Ad Hoc Teaching Evaluation Committee

2008-2009 Annual Report

Stephanie L. Fitch, Chair

MISSOURI S&T
University of
Science & Technology

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Ad Hoc Teaching Evaluation Committee was formed in December of 2008 with members appointed by the President of Faculty Senate to address issues related both to the specific implementation of our current teaching evaluation system and to teaching evaluation and improvement in general. From the end of December 2008 through May of 2009, the committee met every two weeks in Fulton Hall. This report includes a summary of the primary issues addressed during these meetings, accomplishments of the committee, and works in progress as they are reflected in the meeting minutes (see Appendix B).

Opinions regarding teaching evaluations, their administration, use, and even their value are widely disparate. This diversity of thought is reflected in the members of this committee.

The committee began to tackle its charge by looking at the state of S&T's evaluation system both in the short and the long term. Several improvements were made for the short term, including clarifying instructions and adjusting the tabulation method. These improvements have already been implemented for the Spring 2009 evaluations, and we hope to see fewer isolated cases of incorrect or missing evaluation scores. Looking at the long term, the majority of the committee expects we will make strides towards implementing an electronic system rather than a paper one, but this will certainly take time and care to do properly. The committee is currently gathering information on how other institutions implement evaluation systems so that if a revision is recommended, it will be very well researched.

In addition to improving our evaluation system, this committee is considering the broader value of evaluating teaching in order to improve teaching methods. We are attempting to determine whether evaluation scores reflect learning, and we are considering evaluation methods other than those currently in use here at S&T. Pilot programs using peer evaluations and electronic evaluations are also being considered.

The committee recommends continuation of these efforts.

2008-2009
Ad Hoc Teaching Evaluation Committee Members

COMMITTEE CHAIR: Stephanie L. Fitch, Advisor & Instructor, Business & Information Technology Department

1. Mohamed G. Abdel Salam, Associate Professor, Geological Sciences & Engineering
2. Neil L. Book, Associate professor, Chemical & Biological Engineering
3. Margaret Cline (joined 2/2009), Chief Information Officer, Information Technology
4. Steven L. Grant, Associate Professor, Electrical & Computer Engineering
5. Kelly Homan, Associate professor, Mechanical & Aerospace Eningeering
6. Yue-wern Huang, Associate Professor, Biological Sciences
7. Kurt L. Kosbar, Associate Professor, Electrical & Computer Engineering
8. Bih-Ru Lea, Associate Professor, Business & Information Technology
9. James Martin (resigned 3/2009), Associate Professor, Psychological Sciences
10. Dianna G. Meyers, representative from Student Council Executive Committee
11. F. Scott Miller, Associate Teaching Professor, Materials Science & Engineering
12. Charles D. Morris, Associate Professor, Civil, Architectural, and Environmental Enginering
13. Adam Potthast, Assistant Professor, Arts, Languages & Philosophy
14. O. Allan Pringle, Curator's Teaching Professor, Physics
15. Robert W. Schwartz (joined 2/2009), Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
16. Henry A. Wiebe (joined 2/2009), Vice Provost and Dean, Global Learning

Committee Background and Charge

As per Faculty Senate Resolution FS0809res-2 (see Appendix A), this Ad Hoc Teaching Evaluation Committee was appointed in December of 2008 by the President of Faculty Senate.

The charge of this committee is to recommend to Faculty Senate such improvements in the currently teaching evaluation system as the committee may find appropriate.

(1) This committee makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate, and the Provost, regarding the instruments used for student evaluation of teaching, the procedures for conducting these evaluations, and policies related to the public disclosure of the evaluation results. The scope of the committee's responsibilities includes all aspects of teaching in courses with academic credit.

(2) In addition to student evaluations, the committee may consider alternate methods of evaluating teaching, and may suggest methods for improving teaching.

Committee Accomplishments for the 2008-2009 Academic Year

1. The committee worked with John Bax in IT to increase accuracy in tabulating of evaluation scores. Minor adjustments were made in how the program handles discrepancies incorrect class numbers. Separator sheets will now be used to clearly define different classes.

