SEOI – Open Forum summary – 10th March 2021

Notes from the Student Experience of Instruction Open Forum March 10, 2021

Panel and presenters

- Simon Bates, Associate Provost, Teaching and Learning, UBC Vancouver
- Sara-Jane Finlay, Associate Vice President, Equity & Inclusion, UBC Vancouver
- Tanya Forneris, Interim Academic Lead, Centre for Teaching and Learning, UBC Okanagan
- Christina Hendricks, Academic Director, Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology, UBC Vancouver
- Stephanie McKeown, Chief Institutional Research Officer, Planning and Institutional Research (PAIR)
- Ananya Mukherjee Reed, Provost and Vice-President Academic, UBC Okanagan
- Marion Pearson, Chair, Senior Appointments Committee
- Moura Quayle, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, UBC Vancouver
- Mark Trowell, Director, Faculty Relations, UBC Vancouver
- Abdel-Azim Zumrawi, Statistician, Centre for Teaching and Learning and Technology, UBC Vancouver

Opening

***Ananya Mukherjee Reed**, Provost and Vice-President Academic, UBC Okanagan*

I would like to welcome all those joining us today from across the Okanagan campus and look forward to this opportunity for you to participate in the discussion on these changes endorsed by Senate in May 2020.

Let me first acknowledge that UBC Okanagan is situated in the territory of the Syilx Okanagan Nation and their peoples. I would like to acknowledge that you are joining us today from many places, near and far, and acknowledge the traditional owners and caretakers of those lands.

***Moura Quayle**, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, UBC Vancouver*

I would also like to extend a welcome to everyone joining us here. I would like to begin by acknowledging that UBC's Vancouver Point Grey campus, which some of you are probably attending from today, is situated on the traditional, ancestral, unceded territory of the Musqueam people. Some of you are joining us today from other places, and we acknowledge the traditional owners and caretakers of those lands. On behalf of the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic, I thank you for joining us today, for what I trust will be a useful and productive discussion.

Presentation summary

***Simon Bates**, Associate Provost, Teaching and Learning, UBC Vancouver*

Today's forum is about forthcoming changes to UBC's student experience of instruction (formerly student evaluations of teaching).

SEOI – Open Forum summary – 10ᵗʰ March 2021

A cross-campus working group formed in early 2019, did work over a period of 14 months, and brought forward a series of recommendations to the UBCV and UBCO Senates, which endorsed the recommendations in May 2020. Since then, work has been underway through an implementation committee, led by a steering committee.

At the moment, we're in the process of testing of a new question as well as revised wording on some of the other questions, through a series of focus groups and through pilots, across both campuses.

All of this work is happening with the plan of launching the new questions in September 2021, for the new academic year.

Tanya Forneris, **Academic Lead of the Centre for Teaching and Learning at UBC Okanagan**

There were a number of recommendations endorsed by Senate, which included:
- General principles more broadly outlined in the presentation;
- Changes to University Module Items (UMI) included in the surveys and using the same questions across both campuses;
    - UBC Vancouver – 6 UMI questions wording changes
    - UBC Okanagan – 19 UMI questions to 6 questions;
- Changes to reported metrics;
- Exploration of further data collection and analyses needed as part of the student experience of instruction including equity and diversity information;
- Adopting a more integrative approach to evaluation of teaching; and
- Future senate actions needed related to the policy on evaluation of teaching.

To date, most of the work has focused on the changes to the questions as well as the changes to the reported metrics.

There remains a lot of work on the evaluation of teaching moving forward, including:
- Initial work has on exploring a more integrative approach to evaluation of teaching;
- Further work will begin on data collection and analyses such as demographics; and
- Work on senate policies for the evaluation of teaching.

Stephanie McKeown, **Chief Institutional Research Officer, UBC**

As Tanya mentioned, the Steering Committee made recommendations to revise the student evaluation of teaching questions to be more focused on the student experience rather than the evaluation of teaching. To this end, the Steering Committee agreed on six core university questions, written in such a way that aims to put the student experience at the heart of the question.

The Committee also recommended that further data collection and analysis of these proposed questions was needed. Therefore, the implementation committee started working on an 8-step plan to evaluate and test the proposed core university questions.

Starting with the proposed questions from the steering committee, we held focus groups with students across both campuses, all year levels, undergraduate and graduate, and across a diversity of programs. We had a great response from students to our invitations, and as a result, we were able to hold 16 1-hour focus group sessions, which involved 116 students.

