p> <p>Mitry & Smith (2014): conclusions drawn from evaluations may be invalid and harmful</p> <p>Palmer (2012): presents examples of ineffective responses to evaluation results</p>

Multifaceted Evaluation

This category amalgamates the concepts of effective tools and multifaceted evaluations into one theme, since effective tools provide the ingredients for multifaceted evaluations. The ten articles in this category recognize the need for instruments that are of high psychometric quality, and also that evaluations should include multiple sources of information, such as surveys, peer evaluations, self-evaluations, focus groups, and more.

Berk (2013): covers several issues, including multifactorial evaluations

Cox, Peeters, Stanford, & Seifert (2013): a peer assessment instrument was piloted; formative peer assessment seems important

Hughes II & Pate (2013): present a multisource evaluation method

Iqbal (2013): faculty express concerns with peer reviews

Lyde, Grieshaber, & Byrns (2016): a multisource method of evaluating is a useful tool

Marsh & Roche (1997): multidimensional aspects of teaching should be evaluated; suggest nine factors; "homemade" surveys are of questionable quality

Martin, Dennehy, & Morgan (2013): validity of SET is questioned; student focus groups suggested as an alternative

Ridley & Collins (2015): suggests a comprehensive performance evaluation instrument

Stupans, McGuren, & Babey (2016): present a tool for analyzing free-form comments on ratings forms

Zimmerman (2008): some tools may encourage students to focus on negative aspects of teaching; anonymous feedback means students are not accountable for their comments



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
CENTRE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

EVALUATION OF TEACHING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR INTERVIEWS ACROSS CAMPUS

Sarah Forgie & Norma Nocente Principal Investigators
L. Francisco Vargas M. Research Coordinator
Rebecca Best-Bertwistle Research Assistant

2017

“I think these measures are useful, as long as they’re not used by themselves. They need to be supplemented by all kinds of other things” (Department Chair).





Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	5
2. Introduction	6
3. Methods.....	6
3.1. Participants	7
3.2. Data Analysis.....	7
4. Results.....	9
4.1. Use of USRI to Evaluate Teaching.....	9
4.2. Use of Additional Tools & Information to Evaluate Teaching.....	11
4.3. Perceived FEC Weighting of Teaching, Research & Service.....	13
4.4. Need for Additional Supports to Better Evaluate Teaching.....	14
4.5. Difference Between Teaching Evaluation for Annual Review & Promotion	16
4.6. Characteristics of Effective & Excellent Teachers	16
4.7. Experiences Transitioning to e-USRI Compared to Paper-Based USRI	17
5. Conclusions	19
6. Appendix 1: Semi-Structured Interview Questions.....	21
7. Appendix 2: Sample USRI Results for Department Chairs	23



1. Executive Summary

In May 2016, General Faculties Council tasked the Committee on Learning Environment to report on the “... research into the use of student rating mechanisms of instruction in university courses. This will be informed by a critical review of the University of Alberta’s existing Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRIs) and their use for assessment and evaluation of teaching as well as a broad review of possible methods of multifaceted assessment and evaluation of teaching.”

Methods

- Qualitative research. Department chairs (or their equivalents in non-departmental faculties) were asked to participate in short 30-45 minute (audio-recorded) semi-structured interviews with questions regarding their experiences evaluating teaching.
- Data was collected from January to March 2017, with a response rate of 59%.

Our committee sought to address the GFC motion by answering the following three questions:

1. What does the research have to say about student ratings of teaching?

- A literature review on student rating systems previously presented in a 2009 University of Alberta report was updated (*Evaluation of Teaching at the U of A: Report of the Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Learning Environment*).

2. How are the USRIs and other tools used in the evaluation of teaching evaluation at the University of Alberta?

- Participants from all faculties other than FOMD use USRI scores and comments (and only a portion of participants from FOMD) to evaluate teaching.
- Statement 221 (overall the instructor was excellent), and statement 25 (overall the quality of the course content was excellent) are the most commonly used USRI items to evaluate teaching.
- Most participants try to contextualize their interpretation of USRI results.

3. What are some approaches for multi-faceted evaluation of teaching?

- In-class peer teaching observations were the most commonly used additional source of information, followed by annual instructor pedagogical self-reflections.
- Most participants obtain these resources on a voluntary basis, only when professors agree to give them these supplementary resources.
- Some participants have implemented yearly faculty audits, in which a manageable portion of their professorate’s teaching is evaluated using additional information.
- Even when participants obtain these resources, not all reported to bring them to FEC. When this information makes it to FEC, it is used to inform their narrative, and is only explicitly brought up when there is a concern with the numerical scores.
- Despite more value being placed in teaching, most participants still described a strong bias towards research at their respective FECs.
 - **Most participants voiced their need for additional supports to better evaluate teaching.**
 - **Most participants identified some issues when evaluating teaching exclusively with USRI, and some recommended possible alternatives to supplement these scores, but they still hope the institution will provide solutions for their concerns.**

2. Introduction

The University of Alberta's Institutional Strategic Plan, For the Public Good, underscores its strong commitment to teaching and learning. The University community values the intellectual and engaging learning environment that is cultivated by our inspiring teachers. Accordingly, the evaluation of teaching is essential in upholding these values.

Teaching evaluations not only affect the careers of individuals at the University of Alberta, they also shape the quality of instruction being offered to students. Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRI) are often used to evaluate teaching quality for faculty annual review and tenure and promotion (summative evaluation). Also, USRIs can provide insight (formative evaluation) into specific areas of strength or improvement related to different aspects of teaching such as planning and organization, communication, assessment, etc. However, the dual purpose of USRIs is often contentious, particularly because of the perceived weight they carry with Faculty Evaluation Committees.

Consequently, in May 2016, General Faculties Council (GFC) tasked the Committee on Learning Environment (CLE) to report on the "... research into the use of student rating mechanisms of instruction in university courses. This will be informed by a critical review of the University of Alberta's existing Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRIs) and their use for assessment and evaluation of teaching as well as a broad review of possible methods of multifaceted assessment and evaluation of teaching. The ultimate objective will be to satisfy the Institutional Strategic Plan: For the Public Good strategy to: Provide robust supports, tools, and training to develop and assess teaching quality, using qualitative and quantitative criteria that are fair, equitable, and meaningful across disciplines."

Our committee sought to address the GFC motion by answering the following three questions:

1. What does the research have to say about student ratings of teaching?
2. How are the USRIs and other tools used in the evaluation of teaching evaluation at the University of Alberta?
3. What are some approaches for multi-faceted evaluation of teaching?

For the first question, we updated a literature review on student rating systems previously presented in a 2009 University of Alberta report (*Evaluation of Teaching at the U of A: Report of the Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Learning Environment*). To partially address the third question, we resurrected previous work completed at the University of Alberta on the multi-faceted evaluation of teaching. [This information was presented to CLE in September 2016](#). This report primarily addresses the second and third question through information collected in interviews with department chairs across campus.

While University policy suggests that departments utilize a multi-faceted approach to evaluating teaching, we do not have a clear picture of the tools used other than the mandated Universal Student Rating System (USRI). These interviews helped to uncover how department chairs utilize USRIs to make personnel decisions and the helped to determine which other tools they used to evaluate the quality of teaching in their respective departments.

The purpose of this study is to describe the current state of teaching evaluation at the University of Alberta. More specifically it will help us understand the tools used to evaluate teaching at the University of Alberta.

3. Methods


Ethics approval for this qualitative study was sought from the Human Research Ethics Board at the University of Alberta, and obtained December 7, 2016 (Pro00069070). A qualitative approach with interviews was used to elicit the depth of response necessary for understanding the nuances and variety in possible answers.

Department chairs (or their equivalents in non-departmental faculties) were emailed directly with information about the study, and with copy of the research letter of invitation. They were asked to participate in a short 30-45 minute (audio-recorded) semi-structured interview (*see Appendix 1*). The interview protocol was pre-approved by CLE, and it consisted of questions regarding the chairs' experiences evaluating teaching. Participants were also given two sample USRI case studies based on real teaching scores (*see Appendix 2*) and asked to interpret the scores. They were directed to reflect on both scores as if both instructors were teaching different sections of the same course within their department.


Data was collected from January to March 2017.

3.1. Participants

Participants were 43 department chairs (or their equivalents in non-departmental faculties) which is a 59% response rate. The distribution was 9.3% from Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences (ALES), 4.7% from Alberta School of Business (BUS), 20.9% from Arts (ART), 4.7% from Augustana Campus (AUG), 7% from Education (EDU), 7% from Engineering (ENG), 23.3% from Medicine and Dentistry (FOMD), 4.7% from Rehabilitation Medicine (RM), 7% from Science (SCI), and 11.6% from all non-departmental faculties (ND) (see Figure 1). Response rate reached a minimum of 50% within the different faculties (see Figure 2).



Participants reported having an average of 32.07 (*SD* = 22.42) faculty and FSO, 23.18 (*SD* = 27.03) sessional or contract instructors, and 3.06 (*SD* = 3.82) graduate students teaching in their departments. They mentioned working for an average of 4.34 (*SD* = 3.61) years as department chairs (or their equivalents in non-departmental faculties), and 9.3% of the total indicated having an interim appointment.



3.2. Data Analysis

Confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed by assigning pseudonyms to each audio file before it was sent for transcription. Transcripts were further anonymized by removing any information that identified the department under discussion (i.e., mention of disciplines, courses, specific individuals, and others). Participants from departmental faculties were grouped together and those from non-departmental faculties were combined to protect their identity. The complete list of participants, as well as assigned pseudonyms, is only available to the research coordinator. Interview transcripts were then coded with the qualitative data analysis software *NVivo 11*, using the main questions as general guidelines that informed the different codes/nodes. An external research assistant determined an inter-coder percentage agreement of .95 with 10% of the total number of interviews for the qualitative data, and of .98 with 100% of interviews for the quantitative representation of the data.



4. Results

This section offers both a quantitative and a qualitative summary of all participant responses, except section 4.1., section 4.2., and section 4.7., in which results only consider participants who reported using USRI. Information in these sections excludes participants from FOMD who indicated not using USRI, or whose application was not clear (see Figure 3).

4.1. Use of USRI to Evaluate Teaching

Figure 3. Participants from FOMD that Reported Using USRI Scores to Evaluate Teaching



Figure 4. Participants from FOMD that Reported Using USRI Comments to Evaluate Teaching




Participants from all faculties other than FOMD reported using USRI scores and comments as part of their teaching evaluation process (100%). Department chairs from FOMD either mentioned using the USRI scores (40%), not using them (20%), or did not provide a definite answer (40%) (see Figure 3).

Additionally, department chairs from FOMD either indicated using USRI comments (30%), not taking them into consideration (30%), or their responses were unclear (40%) (see Figure 4). “I have never seen it, but our largest undergraduate program has a different evaluation system, which is mainly based on narrative comments. So, your email, as I said, was the first time that I heard the term ever.” They were often unsure if their department used USRI, or had never heard about USRI, or had never seen the scores (see Appendix 2).

FROM THIS POINT ON INFORMATION ONLY CONSIDERS PARTICIPANTS WHO REPORTED USING USRI



Figure 5. USRI Statements Most Commonly Used to Evaluate Teaching



When asked which USRI statements were most commonly used in their teaching evaluation process, statement 221 (overall this instructor was excellent) was identified by 97.3% of participants, statement 25 (overall the quality of the


course content was excellent) was selected by 67.6%, and statement 9 (the instructor treated students with respect) was identified by 35.1% (see Figure 5). In general, participants revealed that one or two items are used as an indicator of effective teaching. They seem to have benchmarks in mind as they review USRI scores:

We consider all of them, but of course we key in right away on ‘the instructor was excellent.’ You always look at that one first. And overall the course content was excellent is the second thing you look at. And then, if there’s problems in either of those two scores you look in more detail at the other questions. There’s something like 300 faculty members in the Faculty of Science for FEC, so we’re only finding ways to efficiently go through these things.




Participants also reflected on the USRI case studies (see Appendix 2). Instructor A had 6 USRI items on the 25th percentile or below, and 1 item below the Tukey fence. This instructor scored 4.0 on statement 221, 3.8 on statement 25, and 4.0 on statement 9. Instructor B had 7 USRI items between the 50th and 25th percentile, but no items were below the Tukey fence. This instructor scored 4.5 on statement 221, 4.2 on statement 25, and 4.8 on statement 9. After reflecting on these sample case studies, 8.1% of participants gave Instructor A ‘unsatisfactory’ reviews, 13.5% thought the scores were ‘okay’, and 24.3% considered the scores were ‘good’ (see Figure 6). Instructor B received more positive reviews, with 8.1% considering the scores were ‘okay’, 27% thinking they were ‘good’, and 10.8% deeming them as ‘excellent’ (see Figure 7). Moreover, believing the USRI data indicated their teaching was ‘okay’, 45.9% of participants mentioned that contextual factors should be considered in the evaluation of teaching (see Figure 6 and 7), and that to provide an informed interpretation of these USRI scores, they required more information than the one provided:

To be perfectly honest, in the abstract I don’t know what I would say. Without knowing the circumstances, if one of those instructors is in her or his first year of teaching, and the other was an experienced professor, I think that interpretation is dramatically different than if they’re both experienced professors or if they’re both new professors. I can say, if we look at the overall averages they’re both scoring in the lower percentile, and that sort of data, but to be perfectly honest that means very little to me because I think that understanding a person’s position is crucial to being able to read any of these numbers.




Additionally, 18.9% would only follow up with Instructor A to address issues related to their teaching scores, and/or to provide supplementary guidance to help them improve their results; 24.3% would follow up with both instructors to discuss their concerns; 8.1% would not follow up with either instructor, due to what they consider a lack of any teaching

red flags; and 45.9% still mentioned that since USRI needs to be interpreted in a contextual way, they need to look into the circumstances of both instructors as part of their normal process (see Figure 8).




Participants also had access to two pieces of reference data when given these case studies. The Tukey fence was not referenced by 81.1% of the participants, even though Instructor A had one score below the Tukey fence, and not all participants (5.4%) seemed familiar with its application (see Figure 9). The Test Scoring & Questionnaire Services (TSQS) Office mentioned that they generate diverse reports for different faculties and departments, and based on that, some participants might not be getting the complete set of data available. Participants were more familiar with quartiles data, however, as 37.8% of participants made explicit reference to them, 13.5% stated departmental expectations regarding USRI scores without making explicit reference to the quartiles, and 43.2% did not provide any definite comment (see Figure 10).




In general, participants from all faculties other than FOMD use USRI scores and comments (and only a portion of FOMD participants reported using this tool) to evaluate teaching. And even when one or two items are mainly used as an indicator of effective teaching, most participants try to contextualize their interpretations of USRI results.

4.2. Use of Additional Tools & Information to Evaluate Teaching



When asked about the use of additional tools and information to evaluate teaching, in-class peer teaching observations were the most commonly implemented resource (70.3%), followed by annual instructor self-reflections about their pedagogical practices (37.8%), review of class materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, and exams) (29.7%), and departmental specific tools that have been created to accommodate to the uniqueness of their departments (21.6%) (see Figure 11).

Figure 12. Distribution of Additional Tools & Information Use by Faculty




But the implementation of these tools varies between departments. Some participants (35.1%) only employ additional resources on a voluntary basis, encouraging professors to provide further information, but reportedly are not able to engage everyone in the department. Another group (27%) uses additional information as a standard, obtaining it through departmental specific tools. Some of them (8.1%) have already implemented yearly departmental audits that include additional tools and information. Furthermore, 18.9% only go beyond USRI when they need to evaluate teaching practices of professors going up for promotion/tenure; 10.8% only implement additional strategies to assess sessional instructors or new professors; and 8.1% acknowledged they did not use any additional tools or information (see Figure 12).

Among the participants who used additional tools and information in any way, 42.8% used one of the listed resources (see Figure 11), 42.8% used two, and 14.4% used three. Nevertheless, most participants share a common rationale for including other tools recognize the need to include other tools are very much alike, as one of them mentioned when reflecting on relying exclusively on USRI to evaluate teaching:

I don't think that's very useful by itself, it's incomplete. I'd feel uncomfortable judging somebody's fate just based on that. I'm not saying it's wrong but it's only one piece. It's one piece of understanding, and we take teaching seriously. It's not just a bunch of simple numbers pouring at us. We don't just look at you're above this number or below this number, and we're done. We're looking at you much more carefully than that, but it's a good start.

Figure 13. Additional Tools & Information Used to Support Teaching



Participants, furthermore, mentioned tools and information they have utilized in their departments to *support* teaching. For instance, 40.5% have organized peer support initiatives (e.g., mentoring, teaching triads, and support groups where instructors find a safe space to talk about their teaching practices). Another 13.5% have referred struggling faculty to departmental specific training and/or workshops, or to other units on campus that offer pedagogical guidance; 13.5% have instituted faculty gatherings to open casual conversations about teaching practices and problems. Additionally, 8.1% have produced departmental teaching handbooks (see Figure 13).

Figure 14. Percentage of Participants that Bring Additional Tools & Information to FEC




When it comes to bringing this additional tools and information to FEC, 45.9% indicated that these sources play a role in their annual teaching evaluation, by informing a narrative and/or the reasoning with other FEC members if their recommendation gets challenged; 21.6% acknowledged not bringing these resources to FEC, and 32.4% did not comment or their responses were unclear (see Figure 14). Thus, even when participants indicated using one or two additional tools to evaluate teaching, most acknowledged using them on a voluntary basis, receiving this information only when faculty agrees to provide these supplementary resources.

4.3. Perceived FEC Weighting of Teaching, Research & Service

FROM THIS POINT ON INFORMATION CONSIDERS ALL PARTICIPANTS

Figure 15. Distribution of Perceived FEC Weighting



Most participants recognized that there is a strong bias towards research (60.5%), despite their FEC’s best efforts to weight them equally (14%) (see Figure 19):

I would say that there’s still a bias towards research. Although my experience was that teaching was taken seriously, and we looked at those things a lot, and they were raised in terms of the kinds of things people were doing, the amount of teaching they were doing, their scores, and all that stuff was taken into consideration, I would still say that the publications and other research activities and outcomes were probably weighed more seriously. So, I’d say it’d be more like 50%, 30%, 20% rather than 40%, 40%, 20%.

An additional 14% mentioned that FEC weights the importance of teaching, research and service based on the specific time allocation of the individual (mostly in health-related disciplines where their contracts have different time allocations), and 11.6% thought that their FEC weights teaching more heavily than research (see Figure 15).


4.4. Need for Additional Supports to Better Evaluate Teaching

Figure 16. Perceived Need for Additional Supports to Better Evaluate Teaching



Most participants also voiced their urgent need for additional supports to better evaluate teaching. One participant, for example, remarked that “I was looking to you to find this out, to find out if the result of this survey would give me some ideas of what this is”; and another commented that in their department “We’re hoping the university will solve this issue.” Indeed, 83.7% of participants mentioned needing some support, whereas 9.3% indicated not needing additional resources (see Figure 16).

Figure 17. Issues Encountered when Evaluating Teaching




Some participants explicitly recognized their concerns about depending exclusively on USRI, and the inability of USRIs to effectively evaluate diverse approaches to teaching (46.5%), other mentioned not having enough time and resources to adopt supplementary tools in the teaching evaluation process (27.9%). Participants also expressed concerns about lower USRI scores for women and visible minorities (11.6%), as well as the difficulties of compelling senior faculty (usually with full professor rank) to improve their teaching practices (9.3%) (see Figure 17):

That question set doesn’t serve the diversity and the kind of pedagogy we have now, and really needs fixing. I think there needs to be a conversation about what this is going to look like over time. I also think the University has to take very seriously the concerns that equity seeking groups have about what happens in teaching evaluations. What happens to women? What happens to visible minority? What happens to people that are perceived to have strong accents? And I think there’s a huge responsibility on chairs and people on FEC to really be educated in how much you can extrapolate from USRI.

TSQS conducted descriptive analyses that generated gender-specific USRI scores using data from the academic years 2011/2012 to 2015/2016. Results show there is no overt difference between scores for males ($N = 18576$, $Mdn = 4.53$) and females ($N = 13679$, $Mdn = 4.57$) for statement 211. Additionally, TSQS measures the reliability of the USRI by comparing medians to the previous academic years. Our research team was not able to find information on the validity of the USRI.

Figure 18. Most Common Ideal Types of Supports to Better Evaluate Teaching




Among the most commonly listed types of supports to better evaluate teaching, participants mentioned that ideally, they would implement peer in-class observations not only for promotion purposes, but across their department (41.9%), obtain university guidelines to understand how to accurately and effectively evaluate teaching (27.9%) (see Figure 18):

My learning curve coming in to the chair role has been huge. We used to have a chair's school kind of thing. Now there's the gold and green leadership college or whatever it's called, and it's a very different thing. So, you transition into chair now and you're on your own. You've got to go figure it out, ask people for coffee, and learn up, but there's no orientation to being a chair.

Some also indicated that it would be useful to gain access to teaching training and workshops that they could refer struggling professors to (when not available in their departments) (20.9%), have discipline specific concept inventories to better determine the knowledge increase in students (11.6%), implement peer support initiatives to improve teaching practices (11.6%), video record lectures for later analysis of the quality of teaching (7%), request pedagogical self-reflections in which professors give a thoughtful summary of their teaching (7%), and review class materials to have a better panorama of the instructor (4.7%) (see Figure 18). Having more resources to better evaluate teaching is important, as one of them mentioned:

I think we need support to develop our own teaching skills more comfortably so we can be excellent teachers, but also it would be important to make sure our instruments are valid and that we can actually use them on a journey of self-improvement, and departmental culture and improvement. And to do that having some facilitation from people who know the art and who can work with us would be better than just having a list of stuff on a website where you do click, click, and access what you want. That's not enough.


4.5. Difference Between Teaching Evaluation for Annual Review & Promotion



Even though evaluation of teaching for annual review and for promotion was a different process for 68.3%, and the same process for 26.8% of participants (see Figure 19), both ends of the spectrum seem to agree that more components were taken into consideration when they were dealing with promotion:

The annual review looks only at that year, and if there's real concerns then you'll look for trends, whereas when it comes to promotion, it looks to a career, what has this individual been doing with teaching, and not just this year but intentionally over the entire career. When it comes to application promotion, there is a larger view taken of teaching.

4.6. Characteristics of Effective & Excellent Teachers



Even though most participants struggled with the breadth of this question, for them an effective and/or excellent teacher appropriately conveys the knowledge and the skills that students need to obtain (58.1%), engages students despite the difficulty of the course material (46.5%), gets high USRI scores and teaching awards (30.2%), innovates in their teaching practices (23.3%), knows how to challenge students without burning them out (18.6%), regularly updates the information and the material of the course (18.6%), and engages in scholarship of teaching and learning related activities (18.6%). Other participants indicated that being supportive of students was also important (14%), seeking professional development opportunities to improve their pedagogical practices (7%), and learning from students as much as students learn from them (4.7%) (see Figure 21):

I try to avoid definitions if that involves any kind of explicit criteria. What I look for, what I think is most important in teaching is that all good teaching is transformative. And it's mostly transformative for the student, although truth be known good teaching is transformative for both student and teacher.