2. The committee revised the evaluation instruction sheet included in the evaluation packets with the cooperation of the CET. The new sheets emphasize the importance of using the correct class number, and clarify the process of identifying multiple instructors in team-taught courses (see Appendix A).

3. The committee added a brightly colored basic evaluation checklist to the evaluation packets for those who administer the evaluations, as it is likely that the entire standard instruction sheet is not read out loud at every evaluation. This is expected to minimize the effects of several common errors (see Appendix A).

4. The committee discussed the purpose of teaching evaluations at great length. A statement of the "Purpose of Teaching Evaluations" was created and adopted by the committee (see Appendix A).

Summary of Recommendations and Work in Progress

The committee members are willing to continue in their ad hoc capacity for the near future, and recommend that a standing committee continue to pursue the committee charge on a permanent basis.

While this committee has implemented several changes in the current system, the committee wishes to continue to consider many evaluation methods, from paper to electronic to peer evaluations, and also how evaluations are handled for distance and team-taught courses. Electronic evaluation methods are of special interest. In addition, the committee must keep in mind how evaluation results are used by students, faculty, and administrators.

A subcommittee is setting up a shared document ("wiki") to collect information on how evaluations are handled at comparator institutions. The entire committee can contribute to this document to help with this information gathering. Information on electronic evaluations is of particular interest.

A scholarly archive is being compiled of relevant documents submitted by committee members and will be kept at the library.

A subcommittee was formed to research whether there is a correlation between survey results and actual learning.

The committee will continue to consider alternate scanning methods, and perhaps a different scanner so that the University can print our own evaluation forms to reduce costs.

Appendix A

Related Documentation

FS0809res-2
Resolution on Ad-Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluations

The Faculty Senate affirms the paramount importance of the accuracy of the campus teaching evaluation system, both for the continual improvement of teaching and for accuracy in administrative procedures and consumer information.

Recognizing that rapidly changing technologies and public interests continually alter the teaching environment, the Senate further charges the President to appoint an ad hoc faculty committee to review and recommend to the Faculty Senate such improvements in the current system as the committee may find appropriate.

Status of Student Evaluations of Faculty Instruction, November 19, 2008

Student response sheets are processed by a scanner, which produces "batches" containing data from up to 1000 scan sheets. Each semester there are approximately 25 batches of scan sheets. The batches are uploaded into a database. Faculty are able to view their teaching evaluation results through the CET web site, by running a script which accesses their data from the database.

IT has identified and corrected three instances of batch mis-handling which affected the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 evaluations:

1. For the Fall 2007 semester, it appears that a batch was uploaded twice into the database. The result was that a number of courses showed more students having evaluated the course than were actually enrolled.
2. For the Spring 2008 semester, it also appears that a batch was uploaded twice into the database.
3. Also for the Spring 2008 semester, a batch or more of student response sheets was scanned but not uploaded into the database. The result was that a number of courses showed no students having evaluated the course, when in fact the courses were evaluated.

IT has produced new tools which check for duplicate uploading of batches, generate internal reports which show what batches actually were uploaded, and contain other logic checks which greatly reduce the opportunities for incorrect processing of scan sheets.

The database for the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 evaluations have been re-generated using the new tools, and the problems identified above have been corrected. In the cases where

batches were uploaded twice, evaluation scores are unchanged (each student response sheet was counted twice, but the average response remains the same). In the cases for Spring 2008 where batches were not uploaded, evaluation scores are now available.

There will remain isolated problems caused by mis-routing of scan sheets, incorrect course or instructor numbers provided to students, incorrect scan sheet "bubbles" filled in by students, and other mistakes related to human handling of evaluation sheets.

The scripts which generate the reports used for Outstanding Teaching awards are being rewritten, and the selection process for those awards will take place when the rewrite is complete.

Faculty are encouraged to check their teaching evaluations for Fall 2007 and Spring 2008, and report any concerns to Dr. Allan Pringle, CET chair, at pringle@mst.edu.

