Lindsay, P. (2011). Teaching centers as teaching advocates: Navigating university politics. *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning, 3*, 7-20.

Teaching Centers as Teaching Advocates: Navigating University Politics

Peter Lindsay
Georgia State University

What happens when teaching centers become advocates for educational change? Is such activity advisable if the centers become polarizing forces on campus? And if polarization occurs, how should directors navigate it? This essay, which focuses on the author's experience advocating for a change in his university's student evaluation forms, provides a framework for answering these questions and, in the process, suggests that advocacy can offer a number of hidden benefits. The article concludes with a suggestion of how this issue might affect conceptions of faculty development programs as well as the manner in which they are assessed.

Teaching centers are traditionally viewed as resources for faculty development. But what happens when centers also become advocates for educational change in their institutions, change that may, in some cases, be opposed by certain constituents (for example, administrators, faculty, students)? Is such activity advisable, even when the center comes to be seen as a polarizing or divisive force on campus? And if divisions do occur, how should center directors navigate them?

I begin by answering the most fundamental question: Yes, teaching centers should advocate for educational change (presuming, of course, we are speaking of *positive* change). If the charge of a teaching center is—to quote from the mission statement of my own center—to "support and promote advances in student learning through improvements in teaching," there is no principled or logical reason to restrict such efforts to the more common teaching center tasks of conducting workshops and seminars, offering faculty consultations and observations, and/or supporting the collection of learning outcomes. In other words, if supporting and pro-

moting student learning is the end, why should a center not pursue all possible means to that end?

Let us consider as an example the issue of how administrators assess instruction. The manner in which an institution goes about that task will set the tone for what it considers to be good and bad teaching. As faculty members—insofar as they want to keep their jobs—must heed this administrative understanding of teaching, teaching centers need to pay close attention to what is being said. At a minimum, failure on the part of a center to ensure that an institution's standards are pedagogically sound will put faculty developers in the position of offering advice that may jeopardize an instructor's career advancement.

What this example indicates is that advocacy is less an option than it is an imperative. As instruction does not happen in a vacuum, neither can instructional development. The vast majority of instructors will never set foot in a teaching center, but all instructors are constrained and guided by the standards and rules of the institutions at which they instruct. Effective faculty development must, therefore, take into account the forces that shape the working lives of instructors, and while taking those forces into account and effecting change to them are not the same thing, the distinction is more conceptual than real: To understand that instruction is being *institutionally* hampered and to do nothing about it borders on a dereliction of duty.

Put in this manner, the argument for involvement in an institution's policies and practices is, then, fairly clear-cut. However, a trickier issue arises when we look more closely at the choices that actually confront center directors. It is one thing to say that effecting positive change in policies and practices comes with the turf, but quite another to say that any and all positive change ought to be pursued. Some changes—most perhaps—come with costs, and so the actual issue to consider is at what point the costs of effecting change outweigh the benefits.

My intention here is to provide a framework from which center directors might approach the issue of advocacy. Obviously, no *a priori* strategy exists. There are, however, considerations that can help guide a director in coming to a strategy appropriate to his or her particular situation. Moreover, as I shall argue below, these considerations, taken as a whole, have implications for the manner in which we should conceive of teaching centers and the role they play in their academic communities.

In the interest of mirroring sound educational practices, I have framed the discussion with a particular experience of my own; an experience that illustrates well the issues involved. It is to this experience that I now turn.

**

My story begins with a committee that our College of Education formed to overhaul its student evaluations of instructor forms (hereafter referred to as SEIs). Because I was at the time the newly appointed director of our Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), the committee members asked my associate director and me to advise them on the issue. The bulk of our time together was spent scrutinizing individual SEI items for their usefulness with regard both to formative and summative assessment. Between meetings, all of us were assigned research on particular aspects of SEIs. Mine was on an item that interested me the most—what's known as "the global question," which, at Georgia State, is worded as follows: "Considering all limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall effectiveness of this instructor?"