4.7. Experiences Transitioning to e-USRI Compared to Paper-Based USRI

FROM THIS POINT ON INFORMATION ONLY CONSIDERS PARTICIPANTS WHO REPORTED USING USRI

Figure 21. Reported Response Rate Experiences with e-USRI compared to Paper-Based USRI



Most participants believed that response rates have decreased since the implementation of the e-USRI: 48.6% had some data to back up this claim, such as their personal USRI response rates, or the actual number of students that now complete the evaluations compared to previous years; and 18.9% believed that the response rates had declined, but had no data to support this claim. Alternatively, 21.6% of participants believed there was a similar response rate with both methods of delivery, 8.1% thought that it increased with the switch to electronic, but did not offer data to support this claim (see Figure 21). Moreover, some participants (8.1%) believed that a major issue with USRI response rates is that students are asked to complete a large amount of assessments:

I think they get completely annoyed because they're being bombarded with e-mails in their last week of classes reminding them to do USRIs, and professors reminding them to do USRIs to the point where I think they just go: I'm really annoyed. I'm not going to do them at all. I don't know what kind of a system they use to send them out, but it's almost like they send out one for every class, for every student, so they're just harassing them to death and they get mad about it.




5. Conclusions

How are the USRIs and other tools used in the evaluation of teaching evaluation at the University of Alberta?

- Participants from all faculties other than FOMD use USRI scores and comments (and only a portion of participants from FOMD) to evaluate teaching.
- Statement 221 (overall the instructor was excellent), and statement 25 (overall the quality of the course content was excellent) are the most commonly used USRI items to evaluate teaching.
- Most participants try to contextualize their interpretation of USRI results.

What are some approaches for multi-faceted evaluation of teaching?

- In-class peer teaching observations were the most commonly used additional source of information, followed by annual instructor pedagogical self-reflections.
- Most participants obtain these resources on a voluntary basis, only when professors agree to give them these supplementary resources.
- Some participants have implemented yearly faculty audits, in which a manageable portion of their professorate's teaching is evaluated using additional information.
- Even when participants obtain these resources, not all reported to bring them to FEC. When this information makes it to FEC, it is used to inform their narrative, and is only explicitly brought up when there is a challenge.
- Participants recognized that there is still a strong bias towards research at their respective FEC.
 - **Most participants voiced their need for additional supports to better evaluate teaching.**
 - **They have identified some issues when evaluating teaching exclusively with USRI, and possible alternatives to supplement these scores, but still they hope the institution provides a solution for their concerns.**



0

6. Appendix 1: Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Study Title: **Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Alberta**

1. Demographics
 - a. Identify department/faculty
 - b. Number of faculty/ FSOs who teach
 - c. Number of sessionals who teach
 - d. Number of graduate students who teach
2. How do you evaluate teaching?
 - a. Do you (or your FEC) use USRIs to evaluate the teaching of your faculty members?
 - b. If yes, which of the following standard USRI statements are considered in your faculty's teaching evaluation process?
 - i. the goals and objectives of the course were clear
 - ii. in-class time was used effectively
 - iii. I am motivated to learn more about these subject areas
 - iv. I increased my knowledge of the subject areas in this course
 - v. Overall the quality of the course content was excellent
 - vi. the instructor spoke clearly
 - vii. the instructor was well prepared
 - viii. the instructor treated students with respect
 - ix. the instructor provided constructive feedback throughout this course
 - x. overall this instructor was excellent
3. How do you compare your experience with e-USRIs and in-class paper-based USRIs?
4. What, if any, additional tools do you regularly use, other than USRI to evaluate teaching? If you don't, why not?
5. Do you use additional sources of information to evaluate teaching? If so, what information do you use and how are these sources of information weighted in teaching evaluations? Why?
6. Do you believe most of the FEC members weight teaching, research and service equally? If not, describe the average weighting, in your opinion.
7. How is evaluation of teaching different (or not) for annual review, or for promotion?
8. How do you define effective and/or excellent teaching? Do you have set standards, or do you make a relative comparison?
9. What additional supports would be useful to you to better evaluate teaching?

7. Appendix 2: Sample USRI Results for Department Chairs

Study Title: Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Alberta



Please look at the USRI information provided for two different instructors teaching the same course. How would you describe the instructors' teaching to FEC? OR In terms of evaluating teaching, what is your interpretation of this data for each instructor?

Instructor A

Question	Reference Data				
	Median	Tukey Fence	25%	50%	75%
The goals and objectives of the course were clear	3.4	2.7	3.9	4.3	4.7
In-class time was used effectively.	3.6	2.5	3.8	4.3	4.7
I am motivated to learn more about these subject areas.	3.5	2.9	4.1	4.5	4.8
I increased my knowledge of the subject areas in this course.	4.4	3.0	4.1	4.6	4.8
Overall, the quality of the course content was excellent.	3.8	2.4	3.8	4.3	4.8
The instructor spoke clearly.	4.5	3.8	4.5	4.8	4.9
The instructor was well prepared.	4.6	3.4	4.3	4.8	4.9
The instructor treated the students with respect.	4.0	4.2	4.7	4.9	5.0
The instructor provided constructive feedback throughout this course.	4.5	2.8	4.0	4.5	4.8
Overall, this instructor was excellent.	4.0	3.2	4.2	4.7	4.9

Instructor B

Question	Reference Data				
	Median	Tukey Fence	25%	50%	75%
The goals and objectives of the course were clear	4.0	2.7	3.9	4.3	4.7
In-class time was used effectively.	4.2	2.5	3.8	4.3	4.7
I am motivated to learn more about these subject areas.	3.7	2.9	4.1	4.5	4.8
I increased my knowledge of the subject areas in this course.	4.1	3.0	4.1	4.6	4.8
Overall, the quality of the course content was excellent.	4.2	2.4	3.8	4.3	4.8
The instructor spoke clearly.	4.7	3.8	4.5	4.8	4.9
The instructor was well prepared.	4.4	3.4	4.3	4.8	4.9
The instructor treated the students with respect.	4.8	4.2	4.7	4.9	5.0
The instructor provided constructive feedback throughout this course.	4.0	2.8	4.0	4.5	4.8
Overall, this instructor was excellent.	4.5	3.2	4.2	4.7	4.9



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
CENTRE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

Appendix C: Interview Questions

Study Title: **Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Alberta**

1. Demographics
 - a. Identify department/faculty
 - b. Number of faculty/ FSOs who teach
 - c. Number of sessionals who teach
 - d. Number of graduate students who teach

2. How do you evaluate teaching?
 - a. Do you (or your FEC) use USRIs to evaluate the teaching of your faculty members?
 - b. If yes, which of the following standard USRI statements are considered in your faculty's teaching evaluation process?
 - i. the goals and objectives of the course were clear
 - ii. in-class time was used effectively
 - iii. I am motivated to learn more about these subject areas
 - iv. I increased my knowledge of the subject areas in this course
 - v. Overall the quality of the course content was excellent
 - vi. the instructor spoke clearly
 - vii. the instructor was well prepared
 - viii. the instructor treated students with respect
 - ix. the instructor provided constructive feedback throughout this course
 - x. overall this instructor was excellent

3. How do you compare your experience with e-USRIs and in-class paper-based USRIs?
4. What, if any, additional tools do you regularly use, other than USRI to evaluate teaching? If you don't, why not?
5. Do you use additional sources of information to evaluate teaching? If so, what information do you use and how are these sources of information weighted in teaching evaluations? Why?
6. Do you believe most of the FEC members weight teaching, research and service equally? If not, describe the average weighting, in your opinion.
7. How is evaluation of teaching different (or not) for annual review, or for promotion?
8. How do you define effective and/or excellent teaching? Do you have set standards, or do you make a relative comparison?
9. What additional supports would be useful to you to better evaluate teaching?

Appendix D: Sample USRI Case Studies

Study Title: **Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Alberta**

Please look at the USRI information provided for two different instructors teaching the same course. How would you describe the instructors' teaching to FEC? OR In terms of evaluating teaching, what is your interpretation of this data for each instructor?

Instructor A

Question	Reference Data				
	Median	Tukey Fence	25%	50%	75%
The goals and objectives of the course were clear	3.4	2.7	3.9	4.3	4.7
In-class time was used effectively.	3.6	2.5	3.8	4.3	4.7
I am motivated to learn more about these subject areas.	3.5	2.9	4.1	4.5	4.8
I increased my knowledge of the subject areas in this course.	4.4	3.0	4.1	4.6	4.8
Overall, the quality of the course content was excellent.	3.8	2.4	3.8	4.3	4.8
The instructor spoke clearly.	4.5	3.8	4.5	4.8	4.9
The instructor was well prepared.	4.6	3.4	4.3	4.8	4.9
The instructor treated the students with respect.	4.0	4.2	4.7	4.9	5.0
The instructor provided constructive feedback throughout this course.	4.5	2.8	4.0	4.5	4.8
Overall, this instructor was excellent.	4.0	3.2	4.2	4.7	4.9

Instructor B

Question	Reference Data				
	Median	Tukey Fence	25%	50%	75%
The goals and objectives of the course were clear	4.0	2.7	3.9	4.3	4.7
In-class time was used effectively.	4.2	2.5	3.8	4.3	4.7
I am motivated to learn more about these subject areas.	3.7	2.9	4.1	4.5	4.8
I increased my knowledge of the subject areas in this course.	4.1	3.0	4.1	4.6	4.8
Overall, the quality of the course content was excellent.	4.2	2.4	3.8	4.3	4.8
The instructor spoke clearly.	4.7	3.8	4.5	4.8	4.9
The instructor was well prepared.	4.4	3.4	4.3	4.8	4.9
The instructor treated the students with respect.	4.8	4.2	4.7	4.9	5.0
The instructor provided constructive feedback throughout this course.	4.0	2.8	4.0	4.5	4.8
Overall, this instructor was excellent.	4.5	3.2	4.2	4.7	4.9

Appendix E: Summary of Positions and Recommendations Related to USRIs in University of Alberta Policy, Documents, and Reports

	2009 CLE report	2013 CLE report	2013 Renaissance Committee report	2012 Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta (AASUA) Position Statement on USRIs	2002 Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) Report from the Sub-committee on Evaluation of Alternate Delivery Courses	GFC Policy Section 111.2
Student input should be sought in teaching evaluation using USRIs or similar instruments	X		X			
Purpose of USRI must be clarified	X	X				
Open-ended comments should be included		X				
Open-ended comments should not be included			X			
Open-ended comments: student identities should not be included in reports to instructors but kept on record (for the protection of instructors and students)			X	X		
Use and administration of USRI must be considered in broader context (not just focused on teaching)	X	X				
USRI is outdated, lacks validation, and needs redevelopment	X	X	X			

(Table continued on next page)

(Table, continued)

	2009 CLE report	2013 CLE report	2013 Renaissance Committee report	2012 Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta (AASUA) Position Statement on USRIs	2002 Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) Report from the Sub-committee on Evaluation of Alternate Delivery Courses	GFC Policy Section 111.2
<i>Required</i> USRI items need to be modified to apply to multiple teaching contexts; additional (optional) question variants should be developed that apply to diverse teaching contexts (e.g. labs, clinical, blended)					X	
A professionally developed instrument should be created to ensure validity and reliability	X	X	X			
A moratorium on USRI use should be implemented until redevelopment occurs; deadline end of 2015 Fall term			X			
USRIs should be used as part of a broader teaching evaluation, not the sole measure of teaching performance	X		X	X		X
Concern that “the instructor was excellent” is the only USRI item used in FEC assessments		X	X			

(Table continued on next page)

(Table, continued)

	2009 CLE report	2013 CLE report	2013 Renaissance Committee report	2012 Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta (AASUA) Position Statement on USRIs	2002 Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) Report from the Sub-committee on Evaluation of Alternate Delivery Courses	GFC Policy Section 111.2
There are aspects of teaching that students cannot evaluate	X			X		

(End of table)

Appendix F: Summary of Positions and Recommendations Related to Multifaceted Evaluation in University of Alberta Policy, Documents, and Reports

	2009 CLE report	2013 CLE report	2013 Renaissance Committee report	2012 Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta (AASUA) Position Statement on USRIs	2002 Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) Report from the Sub-committee on Evaluation of Alternate Delivery Courses	GFC Policy Section 111.2
Teaching evaluation should be multifaceted	X	X	X	X		X
Chairs, Deans, Supervisors and Faculty may struggle with implementing multifaceted evaluation and require support	X	X				
A multifaceted teaching evaluation guide should be developed, including definitions, strategies, and examples	X	X	X			
FEC decisions regarding promotion and tenure must be based on multiple indicators of teaching; this may not have been consistently applied in the past	X		X	X		X
Peer review should be a part of evaluation for tenure and promotion			X			

(Table continued on next page)

(Table, continued)

	2009 CLE report	2013 CLE report	2013 Renaissance Committee report	2012 Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta (AASUA) Position Statement on USRIs	2002 Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) Report from the Sub-committee on Evaluation of Alternate Delivery Courses	GFC Policy Section 111.2
Evaluation of teaching should include broader teaching duties, such as graduate student supervision and mentoring, course design, curriculum development, etc.			X			
Opportunities for teacher training and support are needed			X	X		

(End of table)

Appendix G: References for Reviewed Literature

These are the references used to review the literature only. Other references consulted for preparation of the report (such as University of Alberta reports and documents) are included at the end of the report.

- Al-Eidan, F., Baig, L. A., Magzoub, M., & Omair, A. (2016). Reliability and validity of the faculty evaluation instrument used at King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences: Results from the haematology course. *The Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association*, 66(4), 453-457. http://www.jpma.org.pk/full_article_text.php?article_id=7711
- Backer, E. (2012). Burnt at the student evaluation stake – the penalty for failing students. *E-Journal of Business Education & Scholarship of Teaching*, 6(1), 1-13. Retrieved from http://www.ejbest.org/upload/eJBEST_Backer_2012_1.pdf
- Bedggood, R. E., & Donovan, J. D. (2012). University performance evaluations: What are we really measuring? *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(7), 825-842. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.549221>
- Berk, R. A. (2013). Top five flashpoints in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. *Medical Teacher*, 35(1), 15-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.732247>
- Blackhart, G. C., Peruche, B. M., DeWall, C. N., & Joiner, T. E., Jr. (2006). Faculty forum: Factors influencing teaching evaluations in higher education. *Teaching of Psychology*, 33(1), 37-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top3301_9
- Blair, E., & Valdez Noel, K. (2014). Improving higher education practice through student evaluation systems: is the student voice being heard? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(7), 879-894. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.875984>
- Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. B. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research*, 2016(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AETBZC.v1>
- Boysen, G.A. (2015). Uses and misuses of student evaluations of teaching: The interpretation of differences in teaching evaluation means irrespective of statistical information. *Teaching of Psychology*, 42(2), 109-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0098628315569922>
- Boysen, G. A., Kelly, T. J., Raesly, H. N., & Casner, R. W. (2014). The (mis)interpretation of teaching evaluations by college faculty and administrators. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(6), 641-656. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080.02602938.2013.860950>
- Brown, G. D. A., Wood, A. M., Ogden, R. S., & Maltby, J. (2014). Do student evaluations of university reflect inaccurate beliefs or actual experience? A relative rank model. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 28, 14-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1827>
- Campbell, J. P., & Bozeman, W. C. (2008). The value of student ratings: Perceptions of students, teachers, and administrators. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 32, 13-24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10668920600864137>
- Centra, J.A. (2003). Will teachers receive higher student evaluations by giving higher grades and less course work? *Research in Higher Education*, 44(5), 495-518. <http://www.jstor.org/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/stable/40197319>
- Centra, J. A., & Gaubatz, N. B. (2000). Is there gender bias in student evaluations of teaching?

- The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 17-44.
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.10.2307.2649280&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Chen, Y., & Hoshower, L. B. (2003). Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness: an assessment of student perception and motivation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(1), 71-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0260293032000033071>
- Cheng, D. A. (2015). Effects of professorial tenure on undergraduate ratings of teaching performance. *Education Economics*, 23(3), 338-357.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2013.826632>
- Cho, D., Baek, W., & Cho, J. (2015). Why do good performing students highly rate their instructors? Evidence from a natural experiment. *Economics of Education Review*, 49, 172-179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.10.001>
- Cho, J., & Otani, K. (2014). Differences in student evaluations of limited-term lecturers and full-time faculty. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(2), 5-24.
http://opus.ipfw.edu/profstudies_facpubs/64
- Chonko, L. B., Tanner, J. F., & Davis, R. (2002). What are they thinking? Students' expectations and self-assessments. *Journal of Education for Business*, 77(5), 271-281. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=7214031&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Clayson, D. E. (2013). Initial impressions and the student evaluation of teaching. *Journal of Education for Business*, 88(1), 26-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2011.633580>
- Cohen, E. H. (2005). Student evaluations of course and teacher: factor analysis and SSA approaches. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(2), 123-136.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0260293042000264235>
- Cohen, P. A. (1981). Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multisection validity studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(3), 281-309.
- Cox, C.D., Peeters, M. J., Stanford, B. L., & Seifert, C. F. (2013). Pilot of peer assessment within experiential teaching and learning. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 5(4), 311-320. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2013.02.003>
- Curwood, J.S., Tomitsch, M., Thomson, K., & Hendry, G.D. (2015). Professional learning in higher education: Understanding how academics interpret student feedback and access resources to improve their teaching. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 31(5). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14742/ajet.2516>
- d'Apollonia, S., & Abrami, P. C. (1997). Navigating student ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1198-1208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1198>
- Dolmans, D. M., Janssen-Noordman, A., & Wolffhagen, H. P. (2006). Can students differentiate between PBL tutors with different tutoring deficiencies? *Medical Teacher*, 28(6), 156-161. doi: 10.1080/01421590600776545
- Dodeen, H. (2013). Validity, reliability, and potential bias of short forms of students' evaluation of teaching: The case of UAE University. *Educational Assessment*, 18(4), 235-250.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2013.846670>
- Felton, J., Mitchell, J., & Stinson, M. (2004). Web-based student evaluations of professors: the

- relations between perceived quality, easiness and sexiness. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(1), 91-108. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0260293032000158180>
- Fraile, R., & Bosch-Morell, F. (2015). Considering teaching history and calculating confidence intervals in student evaluations of teaching quality: An approach based on Bayesian inference. *Higher Education*, 70(1), 55-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9823-0>
- Gehrt, K., Louie, T. A., & Osland, A. (2015). Student and professor similarity: Exploring the effects of gender and relative age. *Journal of Education for Business*, 90, 1-9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2014.968514>
- Ginns, P., Prosser, M., & Barrie, S. (2007). Students' perceptions of teaching quality in higher education: the perspective of currently enrolled students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(5), 603-615. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070701573773>
- Grammatikopoulos, V., Linardakis, M., Gregoriadis, A., & Oikonomidis, V. (2015). Assessing the students' evaluations of educational quality (SEEQ) questionnaire in Greek higher education. *Higher Education*, 70(3), 395-408. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9837-7>
- Grayson, J. P. (2015). Repeated low teaching evaluations: A form of habitual behavior? *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 45(4), 298-321. <http://journals.sfu.ca/cjhe/index.php/cjhe/article/view/184404>
- Greenwald, A. G. (1997). Validity concerns and usefulness of student ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1182-1186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1182>
- Greenwald, A. G., Gillmore, G. M. (1997). Grade leniency is a removable contaminant of student ratings. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1209-1217. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1209>
- Greimel-Fuhrmann, B. (2014). Student's perception of teaching behaviour and its effect on evaluation. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education*, 5(1), 1557-1563. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20533/ijcdse.2042.6364.2014.0218>
- Gump, S.E. (2007). Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness and the leniency hypothesis: A literature review. *Education Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 55-68. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/?id=EJ787711>
- Huebner, L., & Magel, R. C. (2015). A gendered study of student ratings of instruction. *Open Journal of Statistics*, 5, 552-567. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojs.2015.56058>
- Hughes II, K. E., & Pate, G. R. (2013). Moving beyond student ratings: A balanced scorecard approach for evaluating teaching performance. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 28(1), 49-75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2308/iace-50302>
- Iqbal, I. (2013). Academics' resistance to summative peer review of teaching: questionable rewards and the importance of student evaluations. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(5), 557-569. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.764863>
- Jackson, M. J., & Jackson, W. T. (2015). The misuse of student evaluations of teaching: Implications, suggestions and alternatives. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 19(3), 165-173. <http://www.alliedacademies.org/academy-of-educational-leadership-journal/>
- Jones, J., Gaffney-Rhys, R., & Jones, E. (2014). Handle with care! An exploration of the

- potential risks associated with the publication and summative usage of student evaluation of teaching (SET) results. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 38(1), 37-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2012.699514>
- Keeley, J. W., English, T., Irons, J., & Henslee, A. M. (2013). Investigating halo and ceiling effects in student evaluations of instruction. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 73(3), 440-457. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164412475300>
- Khong, T. L. (2014). The validity and reliability of the student evaluation of teaching: A case in a private higher educational institution in Malaysia. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 2(9), 57-63. <http://www.ijer.net/index.php/ijer/article/view/317>
- Kim, L. E., MacCann, C. (2016). What is students' ideal university instructor personality? An investigation of absolute and relative personality preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 102, 190-203. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.068>
- Kuwaiti, A. A., AlQuraan, M., & Subbarayalu, A. V. (2016). Understanding the effect of response rate and class size interaction on students evaluation of teaching in a higher education. *Educational Assessment & Evaluation*, 3, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1204082>
- Lama, T., Arias, P., Mendoza, K. & Manahan, J. (2015). Student evaluation of teaching surveys: do students provide accurate and reliable information? *e-Journal of Social & Behavioural Research in Business*, 6(1), 30-39. <http://www.ejsbrb.org/a.php?/content/issue/10>
- Laube, H., Massoni, K., Sprague, J., & Ferber, A. L. (2007). The impact of gender on the evaluation of teaching: What we know and what we can do. *NWSA Journal*, 19(3), 87-104. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40071230>
- Lyde, A.R., Grieshaber, D.C., Byrns, G. (2016). Faculty teaching performance: Perceptions of a multi-source method for evaluation (MME). *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 16(3), 82-94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v16i3.18145>
- Macfadyen, L. P., Dawson, S., Prest, S., & Gasevic, D. (2016). Whose feedback? A multilevel analysis of student completion of end-of-term teaching evaluations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(6), 821-839. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1044421>
- MacNeill, 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4>
- Makondo, L., & Ndebele, C. (2014). University lecturers' views on student-lecturer evaluations. *Anthropologist*, 17(2), 377-386. <http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/T-Anth/Anth-17-0-000-14-Web/Anth-17-0-000-14-Contents/Anth-17-0-000-14-Contents.htm>
- Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective: The critical issues of validity, bias, and utility. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1187-1197. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1187>
- Martin, L. R., Dennehy, R., & Morgan, S. (2013). Unreliability in student evaluation of teaching questionnaires: Focus groups as an alternative approach. *Organization Management Journal*, 10(1), 66-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15416518.2013.781401>

- Maurer, T. W. (2006). Cognitive dissonance or revenge? Student grades and course evaluations. *Teaching of Psychology*, 33(3), 176-179.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top3303_4
- McKeachie, W. J. (1997). Student ratings: The validity of use. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1218-1225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1218>
- Merritt, D. J. (2012). Bias, the brain, and student evaluations of teaching. *St. John's Law Review*, 82(1), Article 6, 235-288.
<http://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/lawreview/vol82/iss1/6>
- Miles, P., & House, D. (2015). The tail wagging the dog: An overdue examination of student teaching evaluations. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(2).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v4n2p116>
- Mitry, D. J., & Smith, D. E. (2014). Student evaluations of faculty members: A call for analytical prudence. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(2), 56-67.
<http://celt.miamioh.edu/ject/issue.php?v=25&n=2>
- Morley, D. D. (2012). Claims about the reliability of student evaluations of instruction: The ecological fallacy rides again. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 38(1), 15-20.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2012.01.001>
- Nargundkar, S., & Shrikhande, M. (2012). An empirical investigation of student evaluations of instruction: The relative importance of factors. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 10(1), 117-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4609.2011.00328.x>
- Nargundkar, S., & Shrikhande, M. (2014). Norming of student evaluations of instruction: Impact of noninstructional factors. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 12(1), 55-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/dsji.12023>
- Otani, K., Kim, J., & Cho, J. (2012). Student evaluation of teaching (SET) in higher education: How to use SET more effectively and efficiently in public affairs education. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 18(3), 531-544.
http://www.naspaa.org/JPAEMessenger/index_2012summer.asp
- Palmer, S. (2012). Student evaluation of teaching: keeping in touch with reality. *Quality in Higher Education*, 18(3), 297-311. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2012.730336>
- Pepe, J.W., & Wang, M.C. (2012). What instructor qualities do students reward? *College Student Journal*, 46(3), 603-614. http://www.projectinnovation.biz/csj_2006.html
- Pounder, J. S. (2007). Is student evaluation of teaching worthwhile? An analytical framework for answering the question. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 15(2), 178-191.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684880710748938>
- Rantanen, P. (2013). The number of feedbacks needed for reliable evaluation. A multilevel analysis of the reliability, stability and generalizability of students' evaluation of teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(2), 224-239.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.625471>
- Reardon, R. C., Leierer, S. J., & Lee, D. (2014). Class meeting schedules in relation to students' grades and evaluations of teaching. *The Professional Counselor*, 2(1), 81-89.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.15241/rcr.2.1.81>
- Reisenwitz, T.H. (2015). Student evaluation of teaching: An investigation of nonresponse bias in an online context. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 38(1), 7-17.

