

COP Evaluation 2017

COP 2017 consisted of Alicia Knijnenburg, Anouk de Jong, Lotte Weedage and Sofie Kölling.

Planning

During the first meeting in December, we made a planning and set deadlines for the rest of the year. One thing we would add to the planning, is asking jury members longer upfront, and not wait for the finalists to be announced. Our finale took place on Wednesday June 21st, between 16:00 and 17:15. The finale date was picked in the early stages as well, and was communicated to study associations at the end of March. Still, one of the finale studies had a mandatory lecture during the finale, and there were other activities of study associations planned at the same moment, but that cannot be helped.

December	Communicate deadline DOP to study associations
January	Brainstorm about the selection procedure
February	Send information about nomination to study associations
<i>31st of March</i>	<i>Deadline for submitting nominees for the COP</i>
17th of April	Round 1: Deadline motivational letter
18th - 24th of April	Selection on basis of motivational letter
24th of April	Announcement of 8 teachers who pass on to round 2
24th of April - 8th of May	Round 2: Preparation microlecture
8th of May - 22th of May	Microlectures by teacher for committee on individual basis
22th of May - 29th of May	Selection on basis of microlecture
29th of May	Announcement of 3 teachers who pass to the final round
June	Promotion
21st of June from 15:30	Finale

Nomination (first round)

Contrary to last year, we selected the nominees in the first round by means of motivational letters, in which teachers were asked to let us know what makes them a good teacher. They could focus on points regarding contact with students, interaction during classes, different teaching methods used, etc. On top of that, we asked for a testimonial by a student about the teacher.

The thirteen letters we received from DOP winners were tested using five criteria, which could have been mentioned in the email as well. A couple of teachers reflected that it was odd to “boast” about themselves in a letter. We did not give feedback on the letters of teachers that were not selected to participate in the second round, this would make it more personal, and could be added next year. We ranked the letters using the following points:

- Interaction with students
- Innovation
- Enthusiasm
- Self reflection

We did not require the motivational letter to be in English, however, the rest of the procedure did take place in English.

Microlectures (second round)

In this round, the eight selected teachers were asked to prepare a fifteen minute microlecture about a topic of their choice. Afterwards, there were fifteen minutes reserved for questions about the microlecture, and the motivational letter as well. Since the finale contained a microlecture as well, this lowered the workload on teachers.

We often found it hard to make an objective comparison between teachers, as many had different views on the content of the microlecture (a regular, but shortened lecture, or for example a lecture about how a teacher normally gives lectures), next to the different subjects of course. We resolved the first problem in the finale by clear communication to the finalists, and as the committee consisted of one person per faculty, it was easier to compare different subjects. During this round we were not strict in the fifteen-minute maximum time of the microlectures, this was better in the finale as well.

We made a grading form with different categories to use in this round, which can be found on our drive. We made a ranking of all the microlectures at the end of each day. At some moments, it was challenging to get enough committee members present at the microlectures, which made the selection even harder.

After the results of the first round were communicated, each teacher was asked to pick a timeslot in a Google forms document we created. This was an easy way to plan all the microlectures. For each participant, a 45-minute timeslot was reserved, so we could use the 15 minutes upfront to prepare, or the teacher could use it to set up the lecture. We did not have a standard list of questions to ask, which could have been useful in hindsight. The questions

were formulated using the motivational letters, and at the moment itself questions about the microlecture were thought up.

The communication to participants was clear, after the initial nomination an elaborate email was sent which contained the entire process in detail. However, communicating the location of the microlectures to the teachers proved to be challenging sometimes. We would recommend naming one committee member the contact person for the teachers, or strictly send emails from the COP alias. This way, they can easily ask questions and are not confused by the numerous people sending them emails.

Finale

During the finale, each teacher gave a fifteen-minute microlecture. After all three participants, the jury asked their questions, and the audience could vote for their favourite. The winner was announced during the drink afterwards, outside behind the Horst.

We did the necessary grocery shopping (many *borrelhapjes!*) on the morning before the finale. Each jury member received a bottle of wine as a thank you, and the finalists got a nice bouquet of flowers. We made a certificate for the winner. Our original idea was to buy a tiny tabletop blackboard with an engraved plaque as a prize, but the blackboard we received by mail half a week before the finale turned out to be broken, and could not be replaced on time.

The finale took place in Horst C101 (maximum of 250 persons). The turnout was high, with an almost full room, students as well as employees. To promote the event, we distributed flyers with candy hearts and the slogan "*Vote for the sweetest teacher*", and placed posters in the university buildings and at the study associations. Some finalists had a personal campaign as well, which also helped greatly in getting people to attend the finale. There were however some end-of-the-year activities planned during the afternoon, so the attendance of students from non-finalist studies was low.

Everyone voted by writing down their top three on a piece of paper, so there was no possibility to vote digitally. The public vote, jury vote and committee vote each had equal weight in determining the winner, but in case of a tie, the committee would have the final vote.

Counting all the votes took approximately half an hour, which was longer than expected. An evaluation point we received from last year, was that the public vote was too large and dependent on the size of the study, and the schedules of the students. In our system, this was resolved as the public vote was present, but not over influential. It could be made more clear that a vote which did not contain a complete top three, would not count.

The jury was not a large addition to this finale. Since they started their question round with a verdict about the finalists, the audience could be influenced by their opinions. The audience could vote first, or clear communication with the jury members could resolve this issue. What did not help, was that the jury was completed merely a week before the finale. We waited for the

finalists to be announced before asking the jury members, which was a mistake, as there was no COP winner of the last five years who had time in their agenda to take place in the jury. Our jury consisted of Hans van den Berg, Pieter Boerman and Ramses Wessel. The jury asked their questions after all the microlectures to all finalists at once, to make an easier comparison. Some questions were too theoretical, or abstract, to keep the interest of the audience. It would be useful to plan a meeting with the jury upfront and go through the details and expectations of the finale. We did not have time to do this, unfortunately.

The finale took place between 16:00 and 17:15, which was a good length. We did not take any pictures, but UT-news was present. You could communicate to associations that they have to take their own pictures, for us pictures had no added value.

General

Our OSb contact person stopped answering his emails and messages halfway through the second round, and did not show up to meetings any more. This would not have been that big a problem, had he not been the person to initially contact all the teachers. We made it with the four of us, but it was harder during for example the second round to have enough committee members present.

One thing to think about, is using a panel of students to evaluate the microlectures in the second round (for example, some people from the OOC). One thing we enjoyed about the small group we received the lecture in, was the personal approach, and it was easier to have a conversation in which all the people in the room participated.

Shortly after the finale announcement, UToday placed a *teacher-of-the-week*-like article about Pieter Roos, which could be seen as unfair promotion, since the other teachers did not receive a similar treatment, but this cannot be helped.

The Student Union has budget available for the COP. We did not use all the budget, but in hindsight we could have had bitterballen from Sodexo.

One final tip is to plan evaluation talks with the finalists of last year, as soon as the committee is formed. We did the same this year, and it was very useful, as in early stages the feedback can be taken into account.

Our used documents, minutes, mails and more can be found on our Google Drive.