This is a question from which I personally have benefitted. The responses I had gotten from students over the years had won me teaching awards, helped to get me tenure, and, in the end, secured my job as the CTL director. I say this not to sing my own praises, but to make roughly the opposite point: The question has a lot of power, yet much of it, I came to see, is unwarranted. This is not to say I did not deserve the awards, the tenure, or the job—only that if I *had* deserved them, it would have been on grounds independent of the global rating that students have given me over my 25-year teaching career.

I will fast forward a bit here: After a few months of research and meetings, the committee recommended to the College of Education executive committee that a "core set of 18 Likert-type response and 5 open-ended response questions will be consistent to all student course evaluations." Missing from that core set was the global "overall effectiveness" question. In anticipating the controversy that this omission would create, the committee remarked in its report that "a thoughtful debate ensued prior to making the decision to delete the question." While this statement is correct, it is also correct that the committee was, in coming to this decision, remarkably undivided. The question, we had come to agree, simply does not have appreciable value as a tool of summative *or* formative assessment.

There was, however, a problem, one that came in the form of a university-wide requirement. Each of Georgia State's six colleges had its own SEI and was free to include on it any items it wished. The only constraint, we discovered, was that *all* of the colleges were required to include six items mandated by the university senate. One of them was the global question.

So—what to do? The committee quickly decided that a misguided

policy should not get in the way. As the CTL director, I had a seat on the university senate (a body comprised mostly of faculty, but also with staff and student representatives), and I also happened to be on the committee (Faculty Affairs) that handled issues such as SEIs. The path was clear: The policy had to change, and I was in a position to effect that change.

Before continuing, I need to provide a bit more detail on the committee's deliberations. A crucial issue in thinking about the potential advocacy role for teaching centers is the manner in which centers decide which issues warrant advocacy and which ones do not. Intrinsic to that concern is the question of whether the proposed change in policy might or might not meet our CTL's mission standard of "support[ing] and promot[ing] advances in student learning through improvements in teaching." What follows, then, is an abbreviated version of the argument that supported the committee's recommendation to drop the global question: an argument that, as I shall demonstrate, contains the elements that make this issue precisely the sort that warrants entrance into an institution's political waters.

**

The main problem with the global SEI question is that we do not know what students are telling us in their responses to it. We do not know for two reasons: First, the question, by its very nature, does not ask students to address any specific criteria of teaching effectiveness (or, for that matter, any criteria *at all*). As a result, we may know if a professor is considered effective overall, but the response gives us no idea why. The second reason we do not know what students are telling us here is that responses to the question consistently deviate from responses to criteria-specific items, and, consequently, we cannot assume that the question provides an accurate summary of views expressed elsewhere on the evaluation. Clearly, this question is capturing *something* the others on the SEI do not—*but what?*

Studies on these matters suggest that student responses to non-criteria-specific evaluation questions are correlated with a number of factors. Among the most commonly cited factors are the instructor's race, gender, and attractiveness (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993; Epstein, 2006; Felton, 2006; Hammermesh & Parker, 2003); the level of the course; the class size (Wines & Lau, 2006); the number of rows in the classroom (Wines & Lau, 2006); the nature of the personal student-faculty relationship (Walsh & Maffei, 1994; Wines & Lau, 2006); the (personal) popularity of the instructor (Sproule, 2000); and the students' first impressions of the instructor (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993; Merritt, 2007). What this means—to put it crudely—is that a less-attractive female of color teaching a large lower-level course

in a classroom of more than five rows can, by virtue of those facts, expect her global score to be significantly (in a statistical sense) below that of her more attractive, white male colleagues teaching upper-level seminars—especially if she happened to have a rough first day of class.