- <https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475315596778>
- Ridley, D., & Collins, J. (2015). A suggested evaluation metric instrument for faculty members at colleges and universities. *International Journal of Education Research*, 10(1), 97-114. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=9ff24389-d34d-43d1-83fc-6ef82bd1ad47%40sessionmgr4009&vid=2&hid=4102>
- Royal, K. D., & Stockdale, M. R. (2015). Are teacher course evaluations biased against faculty that teach quantitative methods courses? *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(1), 217-224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v4n1p217>
- Smith, S. W., Yoo, J. H., Farr, A. C., Salmon, C. T., & Miller, V. D. (2007). The influence of student sex and instructor sex on student ratings of instructors: Results from a college of communication. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 30(1), 64-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2007.10162505>
- Socha, A. (2013). A hierarchical approach to students' assessment of instruction. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(1), 94-113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.604713>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0034654313496870>
- Stein, S. J., Spiller, D., Terry, S., Harris, T., Deaker, L., & Kennedy, J. (2013). Tertiary teachers and student evaluations: never the twain shall meet? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(7), 892-904. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.767876>
- Stonebraker, R. J., & Stone, G. S. (2015). Too old to teach? The effect of age on college and university professors. *Research in Higher Education*, 56(8), 793-812. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-015-9374-y>
- Stupans, I., McGuren, T., & Babey, A. M. (2016). Student evaluation of teaching: A study exploring student rating instrument free-form text comments. *Innovative Higher Education*, 41(1), 33-52. <http://10.1007/s10755-015-9328-5>
- Uijtdehaage, S., & O'Neal, C. (2015). A curious case of the phantom professor: mindless teaching evaluations by medical students. *Medical Education*, 49(9), 928-932. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/medu.12805>
- Uttl, B., White, C. A., Gonzalez, D. W. (2016). Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, (in press, available online September 19, 2106). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.08.007>
- Wilson, J. H., Beyer, D., & Monteiro, H. (2014). Professor age affects student ratings: Halo effect for younger teachers. *College Teaching*, 62, 20-24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2013.825574>
- Wright, S. L., & Jenkins-Guarieri, M. A. (2012). Student evaluations of teaching: combining the meta-analyses and demonstrating further evidence for effective use. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(6), 683-699. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.563279>
- Zimmerman, B. (2008). Course evaluations - students' revenge? *University Affairs*. Retrieved

from

<http://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/course-evaluations-students-revenge/>

Zumbach, J., & Funke, J. (2014). Influences of mood on academic course evaluations. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 19*(4).

<http://pareonline.net/genpare.asp?wh=0&abt=19>

Appendix H: Abstracts for Reviewed Literature

Click on the links to move directly to each bookmarked section. For brief summarizing points of each article, see Appendix A

Biases

- [Gender](#)
- [Instructor characteristics](#)
- [Correlation between grades and ratings](#)
- [Nonresponse](#)
- [Non-instructional](#)
- [Other](#)

[Validity](#)

[Impact on Teaching Quality](#)

[Evaluating Faculty for Tenure and Promotion](#)

[Multifaceted Evaluation](#)

Biases, Gender

Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark (2016): ratings are biased against female instructors by an amount that is large and statistically significant

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. B. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research*, 2016(1).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AETBZC.v1>

[Abstract, abridged] We show: SET are biased against female instructors by an amount that is large and statistically significant; The bias affects how students rate even putatively objective aspects of teaching, such as how promptly assignments are graded; The bias varies by discipline and by student gender, among other things; It is not possible to adjust for the bias, because it depends on so many factors; SET are more sensitive to students' gender bias and grade expectations than they are to teaching effectiveness; Gender biases can be large enough to cause more effective instructors to get lower SET than less effective instructors.

Centra & Gaubatz (2000): only small same-gender preferences found, particularly with females

Centra, J. A., Gaubatz, N. B. (2000). Is there gender bias in student evaluations of teaching? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 17-44.

<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.10.2307.2649280&site=eds-live&scope=site>

[Abstract] In an attempt to determine whether male and female students rate teachers

differently depending on the gender of the teacher, we analyzed data from 741 classes in which there were at least 10 male and 10 female students. The results revealed small same gender preferences, particularly in female students rating female teachers. Teaching style rather than gender may well explain these preferences.

Gehrt, Louie, & Osland (2015): female students evaluated female lower-ranked faculty most favorably; male students evaluations were more favorable for lower ranked male faculty, but they did not degrade higher ranked female faculty

Gehrt, K., Louie, T. A., & Osland, A. (2015). Student and professor similarity: Exploring the effects of gender and relative age. *Journal of Education for Business*, 90, 1-9.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2014.968514>

[Abstract, abridged] It was hypothesized that students would more favorably evaluate faculty who were similar in gender and in relative age (as reflected in faculty rank). As anticipated, female students evaluated female lower ranked faculty most favorably, and male higher ranked faculty least favorably. However, male students showed mixed effects. Although their evaluations were more favorable for lower ranked male faculty, they unexpectedly did not degrade higher ranked female faculty.

Huebner & Magel (2015): variances of the class average responses between male and female faculty were higher for male faculty

Huebner, L., & Magel, R. C. (2015). A gendered study of student ratings of instruction. *Open Journal of Statistics*, 5, 552-567. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojs.2015.56058>

[Abstract, abridged] This research tests for differences in mean class averages between male and female faculty for questions on a student rating of instruction form at one university in the Midwest. Differences in variances of class averages are also examined for male and female faculty. Tests are conducted by first considering all classes across the entire university and then classes just within the College of Science and Mathematics. The proportion of classes taught by female instructors in which the average male student rating was higher than the average female student rating was compared to the proportion of classes taught by male instructors in which the average male student rating was higher than the average female student rating.

Laube, Massoni, Sprague, & Ferber (2007): the inconsistency on the question of whether student evaluations are gendered is itself an artifact of the way that quantitative measures can mask underlying gender bias

Laube, H., Massoni, K., Sprague, J., & Ferber, A. L. (2007). The impact of gender on the evaluation of teaching: What we know and what we can do. *NWSA Journal*, 19(3), 87-104. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40071230>

[Abstract, abridged] Scholars who have attempted to determine whether/how gender enters into students' evaluations of their teachers generally fall into two camps: those who find gender to have no (or very little) influence on evaluations, and those who find gender to affect evaluations significantly. Drawing on insights developed from sociological scholarship on gender and evaluation, we argue that the apparent inconsistency on the question of whether student evaluations are gendered is itself an artifact of the way that quantitative measures can mask underlying gender bias.

MacNeill, Driscoll, & Hunt (2015): students rate males significantly higher than females

MacNeill, 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.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4>

[Abstract, abridged] Although instructor gender has been shown to play an important role in influencing student ratings, the extent and nature of that role remains contested. While difficult to separate gender from teaching practices in person, it is possible to disguise an instructor's gender identity online. In our experiment, assistant instructors in an online class each operated under two different gender identities. Students rated the male identity significantly higher than the female identity, regardless of the instructor's actual gender, demonstrating gender bias.

Miles & House (2015): lower ratings for female instructors teaching larger required classes

Miles, P., & House, D. (2015). The tail wagging the dog: An overdue examination of student teaching evaluations. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(2).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v4n2p116>

[Abstract, abridged] Purpose: The purpose of this research is to examine the impact of several factors beyond the professor's control and their unique impact on Student Teaching Evaluations (STEs). The present research pulls together a substantial amount of data to statistically analyze several academic historical legends about just how vulnerable STEs are to the effects of: class size, course type, professor gender, and course grades.

Design/methodology/approach: This research utilizes over 30,000 individual student evaluations of 255 professors, spanning six semesters, during a three year time period to test six hypotheses. The final sample represents 1057 classes ranging in size between 10 and 190 students. Each hypothesis is statistically analyzed, with either analysis of variance or a Regression model. Findings: This study finds support for 5 out of 6 hypotheses. Specifically, these data suggest STEs are likely to be closest to "5" (using a 1-5 scale with 5 being highest) in small elective classes, and lowest in large required classes taught by females. As well we find support for the notion that higher expected course grades may lead to higher STEs.

Smith, Yoo, Farr, Salmon, & Miller (2007): male and female students rated female instructors more highly; effect was small but significant due to sample size

Smith, S. W., Yoo, J. H., Farr, A. C., Salmon, C. T., & Miller, V. D. (2007). The influence of student sex and instructor sex on student ratings of instructors: Results from a college of communication. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 30(1), 64-77.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2007.10162505>

[Abstract, abridged] We posed research questions as to whether male and female students would rate male or female instructors more highly on five dimensions of student rating forms, one of which was instructor interaction. Results indicated that male and female students rated female instructors more highly on all five dimensions. The effect sizes of these results were extremely small, but significant due to the large sample size (almost 12,000). These findings suggest that administrators should not assume one sex to provide better or poorer instruction, and they should reward instructors on the basis of individual course performance rather than according to instructor sex.

Wilson, Beyer, & Monteiro (2014): lower ratings for older instructors, but more so for females than males

Wilson, J. H., Beyer, D., & Monteiro, H. (2014). Professor age affects student ratings: Halo effect for younger teachers. *College Teaching*, 62, 20-24.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2013.825574>

[Abstract, abridged] In the present study, we examined the potential effects of professor age and gender on student perceptions of the teacher as well as their anticipated rapport in the classroom. We also asked students to rate each instructor's attractiveness based on societal beliefs about age and beauty. We expected students to rate a picture of a middle-aged female professor more negatively (and less attractive) than the younger version of the same woman. For the young versus old man offered in a photograph, we expected no age effects. Although age served as a detriment for both genders, evaluations suffered more based on aging for female than male professors.

Wright & Jenkins-Guarieri (2012): SETs appear to be valid and free from gender bias

Wright, S. L., & Jenkins-Guarieri, M. A. (2012). Student evaluations of teaching: combining the meta-analyses and demonstrating further evidence for effective use. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(6), 683-699.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.563279>

[Abstract, abridged] Given that there is not one study summarising all these domains of research, a comprehensive overview of SETs was conducted by combining all prior meta-analyses related to SETs. Eleven meta-analyses were identified, and nine meta-analyses covering 193 studies were included in the analysis, which yielded a

small-to-medium overall weighted mean effect size ($r = .26$) between SETs and the variables studied. Findings suggest that SETs appear to be valid, have practical use that is largely free from gender bias and are most effective when implemented with consultation strategies.

Biases, Instructor Characteristics

Cheng (2015): tenure does not have a significant impact on student ratings of teaching performance

Cheng, D. A. (2015). Effects of professorial tenure on undergraduate ratings of teaching performance. *Education Economics*, 23(3), 338-357.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2013.826632>

[Abstract, abridged] This study estimates the effect of professorial tenure on undergraduate ratings of learning, instructor quality, and course quality at the University of California, San Diego from Summer 2004 to Spring 2012. During this eight-year period, 120 assistant professors received tenure and 83 associate professors attained full rank. A differences-in-differences model controlling for teaching experience, study hours, response rate, and unobserved heterogeneity among terms, courses, and professors suggests that for a given professor, tenure does not have a significant impact on student ratings of teaching performance, at least in the immediate years after advancement. The results are similar for the promotion from associate to full professor.

Cho & Otani (2014): students give higher ratings for limited-term lecturers versus full-time faculty

Cho, J., & Otani, K. (2014). Differences in student evaluations of limited-term lecturers and full-time faculty. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(2), 5-24.
http://opus.ipfw.edu/profstudies_facpubs/64

[Abstract, abridged] This study compared student evaluations of teaching (SET) for limited-term lecturers (LTLs) and full-time faculty (FTF) using a Likert-scaled survey administered to students ($N = 1,410$) at the end of university courses. Data were analyzed using a general linear regression model to investigate the influence of multi-dimensional evaluation items on the overall rating item (Overall, I would rate the instructor of this course as outstanding) on the SET. Results showed that students provided higher ratings for LTLs than FTF, but they value different items when rating the overall evaluation of LTLs and FTF. Some survey items (for instance, those about instructor planning and enthusiasm) influence more on the rating of the overall item for LTLs than for FTF, whereas other, multi-dimensional items (for instance, those about assessment strategies and instructor's availability) influence more on the overall rating for FTF than for LTLs.

Clayson (2013): students' first perceptions of an instructor's personality are significantly related to ratings at the end of the semester

Clayson, D. E. (2013). Initial impressions and the student evaluation of teaching. *Journal of Education for Business*, 88(1), 26-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2011.633580>

[Abstract, abridged] The author looked at the initial student perceptions and conditions of a class and compared these with conditions and evaluations 16 weeks later at the end of the term. It was found that the first perceptions of the instructor and the instructor's personality were significantly related to the evaluations made at the end of the semester.

Felton, Mitchell, & Stinson (2004): students give attractively-rated professors higher quality and easiness scores

Felton, J., Mitchell, J., & Stinson, M. (2004). Web-based student evaluations of professors: the relations between perceived quality, easiness and sexiness. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(1), 91-108. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0260293032000158180>

[Abstract, abridged] College students critique their professors' teaching at RateMyProfessors.com, a web page where students anonymously rate their professors on Quality, Easiness, and Sexiness. Using the self-selected data from this public forum, we examine the relations between quality, easiness, and sexiness for 3190 professors at 25 universities. For faculty with at least ten student posts, the correlation between quality and easiness is 0.61, and the correlation between quality and sexiness is 0.30. Using simple linear regression, we find that about half of the variation in quality is a function of easiness and sexiness. When grouped into sexy and non-sexy professors, the data reveal that students give sexy-rated professors higher quality and easiness scores.

Kim & MacCann (2016): students' expressed educational satisfaction was related to perceptions of instructor personality

Kim, L. E., MacCann, C. (2016). What is students' ideal university instructor personality? An investigation of absolute and relative personality preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 102, 190-203. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.068>

[Abstract, abridged] The current two studies investigate students' descriptions of "ideal" instructor personality using the Five-Factor Model of personality. Both absolute personality preferences (certain traits are universally desired) and relative personality preferences (certain traits are desired relative to students' own level of the trait) are examined among 137 first year mathematics students (Study 1) and 378 first year psychology students (Study 2). Students provided Big Five personality ratings for themselves, their actual instructor, and their ideal instructor. Supporting the absolute preference hypothesis, students rated their ideal instructor as having significantly higher levels than both themselves and the general population on all five personality domains (except for openness in Study 1), with particularly large effect sizes for emotional stability and conscientiousness. Supporting the relative preference hypothesis, students also rated their ideal instructor as having a similar Big Five profile to themselves. Moreover, if their actual instructor's personality was similar to their ideal instructor's personality, students showed greater educational satisfaction (but not higher performance self-efficacy nor academic achievement).

Stonebraker & Stone (2015): age has a negative impact on student ratings of faculty members; begins around mid-forties; offset by attractiveness

Stonebraker, R. J., & Stone, G. S. (2015). Too old to teach? The effect of age on college and university professors. *Research in Higher Education*, 56(8), 793-812.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-015-9374-y>

[Abstract, abridged] Using data from the RateMyProfessors.com website for a large sample of instructors in a broad cross-section of colleges and universities, we find that age does affect teaching effectiveness, at least as perceived by students. Age has a negative impact on student ratings of faculty members that is robust across genders, groups of academic disciplines and types of institutions. However, the effect does not begin until faculty members reach their mid-forties and does not seem to increase even when they reach the former retirement ages of 65 or 70. Moreover, the quantitative impact of age on student ratings is small and can be offset by other factors, especially the physical appearance of professors and how easy students consider them to be. When we restrict our sample to those professors deemed hot by student raters, the effect of age disappears completely.

Wilson, Beyer, & Monteiro (2014): lower ratings for older instructors, but more so for females than males

Wilson, J. H., Beyer, D., & Monteiro, H. (2014). Professor age affects student ratings: Halo effect for younger teachers. *College Teaching*, 62, 20-24.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2013.825574>

[Abstract, abridged] In the present study, we examined the potential effects of professor age and gender on student perceptions of the teacher as well as their anticipated rapport in the classroom. We also asked students to rate each instructor's attractiveness based on societal beliefs about age and beauty. We expected students to rate a picture of a middle-aged female professor more negatively (and less attractive) than the younger version of the same woman. For the young versus old man offered in a photograph, we expected no age effects. Although age served as a detriment for both genders, evaluations suffered more based on aging for female than male professors.

Biases, Correlation Between Grades and Ratings

Backer (2012): some students punish academics for failing grades with low ratings

Backer, E. (2012). Burnt at the student evaluation stake – the penalty for failing students. *E-Journal of Business Education & Scholarship of Teaching*, 6(1), 1-13. Retrieved from

http://www.ejbest.org/upload/eJBEST_Backer_2012_1.pdf

[Abstract, abridged] Despite the wealth of research in the area of SETs, little has been done

to examine student and academic perceptions of SETs. This research examined student (n=235) and academic (n=49) perceptions concerning SETs at one Australian regional university. Almost one-third of respondents felt that some students punish academics for failing their work by giving the lecturer low scores on the SET form. Thus, academics can essentially be burnt at the student evaluation stake as punishment for failing students.

Blackhart, Peruche, DeWall, & Joiner (2006): higher ratings given to instructors who give higher grades, and also to graduate teaching assistant rank

Blackhart, G. C., Peruche, B. M., DeWall, C. N., & Joiner, T. E., Jr. (2006). Faculty forum: Factors influencing teaching evaluations in higher education. *Teaching of Psychology*, 33(1), 37-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top3301_9

[Abstract, abridged] Past research indicates several factors influencing teaching evaluation ratings instructors receive. We analyzed teaching evaluations from psychology courses during fall and spring semesters of 2003–2004 to determine if class size, class level, instructor gender, number of publications (faculty instructors), average grade given by the instructor, and instructor rank predicted teaching evaluation ratings. Entering predictor variables into a multiple regression analysis concurrently, results indicated that only average grade given and instructor rank significantly predicted instructor ratings. Specifically, higher average grades given by the instructor predicted higher ratings, and graduate teaching assistants received higher overall ratings than faculty instructors.

Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark (2016): ratings are more sensitive to students' grade expectations than they are to teaching effectiveness

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. B. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research*, 2016(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AETBZC.v1>

[Abstract, abridged] We show: SET are biased against female instructors by an amount that is large and statistically significant; The bias affects how students rate even putatively objective aspects of teaching, such as how promptly assignments are graded; The bias varies by discipline and by student gender, among other things; It is not possible to adjust for the bias, because it depends on so many factors; SET are more sensitive to students' gender bias and grade expectations than they are to teaching effectiveness; Gender biases can be large enough to cause more effective instructors to get lower SET than less effective instructors.

Centra (2003): expected grades generally do not affect student evaluations

Centra, J.A. (2003). Will teachers receive higher student evaluations by giving higher grades and less course work? *Research in Higher Education*, 44(5), 495-518. <http://www.jstor.org/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/stable/40197319>

[Abstract, abridged] This study investigated whether mean expected grades and the level of difficult/workload in courses, as reported by students, unduly influence student ratings

instruction. Over 50,000 college courses were analyzed. After controlling for learning outcomes, expected grades generally did not affect student evaluations. In fact, contrary to what some faculty think, courses in natural sciences with expected grades of A were rated lower, not higher. Courses were rated lower when they were rated as either difficult or too elementary. Courses rated at the “just right” level received the highest evaluations.

Cho, Baek, & Cho (2015): students with better grades than their expected grades provide a psychological “gift” to their teachers by giving higher ratings

Cho, D., Baek, W., & Cho, J. (2015). Why do good performing students highly rate their instructors? Evidence from a natural experiment. *Economics of Education Review*, 49, 172-179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.10.001>

[Abstract, abridged] This article analyzes the behavior of students in a college classroom with regard to their evaluation of teacher performance. As some students are randomly able to see their grades prior to the evaluation, the “natural” experiment provides a unique opportunity for testing the hypothesis as to whether there exists a possibility of a hedonic (implicit) exchange between the students’ grades and teaching evaluations. Students with good grades tend to highly rate the teaching quality of their instructors, in comparison with those who receive relatively poor grades. This study finds that students with better grades than their expected grades provide a psychological “gift” to their teachers by giving a higher teacher evaluation, whereas it is the opposite with those students receiving lower grades than their expectation.