Evaluation Process
Provided by Dr. Allan Pringle

1. At the beginning of each semester the Registrar's office provides each department with a list of their courses, and asks the department to identify a faculty person "of record" to be evaluated for each course.

2. Departments complete and return to the Registrar's office the list of who is teaching each course, who is to be evaluated as "primary" instructor, and if course is co-taught, who is to be evaluated as "secondary" instructor. Done through Peoplesoft.

3. Registrar's office enters departmental information from 2 into a database, accessible via Peoplesoft.

4. Based on data in Peoplesoft, VPAA's office assembles packets (as described below) and sends them to mail room. Packets: comment sheets, scan sheets, instructions, labels on outside of envelopes with instructor number. Specially-formatted scan sheets are printed on campus (cost: about $4,000).

5. Packets are held by registrar until the last day for dropping a course that semester, and then sent to departments.

6. Departments do evaluations and return both scan sheets and comment sheets to Registrar's office. Faculty are never supposed to handle evaluations.

7. Registrar keeps scan sheets until a week after final grades are entered in Joe's SS. When CET gives the OK, comment sheets are released departments to be given to faculty and scan sheets are released to IT.

8. IT is responsible for scanning the response sheets: a temp is hired to do the scanning, which takes a full week. The temp receives detailed instructions, designed to catch mistakes, on handling the scan sheets. Scanned data go to a file on a PC. Files on the PC are uploaded to a database, which contains the "raw" scanned data. Information in the database is transferred by a Perl script to a second database (Oracle?), where the results may be viewed by faculty.

9. IT holds on to most-recently scanned response sheets for a semester. The previous semester's scan sheets are stored in files in Parker hall.

10. Scan sheets stored in Parker Hall are kept until space is needed. Typically there is a semester of scan sheets held by IT, and another semester stored in Parker Hall. When space is required in Parker Hall, oldest scan sheets are shredded.

Issues: designation of person responsible; courses that end mid-semester; co-taught courses; co-listed courses; evaluation administration errors; evaluation processing errors; typically 15% of courses are not evaluated; distance courses.

Evaluation Instructions

as Distributed Fall 2008 and Before

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

I. Who can administer: Please do not administer these evaluations if you are the instructor of the class, a student in the class, or have not received approval by the department. In such as event, the results will be disregarded.

2. What day to administer: It is recommended that the evaluations be administered after the 12th week drop deadline, at anytime when the class regularly meets.

3. When to administer during class: Please administer the evaluation at the beginning of the class period, if at all possible. Ifyou must administer the evaluations at the end of the class period, please do not dismiss until you have collected all material (pencils, scan sheets, comment sheets, envelopes) and have sealed the envelopes in front of them.

4. Who can be there: Only participating students. All Instructors at,ld assistants should be absent during administration.

5. What to bring: The materials needed when administering evaluations;
    Packet labeled for the specific class
    #2 pencils for marking scan sheets
    Copy of instructions
    Scan sheet for each student
    Comment sheet for each student
    Return envelopes for scan sheets and comment sheets
    *Ifinstructor, or department, is using additional evaluation questions, a copy of those questions.

6. Read to the Students: Begin the evaluation by reading the paragraph describing the purpose and use of this student survey:

The Provost and Executive Vice Challcellor ofthe University ofMissouri-Rolla asks you to participate in a survey ofthe effectivelless ofthe teaching you have received in this course by this instructor this semester. The primary purpose is to help improve the overall quality ofeducation on this campus. The Committee for EJfeClive Teaching and Faculty Awards will use the results to recognize about 20 ofthe best teachers across c,!mpus. Beyond the awards,thereSults ofthissurveywillbecomepart oftheinstructor'spersonnelfolder. Thismeansthattheresults of the survey become a portion ofthe consideration given to this instrudor in matters ofraises, promotion, tenure, and other professional development decisions. Please answer the questions on the survey in an honest and professional matter. For maximum confidentiality, your surveys will be placed in envelopes thOat are sealed before leaving the room and in front ofyou.