SEOI – Open Forum summary – 10th March 2021

The goal of the focus group was to introduce the six proposed questions and to gain an understanding of how students interpreted and would respond to the survey questions. Further, we asked them to identify any possible confusion that might occur in terms of different interpretations or understanding of the questions, and suggestions on how to improve the questions that might be interpreted differently across students or in different environments, such as a large or small class setting.

We also held 8x1-hour focus group sessions with faculty members, of which 4 involved Okanagan faculty and 4 involved Vancouver faculty. In total, 40 faculty members participated in the sessions, coming from a range of programs, tenure-track and non-tenure track positions. Again, we asked them to provide insight on how they interpreted the proposed questions and their thoughts with how students would understand and respond to the questions. We also collected suggestions on how to reword the questions.

Our next step was to conduct one-on-one interviews with students who had not participated in the previous focus groups. These interviews are called think-aloud sessions or cognitive interviews. In these interviews, we asked students to speak aloud to verbalize their thoughts on how they interpret each of the six questions, what types of examples about the course they recall when responding to the question, and what they consider when responding to each question. We conducted 29 interviews that took between 45 minutes and 1 hour.

We have now completed all of the focus group sessions and student interviews. We have transcribed the recordings and are currently working on the thematic analysis of the qualitative results collected from students and faculty.

Over the next few weeks, we will be developing revised questions based on this feedback. Then we will pilot test the new questions with a sample of students across UBC over the next couple of months. Once we have collected the responses to the questions, we will conduct a quantitative analysis of the student responses with the new questions. We will then review the results and determine if further follow up with students is necessary to clarify any of the questions.

Finally, we will make recommendations to the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee in Vancouver and the Senate Learning and Research Committee in the Okanagan for adoption of the new questions to be deployed in September 2021.

***Abdel-Azim Zumrawi*, statistician in the Centre for Teaching, Learning & Technology at UBC Vancouver**

One of the recommendations of the SEoT working group from 2019-2020 focused on reporting quantitative data. It requires the use of appropriate measures which describe data centrality and distribution, within the context of sample size and response rate. Such measures should be presented and explained in a way that is accessible to all stakeholders, regardless of quantitative expertise.

Quantitative measures already implemented in instructor reports include:
- Interpolated median as a measure of centrality (replacing the mean);
- Dispersion index, a measure of data spread (replacing the standard deviation); and
- Percent favourable, a measure of responses that are higher than neutral, e.g., responses of 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree' on a 5-point Likert scale.

SEOI – Open Forum summary – 10th March 2021

Academic units can request previous data results be translated into the new metrics. Detailed information on these measures can be found on the Student Experience of Instruction website: seoi.ubc.ca.

***Christina Hendricks*, Professor of Teaching in Philosophy and Academic Director of the Centre for Teaching, Learning, and Technology at UBC Vancouver**

I am going to talk about a few upcoming activities of the Implementation Committee, to address several of the recommendations from the May 2020 report to the Senates.

One of the recommendations was that "UBC should prioritize work to extract information from text/open comments submitted as part of the feedback process," to aid faculty in using these for formative purposes. The report goes on to state: "It is recommended that a pilot investigation be undertaken, with one or more Faculties, to investigate the potential of automated approaches to extract useful information from large volumes of text submissions." The Implementation Committee has begun to investigate the possibility of such automated approaches, and further work on this will continue over the summer, and likely beyond.

The May 2020 report also stated that "UBC needs additional and regularized analysis of our own data to answer questions related to potential bias, starting with instructor ethnicity, as it is frequently highlighted as a potential source of bias in the literature on student evaluation of teaching." The Implementation Committee has been in discussion with the Equity and Inclusion Office about how to move forward with this recommendation, and one thing we are currently working on is workflows and access to faculty demographic data for the purpose of conducting analyses for bias. These analyses will be done after better data is available; I'd like to invite Sara-Jane Finlay to say more about that.

***Sara-Jane Finlay,* Associate Vice President, Equity & Inclusion**

In September, we will be launching a new employment equity and inclusion survey, which will provide us with better information in order to undertake the kinds of analyses that are being looked for in the SEI recommendation. Currently, UBC has an employment equity survey with a response rate from faculty of approximately 62%. That survey uses the definitions used by the Employment Equity Act (1984) and the federal contractors program. The updated survey will be much more nuanced, and offers a number of different ways for people to identify, which we believe will better reflect how people consider themselves.