Greenwald & Gillmore (1997): the grades-ratings correlation is due to an unwanted influence of instructors' grading leniency; there are 5 theories of the grades-ratings correlation

Greenwald, A. G., Gillmore, G. M. (1997). Grade leniency is a removable contaminant of student ratings. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1209-1217. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1209>

[Abstract] It is well established that students' evaluative ratings of instruction correlate positively with expected course grades. The authors identify 4 additional data patterns that, collectively, discriminate among 5 theories of the grades-ratings correlation. The presence of all 4 of these markers in student ratings data (obtained at University of Washington) was most consistent with the theory that the grades-ratings correlation is due to an unwanted influence of instructors' grading leniency on ratings. This conclusion justifies use of a statistical correction – illustrated here with actual ratings data – to remove the unwanted inflation of ratings produced by lenient grading. Additional research can profitably seek other inappropriate influences on ratings to identify more opportunities for validity-enhancing adjustments.

Gump (2007): questions the validity of research done on the leniency hypothesis

Gump, S.E. (2007). Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness and the leniency hypothesis: A literature review. *Education Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 55-68. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/?id=EJ787711>

[Abstract, abridged] This review presents an overview of selected articles on the leniency hypothesis: the idea that students give higher evaluations to instructors who grade more leniently. In this diverse literature, research methods and aims have frequently affected the outcomes and conclusions, since SETs are typically context-specific instruments whose results, in isolated instances, do not generalize well. Thus this review questions the very generalizability of the massive and often contradictory SET-related literature on the leniency hypothesis and argues that future research must be designed and carried out in light of the implicit problems existing in the majority of earlier studies.

Maurer (2006): cognitive dissonance may be a theory to explain the grades-ratings correlation

Maurer, T. W. (2006). Cognitive dissonance or revenge? Student grades and course evaluations. *Teaching of Psychology*, 33(3), 176-179.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top3303_4

[Abstract] I tested 2 competing theories to explain the connection between students' expected grades and ratings of instructors: cognitive dissonance and revenge. Cognitive dissonance theory holds that students who expect poor grades rate instructors poorly to minimize ego threat whereas the revenge theory holds that students rate instructors poorly in an attempt to punish them. I tested both theories via an experimental manipulation of the perceived ability to punish instructors through course evaluations. Results indicated that student ratings appear unrelated to the ability to punish instructors, thus supporting cognitive dissonance theory. Alternative interpretations of the data suggest further research is warranted.

Miles & House (2015): higher expected grades may lead to higher ratings

Miles, P., & House, D. (2015). The tail wagging the dog: An overdue examination of student teaching evaluations. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(2).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v4n2p116>

[Abstract, abridged] Purpose: The purpose of this research is to examine the impact of several factors beyond the professor's control and their unique impact on Student Teaching Evaluations (STEs). The present research pulls together a substantial amount of data to statistically analyze several academic historical legends about just how vulnerable STEs are to the effects of: class size, course type, professor gender, and course grades. Design/methodology/approach: This research utilizes over 30,000 individual student evaluations of 255 professors, spanning six semesters, during a three year time period to test six hypotheses. The final sample represents 1057 classes ranging in size between 10 and 190 students. Each hypothesis is statistically analyzed, with either analysis of variance or a Regression model. Findings: This study finds support for 5 out of 6 hypotheses. Specifically,

these data suggest STEs are likely to be closest to "5" (using a 1-5 scale with 5 being highest) in small elective classes, and lowest in large required classes taught by females. As well we find support for the notion that higher expected course grades may lead to higher STEs.

Biases, Nonresponse

Kuwaiti, AlQuraan, & Subbarayalu (2016): ratings are affected by class size and response rate

Kuwaiti, A. A., AlQuraan, M., & Subbarayalu, A. V. (2016). Understanding the effect of response rate and class size interaction on students evaluation of teaching in a higher education. *Educational Assessment & Evaluation*, 3, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1204082>

[Abstract, abridged] This study aims to investigate the interaction between response rate and class size and its effects on students' evaluation of instructors and the courses offered at a higher education Institution in Saudi Arabia. It is observed that when the class size is at the medium level, the ratings of instructors and courses increase as the response rate increases. On the contrary; when the class size is small, a high response rate is required for the evaluation of instructors and at least medium response rate is required for evaluation of courses. The study suggests that the interaction between response rate and class size is an important factor that needs to be taken into account while interpreting the students' evaluation of instructors and courses.

Macfadyen, Dawson, Prest, & Gasevic (2016): much bias based on who is completing the surveys

Macfadyen, L. P., Dawson, S., Prest, S., & Gasevic, D. (2016). Whose feedback? A multilevel analysis of student completion of end-of-term teaching evaluations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(6), 821-839. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1044421>

[Abstract, abridged] While much research has examined the validity of SETs for measuring teaching quality, few studies have investigated the factors that influence student participation in the SET process. This study aimed to address this deficit through the analysis of an SET respondent pool at a large Canadian research-intensive university. The findings were largely consistent with available research (showing influence of student gender, age, specialisation area and final grade on SET completion). However, the study also identified additional influential course-specific factors such as term of study, course year level and course type as statistically significant. Collectively, such findings point to substantively significant patterns of bias in the characteristics of the respondent pool.

Reisenwitz (2015): there are significant differences between those who complete online student evaluations and those who do not

Reisenwitz, T.H. (2015). Student evaluation of teaching: An investigation of nonresponse bias

in an online context. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 38(1), 7-17.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475315596778>

[Abstract, abridged] This study examines nonresponse bias in online student evaluations of instruction, that is, the differences between those students who complete online evaluations and those who decide not to complete them. It builds on the work of Estelami that revealed a response bias based on the timing in which the evaluations were completed, that is, differences in early evaluations versus later evaluations. In contrast, this study examines the demographic variables that have contributed to nonresponse bias in online student evaluations, namely gender, grade point average, and ethnicity. It also examines multiple psychographic variables that may contribute to nonresponse bias: time poverty, complaining behavior, and technology savviness. This study found that there are significant differences between those who complete online student evaluations and those who do not.

Biases, Non-instructional

Kuwaiti, AlQuraan, & Subbarayalu (2016): ratings are affected by class size and response rate

Kuwaiti, A. A., AlQuraan, M., & Subbarayalu, A. V. (2016). Understanding the effect of response rate and class size interaction on students evaluation of teaching in a higher education. *Educational Assessment & Evaluation*, 3, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1204082>

[Abstract, abridged] This study aims to investigate the interaction between response rate and class size and its effects on students' evaluation of instructors and the courses offered at a higher education Institution in Saudi Arabia. It is observed that when the class size is at the medium level, the ratings of instructors and courses increase as the response rate increases. On the contrary; when the class size is small, a high response rate is required for the evaluation of instructors and at least medium response rate is required for evaluation of courses. The study suggests that the interaction between response rate and class size is an important factor that needs to be taken into account while interpreting the students' evaluation of instructors and courses.

Nargundkar & Shrikhande (2014): combined impact of all the noninstructional factors studied is statistically significant

Nargundkar, S., & Shrikhande, M. (2014). Norming of student evaluations of instruction: Impact of noninstructional factors. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 12(1), 55-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/dsji.12023>

[Abstract, abridged] Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEIs) from about 6,000 sections over 4 years representing over 100,000 students at the college of business at a large public university are analyzed, to study the impact of noninstructional factors on student ratings. Administrative factors like semester, time of day, location, and instructor attributes like gender

and rank are studied. The combined impact of all the noninstructional factors studied is statistically significant. Our study has practical implications for administrators who use SEIs to evaluate faculty performance. SEI scores reflect some inherent biases due to noninstructional factors. Appropriate norming procedures can compensate for such biases, ensuring fair evaluations.

Reardon, Leierer, & Lee (2014): class schedule does not affect ratings

Reardon, R. C., Leierer, S. J., & Lee, D. (2014). Class meeting schedules in relation to students' grades and evaluations of teaching. *The Professional Counselor*, 2(1), 81-89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15241/rcr.2.1.81>

[Abstract, abridged] A six-year retrospective study of a university career course evaluated the effect of four different class schedule formats on students' earned grades, expected grades and evaluations of teaching. Some formats exhibited significant differences in earned and expected grades, but significant differences were not observed in student evaluations of instruction.

Royal & Stockdale (2015): students give lower ratings to instructors of quantitative methods subjects

Royal, K. D., & Stockdale, M. R. (2015). Are teacher course evaluations biased against faculty that teach quantitative methods courses? *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(1), 217-224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v4n1p217>

[Abstract, abridged] The present study investigated graduate students' responses to teacher/course evaluations (TCE) to determine if students' responses were inherently biased against faculty who teach quantitative methods courses. Item response theory (IRT) and Differential Item Functioning (DIF) techniques were utilized for data analysis. Results indicate students in non-methods courses preferred the structure of quantitative courses, but tend to be more critical of quantitative instructors.

Biases, Other

Blackhart, Peruche, DeWall, & Joiner (2006): varying results for investigation if class size, class level, instructor gender, number of publications (faculty instructors), average grade given by the instructor, and instructor rank predicted teaching evaluation ratings

Blackhart, G. C., Peruche, B. M., DeWall, C. N., & Joiner, T. E., Jr. (2006). Faculty forum: Factors influencing teaching evaluations in higher education. *Teaching of Psychology*, 33(1), 37-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top3301_9

[Abstract, abridged] Past research indicates several factors influencing teaching evaluation ratings instructors receive. We analyzed teaching evaluations from psychology courses during

fall and spring semesters of 2003-2004 to determine if class size, class level, instructor gender, number of publications (faculty instructors), average grade given by the instructor, and instructor rank predicted teaching evaluation ratings. Entering predictor variables into a multiple regression analysis concurrently, results indicated that only average grade given and instructor rank significantly predicted instructor ratings. Specifically, higher average grades given by the instructor predicted higher ratings, and graduate teaching assistants received higher overall ratings than faculty instructors.

Keeley, English, Irons, & Henslee (2013): found halo and ceiling/floor effects to be present and persistent

Keeley, J. W., English, T., Irons, J., & Henslee, A. M. (2013). Investigating halo and ceiling effects in student evaluations of instruction. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 73(3), 440-457. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164412475300>

[Abstract, abbreviated, and other article text] Many measurement biases affect student evaluations of instruction (SEIs). However, two have been relatively understudied: halo effects and ceiling/floor effects. This study examined these effects in two ways. Both biases were robust and remained despite characteristics of the measure designed to combat them.

“halo effects occur when a rater’s opinion about one aspect of the teacher influences the remainder of that person’s ratings”

“Ceiling and floor effects (also referred to as maximizing and minimizing effects) occur when a scale does not have a sufficient range to produce meaningful variability at the upper or lower ends of possible scores.”

Marsh & Roche (1997): evaluations are valid and unaffected by hypothesized biases

Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making students’ evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective: The critical issues of validity, bias, and utility. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1187-1197. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1187>

[Abstract, abridged] This article reviews research indicating that, under appropriate conditions, students’ evaluations of teaching (SETs) are (a) multidimensional; (b) reliable and stable; (c) primarily a function of the instructor who teaches a course rather than the course that is taught; (d) relatively valid against a variety of indicators of effective teaching; (e) relatively unaffected by a variety of variables hypothesized as potential biases (e.g., grading leniency, class size, workload, prior subject interest); and (f) useful in improving teaching effectiveness when SETs are coupled with appropriate consultation. The authors recommend rejecting a narrow criterion-related approach to validity and adopting a broad construct-validation approach, recognizing that effective teaching and SETs that reflect teaching effectiveness are multidimensional; no single criterion of effective teaching is sufficient; and tentative interpretations of relations with validity criteria and potential biases should be evaluated critically in different contexts, in relation to multiple criteria of effective teaching, theory, and existing knowledge.

Merritt (2012): covers biases in general, including race minority

Merritt, D. J. (2012). Bias, the brain, and student evaluations of teaching. *St. John's Law Review*, 82(1), Article 6, 235-288. <http://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/lawreview/vol82/iss1/6>

[It seems that a 2008 version of this article was used in the UA report, but the version now online is 2012. No abstract.]

Pounder (2007): identifies and organizes factors influencing SET scores; literature review

Pounder, J. S. (2007). Is student evaluation of teaching worthwhile? An analytical framework for answering the question. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 15(2), 178-191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684880710748938>

[Abstract, abridged] Identifies student related, course related and teacher related aspects of research on teaching evaluations. Factors commonly addressed within these aspects are also identified. On the basis of a comprehensive survey of the literature, this paper identifies and discusses the central factors influencing SET scores. These factors are then presented in a comprehensible table that can be used as a reference point for researchers and practitioners wishing to examine the effectiveness of the SET system.

Zumbach & Funke (2014): students' mood affects ratings

Zumbach, J., & Funke, J. (2014). Influences of mood on academic course evaluations. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 19(4). <http://pareonline.net/genpare.asp?wh=0&abt=19>

[Abstract, abridged] In two subsequent experiments, the influence of mood on academic course evaluation is examined. By means of facial feedback, either a positive or a negative mood was induced while students were completing a course evaluation questionnaire during lectures. Results from both studies reveal that a positive mood leads to better ratings of different dimensions of lecture quality. While in Study 1 (N=109) mood was not directly controlled, Study 2 (N=64) replicates the findings of the prior study and reveals direct influences of positive and negative mood on academic course evaluation.

Validity

Al-Eidan, Baig, Magzoub, & Omair (2016): the faculty evaluation tool was found to be reliable, but validity has to be interpreted with caution because of low response

Al-Eidan, F., Baig, L. A., Magzoub, M., & Omair, A. (2016). Reliability and validity of the faculty evaluation instrument used at King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences: Results from the haematology course. *The Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association*, 66(4), 453-457. http://www.jpma.org.pk/full_article_text.php?article_id=7711

[Abstract, abridged] Objectives: To assess reliability and validity of evaluation tool using Haematology course as an example. Results: Of the 116 subjects in the study, 80(69%) were males and 36(31%) were females. Reliability of the questionnaire was Cronbach's alpha 0.91. Factor analysis yielded a logically coherent 7 factor solution that explained 75% of the variation in the data. The factors were group dynamics in problem-based learning (alpha0.92), block administration (alpha 0.89), quality of objective structured clinical examination (alpha 0.86), block coordination (alpha 0.81), structure of problem-based learning (alpha 0.84), quality of written exam (alpha 0.91), and difficulty of exams (alpha0.41). Female students' opinion on depth of analysis and critical thinking was significantly higher than that of the males (p=0.03). Conclusion: The faculty evaluation tool used was found to be reliable, but its validity, as assessed through factor analysis, has to be interpreted with caution as the responders were less than the minimum required for factor analysis.

Bedggood & Donovan (2012): student satisfaction does not equal teaching quality; both student satisfaction and student learning are relevant measures

Bedggood, R. E., & Donovan, J. D. (2012). University performance evaluations: What are we really measuring? *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(7), 825-842.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.549221>

[Abstract, abridged] Despite the criticisms surrounding whether measures associated with these surveys are indeed valid, university managers continue to utilise them in key decision making. However, some argue that universities are misdirected in measuring satisfaction as a proxy for teaching quality, possibly subverting the potentially conflicting objective of student learning. Even so, both student satisfaction and student learning can be relevant performance measures. Accordingly, we have developed two robust measures of these constructs. We argue that student learning can be measured and used to provide formative feedback for improving teaching effectiveness. Alternatively, student satisfaction can be appropriate for determining whether students are 'enjoying' their studies, and likewise offers distinct benefits to university managers measuring performance outcomes.

Brown, Wood, Ogden, & Maltby (2014): students' satisfaction rating is context dependent; objective quality and subjective satisfaction are different things and should be assessed accordingly

Brown, G. D. A., Wood, A. M., Ogden, R. S., & Maltby, J. (2014). Do student evaluations of university reflect inaccurate beliefs or actual experience? A relative rank model. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 28, 14-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1827>

[Abstract] It was shown that student satisfaction ratings are influenced by context in ways that have important theoretical and practical implications. Using questions from the UK's National Student Survey, the study examined whether and how students' expressed satisfaction with issues such as feedback promptness and instructor enthusiasm depends on the context of comparison (such as possibly inaccurate beliefs about the feedback promptness or enthusiasm experienced at other universities) that is evoked. Experiment 1 found strong effects of experimentally provided comparison context—for example, satisfaction with a given feedback time depended on the time's relative position within a context. Experiment 2 used a

novel distribution-elicitation methodology to determine the prior beliefs of individual students about what happens in universities other than their own. It found that these beliefs vary widely and that students' satisfaction was predicted by how they believed their experience ranked within the distribution of others' experiences. A third study found that relative judgment principles also predicted students' intention to complain. An extended model was developed to show that purely rank-based principles of judgment can account for findings previously attributed to range effects. It was concluded that satisfaction ratings and quality of provision are different quantities, particularly when the implicit context of comparison includes beliefs about provision at other universities. Quality and satisfaction should be assessed separately, with objective measures (such as actual times to feedback), rather than subjective ratings (such as satisfaction with feedback promptness), being used to measure quality wherever practicable.

Chen & Hoshower (2003): student motivation to participate in SET affects ratings

Chen, Y., & Hoshower, L. B. (2003). Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness: an assessment of student perception and motivation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(1), 71-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0260293032000033071>

[Abstract, abridged] Very few studies have looked into students' perception of the teaching evaluation system and their motivation to participate. This study employs expectancy theory to evaluate some key factors that motivate students to participate in the teaching evaluation process. The results show that students generally consider an improvement in teaching to be the most attractive outcome of a teaching evaluation system. The second most attractive outcome was using teaching evaluations to improve course content and format. Using teaching evaluations for a professor's tenure, promotion and salary rise decisions and making the results of evaluations available for students' decisions on course and instructor selection were less important from the students' standpoint. Students' motivation to participate in teaching evaluations is also impacted significantly by their expectation that they will be able to provide meaningful feedback.

Chonko, Tanner, & Davis (2002): students focus more on qualities that make a course appealing, not learning

Chonko, L. B., Tanner, J. F., & Davis, R. (2002). What are they thinking? Students' expectations and self-assessments. *Journal of Education for Business*, 77(5), 271-281. Retrieved from <http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=7214031&site=eds-live&scope=site>

[Abstract] Student teacher evaluations have been the subject of a great deal of research. In this study, the authors surveyed 750 freshmen in an Introduction to Business class. The authors found that students' actual perceptions often diverged from what they were assessing on teaching evaluations and that their expectations of the teacher and the class, as well as their self-assessments, were very related to how students rate classes and teachers. The authors suggest that caution should be exercised in the use of student evaluations.

Cohen (1981): student ratings are a valid measure of teaching effectiveness; this is the meta-analysis targeted by Uttl et al., 2016

Cohen, P. A. (1981). Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multisection validity studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(3), 281-309.

[Abstract, abridged] The data for the meta-analysis came from 41 independent validity studies reporting on 68 separate multisection courses relating student ratings to student achievement. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis showed that rating/achievement correlations were larger for full-time faculty when students knew their final grades before rating instructors and when an external evaluator graded students' achievement tests. The results of the meta-analysis provide strong support for the validity of student ratings as measures of teaching effectiveness.

d'Apollonia & Abrami (1997): student ratings are moderately valid; however, they are affected by administrative, instructor, and course characteristics

d'Apollonia, S., & Abrami, P. C. (1997). Navigating student ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1198-1208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1198>

[Abstract, abridged] Many colleges and universities have adopted the use of student ratings of instruction as one (often the most influential) measure of instructional effectiveness. In this article, the authors present evidence that although effective instruction may be multidimensional, student ratings of instruction measure general instructional skill, which is a composite of three subskills: delivering instruction, facilitating interactions, and evaluating student learning. The authors subsequently report the results of a meta-analysis of the multisection validity studies that indicate that student ratings are moderately valid; however, administrative, instructor, and course characteristics influence student ratings of instruction.

Dodeen (2013): validity of SET is questionable

Dodeen, H. (2013). Validity, reliability, and potential bias of short forms of students' evaluation of teaching: The case of UAE University. *Educational Assessment*, 18(4), 235-250. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2013.846670>

[Abstract, abridged] Students' opinions continue to be a significant factor in the evaluation of teaching in higher education institutions. The purpose of this study was to psychometrically assess short students evaluation of teaching (SET) forms using the UAE University form as a model. The study evaluated the form validity, reliability, the overall question, and potential bias with respect to gender, college, grade point average, expected grade, and class size. A total of 3,661 students participated in this study in different random samples. Results indicated that the short SET form lacked content validity and could not identify key dimensions of evaluating teaching effectiveness. The form showed stability over time and acceptable internal reliability. Results indicated also that there was a potential bias due to college, expected grade, and class size, but there was no relationship between grade point average and students' ratings. It was concluded that short SET forms do not cover all domain content

and unable to provide teachers with enough information for the improvement of teaching.

Dolmans, Janssen-Noordman, & Wolfhagen (2006): students can distinguish excellent and poor teaching quality

Dolmans, D. M., Janssen-Noordman, A., & Wolfhagen, H. P. (2006). Can students differentiate between PBL tutors with different tutoring deficiencies? *Medical Teacher*, 28(6), 156-161. doi: 10.1080/01421590600776545

[Abstract, abridged] Although everyone will agree that students are able to distinguish between poor and excellent tutors, one can question whether students are also able to differentiate between tutors with different tutoring deficiencies—tutors who perform badly on a specific key aspect of their performance. The aim of this study was to investigate to what degree students are able to differentiate between tutors with different tutoring deficiencies, how effective tutors are with different deficiencies and what kind of tips students give for improvement of a tutor's behaviour. The results of this study demonstrate that students are not only able to distinguish between poor and excellent tutors, but are also able to diagnose tutors with different tutoring deficiencies and are able to provide tutors with specific feedback to improve their performance.

Ginns, Prosser, & Barrie (2007): the SET tool studied supports quality assurance and improvement processes at the university

Ginns, P., Prosser, M., & Barrie, S. (2007). Students' perceptions of teaching quality in higher education: the perspective of currently enrolled students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(5), 603-615. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070701573773>

[Abstract, abridged] The psychometric properties of a version of the Course Experience Questionnaire revised for students currently enrolled at the University of Sydney, the Student Course Experience Questionnaire (SCEQ), were assessed, gathering students' perceptions on a number of scales, including Good Teaching, Clear Goals and Standards, Appropriate Assessment, Appropriate Workload, and an outcome scale measuring Generic Skills development. Confirmatory factor analyses supported the hypothesised factor structure, and estimates of inter-rater agreement on SCEQ scales indicated student ratings of degrees can be meaningfully aggregated up to the faculty level. Derived from a substantial research base, linking the student experience to approaches to study and learning outcomes, its goal is to support both quality assurance and improvement processes within the university, at both the degree level and faculty level. The analyses described above indicate that the SCEQ is appropriate for these purposes.