We can safely say, then, that student responses to the global question are at best indeterminate and at worst irrelevant to pedagogy (and, thus, invalid in the methodological sense of not measuring what they are intended to measure). (We could, in fact, go further still and conclude with Wright (2006) that "[s]tudent consumers may . . . prefer a teaching style that is *detrimental* to their learning experience" (p. 2; emphasis added).) Even if students' responses are merely indeterminate, that fact alone would render them meaningless as a tool of formative assessment. A faculty member who does not know *why* he or she ranks a 4.3 learns nothing from that fact. That the other questions may provide some of the "why" merely confirms that they *do* have value, value to which the global question adds nothing, or at least nothing of a pedagogically useful nature. (I should note that this is a charitable statement, as the global question commonly *subtracts* from the value of the others by deflecting attention away from them. Instructors often know quite well their three- or five-year global question average, but they have no idea what students say—often repeatedly—about their ability to, say, "return assignments in a timely manner" or "answer questions clearly").

Unfortunately, the lack of formative feedback provided by the global question is only half the problem, for as a summative matter the item's usefulness seems to be *inversely* related to its *use*. While there is widespread agreement that the global question should not be given disproportionate weight in the assessment of instruction (and that SEIs as a whole should never be the sole determinant of an instructor's abilities), administrators often make the claim that a low global score is a helpful red flag, one that prompts a deeper look into a teaching file. This argument relies only on the claims that the global question is *reliable* (that is, that it gives the same result when repeated) and at least valid *at the extremes* (meaning that very low and very high scores *do* correlate to actual differences in teaching ability). Given that both claims have strong empirical backing, the argument is not without merit (although only after some of the factors mentioned above—such as class size and level—are taken into account). The problem with the argument, however, rests in the hidden assumption that the assessment of instruction can be limited to rooting out the poorest of instructors.

We see this assumption when we consider the implication of the administrator's argument—that, absent a red flag, an instructor's portfolio will

receive *lesser* scrutiny. The question that arises is "what might this lesser scrutiny imply?" Absent a red flag, would chairs and deans ignore the information contained in the rest of the evaluation form? Would they find out if instructors were, say, holding their office hours or returning materials in a timely manner? And what about matters requiring expertise that students do not possess? (On this point, see Halonen and Ellenberg, 2006; Merrit, 2007; and Pallett, 2006.) Does lesser scrutiny involve checking to make sure an instructor's reading lists are appropriate to the discipline or that students are learning what is *on* that list? Are the instructor's syllabi checked for conformity with university standards? Are the assignments and methods of assessment reviewed to ensure that they are in line with course objectives?

If we can agree that the assessment of instruction should involve such variables, then the red flag argument becomes little more than an excuse to avoid administrative responsibilities. (And it collapses completely for administrators who claim that they *do* scrutinize these matters, for surely such indices—and not the global score—would be the appropriate red flag.) All of this is not to say that administrators are lazy or unscrupulous. The problem here lies in the fact that meaningful assessment is exceedingly difficult to accomplish, all the more so in an era when resources (and time) are in short supply. We need to face up to that reality, however, not sweep it under the carpet with assuring yet misguided claims about the value of one overhyped, overused slice of a teacher's life.

**

As I said above, I do not present this argument to make the case against the global question. Of greater importance for my purposes is what light the argument sheds on the central question of advocacy: What are the determinants of a cause—a change in policy or practice—that is worth a center director's time and effort? If advocacy is an option at all, what determines when it is a good one? As I have said, I think that the removal of the global question is a worthy cause, but it is not worthy simply because the argument for removal is a good one. At least four other features of the argument make it appealing for a center director's perspective. First, focusing as it does on formative and summative assessment, the issue clearly has importance with regard to—quoting again from GSU's mission statement—"support[ing] and promot[ing] advances in student learning through improvements in teaching." Administrative and self-assessment are not simply factors in the improvement of teaching; they are arguably the most basic requirements of that improvement. Second, the issue is of high impact in terms of the number of faculty affected. No matter how

effective workshops, observations, and consultations may be, they are not likely to affect anywhere close to the 100% of the faculty that are affected by SEIs. While a small change in SEI policy might have a smaller impact on individual faculty members than would a classroom observation, as an aggregate matter the change—if it is, as I have argued, *positive*—is a far more effective way in which to "support and promote advances in student learning through improvements in teaching."