As that dataset grows, we will be able to do further analysis of the data, not just in terms of race and ethnicity, but also across some other measures (depending on the response rate).

We will continue to talk about how best to use that updated data in further analyses for bias, once we get more responses to that improved survey.

***Christina Hendricks,* cont'd**

The next two things on the list of upcoming activities are related. Another of the recommendations from the May 2020 report was: "departments and units should be supported to adopt an integrative and scholarly approach to evaluation that synthesizes multiple data sources (e.g., students, peers, historical patterns, and self-reflection documentation) for a holistic picture, without over-reliance on any single data source."

SEOI – Open Forum summary – 10th March 2021

The Implementation Committee will be working over the summer on a discussion paper on this topic. This paper will include a review of some research literature on integrative approaches to evaluation of teaching, promising practices from other universities, an overview of the various ways teaching is evaluated in units at UBC, and recommendations for addressing gaps and obstacles for a more holistic approach. This paper will be completed by the end of Summer, 2021.

Finally, the SEoT Working Group recommendations included an item about Senate policies on evaluating teaching: "The Vancouver Senate should review the policy on Student Evaluations of Teaching and consider a broader policy on the evaluation of teaching writ large. The Okanagan Senate should develop a similar policy for the Okanagan campus." The working group noted that the Vancouver policy currently is only focused on student surveys, with very little information on how student feedback can or should be integrated with other data used for evaluation of teaching. The recommendation is for UBCV and UBCO to develop either separate but similar policies, or a joint policy, about a broader and more holistic approach to teaching. The discussion paper noted above can feed into those discussions.

Some preliminary discussions about a process for addressing this recommendation have begun, though work on a new or revised policy will likely not begin in earnest until the Fall of 2021.

Summary of common question topics and answers from the panel

General questions

Q – How is UBC using the information from these surveys for personnel decisions, including for merit, promotion and tenure, especially since changes to the University Module Items focus on student experience rather than evaluation of teaching, specifically as a move away from asking students to evaluate teaching?

- The May 2020 report of the SEoT Working Group to both Senates emphasizes that student feedback should be part of a larger set of data used for evaluating teaching:
  - "Evaluation of teaching should include student feedback. Students have a unique and valuable perspective from which to provide feedback on teaching at UBC. Student feedback on teaching is one of several sources of data that should be used for making personnel decisions and for the improvement of teaching."
- Student feedback about their experiences in courses, while not by itself adequate for evaluating teaching, can provide useful data for such evaluation.
- The current UBC Vancouver Senate Policy on Student Evaluations of Teaching also notes that one of the four goals of the surveys is: "To provide the University with data on the quality of teaching to be used for operational purposes, including but not limited to assessment of faculty for merit and/or performance adjustment salary awards, promotion, tenure and institutional recognition."
- In addition, the language of the collective agreement recognizes that the methods and forms of evaluation are multiple and varied and can include student opinion. The language is broad enough to embrace the approach contemplated here.
- These kinds of questions about whether students have expertise to evaluate teaching effectiveness have come up in the focus groups, and it really highlights the important work we are trying to do around integrative evaluation of teaching so that student feedback is one part of a larger set of information used to evaluate teaching. What are the best practices, and how have other institutions moved towards this more holistic model?

SEOI – Open Forum summary – 10ᵗʰ March 2021

- Finally, evaluating teaching should not only be for operational assessment of faculty members; information about teaching from multiple sources can and should be useful for more formative teaching improvement as well, and for learning about and discussing new ways of teaching. It goes well beyond just that operational purpose.

Q - If surveys have low response rates, this can be a problem for using them for personnel decisions as well as for improving teaching. What can be done to increase student response rates?

- There has been some research done at UBC on response rates. What we found is in order to meet reliability and accuracy limits, the percentage of response rates needs to be a above a certain percent. But this depends on class sizes. We have also found that response rates are about 10% lower in W2 compared to W1. Information on the recommended response rates calculated by class size is now included on individual reports of survey results.
- Methods of increasing participation rates:
  - There is some indirect evidence at UBC that leaving time in class to fill out the surveys (even though they are online) leads to an increase in response rate and more consistency in ratings.
  - It can be useful for faculty to explain to students how they have considered and responded such student feedback in the past, such as explaining the rationale behind their teaching methods, or giving an example of how they have changed their teaching based on student feedback
  - We have heard from students that they are not sure what happens with the results of the evaluations, so speaking to students about how these results are used may be helpful in increasing response rates as well.
  - Doing mid-course feedback surveys and responding to the feedback can also show that a faculty member is interested in and will pay attention to their feedback.