Grammatikopoulos, Linardakis, Gregoriadis, & Oikonomidis (2015): provides evidence of a valid SET instrument; evaluating test validity is a continuous process, not a one-time event

Grammatikopoulos, V., Linardakis, M., Gregoriadis, A., & Oikonomidis, V. (2015). Assessing the students' evaluations of educational quality (SEEQ) questionnaire in Greek higher education. *Higher Education*, 70(3), 395-408. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9837-7>

[Abstract, abridged] The aim of the current study was to provide a valid and reliable instrument for the evaluation of the teaching effectiveness in the Greek higher education system. Other objectives of the study were (a) the examination of the dimensionality and the higher-order structure of the Greek version of Students' Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) questionnaire, and (b) the investigation of the effects of several background variables on students' evaluations of teaching (SET) scores provided by the Greek version of SEEQ. A total of 1,264 students participated by filling in the questionnaires administered to them. The results showed solid evidence of the applicability of the Greek version of SEEQ, by confirming the factor structure of the instrument and reassuring the multidimensionality of the teaching effectiveness construct. Additionally, the effects of several background variables on teaching effectiveness further supported the validity of SET scores.

Grayson (2015): questions student's ability to give accurate ratings

Grayson, J. P. (2015). Repeated low teaching evaluations: A form of habitual behavior? *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 45(4), 298-321.
<http://journals.sfu.ca/cjhe/index.php/cjhe/article/view/184404>

[Abstract, abridged] In this article, comparisons were made between first- and third-year collective evaluations of professors' performance at the University of British Columbia, York University, and McGill University. Overall, it was found that students who provided low evaluations in their first year were also likely to do so in their third year. Given that over the course of their studies, students likely would have been exposed to a range of different behaviours on the part of their professors, it is argued that the propensity of a large number of students to give consistently low evaluations was a form of "habitual behaviour."

Greenwald (1997): student rating measures have validity concerns

Greenwald, A. G. (1997). Validity concerns and usefulness of student ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1182-1186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1182>

[Abstract] The validity of student rating measures of instructional quality was severely questioned in the 1970s. By the early 1980s, however, most expert opinion viewed student rating measures as valid and as worthy of widespread use. In retrospect, older discriminant-validity concerns were not so much resolved as they were displaced from research attention by accumulating evidence for convergent validity. This article introduces a Current Issues section that gives new attention to validity concerns associated with student ratings. The section's 4 articles deal, respectively, with (a) conceptual structure (are student ratings unidimensional or multidimensional?), (b) convergent validity (how well do ratings correlate with other indicators of effective teaching?), (c) discriminant validity (are ratings influenced by factors other than teaching effectiveness?), and (d) consequential validity (are ratings used effectively in personnel development and evaluation?). Although all 4 articles favor the use of ratings, they disagree on controversial points associated with interpretation and use of ratings data.

Khong (2014): SET is a valid instrument in evaluating teaching effectiveness

Khong, T. L. (2014). The validity and reliability of the student evaluation of teaching: A case in a private higher educational institution in Malaysia. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 2(9), 57-63. <http://www.ijer.net/index.php/ijer/article/view/317>

[Abstract, abridged] Most universities are using the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) as an instrument for students to assess a lecturer's teaching performance. It is an essential instrument to reflect the feedback in enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. The purpose of this paper is to examine the validity and reliability of the SET as a valid instrument in evaluating teaching effectiveness in a private higher education institution in Malaysia. Exploratory Factor Analysis and Confirmatory Factor Analysis have validated all 10 items of SET whereby all items indicated high reliability and internal consistency.

The conclusion of this study showed that the SET is a valid instrument in evaluating teaching effectiveness.

Lama, Arias, Mendoza, & Manahan (2015): lack of student diligence when rating instructors raises validity concerns

Lama, T., Arias, P., Mendoza, K. & Manahan, J. (2015). Student evaluation of teaching surveys: do students provide accurate and reliable information? *e-Journal of Social & Behavioural Research in Business*, 6(1), 30-39. <http://www.ejsbrb.org/a.php?/content/issue/10>

[Abstract, abridged] This paper explores patterns of students' response behaviour of international students studying in an Australian university when filling out student surveys evaluating lecturers and courses. The study focuses on whether information obtained through the survey process can be relied upon to make management decisions. The results of the study seem to suggest a reasonable level of diligence is lacking on the students' part in answering the surveys, raising a concern about the reliability of information. This tendency seems to be prevalent among all students irrespective of their gender and nationality.

Marsh & Roche (1997): evaluations are relatively valid and unaffected by hypothesized biases

Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective: The critical issues of validity, bias, and utility. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1187-1197. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1187>

[Abstract, abridged] This article reviews research indicating that, under appropriate conditions, students' evaluations of teaching (SETs) are (a) multidimensional; (b) reliable and stable; (c) primarily a function of the instructor who teaches a course rather than the course that is taught; (d) relatively valid against a variety of indicators of effective teaching; (e) relatively unaffected by a variety of variables hypothesized as potential biases (e.g., grading leniency, class size, workload, prior subject interest); and (f) useful in improving teaching effectiveness when SETs are coupled with appropriate consultation. The authors recommend rejecting a narrow criterion-related approach to validity and adopting a broad construct-validation approach, recognizing that effective teaching and SETs that reflect teaching effectiveness are multidimensional; no single criterion of effective teaching is sufficient; and tentative

interpretations of relations with validity criteria and potential biases should be evaluated critically in different contexts, in relation to multiple criteria of effective teaching, theory, and existing knowledge.

Martin, Dennehy, & Morgan (2013): validity of SET is questioned; student focus groups suggested as an alternative

Martin, L. R., Dennehy, R., & Morgan, S. (2013). Unreliability in student evaluation of teaching questionnaires: Focus groups as an alternative approach. *Organization Management Journal*, 10(1), 66-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15416518.2013.781401>

[Abstract, abridged] Research on the validity and reliability of SETs is vast, though riddled with inconsistencies. The many “myths” of SETs are investigated and the incongruities are demonstrated. We hypothesize that the discrepancies in empirical studies come from misunderstanding and inappropriate actions by students. To address the complexity inherent in these problems, we suggest the use of focus groups as an alternative approach or complement to the standard SETs. A recommended format and guidelines for running classroom focus groups are provided. Institutional constraints and implementation concerns are addressed as well. This article lays the foundation for implementing a change in student assessment of teaching by proposing a method to compensate for bias in SETs, using focus groups as an evaluation tool, either as a stand-alone process or as a supplement to current methods.

McKeachie (1997): student ratings are valid but affected by contextual variables such as grading leniency

McKeachie, W. J. (1997). Student ratings: The validity of use. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1218-1225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1218>

[Abstract, abridged] In this article, the author discusses the other articles in this Current Issues section and concludes that all of the authors agree that student ratings are valid but that contextual variables such as grading leniency can affect the level of ratings. The authors disagree about the wisdom of applying statistical corrections for such contextual influences. This article argues that the problem lies neither in the ratings nor in the correction but rather in the lack of sophistication of personnel committees who use the ratings. Thus, more attention should be directed toward methods of ensuring more valid use.

Morley (2012): student evaluations in this study were generally unreliable

Morley, D. D. (2012). Claims about the reliability of student evaluations of instruction: The ecological fallacy rides again. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 38(1), 15-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2012.01.001>

[Abstract, abridged] The vast majority of the research on student evaluation of instruction has assessed the reliability of groups of courses and yielded either a single reliability coefficient for the entire group, or grouped reliability coefficients for each student evaluation of teaching (SET) item. This manuscript argues that these practices constitute a form of ecological

correlation and therefore yield incorrect estimates of reliability. Intraclass reliability and agreement coefficients were proposed as appropriate for making statements about the reliability of SETs in specific classes. An analysis of 1073 course sections using inter-rater coefficients found that students using this particular instrument were generally unable to reliably evaluate faculty. In contrast, the traditional ecologically flawed multi-class “group” reliability coefficients had generally acceptable reliability.

Nargundkar & Shrikhande (2012): an instrument that was validated 20 years ago is still valid

Nargundkar, S., & Shrikhande, M. (2012). An empirical investigation of student evaluations of instruction: The relative importance of factors. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 10(1), 117-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4609.2011.00328.x>

[Abstract, abridged] We analyzed over 100,000 student evaluations of instruction over 4 years in the college of business at a major public university. We found that the original instrument that was validated about 20 years ago is still valid, with factor analysis showing that the six underlying dimensions used in the instrument remained relatively intact. Also, we found that the relative importance of those six factors in the overall assessment of instruction changed over the past two decades, reflecting changes in the expectations of the current millennial generation of students. The results were consistent across four subgroups studied—Undergraduate Core, Undergraduate Noncore, Graduate Core, and Graduate Noncore classes, with minor differences.

Rantanen (2013): reliability of SET is questionable; multiple feedbacks required

Rantanen, P. (2013). The number of feedbacks needed for reliable evaluation. A multilevel analysis of the reliability, stability and generalizability of students’ evaluation of teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(2), 224-239. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.625471>

[Abstract, abridged] A multilevel analysis approach was used to analyse students’ evaluation of teaching (SET). The low value of inter-rater reliability stresses that any solid conclusions on teaching cannot be made on the basis of single feedbacks. To assess a teacher’s general teaching effectiveness, one needs to evaluate four randomly chosen course implementations. Two implementations are needed when one course is evaluated, and if one implementation is evaluated, up to 15 feedbacks are needed. The stability of students’ ratings is very high, which reflects students’ stable rating criteria. There is an obvious rating paradox: from the student’s point of view, each rating is very precise, stable and justifiable, but from the teacher’s point of view a single feedback reflects the quality of teaching to just a moderate extent. Cross-hierarchical analysis reveals that there are large discrepancies between the uses of rating scales; some students are systematically more lenient in their rating whereas others are systematically more severe. The study also reveals that some courses are generally rated more favourably and that some courses are more suitable for certain teachers.

Socha (2013): a SET instrument was found to have overall good reliability and validity with relatively few biases

Socha, A. (2013). A hierarchical approach to students' assessment of instruction. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(1), 94-113.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.604713>

[Abstract, abridged] Since students are extensively exposed to course elements, students' evaluation of instruction should be one of several components in the teacher evaluation system. Since traditional methods, such as Cronbach's alpha and ordinary least squares regression, do not address the hierarchical data of the classroom, the current study used the statistical techniques of confirmatory factor analysis and hierarchical linear modelling in order to properly investigate the reliability and validity of the Students' Assessment of Instruction (SAI) instrument. Overall, the SAI was found to have good reliability and validity with relatively few biases and could be used to extract five distinguishable traits of instructional effectiveness.

Spooren, Brockx, & Mortelmans (2013): the utility and validity of SET is questionable

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.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0034654313496870>

[Abstract] This article provides an extensive overview of the recent literature on student evaluation of teaching (SET) in higher education. The review is based on the SET meta-validation model, drawing upon research reports published in peer-reviewed journals since 2000. Through the lens of validity, we consider both the more traditional research themes in the field of SET (i.e., the dimensionality debate, the 'bias' question, and questionnaire design) and some recent trends in SET research, such as online SET and bias investigations into additional teacher personal characteristics. The review provides a clear idea of the state of the art with regard to research on SET, thus allowing researchers to formulate suggestions for future research. It is argued that SET remains a current yet delicate topic in higher education, as well as in education research. Many stakeholders are not convinced of the usefulness and validity of SET for both formative and summative purposes. Research on SET has thus far failed to provide clear answers to several critical questions concerning the validity of SET.

Uttl, White, & Gonzalez (2016): SETs do not indicate teaching quality, meta-analysis

Uttl, B., White, C. A., Gonzalez, D. W. (2016). Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, (in press, available online September 19, 2106).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.08.007>

[Abstract, abridged] We re-analyzed previously published meta-analyses of the multisection studies and found that their findings were an artifact of small sample sized studies and publication bias. Whereas the small sample sized studies showed large and moderate correlation, the large sample sized studies showed no or only minimal correlation between SET ratings and learning. Our up-to-date meta-analysis of all multisection studies revealed no significant correlations between the SET ratings and learning. These findings suggest that

institutions focused on student learning and career success may want to abandon SET ratings as a measure of faculty's teaching effectiveness.

Wright & Jenkins-Guarieri (2012): SETs appear to be valid and free from gender bias

Wright, S. L., & Jenkins-Guarieri, M. A. (2012). Student evaluations of teaching: combining the meta-analyses and demonstrating further evidence for effective use. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(6), 683-699.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.563279>

[Abstract, abridged] Given that there is not one study summarising all these domains of research, a comprehensive overview of SETs was conducted by combining all prior meta-analyses related to SETs. Eleven meta-analyses were identified, and nine meta-analyses covering 193 studies were included in the analysis, which yielded a small-to-medium overall weighted mean effect size ($r = .26$) between SETs and the variables studied. Findings suggest that SETs appear to be valid, have practical use that is largely free from gender bias and are most effective when implemented with consultation strategies.

Impact on Teaching Quality

Blair & Valdez Noel (2014): little evidence that student feedback is leading to improved teaching

Blair, E., & Valdez Noel, K. (2014). Improving higher education practice through student evaluation systems: is the student voice being heard? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(7), 879-894. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.875984>

[Abstract, abridged] This paper examines the student evaluations at a university in Trinidad and Tobago in an effort to determine whether the student voice is being heard. The research focused on students' responses to the question, 'How do you think this course could be improved?' Student evaluations were gathered from five purposefully selected courses taught at the university during 2011–2012 and then again one year later, in 2012–2013. This allowed for an analysis of the selected courses. Whilst the literature suggested that student evaluation systems are a valuable aid to lecturer improvement, this research found little evidence that these evaluations actually led to any real significant changes in lecturers' practice.

Campbell & Bozeman (2008): questions the effect student evaluations have on teaching quality

Campbell, J. P., & Bozeman, W. C. (2008). The value of student ratings: Perceptions of students, teachers, and administrators. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 32, 13-24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10668920600864137>

[Abstract, abridged] This research responded to the lack of emphasis on more effective use of the data for the purpose of improving teaching effectiveness by questioning the opinions and

practices of students, faculty, and administrators. More importantly, this research questioned the value of student ratings of teaching: Is the effort of doing student evaluations worth the institutional investment or is it simply a routine process which has little or no effect on improving teaching?

Curwood, Tomitsch, Thomson, & Hendry (2015): provide an example of support for academics' learning from SETs

Curwood, J.S., Tomitsch, M., Thomson, K., & Hendry, G.D. (2015). Professional learning in higher education: Understanding how academics interpret student feedback and access resources to improve their teaching. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 31(5). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14742/ajet.2516>

[Abstract, abridged] Previous research on professional learning has identified that face-to-face consultation is an effective approach to support academics' learning from student feedback. However, this approach is labour and time intensive, and does not necessarily provide all academics with just-in-time support. In this article, we describe an alternative approach, which involves the creation of *Ask Charlie*, a mobile website that visually represents results from student evaluation of teaching (SET), and provides academics with personalised recommendations for teaching resources. *Ask Charlie* was developed and evaluated by drawing on design-based research methods with the aim to support professional learning within higher education.

Makondo & Ndebele (2014): SETs are beneficial for improving teaching quality

Makondo, L., & Ndebele, C. (2014). University lecturers' views on student-lecturer evaluations. *Anthropologist*, 17(2), 377-386. <http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/T-Anth/Anth-17-0-000-14-Web/Anth-17-0-000-14-Contents/Anth-17-0-000-14-Contents.htm>

[Abstract, abridged] This paper discusses university lecturers' views on student-lecturer evaluation of teaching and learning process. Specific reference is given to the university lecturers' views on the usefulness of the evaluation exercise, the evaluation process, items in the evaluation questionnaires and evaluation feedback reports at a formerly disadvantaged South African University. A total of 118 (53.8%) lecturers out of a staff establishment of 219 teaching staff volunteered their participation in this study. The findings of the study show that insights from student-lecturer evaluations are an important source of information for university teaching staff and administration to consider in their quest to improve on the quality of university teaching and learning moves that can help improve on throughput rates.

Stein, Spiller, Harris, Deaker, & Kennedy (2013): there are gaps in the way academics engage with student evaluation

Stein, S. J., Spiller, D., Terry, S., Harris, T., Deaker, L., & Kennedy, J. (2013). Tertiary teachers and student evaluations: never the twain shall meet? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(7), 892-904. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.767876>

[Abstract, abridged] While extensive research has been done on student evaluations, there is less research-based evidence about teachers' perceptions of and engagement with student evaluations, the focus of the research reported in this paper. Results highlighted the general acceptance of the notion of student evaluations, recurring ideas about the limitations of evaluations and significant gaps in the way academics engage with student evaluation feedback.

Evaluating Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

Boysen (2015): faculty and administrators can over-interpret small variations

Boysen, G. A. (2015). Uses and misuses of student evaluations of teaching: The interpretation of differences in teaching evaluation means irrespective of statistical information. *Teaching of Psychology*, 42(2), 109-118.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0098628315569922>

[Abstract] Student evaluations of teaching are among the most accepted and important indicators of college teachers' performance. However, faculty and administrators can overinterpret small variations in mean teaching evaluations. The current research examined the effect of including statistical information on the interpretation of teaching evaluations. Study 1 ($N = 121$) showed that faculty members interpreted small differences between mean course evaluations even when confidence intervals and statistical tests indicated the absence of meaningful differences. Study 2 ($N = 183$) showed that differences labeled as nonsignificant still influenced perceptions of teaching qualifications and teaching ability. The results suggest the need for increased emphasis on the use of statistics when presenting and interpreting teaching evaluation data.

Boysen, Raesly, & Casner (2014): ratings are misinterpreted by faculty and administrators

Boysen, G. A., Kelly, T. J., Raesly, H. N., & Casner, R. W. (2014). The (mis)interpretation of teaching evaluations by college faculty and administrators. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(6), 641-656. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080.02602938.2013.860950>

[Abstract, abridged] The current research consisted of three studies documenting the effect of small mean differences in teaching evaluations on judgements about teachers. Differences in means small enough to be within the margin of error significantly impacted faculty members' assignment of merit-based rewards (Study 1), department heads' evaluation of teaching techniques (Study 2) and faculty members' evaluation of specific teaching skills (Study 3). The results suggest that faculty and administrators do not apply appropriate statistical principles when evaluating teaching evaluations and instead use a general heuristic that higher evaluations are better.

Fraile & Bosch-Morell (2015): present a reliable approach to SET interpretation

Fraile, R., & Bosch-Morell, F. (2015). Considering teaching history and calculating confidence

intervals in student evaluations of teaching quality: An approach based on Bayesian inference. *Higher Education*, 70(1), 55-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9823-0>

[Abstract, abbreviated, edited] Student evaluations of teaching quality are among the most used and analysed sources of such information [for lecturer promotion and tenure decisions]. However, to date little attention has been paid in how to process them in order to be able to estimate their reliability. Within this paper we present an approach that provides estimates of such reliability in terms of confidence intervals. This approach, based on Bayesian inference, also provides a means for improving reliability even for lecturers having a low number of student evaluations. Such improvement is achieved by using past information in every year's evaluations.

Jackson & Jackson (2015): concerns with use of SETs for summative purposes

Jackson, M. J., & Jackson, W. T. (2015). The misuse of student evaluations of teaching: Implications, suggestions and alternatives. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 19(3), 165-173. <http://www.alliedacademies.org/academy-of-educational-leadership-journal/>

[Abstract, abridged] A five year longitudinal study of the results from Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs) was accomplished within the business school of a small southwestern state university. Based upon the findings of the study, the authors argue that prior practices in applying the results of SETs for summative purposes have not been based upon a sound statistical foundation. Results from both instructor samples and populations are compared and indicate that the use of means to measure and compare instructor effectiveness requires assumptions of normality which the data does not meet.

Jones, Gaffney-Rhys, & Jones (2015): presents issues if decision-makers use SET results summatively

Jones, J., Gaffney-Rhys, R., & Jones, E. (2014). Handle with care! An exploration of the potential risks associated with the publication and summative usage of student evaluation of teaching (SET) results. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 38(1), 37-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2012.699514>

[Abstract, abridged] This article presents a synthesis of previous ideas relating to student evaluation of teaching (SET) results in higher education institutions (HEIs), with particular focus upon possible validity issues and matters that HEI decision-makers should consider prior to interpreting survey results and using them summatively. Furthermore, the research explores relevant legal issues (namely, defamation, breach of the duty to take reasonable care for an employee's welfare, breach of the duty of trust and confidence, breach of the right to privacy and, if the lecturer is forced to resign as a consequence of such infringements, constructive dismissal) that decision-makers, in UK HEIs, should appreciate if survey results are widely published or used to inform employment decisions.

Mitry & Smith (2014): conclusions drawn from evaluations may be invalid and harmful

Mitry, D. J., & Smith, D. E. (2014). Student evaluations of faculty members: A call for

analytical prudence. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(2), 56-67.
<http://celt.miamioh.edu/ject/issue.php?v=25&n=2>

[Abstract, abridged] The authors of this article express concern about the use of parametric techniques to report faculty performance based on categorical Likert survey data gleaned from student responses to teaching evaluations. They argue that these surveys often violate primary statistical requirements for evaluative application. Therefore, the conclusions drawn from such evaluations may be invalid and even harmful to faculty members over time. The authors conclude that it is imprudent for university administrators to support questionable analysis methods simply because they have, on the surface, the appearance of rigor, or because the practice has become commonplace.

Palmer (2012): presents examples of ineffective responses to evaluation results

Palmer, S. (2012). Student evaluation of teaching: keeping in touch with reality. *Quality in Higher Education*, 18(3), 297-311. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2012.730336>

[Abstract, abridged] This article used publicly available student evaluation of teaching data to present examples of where institutional responses to evaluation processes appeared to be educationally ineffective and where the pursuit of the 'right' student evaluation results appears to have been mistakenly equated with the aim of improved teaching and learning. If the vast resources devoted to student evaluation of teaching are to be effective, then the data produced by student evaluation systems must lead to real and sustainable improvements in teaching quality and student learning, rather than becoming an end in itself.

Multifaceted Evaluation

Berk (2013): covers several issues, including multifactorial evaluations

Berk, R. A. (2013). Top five flashpoints in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. *Medical Teacher*, 35(1), 15-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.732247>

[Berk is also the author of the 2013 book "Top 10 Flashpoints in Student Ratings and the Evaluation of Teaching"]

[Abstract, abridged] Five flashpoints are defined, the salient issues and research described, and, finally, specific, concrete recommendations for moving forward are proffered. Those flashpoints are: (1) student ratings vs. multiple sources of evidence; (2) sources of evidence vs. decisions: which come first? (3) quality of "home-grown" rating scales vs. commercially-developed scales; (4) paper-and-pencil vs. online scale administration; and (5) standardized vs. unstandardized online scale administrations. Conclusions: Multiple sources of evidence collected through online administration, when possible, can furnish a solid foundation from which to infer teaching effectiveness and contribute to fair and equitable decisions about faculty contract renewal, merit pay, and promotion and tenure.

Cox, Peeters, Stanford, & Seifert (2013): a peer assessment instrument was piloted; formative peer assessment seems important

Cox, C.D., Peeters, M. J., Stanford, B. L., & Seifert, C. F. (2013). Pilot of peer assessment within experiential teaching and learning. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 5(4), 311-320. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2013.02.003>

[Abstract, abridged] Objectives of this study were as follows: (1) to pilot test an instrument for peer assessment of experiential teaching, (2) to compare peer evaluations from faculty with student evaluations of their preceptor (faculty), and (3) to determine the impact of qualitative, formative peer assessment on faculty's experiential teaching. Faculty at Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center School of Pharmacy implemented a new peer assessment instrument focused on assessing experiential teaching. Eight faculty members participated in this pilot. Conclusion: A peer assessment of experiential teaching was developed and implemented. Aside from evaluation, formative peer assessment seemed important in fostering feedback for faculty in their development.