7. Distribute the material: Distribute scan sheets, comment sheets, pencils and instructions for department/instructor ' questions (if applicable).

8. Identify reference number: Write the course reference number on the board (number is on the right-hand side of the 1st line of the label) and instruct students to copy the six-digit number on top left blanks, and darken the corresponding number-circle beneath each blank. (Sixth number--right side blank .-will be a "0" for single instructor courses, the number of instructors in multiple instructor courses.)

9. Instructions for scan sheet: Instruct students to darken the circles for each question (and added "Department Evaluations" questions, if applicable)

10. Instructions for comment sheets: Read the following instructions:
The comments sheets are not part ofthe officUd student survey. They are a private correspondence between you and theinstructor oftheclass. Theinstructorwillnotreceivethecommentsheetsuntilafterthe endofthesemester and grades have been submitted. They will not be seen by any ofthe instructor's supervisors unless the instructor wishes. To comment on this instructor to hislher supervisors, you must contact them directly.

11. Silence: Please refrain from talking during the evaluations.

12. Collect tbe Scan Sbeets: Retrieve scan sheets when completed by all students, place in envelope marked "for returning scan sheets" -include all unused scan sheets as well.

13. Collect tbe Comment Sheets: Retrieve written comment sheets when completed by all students, place in envelope marked

"for returning comment sheets" .-include all unused comment sheets as well. 14.. Seal botb envelopes: The envelopes must be sealed before leaving the room arid in front ofthe students.

15. Dismissing the studentsl Restarting tbe class: If the survey was given at the beginning of class, gather all materials and notify the instructor the evaluation is complete and that class can proceed. (This is the recommended procedure.) If the survey was given at the end of a class period (not recommended), then do not allow the students to leave until all have completed the survey, the sheets have been gathered, and the envelopes have been sealed in front of them.

16. Returning the survey: Please immediately return the completed surveys to the departmental office for collection and return to the Office of the Registrar. Do not take them back to your office for later return.

```
Questions: If you have questions please see the "Frequently Asked Questions" link on
 our web site http://www.umr.edu/-eet. There is a list ofcontact people for specific
                                  concerns.
```

Revised Evaluation Instructions, approved by CET

distributed starting Spring 2009

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

1. **Who can administer:** Please **do not** administer these evaluations if you are the instructor of the class, a student in the class, or have not received approval by the department. In such an event, the results will be disregarded.
2. **What day to administer:** It is recommended that the evaluations be administered after the 12th week drop deadline, during a regularly scheduled class meeting.
3. **When to administer during class:** Please administer the evaluation at the **beginning** of the class period, if at all possible. If you must administer the evaluations at the **end** of the class period, please **do not dismiss** until you have collected all material (pencils, scan sheets, comment sheets, envelopes) and have **sealed** the envelopes in front of them.
4. **Who can be there:** Only participating students. All Instructors and assistants should be absent during administration.
5. **What to bring:** The materials needed when administering evaluations;
    a. Packet labeled for the specific class
    b. #2 pencils for marking scan sheets
    c. Copy of instructions
    d. Scan sheet for each student
    e. Comment sheet for each student
    f. Return envelopes for scan sheets and comment sheets
    g. If instructor, or department, is using additional evaluation questions, a copy of those questions.
6. **Read to the Students:** Begin the evaluation by reading the paragraph describing the purpose and use of this student survey:

    The Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor of the University of Missouri – Rolla asks you to participate in a survey of the effectiveness of the teaching you have received in this course by this instructor this semester. The primary purpose is to help improve the overall quality of education on this campus. The Committee for Effective Teaching and Faculty Awards will use the results to recognize about 20 of the best teachers across campus. Beyond the awards, the results of this survey will become part of the instructor's personnel folder. This means that the results of the survey become a portion of the consideration given to this instructor in matters of raises, promotion, tenure, and other professional development decisions. Please answer the questions on the survey in an honest and professional matter. For maximum confidentiality, your surveys will be placed in envelopes that are sealed before leaving the room and in front of you. (This statement was revised by the CET, new statement is below).