Q – Is extracting meaning from the text comments for evaluating the course or for the instructor to use in improving their course?

- We are currently looking at this functionality for the benefit of the instructor, for the sake of considering how students experienced their courses and possibly considering changes if relevant.

On the New/Revised Questions

Q – Is using the six University Module Items (UMI) a requirement for all UBC Departments? Can faculties or departments still add their own questions to the surveys? And will faculty or department questions go through a rigorous process of analysis like is being done for the UMI?

- The UBC Vancouver Senate policy states: "Student Evaluations of Teaching should be administered in every course section at UBC every time it is offered including those offered to undergraduate, graduate and continuing studies students. Exceptions to this requirement are courses of an individual/independent nature (e.g., independent study courses, special research projects, thesis, music studios, etc.) or sections with very small enrollments as defined by each faculty, where other means of obtaining student feedback may be more appropriate."
- The system will remain modular, such that faculties and units can still add their own questions in addition to the UMI.

SEOI – Open Forum summary – 10ᵗʰ March 2021

- Historically, the faculty and department level questions have not undergone the same level of analysis before use. However, it is possible that Faculties may want to adopt a streamlined version of the process we are following with the UMI questions, to ensure that they are understood by students as intended.

Q – How will the six UMI take into account differences in teaching contexts and practices, including both classroom and non-campus instruction such as in clinics, hospitals, fieldwork, etc.?

- The goal when the UMI were created originally was to provide broad questions that would apply to all aspects of teaching, but try to limit that to a smaller number and then allow contextual questions through the faculty. We are continuing this approach, with Faculties and units adding their own questions that can focus on more specific teaching contexts and practices.

Regarding bias

Q – Will sources of bias other than ethnicity, be considered (e.g., gender, disability)?

- Yes, other possible sources of bias will also be included in analyses.
- Starting in September, a new Employment Equity survey will be available for all existing faculty and staff; new staff have already been completing the new questions. The new questions should contribute to better data on various identity categories with which to do analyses for bias once there are high enough response rates after the new survey is fully rolled out.
- Note that we will not be asking students to identify the racial, gender, or other identities of their instructors, but will use the data provided by the Employment Equity survey.

Q – The May 2020 SEoT working group report says that UBC's own data suggests "no systematic differences in aggregate data" by instructor gender. Please comment on this in relation to other studies that suggest gender and other biases.

- There were analyses for gender bias on both campuses that used different methodologies. For the Okanagan analysis) we used item response theory: how individuals interacted with individual items. We found there were some questions that were gendered, but overall, in terms of the entire survey they ended up evening out. In Vancouver, there have been two studies on gender bias, in 2009 and 2015, each showing statistically significant but very small effects (see Appendix 3 in the May 2020 report of the SEoT working group).
- More work will need to be done to look at gender bias at UBC, and more work beyond the binary female/male identities that were the only available ones in the data we had at the time.
- When looking at aggregate data you lose a lot of the detail, and individual experiences can be very different than what aggregate analyses suggest. It is important to recognize, therefore, that aggregate analyses for bias have limitations.

Q – Is the use of a preamble, regarding potential bias, being considered to add alongside the instructions to the start of the survey?

- This was discussed at one of the open forums with the SEoT Working Group in 2019-2020.
- A journal paper was published last year on the topic of adding a preamble about bias to student surveys, an exploratory paper on how to mitigate gender bias. It was a small study, the authors acknowledged that, but it did seem to be promising in the sense that the students who had the anti-bias language in a preamble to the surveys had significantly higher rankings for female instructors than those in the control group.

SEOI – Open Forum summary – 10ᵗʰ March 2021

- There are researchers at UBC currently doing a study to test some prompts designed to mitigate bias that could be included as a preamble on SEI surveys; the results of this research will inform further discussions on this topic.