Third, the issue is relatively uncontroversial, at least as an *academic* matter (a caveat that will come into play shortly). What stands out in the literature is the one-sidedness of debate on the issue (Algozzine et al., 2004). Here is a convergence of viewpoints that I have certainly not seen in my own academic field of political philosophy.[1] As such, the issue presents no uncertainty with regard to the normative stance a center director should take.

Finally, the issue is not only uncontroversial academically; it is also conceptually simple and relatively straightforward. (Granted, it did take me a few paragraphs to explain.) Unlike issues such as "How should we assess instruction?" "What classroom designs make pedagogical sense?" or "What are the determinants of academic dishonesty?" the argument against the global question requires no complex reasoning or any great knowledge of teaching or learning. It is precisely the sort of argument one could present to a group of otherwise preoccupied faculty, students, and/or administrators without risk of losing the forest for the trees.

To summarize: The issue is immediately relevant to education, of high impact, of sound and established logic, and straightforward. As we shall see, these four criteria comprise only a partial list of those that warrant consideration with respect to advocacy. To see what remains, I now pick up the story where we left off, with the decision that began my six-month political odyssey.

**

The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee was overwhelmingly in favor of the dropping the global question as a university-wide requirement. There was, however, one naysayer on the committee who persistently counter-asserted that the question was pedagogically useful, and she managed to find a like-minded ally on the Senate Executive Committee (the committee that decides which proposals are brought to a full senate vote). Both individuals seemed to feel that there was another side to the issue in the literature, although it was unclear to me what the basis of that conviction was.

The net effect of these naysayers was a delay in the senate process. At

one point, the two of them became students' rights advocates, claiming that the students had insisted on this question as a requirement, and that—notwithstanding the fact that SEIs were never billed as a device for students—it would be violating their trust to drop it. This claim led to a meeting with the Student Government Association (SGA). It was at this meeting that one of the naysayers pointed her finger at me and said, "*he* thinks *you* aren't qualified to give a professor an overall rating." I replied that I was not sure *anyone* was, but that we really did value their insights on specific teaching matters, such as whether their work was returned in a timely fashion or whether the instructor's explanations of the subject matter were clear. Basically, I explained, we wanted them to *describe* the class and instructor, but not to *evaluate* them. As for the students' right to express their opinion (a right that my colleague conjured out of thin air and insisted they had), I suggested the right, if it existed at all, was really only to *informed* opinions—which they could adequately express in their responses to the other SEI questions—and that in any case whatever rights they had needed to be balanced by the interests of faculty and administrators (see Haskell, 1997). In the end, the SGA largely agreed that the question did not belong on the evaluation and indicated that if it came to a senate vote, its representatives would support the measure.

At this point, my naysaying colleagues floated an e-mail to their college, stating—inaccurately—that I was seeking to *remove* the global question from their college's SEI, and asking if anyone could "counter Peter's findings, and provide a more balanced perspective." Happily, this ploy also backfired, as their college colleagues let loose their pent-up frustration at the question in a slew of e-mail responses. One colleague railed, "Students don't have the qualifications to answer the question. They are reacting to such things as whether you made them buy a book (negative); served pizza at certain classes (positive); gave out t-shirts or bumper stickers (positive); or had a final exam during the final exam period (negative)." Another colleague offered what struck me as a reasonable suggestion: "If we still wish to directly evaluate our teaching effectiveness and course value, why not survey alumni who have been graduated for several years?" (see Rice, Stewart, and Hujber, 2000). For the most part, the replies highlighted the perception among faculty that administrators were routinely reducing their instructional abilities to the scores they got on this one question—as in "Joe? He's a 4.63. Mary? a 4.72." More importantly, they highlighted just how tired the faculty were of this practice.