Hughes II & Pate (2013): present a multisource evaluation method

Hughes II, K. E., & Pate, G. R. (2013). Moving beyond student ratings: A balanced scorecard approach for evaluating teaching performance. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 28(1), 49-75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2308/iace-50302>

[Abstract, abridged] This position paper proposes a viable alternative to higher education's current focus on student ratings as the primary metric for summative teaching evaluations (i.e., for personnel decisions). In contrast to the divergent opinions among educational researchers about the validity of student ratings, a strong consensus exists that summative measures derived from the student ratings process represent a necessary rather than a sufficient source for evaluating teaching performance (Cashin 1990; Berk 2005). Accordingly, to more completely describe annual teaching performance, we propose a multisource, multiple-perspective Teaching Balanced Scorecard (TBSC), fashioned from the "classic" Balanced Scorecard developed by Kaplan and Norton (1992a). The TBSC can guide academic administrators to expand their conceptual view of teaching performance beyond the boundaries of the classroom, while coherently communicating the department's teaching expectations to the faculty; consistent with this proposition, we provide supporting evidence from a successful TBSC implementation in an academic department.

Iqbal (2013): faculty express concerns with peer reviews

Iqbal, I. (2013). Academics' resistance to summative peer review of teaching: questionable rewards and the importance of student evaluations. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(5), 557-569. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.764863>

[Abstract, abridged] This study draws from 30 semi-structured interviews with tenure-track faculty members in a research-intensive university to examine their lack of engagement in the summative peer review of teaching. Findings indicate that most academics in the study do not think peer review outcomes contribute meaningfully to decisions about career advancement

and believe that, in comparison, student evaluation of teaching scores matter more. The findings suggest that faculty member resistance to summative peer reviews will persist unless academics are confident that the results will be seriously considered in decisions about tenure and promotion.

Lyde, Grieshaber, & Byrns (2016): a multisource method of evaluating is a useful tool

Lyde, A.R., Grieshaber, D.C., Byrns, G. (2016). Faculty teaching performance: Perceptions of a multi-source method for evaluation (MME). *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 16(3), 82-94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v16i3.18145>

[Abstract, abridged] A holistic system of evaluating university teaching is necessary for reasons including the limitations of student evaluations and the complexity of assessing teaching performance. University faculty members were interviewed to determine their perceptions of the multisource method of evaluating (MME) teaching performance after a revision of policies and procedures was approved. The MME is comprised of three primary data sources: student evaluations, instructor reflections describing attributes of their own teaching such as the teaching philosophy, and a formative external review. While the faculty perceived the MME as a useful tool, they still believe it operates more to produce a summative product than work as a formative process. According to the results, a more formative process would be supported by addressing several factors, including timing of reflections, accountability from year to year, and mentoring. Improving these constraints may make the proposed MME a more appropriate tool for formative review of teaching.

Marsh & Roche (1997): multidimensional aspects of teaching should be evaluated; suggest nine factors

Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective: The critical issues of validity, bias, and utility. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1187-1197. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1187>

This article has been included in previous themes. For this theme, Marsh & Roche (1997) believe that effective evaluation tools should consider nine factors: "Learning/Value, Instructor Enthusiasm, Organization/Clarity, Group Interaction, Individual Rapport, Breadth of Coverage, Examinations/Grading, Assignments/Readings, and Workload/Difficulty" (p.1187). The authors also comment on the nature of "homemade" evaluation instruments being of questionable quality (p. 1188).

Martin, Dennehy, & Morgan (2013): validity of SET is questioned; student focus groups suggested as an alternative

Martin, L. R., Dennehy, R., & Morgan, S. (2013). Unreliability in student evaluation of teaching questionnaires: Focus groups as an alternative approach. *Organization Management Journal*, 10(1), 66-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15416518.2013.781401>

[Abstract, abridged] Research on the validity and reliability of SETs is vast, though riddled

with inconsistencies. The many “myths” of SETs are investigated and the incongruities are demonstrated. We hypothesize that the discrepancies in empirical studies come from misunderstanding and inappropriate actions by students. To address the complexity inherent in these problems, we suggest the use of focus groups as an alternative approach or complement to the standard SETs. A recommended format and guidelines for running classroom focus groups are provided. Institutional constraints and implementation concerns are addressed as well. This article lays the foundation for implementing a change in student assessment of teaching by proposing a method to compensate for bias in SETs, using focus groups as an evaluation tool, either as a stand-alone process or as a supplement to current methods.

Ridley & Collins (2015): suggests a comprehensive performance evaluation instrument

Ridley, D., & Collins, J. (2015). A suggested evaluation metric instrument for faculty members at colleges and universities. *International Journal of Education Research*, 10(1), 97-114.

Retrieved from

<http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=9ff24389-d34d-43d1-83fc-6ef82bd1ad47%40sessionmgr4009&vid=2&hid=4102>

[Abstract, abridged] This study puts forth a comprehensive performance evaluation method for university faculty members. The instrument is comprised of a teaching evaluation metric, a research evaluation metric, and a service evaluation metric. This study provides a unique method for measuring the performance of university faculty members by regressing cumulative student grade point average on the fraction of the total number of credit hours that students are taught by each faculty member. The study postulates that the resulting regression coefficients measure the average rate at which each faculty member contributes to student learning as measured by cumulative grade points earned per contact hour of instruction. Since this model of teaching effectiveness is based on grades, freely assigned by individual faculty members, it is a no contact, non-intrusive, non-confrontational, non-threatening, non-coercive evaluation of teaching.

Stupans, McGuren, & Babey (2016): present a tool for analyzing free-form comments on ratings forms

Stupans, I., McGuren, T., & Babey, A. M. (2016). Student evaluation of teaching: A study exploring student rating instrument free-form text comments. *Innovative Higher Education*, 41(1), 33-52. <http://10.1007/s10755-015-9328-5>

[Abstract] Student rating instruments are recognised to be valid indicators of effective instruction, providing a valuable tool to improve teaching. However, free-form text comments obtained from the open-ended question component of such surveys are only infrequently analysed comprehensively. We employed an innovative, systematic approach to the analysis of text-based feedback relating to student perceptions of and experiences with a recently developed university program. The automated nature of the semantic analysis tool "Leximancer" enabled a critical interrogation across units of study, mining the cumulative text for common themes and recurring core concepts. The results of this analysis facilitated the identification of issues that were not apparent from the purely quantitative data, thus providing

a deeper understanding of the curriculum and teaching effectiveness that was constructive and detailed.

[Link from **Zimmerman** (2008): some tools may encourage students to focus on negative aspects of teaching; anonymous feedback means that students are not held accountable for their comments

Zimmerman, B. (2008). Course evaluations - students' revenge? *University Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/course-evaluations-students-revenge/>

This is an online opinion article.

“Even choosing the right questions is difficult. Instead of ‘What did you like least about the lectures?’ shouldn’t we be asking, ‘Is there something you liked least about the lectures?’ When we manipulate students into providing negative responses, we encourage them to cast about for some negative remark, *any* negative remark, when they might otherwise have been declined” (paragraph 7).

“Many students don’t need any encouragement to bash their teachers. The exercise is meant in part to ensure that instructors are held accountable, yet students engage in libel with impunity. The student who referred to a colleague as a “cow” was not held accountable” (paragraph 8).

Appendix I: Recommendations Related to Evaluation of Teaching from the 2013 Renaissance Committee Report

These recommendations are taken from pages 11 and 12 of the report.

Source: Cheeseman, C., MacLaren, I., Carey, J., Glanfield, F., Liu, L., McFarlane, L., Cahill, J. C., Garneau, T., Supernant, K., & Szeman, I. (2013, December 9). *Report of the Renaissance Committee*. Retrieved from <http://www.renaissance.ualberta.ca/>

3-2 That all scholars be evaluated using the same evaluation structure, with constituency-specific evaluation committees. Non-scholarly activities should be evaluated separately.

3-3 That the number of committees evaluating the excellence of scholarly activities performed by a single constituency be substantially reduced from 3 to 6. Such committees will be formed around scholarly discipline, not faculty boundaries. Cultural practices within the unit should not be allowed to influence the salary trajectories nor the process by which scholars are evaluated.

3-4 That there be greater consistency in the size of comparator groups used for evaluation, at both the small and large unit levels.

3-8 That all scholars, which include tenure-track faculty, librarians, and specialized scholars, be evaluated in accordance with the broad definition of Scholarship provided in Section 2 of this report. These constituencies should be evaluated equitably based on the Scholarship performance measures and the extent to which Scholarship comprises a part of their duties.

3-9 That all scholarly activities be evaluated using more than simple metrics (e.g. Impact Factors, USRI); that multifaceted evaluations be applied to all scholarly activities to allow for identification of scholarly excellence.

3-11 Establishment of a Teaching Strategy for the University of Alberta that reviews and updates the teaching and learning policies currently in place in the GFC Policy Manual, and determined implementation of those policies.

3-12 Creation of specific, transparent policies for teaching evaluation to guide annual reviews, contract renewal decisions, and decisions on tenure and promotion. (As, for example, delineated in the CAUT model policy on the evaluation of teaching performance, create policies and procedures that allow recognition of all aspects of teaching duties performed by academic staff.)

3-13 Establish a committee to redesign the USRI questions, ensuring a reliable and valid tool that meets international standards for summative evaluation, provides a degree of formative feedback, minimizes the potential for derogatory feedback, ensures value to the students who

participate in the process, and is in alignment with the University's Teaching Strategy. To ensure movement on this recommendation, establish a two-year limit on implementation.

3-14 If changes to the USRI are not accomplished within two years (end of Fall term, 2015), (AASUA and Administration) declare a moratorium on their use.

3-15 Provide leadership, support, and resources further to encourage teaching development and teaching Scholarship at the University of Alberta.

3-16 Standardize reporting periods for all evaluation committees.

3-22 require all scholarly evaluation committees to use external standards for the assessment of Scholarship, reaching decisions by reference to agreed-upon external standards rather than to colleagues' performance.

OUTLINE OF ISSUE
Action Item

Agenda Title: **Proposed Revisions to Standing Committee Terms of Reference GFC Campus Law Review Committee (CLRC) including a name change to GFC Student Conduct Policy Committee (SCPC)**

Motion: THAT General Faculties Council approve the proposed changes to the GFC Campus Law Review Terms of Reference including a name change to GFC Student Conduct Policy Committee (SCPC) as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect upon approval.

Item

Action Requested	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation
Proposed by	Steven Penney, Chair, GFC Campus Law Review Committee
Presenter	Steven Penney, Chair, GFC Campus Law Review Committee

Details

Responsibility	General Faculties Council
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	To approve the revised terms of reference for the GFC Campus Law Review Committee.
The Impact of the Proposal is	The committee terms of reference are being amended to reflect the GFC principles on delegated authority and committee composition approved by GFC on April 21, 2017. The Report of the <i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Academic Governance including Delegated Authority, endorsed by GFC on April 21, 2017, noted that CLRC currently works within a well defined mandate and the delegated authority given to the committee is also well defined. The benefits to having a Chair with legal training was emphasized in the report and has been added to the proposed terms of reference. No major changes were recommended.
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	Current committee terms of reference.
Timeline/Implementation Date	To be effective upon approval.
Estimated Cost and funding source	N/A
Next Steps (ie.: Communications Plan, Implementation plans)	Membership changes will be phased in to allow current members to complete their terms. Reference to the committee name in the Code of Student Behaviour, Code of Applicant Behaviour, and Practicum Intervention Policy will be changed effective July 1, 2018.
Supplementary Notes and context	The proposed terms of reference reflect a standard template that will be used for all GFC standing committees which has been designed to provide increased clarity on mandate, responsibilities, and delegated authority. Further changes to the CLRC terms of reference include: 1. Reference to student residence codes has been removed in accordance with the Board's delegation of creation and revision of these codes to Residence Services (February 2011).

FINAL Item No. 9

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The addition that preference be given for a Chair who has legal training, which the Committee has discussed and agreed upon previously (CLRC meetings of January 25 and May 25, 2017). 3. The addition of one elected academic staff member from GFC to the committee composition in accordance with principle 1 of the Principles for Standing Committee Composition: <i>“Wherever possible, the majority of elected members of each standing committee should be drawn from the membership of GFC to provide tangible links between GFC and its standing committees and increase engagement of the greater GFC community.”</i> 4. The voting status of ex-officio members has been revised to reflect their voting status in accordance with principle 3 of the Principles for Standing Committee Composition on GFC. 5. The terms will now note that CLRC makes recommendations to General Faculties Council, rather than to GFC Executive Committee.
--	---

Engagement and Routing (Include meeting dates)

Participation: (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity) <For further information see the link posted on the Governance Toolkit section Student Participation Protocol >	<p><u>Those who have been informed:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus Law Review Committee • General Faculties Council • Board of Governors has been provided with brief highlights of the work of the <i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Academic Governance including Delegated Authority
	<p><u>Those who have been consulted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of the ad hoc Committee on Academic Governance Including Delegated Authority Appendix 6: List of Consultations • Campus Law Review Committee • General Faculties Council • GFC Executive Committee
	<p><u>Those who are actively participating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Academic Governance Including Delegated Authority • Campus Law Review Committee • General Faculties Council • GFC Executive Committee
Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)	GFC Campus Law Review Committee - September 28, 2017 GFC Executive Committee - October 16, 2017 General Faculties Council - October 30, 2017
Final Approver	General Faculties Council

Alignment/Compliance

Alignment with Guiding Documents	<p><i>For the Public Good</i></p> <p>Objective 21: Encourage continuous improvement in administrative, governance, planning, and stewardship systems, procedures, and policies that enable students, faculty, staff, and the institution as a whole to achieve shared strategic goals.</p> <p>Principles for General Faculties Council Delegation of Authority</p>
----------------------------------	---

FINAL Item No. 9

	<p><u>Principles for General Faculties Council Standing Committee Composition</u></p>
<p>Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please <u>quote</u> legislation and include identifying section numbers)</p>	<p>1. Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA) “Powers of general faculties council” 26(1) Subject to the authority of the board, a general faculties council is responsible for the academic affairs of the university [...]</p> <p>(3) A general faculties council may delegate any of its powers, duties and functions under this Act, including the powers referred to in section 31, as it sees fit and may prescribe conditions governing the exercise or performance of any delegated power, duty or function, including the power of subdelegation.”</p> <p>2. GFC Executive Committee Terms of Reference “5. Agendas of General Faculties Council GFC has delegated to the Executive Committee the authority to decide which items are placed on a GFC Agenda, and the order in which those agenda items appear on each GFC agenda.</p> <p>With respect to recommendations from other bodies and other GFC committees, however, the role of the Executive Committee shall be to examine and debate the substance of reports or recommendations and to decide if an item is ready to be forwarded to the full governing body.”</p>

Attachment:

1. Attachment 1: Draft Terms of Reference
2. Attachment 2: Current Terms of Reference

Prepared by: University Governance



1. Mandate and Role of the Committee

The Student Conduct Policy Committee (SCPC) is a standing committee of General Faculties Council charged with providing oversight to the university's student discipline codes. The committee reviews and recommends on new codes, and policies and procedures related to discipline. SCPC may be called upon to provide advice to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) on items which may include, but are not limited to, rules and regulations other than discipline codes.

2. Areas of Responsibility

- a. Review and recommend changes to General Faculties Council on:
 - the Code of Student Behaviour and student discipline procedures
 - the Code of Applicant Behaviour
 - the Practicum Intervention Policy
 - the Residence Community Standards Policy
- b. Discuss annual residence discipline statistics and forward reports to GFC for information.
- c. Discuss annual statistical reports on discipline cases dealt with by Faculties, the Discipline Officer, the Registrar, Unit Directors, the University Appeal Board (UAB), GFC Academic Appeals Committee (AAC), and the GFC Practice Review Board (PRB) and forward reports to GFC for information.

3. Composition

Voting Members (13)

Ex-officio (1)

- Vice-Provost and Dean of Students

Appointed (4)

- 1 academic staff (A1.1, A1.5, A1.6, A1.7) to serve as Chair; appointed by GFC Executive Committee for a two year term. Strong preference is given to an individual with legal training.
- 1 representative from each of the following (3 total):
 - Students' Union Executive, appointed by the Students' Union Executive
 - Graduate Students' Association Executive, appointed by the Graduate Students' Association Executive
 - Residences, appointed by Council of Residence Association

Cross Appointed (1)

- Dean (or designate) from the GFC Academic Standards Committee (ASC), elected by ASC for a one year term

Elected by GFC (7)

- 2 student members of GFC (graduate or undergraduate)
- 2 academic staff (A1.1, A1.5, A1.6, A1.7) at least 1 of whom is a member of GFC
- 1 academic staff (A1.1, A1.5, A1.6, A1.7) who is a former Associate Dean or a former University Appeals Board (UAB) Chair
- 2 staff members (A1.0, A2.0 and/or S1.0, S2.0)

Note: The Vice-Chair will be appointed by the GFC Executive Committee from amongst the elected academic staff (A1.1, A1.5, A1.6, A1.7) of SCPC for a one year term.

Non-Voting Members

- Discipline Officer
- Appeals Coordinator as defined in the Code of Student Behaviour, Code of Applicant Behaviour and the Practicum Intervention Policy
- Director of University of Alberta Protective Services
- Assistant Dean of Students (Residence)
- GFC Secretary
- University Secretary
- Representative from the Office of the Student Ombuds

4. Delegated Authority from General Faculties Council

Should be reviewed at least every three years and reported to GFC.

4.1 Approve editorial amendments to:

- a. the Code of Student Behaviour (except as listed under 7. Limitations to Authority)
- b. the Code of Applicant Behaviour (except as listed in 7. Limitations to Authority)
- c. the Practicum Intervention Policy (except as listed in 7. Limitations to Authority)

5. Responsibilities Additional to Delegated Authority

5.1 To recommend to GFC on proposals for substantive changes to the Code of Student Behaviour, the Code of Applicant Behaviour, and the Practicum Intervention Policy.

6. Sub-delegations from GFC SCPC

Should be reviewed at least every three years and reported to GFC.

None.

7. Limitations to Authority

The following further refines or places limitations on authorities held by or delegated to SCPC:

7.1 Substantive Amendments, as determined by SCPC, are forwarded to General Faculties Council for recommendation to the Board of Governors:

- a. the Code of Student Behaviour
- b. the Code of Applicant Behaviour
- c. the Practicum Intervention Policy

7.2 All Amendments to the following sections are forwarded to General Faculties Council for recommendation to the Board of Governors:

- a. the Code of Student Behaviour
 - 30.6: Procedures for Appeal of Decisions to the University Appeal Board (UAB)
- b. the Code of Applicant Behaviour
 - 11.8.9: Appeals Against Decisions of the Registrar
- c. the Practicum Intervention Policy
 - 87.5: Appeals to the GFC Practice Review Board (PRB)
 - 87.6: GFC PRB Terms of Reference, Powers and Jurisdiction
 - 87.7: Composition of the GFC PRB
 - 87.8: Procedures Prior to GFC PRB Hearings
 - 87.9: Procedures at the GFC PRB Hearing
 - 87.10: Confidentiality of Hearing and Material)

8. Reporting to GFC

The Committee should regularly report to GFC with respect to its activities and decisions.

9. Definitions

Editorial and Substantive – The Student Conduct Policy Committee determines which amendments are editorial and which are substantive.

Academic staff – as defined by the [Recruitment Policy \(Appendix A\) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff, Administrators and Colleagues](#) in UAPPOL

Non-Academic staff – as defined by the [Recruitment Policy \(Appendix B\) Definition and Categories of Support Staff](#) in UAPPOL

10. Links

[Code of Student Behaviour](#)

[Code of Applicant Behaviour](#)

[Practicum Intervention Policy](#)

[Residence Community Standards](#)

Approved by General Faculties Council: <>

GFC Campus Law Review Committee Terms of Reference

1. Authority

The *Post-Secondary Learning Act* gives General Faculties Council (GFC) responsibility, subject to the authority of the Board of Governors, over "academic affairs" (section 26(1)) and "general supervision of student affairs" (section 31), including authority concerning "student discipline." GFC has thus established a Campus Law Review Committee (GFC CLRC) and a University Appeal Board (GFC UAB), as set out below.

The complete wording of the section(s) of the *Post-Secondary Learning Act*, as referred to above, and any other related sections, should be checked in any instance where formal jurisdiction needs to be determined.

2. Composition of the Committee

The GFC Executive Committee will appoint a faculty member to chair the CLRC, and the faculty member will be appointed for more than two years in order to provide continuity. The Chair may be appointed from among the elected faculty members of the CLRC or may be appointed at-large from categories A1.1 and A1.6 and their counterparts in A1.5 and A1.7*. If the Chair is appointed from among the faculty members on the CLRC, upon appointment by the GFC Executive Committee that seat shall be declared vacant, to be replenished by GFC. (EXEC 30 JUN 2000) (EXEC 04 DEC 2006)

The GFC Executive Committee also appoints the Vice-Chair of the CLRC. The Vice-Chair must be appointed from among the elected faculty members of the CLRC. (EXEC 08 APR 2002) (EXEC 04 DEC 2006)

One non-student member of the Committee must have legal training. (EXEC 04 DEC 2006)

Ex Officio

Discipline Officer (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)
Vice-Provost and Dean of Students
Director of Campus Security Services
Director of Residence Services

One representative from each of the following:

- Students' Union Executive or their designee, appointed by the Students' Union Executive
- Graduate Students' Association, appointed by the GSA Executive
- Residences, elected by the University of Alberta Residence Hall Association
- Student Ombudservice, to be appointed by the members of the Student Ombudservice (EXEC 09 DEC 2002)

Elected by GFC

Two students-at-large (graduate or undergraduate)

One staff member elected from Categories A1.1 and A1.6 and their counterparts in A1.5 and A1.7* (EXEC 03 MAY 2010)

One staff member elected from Categories A1.1 and A1.6 and their counterparts in A1.5 and A1.7* who is a current Associate Dean (EXEC 03 MAY 2010)

One staff member elected from Categories A1.1 and A1.6 and their counterparts in A1.5 and A1.7* who is a former Associate Dean or a former Discipline Officer or a former University Appeals Board (UAB) Chair

(EXEC 03 MAY 2010)

Two staff members selected from Categories A1.0, A2.0 and/or S1.0* and S2.0* (EXEC 04 DEC 2006)

Non-voting Resource Members

Appeals Coordinator, University Appeal Board

Director, General Faculties Council Services and Secretary to GFC

Dean (or designate) cross-representative from the GFC Academic Standards Committee (ASC), appointed by the Chair of GFC ASC

* See UAPPOL Recruitment Policy (Appendixes A) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff and Colleagues and (Appendix B) Definition and Categories of Support Staff for definitions of these categories of staff.

