

Evaluation UTea 2019

Before the Event

The committee was created at the end of January. The first thing we did was create a timeline for when the DOPs must be done, and clearly communicating it to the study associations. This deadline was set on the 31st of March, and we had a small margin of a week before discussing the motivational letters.

Keeping a margin was nice and making it larger, for example two weeks, would maybe be a good idea. It could be a good idea to send the email about the fact Study Associations have to organize the DOP a bit earlier, but this can be sent by the OS, and does not have to be done by the UTEA itself. This way you can ensure that study associations have the time to organize everything. We met once every 2 weeks and weekly six weeks before the event. We think this was a nice amount.

We made criteria to access the motivational letters and had an afternoon session during which we graded the different motivational letters. This went quite well. Make sure how the assessment of the motivational letters is done is clear for the lecturers. We had 5 topics that had to be addressed in the motivational letter, these topics worked out fine for us, but are easily up for discussion for the next committee. Initially we wanted 6 people to go on to the semi-finals, but because of us being indecisive, 7 went on instead.

The mini-lectures were very nice, and most lecturers really tried their best to give a good presentation. One pitfall that should be avoided is that the award is about the best teacher, and not the best presenter. Thus, try to keep the motivational letter in mind when assessing teachers. Prepare your selection criteria well.

Jury

We also contacted different people to be in the Jury committee. We chose a few previous winners of the UTEA from different faculties, to have a nice selection of people. A few weeks before the finals, we had a meeting with the jury about the UTEA, and their thoughts about previous editions and what we should consider. Their feedback was helpful, so we would advise doing this as well 4 weeks before the finals. They also advised us to add someone who has experience with educational science, and thus we had a jury consisting of 4 members.

For the finals, a few preparations must be made:

- Ensure that you have a clear script, and everyone know what to do.
- Booked a location for the lecture and the drink afterwards as well as a room for the jury to discuss the finalists and choose a winner.
- A prize for the winner and the runner ups as well as a thank you gift for the jury and bhv/tappers.

Promotion

For promotion, we used four channels. We made posters which we placed all around the university at the study associations. We also used the screens on the campus and made a Facebook event. Next to this we sent an email to all study associations to promote among their members. We could have poked them a bit more about this. One last thing we did not do, but might be a good idea, is also sending an email to staff of study associations. In the end we had about 70 people show up. We also contacted UToday and M&C, which were both present at the event. Astrid de Graaff is the person responsible for making the video that will be shown during the Opening of the Academic Year.

The Event

The finals themselves went quite well. The event started at 15:45 until 17:00, which was nice and not too long. First, a short introduction was given by two members of the UTEA committee about the process up to the finals as well as an introduction of the jury and the voting procedure. Then, each lecturer had 15 minutes for their lecture. We ensured that it was not longer than 15 minutes, by having a timer. Each lecturer also had a student of his/her class introduce why they nominated their teacher. This was very nice, but we communicated this a bit too late to the lecturers, hence not all finalists could find a student. We think this is still very nice, if told to the lecturers on time.

For the voting, we had our four jury members who would give a grade to each lecturer. Next to this, the crowd could distribute 2 bonus points. These were divided, dependent on the ratios of on who the crowd voted on. This was done by using voting cards. The reason for this was that during previous years, there were issues with the usage of digital voting apps, so just using paper ensured everything would work out fine. This scoring system worked quite well, as it means the Finals are not a popularity contest, but the crowd would still have an influence.

Afterwards we had the drink during which the winner would be announced. This was nice, as it meant finalists could talk with people that attended the event in a less formal way. During this drink the jury would be discussing who the winner would be. However the Jury meeting during which the winner would be declared took an hour, which meant a lot of people were waiting because it took too long. Try to make this process a shorter by at least 30 minutes.

Before the event started, finalist could have been received better. This will make them feel more at ease. Dedicate one of the committee members have some talk with them to make them feel welcome. Also, it was still a bit messy beforehand, with plastic water bottles and random papers lying around. Try to keep everything neat, it will look more professional and enhance the experience for both participants and attendees.

After the event

After the event, M&C will contact the committee about who will give a little speech during the opening of the academic year and will hand out the award to the winner. Also, one committee member will be asked to say something on camera about the finals and congratulate the winner. This video (together with an interview with the winner) will be shown during the OAY and will be published online.