Although I now had strong reason to believe that the proposed change in policy would be supported by the faculty and the student government (I have omitted other communications with faculty, but there were

many, and the overriding sentiment was in favor of dropping the global question), the senate vote still hung in the balance. I decided, therefore, to lobby one other group: senior administrators (deans and department chairs). Not only were many of them also senate members, they were people who would be affected acutely by the change. Therefore, I wanted to make sure they understood the rationale for it. (If it passed, after all, I, and of course the Center, would be linked to it.) So off I went to chairs meetings and deans meetings, only to discover that their account of the role of the global question in assessing instruction was sharply at odds with the account the faculty gave. Administrators maintained that there was *no* danger of overreliance on this item—that they gave each file the closest scrutiny possible.[2]

It was at this point, of course, that I got first-hand renditions of the "red flag" argument. As I mentioned above, there is an easy reply to this argument. I did not, however, make it. In fact, my discussions with administrators were cut mercifully short by an abrupt and somewhat comical end to the story.

**

Before I get to that end, let me pause to suggest how we might conceptualize the events thus far and, in the process, determine the wisdom, or lack thereof, of advocating for educational change. In recounting my own experience, I have disentangled the four predominant groups involved—senators, the SGA, rank and file faculty members, and upper level administrators—and spoken of them as discrete entities. I did so for analytical reasons rather than narrative accuracy: In thinking about advocacy, it is best to consider its effects on individual constituencies separately. It is not only more manageable in that manner; doing so allows us to raise answerable questions: Are there characteristics unique to each group that make predicting their reactions fairly straightforward? What are the vested interests of each? Do members of each group—*qua* members of each group—have a specific relationship to teaching and learning that would inform and constrain the reaction they would have to changes in teaching and learning practices? And—this is the vital issue—how do these groups' respective relationships to a teaching center color the manner in which a center director should be concerned with their reactions?

In short, there are two specifically *strategic* issues for center directors to consider in navigating university politics: What is the anticipated reaction of each constituency? and How important is that constituency to the functioning of the center? While the factors mentioned above—the issue's relevance to education, its impact, the soundness of its logic, and

its straightforwardness—are the *substantive* considerations of advocacy, a center director cannot weigh them in isolation from the impact that advocacy will have on his or her centers' relationship with the institution's community. An issue that is directly relevant to education, of high impact, sound in logic, and straightforward may be best untouched if, for whatever reason, advocacy would lead to strained relationships with important constituencies, constituencies whose support or respect for a center is the *sine quo non* of its effective functioning.

In my case, two such constituencies were at this level. The first, obviously, was the faculty, without whose respect the Center would languish. Because in this case the faculty were supportive of the policy change, I was encouraged to press ahead. The other constituency comprised upper-level administrators, individuals whose supportive words to their departments and colleges help make the Center's programs visible and desirable. Here support was lukewarm at best, and for that reason I was wary, notwithstanding the substantive considerations, of advocacy. The other two constituencies—the senate and the student body—were of far less strategic consequence, which meant that neither the roadblocks of the senate nor the support of the students had much of an impact on my decision.

In totality, the strategic factors made the case for advocacy, meaning concretely that the support of the faculty was, in my estimation, strong enough to overcome the lack thereof on the part of the senior administration. I should emphasize that my narrative is not meant as a case study to be extrapolated—my strategic calculations were unique to my campus. The point of discussing them is simply to highlight that strategic factors must be taken into account in decisions about advocacy. The precise manner in which those factors play out on a particular campus will vary depending on numerous cultural and institutional idiosyncrasies. While I suspect that I am not alone in my view of senior administrators and rank and file faculty, the precise importance of these and other constituencies will vary as much with the issues involved (in other words, the substantive considerations) as it will with an institution's administrative culture. It is precisely because there *is* no one heuristic for sorting out strategic considerations that their importance cannot be underestimated.