3. Mandate of the Committee

A. Code of Student Behavior

1. To review, from time to time, the Code of Student Behavior and student discipline procedures.
2. On delegated authority from GFC, to approve all editorial amendments to the Code of Student Behaviour except editorial amendments to Section 30.6. (EXEC 02 MAY 2005)
3. Amendments to the Code of Student Behaviour deemed substantive by CLRC are forwarded to the GFC Executive Committee, which will decide whether or not it can act on behalf of GFC. (See *Amendment of the Code*, Section 30.7 of the GFC Policy Manual (Code of Student Behaviour.))

B. Code of Applicant Behavior

1. To review, from time to time, the Code of Applicant Behaviour.
2. On delegated authority from GFC, to approve all editorial amendments to the Code of Applicant Behaviour except editorial amendments to Section 11.8.8. (EXEC 02 MAY 2005)
3. Amendments to the Code of Applicant Behaviour deemed substantive by CLRC are forwarded to the GFC Executive Committee, which will decide whether or not it can act on behalf of GFC. (See *Amendment of the Code of Applicant Behaviour*, Section 11.8.9 of the GFC Policy Manual.)

C. Practicum Intervention Policy

1. To review, from time to time, the Practicum Intervention Policy (EXEC 02 MAY 2005) (GFC 31 MAR 2008) (EXEC 02 MAR 2009)
2. On delegated authority from GFC, to approve all editorial amendments to the Practicum Intervention Policy as noted in Section 87.14. (EXEC 02 MAY 2005) (EXEC 02 MAR 2009)

D. Residence Codes and Community Standards

1. To review, from time to time, the community standards of the University student residence associations, with a full review of Residence Community Standards to be considered every three years (beginning in 2005).
2. New student residence codes shall be submitted to the GFC Campus Law Review Committee which will make a recommendation to the GFC Executive Committee. The GFC Executive has the delegated authority from General Faculties Council to approve new residence codes.
3. Any changes to existing student residence codes shall be submitted to the GFC Campus Law Review Committee. The CLRC has the delegated authority from General Faculties Council to approve changes which in its view are editorial or minor; all such approvals will be filed with the GFC Executive Committee. Any major changes to existing student residence codes shall be forwarded with the recommendation of the CLRC to the GFC Executive for final approval.

E. Other GFC Regulations

1. From time to time the Chair of GFC CLRC will bring forward to GFC CLRC items where the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), in consultation with other units or officers of the University, is seeking the advice of the committee. These matters may include, but are not limited to, rules and regulations, other than discipline codes. (EXEC 02 MAY 2005)

4. Committee Procedures

Quorum

The quorum for the Campus Law Review Committee shall conform to the quorum requirements set out in the *General Terms of Reference - Standing and Other Committees of General Faculties Council (GFC) General Terms of Reference*, with at least two voting members from each of the following three groups of members:

- ex officio members who hold administrative positions;
- ex officio and elected students;
- elected staff. (GFC 22 JUN 1987)(EXEC 23 JUL 1990)

5. Reporting Requirements

Residence Discipline Reports: To receive annually reports from the student residence associations on the number and disposition of discipline cases in the residences, and forward the reports to the GFC Executive Committee. (EXEC 14 JUL 1997)

Any student residence with a code or similar set of regulations is required to report annually on the operation of that code to General Faculties Council through its Campus Law Review Committee and its Executive Committee. (GFC 22 SEP 1997)

Discipline Cases: University Governance has been asked by the GFC Executive to attempt to have all appeal Boards (UAB, GFC AAC and GFC PRB) report to GFC at the same meeting, through the GFC Campus Law Review Committee (CLRC). (EXEC 02 MAR 2009)

The Appeals Coordinator on behalf of the Campus Law Review Committee will submit annually to GFC in the fall, statistical information on discipline cases dealt with by Faculties, the Discipline Officer, the Registrar, Unit Directors, the University Appeal Board and the GFC Practice Review Board. The discipline reports will include the year of the student, the offence with which they were charged and the outcome, but not any personally identifying information. When reporting statistics for applicants, the offence with which the applicant is charged and the outcome, but not any personally identifying information, will be provided. As far as is practical, comparative information from the most recent reporting period will be included. (EXEC 10 DEC 1990) (EXEC 15 MAY 1995) (EXEC 14 JAN 2001)(EXEC 08 APR 2002) (EXEC 02 MAR 2009)

The Appeals Coordinator shall place an ad in the Gateway in the fall and spring. The ad can target a particular area of concern or provide educational information regarding student discipline. These materials may also appear in other University publications. (EXEC 02 MAR 2009)

OUTLINE OF ISSUE
Action Item

Agenda Title: **Proposed Revisions to Standing Committee Terms of Reference - GFC Facilities Development Committee (FDC)**

Motion: THAT General Faculties Council approve the proposed changes to the GFC Facilities Development Committee Terms of Reference as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect upon approval.

Item

Action Requested	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation
Proposed by	Wendy Rodgers, Chair
Presenter	Wendy Rodgers, Chair

Details

Responsibility	General Faculties Council
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	To approve the revised terms of reference for the GFC Facilities Development Committee (FDC).
The Impact of the Proposal is	The committee terms of reference are being amended to reflect the GFC principles on delegated authority and committee composition approved by GFC on April 21, 2017. The Report of the <i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Academic Governance including Delegated Authority, endorsed by GFC on April 21, 2017, did not recommend any substantive changes to the GFC FDC terms of reference.
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	Current committee terms of reference.
Timeline/Implementation Date	To be effective upon approval.
Estimated Cost and funding source	N/A
Next Steps (ie.: Communications Plan, Implementation plans)	Membership changes will be phased in to allow current members to complete their terms. Therefore, as the terms of the elected academic staff and elected student members expire, these positions will be filled, wherever possible, with elected GFC members.
Supplementary Notes and context	The proposed terms of reference reflect a standard template that will be used for all GFC standing committees which has been designed to provide increased clarity on mandate, responsibilities, and delegated authority. Further changes to the FDC terms of reference include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Various changes to update office names and position titles for members 2. Reference to the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and joint-use facilities 3. The inclusion of a comprehensive Definitions section and links to relevant institutional policies and procedures 4. Stipulation that three of the five academic staff members must be a members of GFC, as per Principle 1 of the Principles for Standing Committee Composition: <i>"Wherever possible, the majority of elected members of each</i>

FINAL Item No. 10

	<p><i>standing committee should be drawn from the membership of GFC to provide tangible links between GFC and its standing committees and increase engagement of the greater GFC community.”</i></p> <p>5. The voting status of ex-officio members has been revised to reflect their voting status in accordance with principle 3 of the Principles for Standing Committee Composition on GFC.</p>
--	--

Engagement and Routing (Include meeting dates)

<p>Participation: (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)</p> <p><For further information see the link posted on the Governance Toolkit section Student Participation Protocol></p>	<p><u>Those who have been informed:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities Development Committee • General Faculties Council • Board of Governors has been provided with brief highlights of the work of the <i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Academic Governance including Delegated Authority
	<p><u>Those who have been consulted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of the <i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Academic Governance Including Delegated Authority Appendix 6: List of Consultations • Facilities Development Committee • General Faculties Council • GFC Executive Committee
	<p><u>Those who are actively participating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Academic Governance Including Delegated Authority • Facilities Development Committee • General Faculties Council • GFC Executive Committee
<p>Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)</p>	<p>GFC Facilities Development Committee (September 28, 2017) GFC Executive Committee (October 16, 2017) General Faculties Council (October 30, 2017)</p>
<p>Final Approver</p>	<p>General Faculties Council</p>

Alignment/Compliance

<p>Alignment with Guiding Documents</p>	<p><i>For the Public Good</i></p> <p>Objective 21: Encourage continuous improvement in administrative, governance, planning, and stewardship systems, procedures, and policies that enable students, faculty, staff, and the institution as a whole to achieve shared strategic goals.</p> <p>Principles for General Faculties Council Delegation of Authority</p> <p>Principles for General Faculties Council Standing Committee Composition</p>
<p>Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please <u>quote</u> legislation and include identifying section numbers)</p>	<p>1. <i>Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA)</i> “Powers of general faculties council”</p> <p>26(1) Subject to the authority of the board, a general faculties council is responsible for the academic affairs of the university [...]</p> <p>(3) A general faculties council may delegate any of its powers, duties</p>

FINAL Item No. 10

	<p>and functions under this Act, including the powers referred to in section 31, as it sees fit and may prescribe conditions governing the exercise or performance of any delegated power, duty or function, including the power of subdelegation.”</p> <p>2. GFC Executive Committee Terms of Reference</p> <p>“5. Agendas of General Faculties Council</p> <p>GFC has delegated to the Executive Committee the authority to decide which items are placed on a GFC Agenda, and the order in which those agenda items appear on each GFC agenda.</p> <p>With respect to recommendations from other bodies and other GFC committees, however, the role of the Executive Committee shall be to examine and debate the substance of reports or recommendations and to decide if an item is ready to be forwarded to the full governing body.”</p>
--	---

Attachment:

1. Attachment 1: Draft Terms of Reference
2. Attachment 2: Current Terms of Reference

Prepared by: University Governance



1. Mandate and Role of the Committee

The GFC Facilities Development Committee (FDC) is a standing committee of GFC with delegated authority to make recommendations to General Faculties Council and the Board of Governors. The committee reviews and recommends on general space and functional programs, the design and use of facilities, and policies related to facilities and planning.

In addition, the President, Provost and Vice-President (Academic), and the Vice-President (Facilities and Operations) may refer matters to FDC for consideration or advice.

2. Areas of Responsibility

- a. Policy with respect to planning and facilities
- b. General Space Programs for Academic Units
- c. Design and use of all new facilities and repurposing of existing facilities
- d. Other matters within the purview of the committee

3. Composition

Voting Members (13)

Ex Officio (5)

- Provost and Vice-President (Academic), Chair
- Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)
- Vice-President (Academic), Students' Union
- Vice-President (Academic), Graduate Students' Association
- Vice-Provost and University Registrar

Elected by GFC (7)

- 5 academic staff (A1.0), of which 3 are members of GFC (with no more than one representative from any Faculty); one of whom will be elected by the committee to serve as Vice-Chair for a one year term
- 1 non-academic staff (S1.0, S2.0)
- 1 undergraduate student member of GFC

Cross Appointed (1)

- 1 academic staff member of the GFC Academic Planning Committee (APC) elected by APC to serve a one year term

Non-voting Members

- University Architect
- Associate Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)
- University Secretary
- GFC Secretary

4. Delegated Authority from General Faculties Council and/or the Board of Governors

Should be reviewed at least every three years and reported to GFC.

- 4.1 To approve proposed General Space Programs for academic units
- 4.2 To approve proposals concerning the design and use of all new facilities and the repurposing of existing facilities and to routinely report these decisions for information to the Board of Governors. In considering such proposals, FDC may provide advice, upon request, to the

Provost and Vice-President (Academic), Vice-President (Facilities and Operations), and/or the University Architect on the siting of such facilities.

5. Responsibilities Additional to delegated Authority

FDC is responsible for making recommendations to APC concerning policy matters with respect to the following:

5.1 Planning

- a. Comprehensive facilities development plan
- b. Long Range Development Plan (LRDP)

5.2 Facilities

- a. Planning and use of physical facilities including parking facilities and transportation
- b. Use of land owned or leased by the University
- c. Standards, systems and procedures for planning and designing physical facilities

5.3 Other

- a. Any other matter deemed by FDC to be within the purview of its general responsibility.

To initiate studies and make reports and recommendations on matters within the purview of FDC

6. Sub-Delegations from GFC Facilities Development Committee

Should be reviewed at least every three years and reported to GFC.

None.

7. Limitations to Authority

The following further refines or places limitations on authorities held by or delegated to FDC:

None.

8. Reporting to GFC

The Committee should regularly report to GFC with respect to its activities and decisions.

9. Definitions

University Facilities: All lands, buildings, and space owned, operated, or leased by or from the University of Alberta. (as per UAPPOL)

General Space Program: A general space program describes the current state of an academic, research and/or administrative unit's activities in terms of their space needs, including student, staffing and support requirements. A space program includes a space budget that outlines how much space the unit has currently, how much it will require in the near future, and also predicts what amount of space may be required over a long-term planning period. (as per UAPPOL)

Repurposing: Significant changes to the use of a facility, as determined by the Vice-President (Facilities and Operations) or delegate.

Space/Systems Renewal: Upgrades and improvements to space that involve renewed surface finishes and systems improvements. Renewal projects would apply to areas in which there is no change in use and would be used to upgrade large base building system deferred maintenance issues in order to support current usage and operation. Examples of renewal include the following: repairs as repainting,

replacement of flooring, replacing of piping, replacement of air systems, rebuilding of sidewalks, or upgrading a building envelope. (as per UAPPOL)

Renovation or Alteration: Any physical change to space that relates to more than renewed surface finishes. (as per UAPPOL)

Major Maintenance: Unplanned repairs and replacement that must be accomplished, but that is not funded by normal maintenance resources received in the annual operating budget cycle, and includes significant repairs and building system/component replacement in-kind. Examples include replacement of skylights, fire alarm systems, complete replacement of flooring for a department. (as per UAPPOL)

Repairs: Work to restore damaged or worn-out facilities (e.g., large-scale roof replacement after a wind storm) to normal operating condition. (as per UAPPOL)

Academic Staff: As defined by the [Recruitment Policy \(Appendix A\) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff, Administrators and Colleagues](#) in UAPPOL

Non-Academic Staff: As defined by the [Recruitment Policy \(Appendix B\) Definition and Categories of Support Staff](#) in UAPPOL

10. Links

[Planning and Renovation of Existing Facilities Policy](#)

[Long Range Development Plan \(LRDP\)](#)

[Sector Plans](#)

[Current Construction Projects](#)

Approved by General Faculties Council: <>

GFC Facilities Development Committee Terms of Reference

1. Authority

The *Post-Secondary Learning Act* gives General Faculties Council (GFC) responsibility, subject to the authority of the Board of Governors, over "academic affairs" (section 26(1)), and provides that GFC may make recommendations to the Board of Governors on a "building program" (section 26(1)(o)). Section 19 requires that the Board of Governors "consider the recommendations of the general faculties council, if any, on matters of academic import prior to providing for (a) the support and maintenance of the university, (b) the betterment of existing buildings, (c) the construction of any new buildings the board considers necessary to the purposes of the university." GFC has thus established a Facilities Development Committee (FDC), as set out below. Subject to the authority of the Board of Governors, GFC delegates certain of its powers to its Facilities Development Committee.

The complete wording of the section(s) of the *Post-Secondary Learning Act*, as referred to, should be checked in any instance where formal jurisdiction needs to be determined.

2. Composition of the Committee

Chair - Provost and Vice-President (Academic) or Delegate (*Ex Officio* Member)

Note Regarding the Vice-Chair – The Vice-Chair will be appointed by the GFC Executive Committee from among the faculty members on FDC.

Ex Officio (see above):

Students' Union Vice-President (Academic) or Delegate

Graduate Students' Association Vice-President (Academic) or Delegate

Vice-President (Facilities and Operations) or Delegate (EXEC 03 FEB 2003)

Members Elected by GFC

Five members from Category A1.0*, plus one cross-representative appointed by the Chair of APC from that committee. There shall be no more than one representative from any Faculty (except for the cross-representative).

One member of the support staff (Categories S1.0 and S2.0*), elected by GFC

One undergraduate student (EXEC 14 JUN 2004)

Non-voting members:

Director of Engineering Infrastructure or Delegate

University Architect or Delegate

Associate Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)

Vice-Provost and University Registrar or Delegate (EXEC 23 JUN 2003)

* See UAPPOL Recruitment Policy (Appendix A) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff and Colleagues and (Appendix B) Definition and Categories of Support Staff for definitions of these categories of staff.

3. Mandate of the Committee

1. Policy Matters

The Facilities Development Committee is responsible for making recommendations to the Academic Planning Committee or the Board of Governors concerning policy matters with respect to the following. (GFC 29 SEP 2003)

A. Planning

1. Comprehensive facilities development plan.

B. Facilities

1. Planning and use of physical facilities, including parking facilities and transportation. (GFC 29 SEP 2003)
2. Use of land owned or leased by the University.
3. Standards, systems and procedures for planning and designing physical facilities.

C. Other

Any other matter deemed by the FDC to be within the purview of its general responsibility.

2. Delegation of Authority

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the terms of reference above, the Board of Governors and General Faculties Council have delegated to the Facilities Development Committee the following powers and authority:

A. Facilities

1. To approve proposed General Space Programmes (Programs) for academic units.
2. (i) To approve proposals concerning the design and use of all new facilities and the repurposing of existing facilities and to routinely report these decisions for information to the Board of Governors.

(ii) In considering such proposals, GFC FDC may provide advice, upon request, to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), Vice-President (Facilities and Operations), and/or the University Architect (or their respective delegates) on the siting of such facilities. (GFC SEP 29 2003)

B. Other Matters

The Chair of FDC will bring forward to FDC items where the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and/or the Office of the Vice-President (Facilities and Operations), in consultation with other units or officers of the University, is seeking the advice of the Committee.

C. Studies

In light of the academic priorities set by General Faculties Council, to initiate studies, and respond to requests for studies, opinion, and information within the purview of its general responsibilities and make reports and recommendations to the appropriate office or committee. (GFC 29 SEP 2003)

D. Sub-Delegation

To appoint such subcommittees, and to delegate to such subcommittees or to the Vice-President (Facilities and Operations) such of its powers, duties and functions, or any part thereof, including the power of sub-delegation and subject to such conditions as it deems necessary. (GFC 29 SEP 2003)

4. Committee Procedures

See General Terms of Reference.

5. Additional Reporting Requirements

None.

R:\GO04 General Faculties Council - General\PRO\TER\FAC\Facilities-Development-Committee-Amended.doc

OUTLINE OF ISSUE
Information Item

Agenda Title: **Proposed Changes to the Admission of Aboriginal Students Calendar Section and updates to Faculty Sections**

Motion: THAT General Faculties Council approve the proposed changes to the calendar sections related to the admission of First Nations, Métis and Inuit students as set forth in Attachments 1 and 2, and as recommended by the GFC Academic Planning Committee and the GFC Academic Standards Committee, to take effect in 2018/19.

Item

Action Requested	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation
Proposed by	Lisa Collins, Vice-Provost and University Registrar
Presenter	Lisa Collins, Vice-Provost and University Registrar Chris Andersen, Dean, Faculty of Native Studies

Details

Responsibility	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	To update impacted calendar sections on Aboriginal Admissions.
The Impact of the Proposal is	In order to achieve consistency across Faculties, calendar sections are being updated to indicate that proof of Aboriginal identity will be required.
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	Impacted sections of the University of Alberta Calendar.
Timeline/Implementation Date	For implementation and publication in the 2018/19 University Calendar.
Estimated Cost and funding source	N/A
Next Steps (ie.: Communications Plan, Implementation plans)	The Council on Aboriginal Initiatives requested that a First Nations, Metis, Inuit (FNMI) Working Group review the Admission of Aboriginal Students calendar entry and prepare any recommended changes. This will be communicated back to CAI at their next meeting.
Supplementary Notes and context	Faculty specific sections were approved by faculty councils.

Engagement and Routing (Include meeting dates)

Participation: (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity) <For further information see the link posted on the Governance Toolkit section Student Participation Protocol >	<u>Those who have been informed:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
	<u>Those who have been consulted:</u> October 27, 2014 - FNMI Definitions Working Group (Subcommittee of the Council on Aboriginal Initiatives) – Collaboration on changes November 17, 2014 - Vice-Provosts' Council - Advice December 1, 2014 – Vice Provosts' Council - Advice December 11, 2014 -Council on Aboriginal Initiatives – Reporting/Consultation February 2, 2015 – Aboriginal Students' Association – Consultation February 9 , 2015 – Native Studies Students' Association - Consultation February 10, 2015 - University Legal Counsel - Advice February 13, 2015 – Council on Aboriginal Initiatives -

FINAL Item No. 11

	<p>Reporting/Consultation March 9, 2015 – Safe Disclosure and Human Rights - Advice April 1, 2015 – Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Indigenous Health Initiatives - Consultation May 5, 2015 - Students' Union - Consultation May 5, 2015 - Graduate Students Association – Consultation November 16, 2015 - Consultation with Catherine Bell, Faculty of Law November 10, 2015 Consultation with Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine November 17, 2015 – Law Faculty Councils – Approval November 17, 2015 – Medicine and Dentistry Faculty Councils – Approval November 23, 2015 – Vice-Provosts' Council - Advice November 25, 2015 – FGSR Council - Approval of Occupational Therapy Section November 26, 2015 - President's Executive Committee – Operational – Consultation November 26, 2015 - General Council - Consultation December 2, 2015 - Deans' Council -Consultation December 15, 2015 - FNS Executive Meeting - Consultation December 17, 2015 – Council on Aboriginal Initiatives - Consultation November, 2016 Approval by Faculty of Native Studies Faculty Council May 9, 2017 Approval by Nursing Faculty Council June 1, 2017 Academic Standards Committee Subcommittee on Standards – Consultation June 15, 2017 – GFC Academic Standards Committee (ASC) September 13, 2017 – GFC Academic Planning Committee (APC)</p> <p><u><i>Those who are actively participating:</i></u> September 13, 2017 – GFC Academic Planning Committee (APC)</p>
<p>Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)</p>	<p>Academic Standards Committee - June 15, 2017 Academic Planning Committee – June 14, 2017 GFC Executive Committee (for information) – October 16, 2017 General Faculties Council – October 30, 2017</p>
<p>Final Approver</p>	<p>General Faculties Council</p>

Alignment/Compliance

<p>Alignment with Guiding Documents</p>	<p>OBJECTIVE: Build a diverse, inclusive community of exceptional undergraduate and graduate students from Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, and the world.</p> <p>Strategy: Develop and implement an undergraduate and graduate recruitment and retention strategy to attract Indigenous students from across Alberta and Canada.</p>
<p>Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please quote legislation and include identifying section numbers)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA): The Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA) gives GFC responsibility, subject to the authority of the Board of Governors, over academic affairs Section 26(1)). PSLA: The PSLA gives Faculty Councils power to “provide for the admission of students to the faculty” (29(1)(c)). UAPPOL Admissions Policy: “Admission to the University of

Alberta is based on documented academic criteria established by individual Faculties and approved by GFC. This criteria may be defined in areas such as subject requirements, minimum entrance averages, and language proficiency requirements. In addition to academic requirements for admission, GFC authorizes each Faculty to establish such other reasonable criteria for admission of applicants as the Faculty may consider appropriate to its programs of study, subject to the approval of GFC (e.g. interview, audition, portfolio, etc.)

The admission requirements for any Faculty will be those approved by GFC as set forth in the current edition of the University Calendar. In addition to the admission requirements, selection criteria for quota programs, where they exist, will also be published in the current edition of the University Calendar.

The responsibility for admission decisions will be vested in the Faculty Admission Committees or in the Deans of the respective Faculties, as the councils of such Faculties will determine.”