Q – The wording of the new UMI 6 ("Overall, the instructor was effective in helping me learn") could lead to gender bias given women's traditional roles as helpers—students may think women faculty are not helpful enough. Are these questions as presented or will they be reviewed further?

- The UMI questions may be revised before implementation in September, as we are still working on testing them. For example, both faculty and students had identified the issue noted above and suggested we should reword that question.

Q – How can the university address negative feedback based on biases or from students who have an axe to grind, particularly since these surveys are used for merit, tenure, & promotion for example, some students may react negatively to work done to create inclusive classes by focusing on marginalized students.

- The university has made significant commitments around inclusion and decolonization and faculty members that are taking these priorities on board and being somehow penalized for this goes strongly against what we are trying to achieve.
- When SAC is reviewing a file and looking at the teaching component, normally they do not see the raw data from the student surveys, but can request it if there is insufficient information in the summary report, and that does happen on occasion. Normally they rely on what is in the candidate's CV (where faculty members have an opportunity to write a narrative about their teaching), a teaching report that is part of the Head's letter and where contextual information about teaching can also be provided, and the Dean's letter.
- Individual faculty members often are the ones who provide an initial narrative and building a case within their teaching dossier for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, and can contextualize results in that narrative. However, this responsibility should not only be with the faculty member. The Head of Dept (or their delegate) is expected to help build this narrative and thus individual faculty members should not have to bear the added effort and stress of contextualizing student feedback; it places an added burden on those who are already experiencing oppression and harm, and that should not be where the burden lies.
- The university has a responsibility to make changes to address systemic inequities, and academic leaders should be aware of how such systemic problems can affect SEI results, and take that into account in interpreting these results. The Steering and Implementation Committees can work in the coming months on how to better communicate and educate academic leaders in this regard.

Q – One alternative to relying mostly on student feedback is to include other sources of data for teaching evaluation, such as peer review and self-reflection. Are these equally or more flawed than student surveys?

- As humans, we will never get away from bias. We need to pay attention to it and identify where bias can and does occur, and take steps to mitigate it. This again speaks to the importance of exploring a more integrative approach to evaluation of teaching at UBC. There is no one perfect way to evaluate teaching, which is why we need to have multiple different forms, and being aware of and how to mitigate bias within each method will be important moving forward.

SEOI – Open Forum summary – 10ᵗʰ March 2021

Q – Faculty have reported that there are abusive comments from students, particularly related to marginalized identities. How will the university address this situation and the harm done to mental wellness from such comments?

- We have heard that some faculty receive abusive or otherwise harmful comments on student surveys. Such comments can be removed subsequently, at the request of the relevant Dean; however, this would happen after the faculty member reads the comment first.
- At present, there is no automated way to detect and remove these before the results are released, though it could be possible for Faculty or unit leaders to do so manually. We are looking to possibly use natural language processing techniques to remove harmful comments, though this still needs further investigation.

Metrics and Reporting

Q –Regarding converting historical data that has old metrics (mean and standard deviation) to the new metrics, how far back (in time) can requests be made?"

- There isn't a limit in the sense that any of the historical data that is available on the system can be converted.

Q – The survey report forms are exported in PDF, but this is difficult to work with. Can the data be exported in any other format?

- Results can be exported to CSV; please use the email address on the ["Contact" page on the SEI website](#) to request this format.
- With anew platform underway we're looking at how to present the reports interactively. People can also can approach us if they want more detailed data.

Educative aspects

Q – Can you say more about the efforts to help students better understand the purpose and use of the surveys, as well as how to provide effective feedback? What will be done to think about the responsibility of students to really take this seriously as it can harm tenure/promotion processes?

- We have heard similar concerns through the Working Group discussions and consultations with students. Many students were not clear on the purpose of these feedback surveys, how important they were for personnel and career advancement.
- The Implementation Committee will be working over the summer on information and advice aimed at students who fill out the survey, including about the purpose of the surveys, how results are used, and also advice on providing constructive and effective feedback. They will be gathering support resources, both internally and from other universities. They will reach out to student leadership on both campuses as well, in order to help ensure the information is useful and relevant for students.
- This information will be posted on the SEI website, as well as information that can be posted on Canvas courses or slides that can be shown before surveys are run.

Improving Course / Instruction

Q – How will these new measures actually help improve courses and instruction, rather than mainly or only being used for personnel decisions?