**

Of course, strategic considerations do not always play out as one anticipates. In some cases—mine—they do not play out at all. After hearing that the student body had wanted the six required questions included in the evaluation, I decided to take a deeper look into their history. After

numerous inquiries and document searches, what I discovered was that the questions were largely of unknown origin. In fact, there was no actual record of their every having been required at all, meaning that for six months much of the community had hotly debated a question that had no relevance to the world we inhabited. As a philosopher, I was, of course, at home in this realization—practical irrelevance is our stock and trade. As an administrator, however, I confess I was no less enthusiastic with the discovery, as the process had brought a number of benefits. To begin with, we had arrived at our desired destination, as all of the university's colleges were immediately made aware of the fact that the global question was *not* a required item on their SEIs (a point that was underscored when the senate shortly afterward passed a policy requiring the *other* five items). To be sure, the process will not be truly finished until each college has taken action, but that is a future struggle with future calculations.

More significantly, there were a couple of unanticipated ancillary benefits, benefits that need to be added to any projected gains stemming from the policy change. First, the process had put the CTL in the public light. I should note that whenever I spoke to any constituency about SEIs it was always in my capacity as the CTL director. As a result, the issue was seen in the university community as one that the CTL was behind. To be sure, I personally came to be known to many for the first time, but to the extent that I was known more as the CTL director than by my name, it was the CTL, not me, that gained visibility.

The importance of that visibility cannot be underestimated. We can ponder whether trees falling in empty woods make sounds, but it takes no such mental gymnastics to see that unattended workshops and low demand for consultations and observations do little for teaching and learning. In this sense, the adage that all publicity is good publicity is largely true. (I can unscientifically report that the response to CTL programs and activities increased in the months during and after the time I had spent on the SEI project.)

A second benefit can be seen if we look more closely at what advocacy—*legitimate* advocacy—actually entails. It is a misconception to see it as fighting for change. It is not; there should be no fight. Legitimate advocacy is about structuring a dialogue in which people come to see *why* change makes sense and why it makes sense *on their terms*. What separates legitimate advocacy from demagoguery is, in a word, pedagogy. Seen in this light, advocacy becomes a legitimate center activity not simply for whatever benefits it might, on its own terms, bring. More significantly, its legitimacy rests on the pedagogical experience it fosters. As a campus, we spent six months giving thought to an issue that affects every member of

the faculty and every student on campus: What is good teaching, and how can it be recognized? Even if the global question remains on most college SEIs for the foreseeable future (as it likely will, change being glacial in university politics), the conversation we had about it affected the manner in which our students, administrators, and faculty all view that issue.

**

Perhaps the most profound benefit of the process was to me. The experience changed radically how I came to view the CTL's mission, for it demonstrated that concrete and practical improvements in teaching did not need to be the CTL's sole, or even primary, focus. On a research campus, especially, that focus can go only so far. Better, I came to see, was a center that also could present education as the object of academic inquiry—something to be studied and debated, something of intrinsic intellectual interest. Advocacy became a key component of that broadened focus, but others—a newsletter offering controversial ideas, faculty seminars focusing on abstract educational theories such those of Plato, Jean Jacques Rousseau, John Dewey, Michel Foucault, bell hooks, and Stanley Fish—became vital as well. Together, these and other activities have gone a long way toward bringing about the vision that I have come to hold: teaching centers as *think tanks*.

I am, of course, only reinventing a wheel here, as I am certainly not alone in my efforts. And yet, as an academic matter, the vision of a teaching center as an advocate for sound policies and, more generally, as a think tank, stands in need of more thorough investigation. While there is a rich and very helpful literature on how we ought to assess the performance of teaching centers (for example, Jacobson, Wulff, Grooters, Edwards, & Freisem, 2009; Lieberman & Reuter, 1996; Schroeder, Blumberg, Chism, & Frerichs, 2010; Sorcinelli, 2002), the focus for the most part is on teaching centers as providers of "development services" (Hoyt & Howard, 1978). If we are to view our mission more broadly, however, we will need also to widen the lens through which we assess our performance. Only in this manner can we come to an understanding of our true successes and failures.

Footnotes

[1]With respect to summative feedback, Cashin (1988, 1992, 1995) and Abrami and D'apollonia (1990) are notable exceptions.

[2]A few administrators did sidle up to me after these meetings and confess that, in about 80% of the cases, the global question was all they

looked at. But then publicly we all went back to the charade—they pretended to be giving each file thoughtful scrutiny, and I pretending to believe them. Together, we forged what I have come to think of as "the big lie" of education.

