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1. A bit about how we got here
2. Some constraints on the project
3. CEPT goals for the “core instrument”
4. Other aspects of teaching evaluation
5. Using the tools (discussion and feedback wanted!)
HOW WE GOT HERE

CEPT
PHASE 1 ➔ SENATE
SEPT ‘17 ➔ PHASE 2 CEPT
WORK TO DATE
 CONSTRAINTS ON CEPT(2) 

1. Summative and comparative evaluation of teaching performance is unavoidable

2. Students want an appropriate voice

3. Accountability expectations

BUT ...

We’re an educational and research institution --- surely we should make evaluations using reasonable evidence
Intentions for the Core Instrument

1. Ask sensible questions
   - About topics students can have an informed opinion about
   - That don’t presume a single method of content delivery
   - That are not worded in biasing ways (e.g. likely to produce a gendered response)

2. Ask about “priority areas”
   - Course design
   - Content delivery
   - Learning atmosphere created by instructor
What’s Missing and what to do about it?

1. Eventual cascaded model
2. “Complementary methods”
   1. Peer review?
   2. Teaching dossiers?
   3. Self-assessments?
   4. Getting beyond counting for grad supervision?
Questions for y’all

1. Access to answers to open-ended questions?
2. How important are “complementary methods” now?
3. Useful to have multiple composite measures for, e.g., courses where instructor evaluated didn’t design the course?
4. “Users’ Guides” ... what would be useful to know?
Example: How useful are tables like these?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Size</th>
<th>1-25</th>
<th>26-50</th>
<th>51-100</th>
<th>101-200</th>
<th>200+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interval around the mean</td>
<td>Recommended interpretation of the quality of the mean estimate</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; ±0.1</td>
<td>Very precise estimate</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; ±0.2</td>
<td>Precise estimate</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;70%</td>
<td>&gt;70%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; ±0.5</td>
<td>Somewhat precise estimate</td>
<td>&gt;70%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;40%</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; ±1.0</td>
<td>General estimate</td>
<td>&gt;60%</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1.0+</td>
<td>Very general estimate</td>
<td>&lt; 30%</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>&lt;3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of Typical ICM Scores for Each Course Size Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course size</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Typical (middle 70%)</th>
<th>Lower than typical (bottom 15%)</th>
<th>Higher than typical (top 15%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7 and 4.8</td>
<td>≤3.6</td>
<td>&gt;4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6 and 4.5</td>
<td>≤3.5</td>
<td>&gt;4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4 and 4.4</td>
<td>≤3.3</td>
<td>&gt;4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4 and 4.3</td>
<td>≤3.3</td>
<td>&gt;4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201+</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4 and 4.2</td>
<td>≤3.3</td>
<td>&gt;4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of Toronto Validation Study, Sept. 2018