SEOI – Open Forum summary – 10ᵗʰ March 2021

- During the SEoT Working Group consultations, we frequently heard from faculty a desire to find a way to extract meaningful data from the text comments (which led to a recommendation about this in the working group's final report. That's where we get thoughtful insight from students that can be very helpful in learning how the student experience can be enhanced. As noted above, this data can be used for formative purposes by individual faculty, to consider possible improvements to their courses.
- In addition, these formal end-of-course surveys are only one example of how faculty seek feedback. Other mechanisms include mid-course feedback that enables instructors to make changes, if needed, while the course is still ongoing.

Q- How can the university assess whether the student opinions are accurately reflective of effective teaching?

- This raises the question: 'What is effective teaching?' There is guidance in the Collective Agreement and the SAC guide.
- The lack of a broader policy on evaluation of teaching has meant that we have not been as forthcoming in articulating what is needed for effective teaching as we could be. This is part of the reason for the SEoT Working Group's recommendation in the May 2020 report that the UBCO and UBCV Senates work towards a policy about evaluation of teaching that is broader than the current Senate policy focus on student feedback.
- As mentioned above, when SAC is reviewing a file and looking at the teaching component, they rely on several sources of data: the candidate's CV, the teaching report that forms part of the Head's letter, and the Dean's letter. All those things are considered together when looking at the effectiveness of teaching.

Q – Have you considered analyzing SEI data to see if students have different experiences of teaching based on identities such as sex, gender, ability, race, etc.?

- A project to gather more disaggregated demographic data about students is currently being planned; it's about a year away. Right now, we are limited by the information we gather from students upon application.

Q - Recognizing the importance of acknowledging the diversity and multiplicity of perspectives, it is clear there is a lack of representation from equity-seeking populations on this panel and possibly on other committees involved in this process.

Thank you for noting this. We acknowledge the limited diversity within this panel and we will give this more thorough consideration in the future. In addition, we are and will continue to work on ensuring diverse representation in all aspects of this work as we move forward. You can see a list of [the Steering and Implementation Committee members](#) on the new SEI website.

SEOI – Open Forum summary – 10ᵗʰ March 2021

Research literature shared by participants during the forum

Please note a study done here at UBC two years ago that looked at interventions with students and instructors at improving the outcomes for SETs and instructors' coping mechanisms to address abusive "Facebook"-like comments.

- Moralejo, L., Anderson, E., Kennedy, L., Hilsmann, N. (2019). Measuring Student Responses in and Instructors' Perceptions of Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET), Pre and Post Intervention. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Volume 10, No.3, Winter 2019.

Other research shared:

- "Student evaluations of teaching are widely believed to contain gender bias." (Peterson et al., 2019)
    - Peterson, D. A. M., Biederman, L. A., Andersen, D., Ditonto, T. M., & Roe, K. (2019).Mitigating gender bias in student evaluations of teaching. PLoS ONE, 14(5), 1–10.
    - This is in the annotated bibliography in the May 2020 report to both Senates

- "Gender bias in these ratings constitutes an important form of inequality facing women in academia that is often unaccounted for in such decisions. Students perceive, evaluate, and treat female instructors quite differently than they do male instructors (Basow, 1995; Centra & Gaubatz, 2000; Feldman, 1992; Young, Rush, & Shaw, 2009)." (MacNell et al., 2014)
    - MacNell, L., Driscoll, A. & Hunt, A.N. What's in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching. *Innov High Educ* **40,** 291–303 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4

- "Female instructors receive substantively and significantly lower ratings than male instructors in large courses. The author discusses the implications of apparent gender bias in teaching evaluations for the professional success of female faculty." (Martin, 2016)
    - Martin, L. (2016). Gender, Teaching Evaluations, and Professional Success in Political Science.*PS: Political Science & Politics, 49*(2), 313-319. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096516000275

- "The authors show that the language students use in evaluations regarding male professors is significantly different than language used in evaluating female professors. They also show that a male instructor administering an identical online course as a female instructor receives higher ordinal scores in teaching evaluations, even when questions are not instructor-specific. Findings suggest that the relationship between gender and teaching evaluations may indicate that the use of evaluations in employment decisions is discriminatory against women." (Mitchell & Martin, 2018)
    - Mitchell, K., & Martin, J. (2018). Gender Bias in Student Evaluations. *PS: Political Science& Politics, 51*(3), 648-652. https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651800001X