CoDEI reviewed the Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation of Faculty Teaching. We are generally positive on the steps that are being taken to address bias in student evaluations of teaching (SETs) and the process of teaching evaluation for merit and promotion at UC Riverside. Following the format of the report itself, we have divided our response into short-term (Phase I) and long-term (Phase II) comments. Our short-term comments include the following:

- It could be helpful to compile evidence of the existing bias in the evaluation of teaching at the university, based on historical data. Although these statistics cannot serve as proof of bias, it will allow administrators to (1) discover where bias may be present within our own evaluation process, which can guide the decisions about the benefit of potential changes, and (2) later observe if the implemented changes appear to reduce evidence of bias in SETs and the merit and promotion process.
- Add information to the proposed preamble about the purpose of SETs, which will help students understand how they are contributing to teaching evaluation and how biased responses could be detrimental to the individuals involved.
- We look favorably on the option for faculty to include other forms of evidence of teaching quality, particularly the self-reflective teaching statement. It may be helpful to give faculty information on how they can use a teaching statement to address and alleviate bias in their SETs.

In response to the long-term proposals, we have the following comments:

- Any future changes would apply to all faculty, regardless of their likelihood of being discriminated against in the evaluation process. It is possible these changes could benefit the unintended group more than the intended group, which would widen any unfair gaps. For example, there is evidence that giving parental leave to all parents actually puts female faculty at a disadvantage when applying for promotion because male faculty use the leave to improve their research more than contributing to household production (https://www.iza.org/publications/dp/9904). Any new policies should be created with this possibility in mind.
• Assuming that numerical teaching evaluation scores remain, removing numerical department means could result in increased bias at CAP because it leaves CAP members to construct their own expectations and comparison groups.

• Several members of the committee have broader concerns about the value of SETs and prefer that the university consider more meaningful reforms, including the possibility of eliminating SETs entirely. As a minimum, they suggest that SETs be used as a formative, rather than summative assessment. This requires building mechanisms to assess how instruction was modified in response to SETs, rather than looking at the SETs themselves to assess teaching effectiveness.

• Reducing bias is the primary goal of this endeavor, but a legitimate secondary goal should be to incentivize faculty to increase their commitment to student learning and success. We believe that using this secondary goal as a guide in the reform will benefit faculty, students and the university community in the long run.