References

Abrami, P. C., & D'apollonia, S. (1990). The dimensionality of ratings and their use in personnel decisions. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 43,* 97-111.

Algozzine, B., Beattie, J., Bray, M., Flowers, C., Gretes, J., Howley, L., Mohanty, G., et al. (2004). Student evaluation of college teaching: A practice in search of principles. *College Teaching, 52*(4), 134-141.

Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1993). Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of nonverbal behavior and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64,* 431-441.

Cashin, W. E. (1988). *Student ratings of teaching: A summary of the research* (IDEA Paper No. 20). Manhattan, KS: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Division of Continuing Education, Kansas State University.

Cashin, W. E. (1995). *Student ratings of teaching: The research revisited* (IDEA Paper No. 32). Manhattan, KS: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Division of Continuing Education, Kansas State University.

Cashin, W. E., & Downey, R. G. (1992). Using global student rating items for summative evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(4), 563-72.

Epstein, D. (2006). "Hotness" and quality. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2006/05/08/rateprof

Halonen, J., & Ellenberg, G. (2006). Teaching evaluation follies: Misperception and misbehavior in student evaluations of teachers. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *Evaluating faculty performance: A practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service* (pp. 150-165). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Hamermesh, D., & Parker, A. M. (2003). *Beauty in the classroom: Professors' pulchritude and putative pedagogical productivity.* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series, No. 9853.

Haskell, R. E. (1997). Administrative use of student evaluation of faculty. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 5,* 21.

Hoyt, D. P., & Howard, G. S. (1978). The evaluation of faculty development programs. *Research in Higher Education, 8*(1), 25-38.

Jacobson, W., Wulff, D. H., Grooters, S., Edwards, P. M., & Freisem, K. (2009). Reported long-term value and effects of teaching center consultations. *To Improve the Academy, 27,* 223-246.

Lieberman, D. A., & Reuter, J. (1996). Designing, implementing, and assessing a university technology-pedagogy institute. *To Improve the Academy, 15.* 231-249.

Merritt, D. (2007, January 11). *Bias, the brain, and student evaluations of teaching.* Berkeley, CA: bepress Legal Series Working Paper 1939.

Pallet, W. (2006). Uses and abuses of student ratings. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *Evaluating faculty performance: A practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service* (pp. 50-65). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Rice, R. E., Stewart, L. P., & Hujber, M. (2000). Extending the domain of instructional effectiveness assessment in student evaluations of communication courses. *Communication Education, 49*(3), 253-66.

Schroeder, C. (2010). *Coming in from the margins: Faculty development's emerging organizational development role in institutional change.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (2002). *A guide to faculty development: Practical advice, examples, and resources* (K. H. Gillespie, Ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Sproule, R. (2000). Student evaluation of teaching: A methodological critique of conventional practices. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8*(50), 1-23.

Walsh, D. J., & Maffei, M. J. (1994). Never in a class by themselves: An examination of behaviors affecting the student-professor relationship. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 5*(2), 23-49.

Wines, W., & Lau, T. (2006). Observations on the folly of using student evaluations of college teaching for faculty evaluation, pay, and retention decisions and its implications for academic freedom. *William & Mary Journal of Women and the Law, 13*(1), 167.

Wright, R. E. (2006). Student evaluations of faculty: Concerns raised in the literature, and possible solutions. *College Student Journal, 40*(2), 417-422.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank Harry Dangel and the anonymous reviewers of this journal for their help with earlier drafts of this article.

Peter Lindsay *is an Associate Professor of Political Science and Philosophy at Georgia State University. He is the author of* Creative Individualism: The Democratic Vision of C. B. Macpherson *(SUNY Press, 1996) as well as numerous articles in political theory and in teaching and learning. From 2007 until 2011, he directed Georgia State's Center for Teaching and Learning. He is currently writing a book on college teaching. His e-mail address is: plindsay2@gsu.edu.*