4. UAPPOL Admissions Procedure:

“PROCEDURE

1. EFFECTIVE DATE OF CHANGES TO ADMISSION REGULATIONS

Following approval by GFC:

a. Where changes to admission regulations may disadvantage students in the current admission cycle, normally implementation will be effective after the change has been published in the University Calendar for one full year (i.e., effective the second year that the information is published in the University Calendar).

For example, a change approved in May 2005 would be first published in the 2006-2007 University Calendar in March 2006. Therefore the statement cannot come into effect until September 2007 (affecting applicants who apply for the September 2007 term beginning July 2006).”

b. Where changes to admission regulations are deemed by the approving body to be ‘advantageous to students’, normally the date of implementation will be effective immediately or at the next available intake for the admitting Faculty.”

5. GFC Academic Standards Committee (ASC) Terms of Reference (Mandate): “B. Admission and Transfer, Academic Standing, Marking and Grading, Term Work, Examinations, International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced Placement (AP)

i. All proposals from the Faculties or the Administration related to admission and transfer, to the academic standing of students, to institutional marking and grading policies and/or procedures and to term work policies and procedures are submitted to the Provost and

FINAL Item No. 11

	<p>Vice-President (Academic) (or delegate) who chairs the GFC Academic Standards Committee. ASC will consult as necessary with the Faculties and with other individuals and offices in its consideration of these proposals.</p> <p>ii. ASC acts for GFC in approving routine and/or editorial changes to both admission/transfer policies [...]</p> <p>iv. ASC provides advice or recommends to the GFC Academic Planning Committee (APC) on proposals which involve substantial change to admission/transfer regulations or to academic standing regulations.</p> <p>6. GFC Academic Planning Committee (APC) Terms of Reference (Mandate): Admission, Transfer and Academic Standing</p> <p>a. To consider advice or recommendation from the GFC ASC on proposals for the establishment of or change to general University admission or transfer policies affecting students, including policies affecting Open Studies students, and to act for GFC in approving policies which in APC's view are minor or routine; and to recommend to GFC on proposals involving major change</p> <p>b. To consider advice or recommendation from the GFC ASC on proposals which involve substantial change to admission/transfer regulations or to academic standing regulations.</p> <p>7. GFC Executive Committee Terms of Reference: Agendas of General Faculties Council</p> <p>GFC has delegated to the Executive Committee the authority to decide which items are placed on a GFC agenda, and the order in which those agenda items appear on each GFC agenda.</p> <p>When ordering items, the GFC Executive Committee will be mindful of any matters that are of particular concern to students during March and April so that the student leaders who bring those items forward are able to address these items at GFC before their terms end.</p> <p>When recommendations are forwarded to General Faculties Council from APC, the role of the Executive shall be to decide the order in which items should be considered by GFC. The Executive Committee is responsible for providing general advice to the Chair about proposals being forwarded from APC to GFC.</p>
--	--

1. Attachment 1 (page(s) 1 - 7) Admission of Aboriginal Students Calendar Section
2. Attachment 2 (page(s) 1 - 5) Faculty Calendar Sections

**Office of the Registrar
For Implementation and Publication in the 2018-19 Calendar**

Current	Proposed
<p>Faculty of Law</p> <p>Special Applicants</p> <p>No applicant can elect to be placed in any category. Allocation to such category shall be the responsibility of the Committee.</p> <p>(1) Aboriginal Applicants: For the purpose of application and admission to the University of Alberta, and in accordance with the Constitution Act, 1982, Part II, Section 35(2), an Aboriginal Applicant is an Indian, Inuit or Métis person of Canada, or a person who is accepted by one of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada as a member of their community. Refer to §14.1.2 for further details regarding proof of Aboriginal ancestry.</p> <p>Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry</p> <p>BSc in Medical Laboratory Science</p> <p>IV. Aboriginal Applicants</p> <p>The Division of Medical Laboratory Science will give up to one position within the quota for the BSc MLS program to Aboriginal applicants. Students of Aboriginal ancestry within the meaning of the Constitution Act, 1982, Section 35, Part 2, or a person accepted by one of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada as a member of their community, will be considered in this category.</p> <p>Candidates will be subject to normal minimum admission requirements as outlined in §15.9.2 and approval by the Divisional Admissions Committee. If there are no qualified Aboriginal applicants in any given year, the position will be allocated to the general applicant pool.</p> <p>Aboriginal applicants should contact the</p>	<p>Faculty of Law</p> <p>Special Applicants</p> <p>No applicant can elect to be placed in any category. Allocation to such category shall be the responsibility of the Committee.</p> <p>(1) Aboriginal Applicants: For the purpose of application and admission to the University of Alberta, and in accordance with the Constitution Act, 1982, Part II, Section 35(2), an Aboriginal Applicant is an Indian, Inuit or Métis person of Canada, or a person who is accepted by one of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada as a member of their community. Refer to §14.1.2 for further details regarding proof of Aboriginal identity.</p> <p>Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry</p> <p>BSc in Medical Laboratory Science</p> <p>IV. Aboriginal Applicants</p> <p>The Division of Medical Laboratory Science will give up to one position within the quota for the BSc MLS program to Aboriginal applicants. Students of Aboriginal identity within the meaning of the Constitution Act, 1982, Section 35, Part 2, or a person accepted by one of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada as a member of their community, will be considered in this category.</p> <p>Candidates will be subject to normal minimum admission requirements as outlined in §15.9.2 and approval by the Divisional Admissions Committee. If there are no qualified Aboriginal applicants in any given year, the position will be allocated to the general applicant pool.</p> <p>Aboriginal applicants should contact the</p>

Coordinator, Division of Medical Laboratory Science, for career planning.

Dental Hygiene Diploma

IV. Aboriginal Applicants

Besides the regular quota positions, additional position(s) per year are available in the Dental Hygiene program for a qualified student of Aboriginal **ancestry**, within the meaning of the Constitution Act of 1982, Section 35(2). Applicants interested in this program should contact the Administrator, Indigenous Health Initiatives, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry. See also §14.1.

Doctor of Dental Surgery (DDS)

IV. Aboriginal Applicants

Besides the regular quota positions, an additional position per year is available in the DDS program for a qualified student of Aboriginal **ancestry**, within the meaning of the Constitution Act of 1982, Section 35, Part 2. Applicants interested in this program should contact the Administrator, Indigenous Health Initiatives, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry. See also §14.1.

Doctor of Medicine (MD)

III. Aboriginal Applicants

The Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry may provide up to five positions within quota for the MD program to qualified Aboriginal applicants over and above Aboriginal applicants who were admitted in the regular process. Candidates will be subject to normal minimum admission requirements as outlined in ~~§15.9.9~~ and to approval by the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Admissions Committee. For more information, contact the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Undergraduate Admissions Office.

Students who are of Aboriginal **ancestry** within

Coordinator, Division of Medical Laboratory Science, for career planning.

Dental Hygiene Diploma

IV. Aboriginal Applicants

Besides the regular quota positions, additional position(s) per year are available in the Dental Hygiene program for a qualified student of Aboriginal **identity**, within the meaning of the Constitution Act of 1982, Section 35(2). Applicants interested in this program should contact the Administrator, Indigenous Health Initiatives, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry. See also §14.1.

Doctor of Dental Surgery (DDS)

IV. Aboriginal Applicants

Besides the regular quota positions, an additional position per year is available in the DDS program for a qualified student of Aboriginal **identity**, within the meaning of the Constitution Act of 1982, Section 35, Part 2. Applicants interested in this program should contact the Administrator, Indigenous Health Initiatives, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry. See also §14.1.

Doctor of Medicine (MD)

III. Aboriginal Applicants

The Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry may provide up to five positions within quota for the MD program to qualified Aboriginal applicants over and above Aboriginal applicants who were admitted in the regular process. Candidates will be subject to normal minimum admission requirements as outlined in **Doctor of Medicine** and to approval by the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Admissions Committee. For more information, contact the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Undergraduate Admissions Office.

Students who are of Aboriginal **identity** within

the meaning of the Constitution Act, 1982, Section 35(2) will be considered in this category.

Aboriginal student applicants and prospective pre-medical students should contact the Coordinator, Aboriginal Health Care Careers, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry for individual counseling and career planning. See also §14.1.

Bachelor of Science in Radiation Therapy

IV. Aboriginal Applicants

The Department of Oncology will provide up to one position within the quota for the BSc Radiation Therapy program to Aboriginal applicants. Students of Aboriginal **ancestry** within the meaning of the Constitution Act, 1982, Section 35, Part 2, or a person accepted by one of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada as a member of their community, will be considered in this category.

Candidates will be subject to normal minimum admission requirements as outlined in §15.9.10 and approval by the Radiation Therapy Admissions Committee. If there are no qualified Aboriginal applicants in any given year, the position will be allocated to the general applicant pool.

Aboriginal applicants should contact the Department of Oncology in the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry for career planning.

Faculty of Native Studies

BA (Native Studies)/BEd Combined Degrees

The Bachelor of Arts in Native Studies/Bachelor of Education Combined Degrees program allows students to complete both degrees in a five-year program consisting of *150. Students may select either the Secondary or the Elementary program. The program is open to both Native and non-Native applicants. However, to correct an historic disadvantage and in recognition that the demand

the meaning of the Constitution Act, 1982, Section 35(2) will be considered in this category.

Aboriginal student applicants and prospective pre-medical students should contact the Coordinator, Aboriginal Health Care Careers, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry for individual counseling and career planning. See also **Admission of Aboriginal Applicants.**

Bachelor of Science in Radiation Therapy

IV. Aboriginal Applicants

The Department of Oncology will provide up to one position within the quota for the BSc Radiation Therapy program to Aboriginal applicants. Students of Aboriginal **identity** within the meaning of the Constitution Act, 1982, Section 35, Part 2, or a person accepted by one of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada as a member of their community, will be considered in this category.

Candidates will be subject to normal minimum admission requirements as outlined in §15.9.10 and approval by the Radiation Therapy Admissions Committee. If there are no qualified Aboriginal applicants in any given year, the position will be allocated to the general applicant pool.

Aboriginal applicants should contact the Department of Oncology in the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry for career planning.

Faculty of Native Studies

BA (Native Studies)/BEd Combined Degrees

The Bachelor of Arts in Native Studies/Bachelor of Education Combined Degrees program allows students to complete both degrees in a five-year program consisting of *150. Students may select either the Secondary or the Elementary program. The program is open to both Native and non-Native applicants. However, to correct an historic

for students of native **ancestry** is significant, Native students are especially encouraged to apply.

Faculty of Nursing

BSc in Nursing–Collaborative Program

IV. Aboriginal Applicants

(1) In addition to the regular quota positions, up to six more positions per year are available in the Collaborative BScN program for qualified students of Native **ancestry** within the meaning of the Constitutional Act of 1982, Section 35, Part 2. Please refer to §14.1 for regulations and requirements.

Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Aboriginal Applicants

The Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences may provide one position to an Aboriginal applicant, over the regular quota of 130 students. Students who are of Aboriginal **ancestry** within the meaning of the Constitution Act, 1982, Section 35(2) will be considered in this category (§14.1). Proof of Aboriginal status, to be provided as part of the application for admission, is required for consideration of this position [§14.1.2(2)].

Candidates will be subject to admission as outlined in §15.12.1, and to approval by the Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences Admissions Committee. If there are no qualified Aboriginal students in any given year, this position will not be allocated to other applicants.

Aboriginal student applicants should contact the Coordinator, Native Health Care Careers, for individual counselling and career planning. See also §14.1.

disadvantage and in recognition that the demand for students of native **identity** is significant, Native students are especially encouraged to apply.

Faculty of Nursing

BSc in Nursing–Collaborative Program

IV. Aboriginal Applicants

(1) In addition to the regular quota positions, up to six more positions per year are available in the Collaborative BScN program for qualified students of Native **identity** within the meaning of the Constitutional Act of 1982, Section 35, Part 2. Please refer to §14.1 for regulations and requirements.

Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Aboriginal Applicants

The Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences may provide one position to an Aboriginal applicant, over the regular quota of 130 students. Students who are of Aboriginal **identity** within the meaning of the Constitution Act, 1982, Section 35(2) will be considered in this category (§14.1). Proof of Aboriginal status, to be provided as part of the application for admission, is required for consideration of this position [§14.1.2(2)].

Candidates will be subject to admission as outlined in §15.12.1, and to approval by the Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences Admissions Committee. If there are no qualified Aboriginal students in any given year, this position will not be allocated to other applicants.

Aboriginal student applicants should contact the Coordinator, Native Health Care Careers, for individual counselling and career planning. See also §14.1.

Occupational Therapy

General Information

Aboriginal Applicants

Two positions in the occupational therapy program are available to applicants of aboriginal **ancestry** as defined in the Constitution Act, 1982, Part II, Section 35(2). Applicants must meet all entrance requirements as specified below. If suitable Aboriginal applicants cannot be found, these positions will be filled by applicants from the general pool.

Occupational Therapy

General Information

Aboriginal Applicants

Two positions in the occupational therapy program are available to applicants of aboriginal **identity** as defined in the Constitution Act, 1982, Part II, Section 35(2). Applicants must meet all entrance requirements as specified below. If suitable Aboriginal applicants cannot be found, these positions will be filled by applicants from the general pool.

**Office of the Registrar
For Publication in 2018-19 Calendar
For Implementation in 2018-19**

Current	Proposed	Explanation
<p>Admission of Aboriginal Students</p> <p>General Statement</p> <p>The University of Alberta is committed to the recruitment, retention and graduation of Aboriginal students. The University also recognizes that Aboriginal applicants have traditionally been under represented in higher education and strives towards having the University's Aboriginal student population attain a level that is at least proportionate to the Aboriginal population of the province.</p> <p>In order to facilitate appropriate representation of Aboriginal students on campus, additional qualified applicants may be considered over and above the Aboriginal students who are admitted in the regular competition for places in a Faculty. Aboriginal applicants who wish to be considered for such additional places must attain the minimum admission requirements of their chosen program as prescribed by the University and its Faculties and Schools. To assist the University in achieving this overall goal, Faculties are encouraged to set aside places specifically for Aboriginal applicants, the number being consistent with the available pool, student interests, and available teaching and learning support services.</p>	<p>Admission of Aboriginal Students</p> <p>General Statement</p> <p>The University of Alberta is committed to the recruitment, retention and graduation of Aboriginal students. The University also recognizes that Aboriginal applicants have traditionally been under represented in higher education and strives towards having the University's Aboriginal student population attain a level that is at least proportionate to the Aboriginal population of the province. All Aboriginal students are encouraged to self-identify. In order to facilitate appropriate representation of Aboriginal students on campus, additional qualified applicants may be considered over and above the Aboriginal students who are admitted in the regular competition for places in a Faculty. Aboriginal applicants who wish to be considered for such additional places must attain the minimum admission requirements of their chosen program as prescribed by the University and its Faculties and Schools. To assist the University in achieving this overall goal, Faculties are encouraged to set aside places specifically for Aboriginal applicants, the number being consistent with the available pool, student interests, and available teaching and learning support services.</p> <p>Definition of Aboriginal People for</p>	

Definition of Aboriginal People for the Purpose of Admission

(1) **Definition of an Aboriginal Applicant:** For the purpose of application and admission to the University of Alberta, and in accordance with the Constitution Act, 1982, Part II, Section 35(2), an Aboriginal applicant is an Indian, Inuit, or Métis person of Canada, ~~or a person who is accepted by one of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada as a member of their community.~~

(2) **Proof of Aboriginal Ancestry:** ~~Proof of Aboriginal ancestry may be required by Faculties; candidates will be advised at the time of application if they must provide it. Where proof is required, documentation will be verified by~~

- a. the Faculty of Law, if application is made to the Faculty of Law;
- b. the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, if the application is made to the Dentistry, Medicine, Dental Hygiene or Medical Laboratory Science programs;
- c. the Aboriginal Student Services Centre, acting on behalf of all other Faculties,

the Purpose of Admission

(1) **Definition of an Aboriginal Applicant:** For the purpose of application and admission to the University of Alberta, and in accordance with the Constitution Act, 1982, Part II, Section 35(2), an Aboriginal applicant is an Indian, Inuit, or Métis person of Canada.

(2) **Proof of Aboriginal Identity:** Aboriginal applicants who wish to be considered for places reserved for Aboriginal students will be required to provide proof of Aboriginal identity. Documentation will be verified by

- a. the Faculty of Law, if application is made to the Faculty of Law;
- b. the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, if the application is made to the Dentistry, Medicine, Dental Hygiene, Radiation Therapy, or Medical Laboratory Science programs;
- c. the Aboriginal Student Services Centre, acting on behalf of all other Faculties,

This changed language is consistent with that used by other U15 institutions and keeps the definition consistent with the Constitution Act.

*Additional clarity
The change from “ancestry” to “identity” reflects evolution of language across the country.*

A requirement to prove identity ensures that Aboriginal applicants are being treated fairly and consistently across Faculties, where those applicants are competing for places reserved for Aboriginal students.

<p>if application is made to any other program.</p> <p>Aboriginal applicants must be aware that proof of ancestry does not guarantee admission to any program. All positions at the University are competitive and admission committees will make their selections from among the best qualified candidates. Candidates may also be required to demonstrate their connection to an Aboriginal community.</p> <p>The following is accepted as proof of ancestry, for the purpose of application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a certified copy of a Status or Treaty card; b. a certified copy of a Métis membership card; c. a certified copy of a Nunavut Trust Certificate card, roll number or any other proof accepted by Inuit communities; d. proof that an ancestor's name has been entered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) in the Indian Register according to the 	<p>if application is made to any other program.</p> <p>The following is accepted as proof of <u>Aboriginal identity</u>, for the purpose of application. <u>Other forms of proof may be considered.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a certified copy of a Status card; b. <u>certified copy of citizenship or membership in a Metis Settlement from one of the five Métis Provincial Affiliates: Métis Nation of Alberta, Métis Nation of Ontario, Manitoba Métis Federation, Métis Nation-Saskatchewan, Métis Nation British of Columbia.</u> c. a certified copy of a Nunavut Trust Certificate card; d. proof that an ancestor's name has been entered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) in the Indian Register according to the 	<p><i>Note: This paragraph moved below.</i></p> <p><i>Moved below</i></p> <p><i>This language provides greater specificity as to the kinds of membership cards that Métis applicants may have.</i></p>
---	---	--

<p>Indian Act, or</p> <p>2) on the band list of an individual band, or</p> <p>3) on the Inuit roll;</p> <p>e. evidence of an ancestor who received a land grant or a scrip grant under the Manitoba Act or the Dominion Lands Act;</p> <p>f. written confirmation of Aboriginal ancestry from the Department of Indian Affairs;</p> <p>g. written confirmation of membership by a band council which has enacted its own band membership code;</p> <p>h. a Statutory Declaration by an applicant attesting to Aboriginal ancestry, supplemented by letters or documentation supporting the Declaration</p> <p>1) from an official of a recognized native organization, or</p>	<p>Indian Act, or</p> <p>2) on the band list of an individual band, or</p> <p>3) <u>as beneficiaries of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement or other claim regions such as Nunatsiavut, Nunavik, and Inuvialuit;</u></p> <p>e. written confirmation of Aboriginal <u>identity</u> from <u>Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) or Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated;</u></p> <p>f. written confirmation of membership by a band council which has enacted its own band membership code;</p>	<p><i>Updated language</i></p> <p><i>Updated language</i></p> <p><i>Statutory Declarations as described here are difficult to verify. Note that the University does leave open the possibility of other forms of proof being considered.</i></p>
--	--	--

<p>2) from a relative in an Aboriginal community, or 3) from the applicant describing involvement with Aboriginal issues.</p> <p>Other forms of proof may be considered.</p> <p>(3) Residence</p> <p>a. Regarding Application: Residence regulations affecting application to any program at this University shall be waived for Aboriginal applicants.</p> <p>b. Regarding Admission: For the purpose of determining admission to a program, an Aboriginal applicant who is not resident in Alberta will be considered in the following categories and in the order specified:</p> <p>1) First, as a candidate for the positions reserved for out-of-province applicants.</p>	<p>Aboriginal applicants must be aware that proof of Aboriginal identity does not guarantee admission to any program. All positions at the University are competitive and admission committees will make their selections from among the best qualified candidates. Candidates may also be required to demonstrate their connection to an Aboriginal community.</p> <p>(3) Residence</p> <p>a. Regarding Application: Residence regulations affecting application to any program at this University shall be waived for Aboriginal applicants.</p> <p>b. Regarding Admission: For the purpose of determining admission to a program, an Aboriginal applicant who is not resident in Alberta will be considered in the following categories and in the order specified:</p> <p>1) First, as a candidate for the positions reserved for out-of-province applicants.</p>	<p><i>Moved above.</i></p> <p><i>Moved from above.</i></p>
---	---	--

<p>2) Second, as a candidate for the positions reserved for Alberta residents. Residence regulations shall be waived for this purpose.</p> <p>3) Third, as a candidate for positions set aside specifically for Aboriginal applicants. Preference for these positions may be given to those who are resident in Alberta.</p> <p>(4) Appeal on Aboriginal Status Appeals regarding Aboriginal status for the purpose of application can be made to the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). Appeals may be made on status only and must be received, in writing, within 30 days of the date on the letter advising that proof submitted in support of Aboriginal status has not been accepted for the purpose of application to a program. In the case of an appeal, the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) shall authorize a panel to review the decision, consisting of the following members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in the Chair, the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) (or delegate) - President, Aboriginal Students 	<p>2) Second, as a candidate for the positions reserved for Alberta residents. Residence regulations shall be waived for this purpose.</p> <p>3) Third, as a candidate for positions set aside specifically for Aboriginal applicants. Preference for these positions may be given to those who are resident in Alberta.</p> <p>(4) Appeal Appeals regarding <u>proof of Aboriginal identity</u> for the purpose of application can be made to the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). Appeals may be made on <u>proof of Aboriginal identity only, and not on the admission decision</u>, and must be received, in writing, within 30 days of the date on the letter advising that proof submitted in support of Aboriginal <u>identity</u> has not been accepted for the purpose of application to a program. In the case of an appeal, the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) shall authorize a panel to review the decision, consisting of the following members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in the Chair, the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) (or delegate) - President, Aboriginal Students 	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Updated language</i></p>
---	---	--

<p>Council (or delegate)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an Elder (appointed by the University of Alberta Aboriginal Council) - an appropriate representative of an Indian, Métis or Inuit community (appointed by the University of Alberta Aboriginal Council) - a member of a Faculty not associated with the case [appointed by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)]. <p>The decision of the appeal panel is final and binding.</p>	<p>Council (or delegate)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an Elder (appointed by the <u>Council on Aboriginal Initiatives</u>) - an appropriate representative of a <u>First Nations</u>, Métis or Inuit community (appointed by the <u>Council of Aboriginal Initiatives</u>) - a member of a Faculty not associated with the case [appointed by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)]. <p>The decision of the appeal panel is final and binding.</p>	
--	--	--