> **Comment [SM1]:** The CET website has s revised version of these instructions , and includes the following version of this statement

The Provost of Missouri University of Science and Technology asks you to participate in a survey of the effectiveness of the teaching you have received in this course by this instructor this semester. The primary purpose is to help improve the overall quality of education on this campus. The Committee for Effective Teaching and Faculty Awards will use the results to recognize some of the best teachers across campus. Beyond the awards, the results of this survey will become part of the instructor's personnel folder. This means that the results of the survey become a portion of the consideration given to this instructor in matters of raises, promotion, tenure, and other professional development decisions. Please answer the questions on the survey in an honest and professional matter. For maximum confidentiality, your surveys will be placed in envelopes that are sealed before leaving the room and in front of you.

7. **Distribute the material:** Distribute scan sheets, comment sheets, pencils and instructions for department/instructor questions (if applicable).

8. **Identify reference number:** Write the <u>course reference number</u> on the board (number is on the right-hand side of the 1st line of the label on the envelope) and instruct students to copy the six-digit number to the top left blanks, and darken the corresponding number-circle beneath each blank. For single-instructor courses, the sixth number – right side blank – will be a "0". For multiple-instructor courses, the sixth number is the instructor's single-digit assigned number from the label on that instructor's envelope.

9. **Instructions for scan sheet:** Instruct students to darken the circles for each question (and added "Department Evaluations" questions, if applicable).

10. **Instructions for comment sheets:** Read the following instructions:
    The comments sheets are not part of the official student survey. They are a private correspondence between you and the instructor of the class. The instructor will not receive the comment sheets until after grades have been submitted at the end of the semester. They will not be seen by any of the instructor's supervisors unless the instructor wishes. To comment on this instructor to his/her supervisors, you must contact the supervisor(s) directly.

11. **Silence:** Please refrain from talking during the evaluations.

12. **Collect the scan sheets:** Retrieve scan sheets when completed by all students, place in envelope marked **"for returning scan sheets"** – include all unused scan sheets as well.

13. **Collect the comment sheets:** Retrieve all comment sheets when completed by all students, place in envelope marked **"for returning comment sheets"** – include all unused comment sheets as well.

14. **Seal both envelopes:** The envelopes must be sealed **before** leaving the room and **in front of** the students.

15. **Dismissing the students/Restarting the class:** If the survey was given at the beginning of class, gather all materials and notify the instructor the evaluation is complete and that class can proceed. (This is the recommended procedure.) If the survey was given at the end of a class period (not recommended), then do not allow the

students to leave until all have completed the survey, the sheets have been gathered, and the envelopes have been **sealed in front of them.**

16. **Returning the survey:** Please **immediately** return the completed surveys to the departmental office for collection and return to the Office of the Registrar. **Do not take them back to your office for later return.**

Questions: If you have questions please see the "Frequently Asked Questions" link on our web site http://campus.mst.edu/cet/faq2.htm. There is a list of contact people for specific concerns.

This evaluation will **<u>not</u>** be tabulated correctly **<u>unless</u>** you complete the following steps:

- **<u>WRITE</u>** the CORRECT 5-digit course number AND the 1-digit instructor number (from the envelope label) on the board in the classroom.
- **<u>INSTRUCT</u>** students to copy the EXACT course number and instructor number into the boxes on the top left of the scan sheet. Students MUST also fill in the appropriate bubbles below those numbers.
- **<u>PREVENT</u>** discussion among students during the evaluation process to ensure objectivity.
- **<u>SEPARATE</u>** scan sheets (white bubble sheets) from comment sheets (manila) and place them in the appropriate envelopes. BE SURE the pages are in the correct envelopes. Seal the envelopes.
- **<u>RETURN</u>** envelopes immediately to the department office.

Purpose of Teaching Evaluations
Approved by committee 5/6/09

The purpose of the teaching evaluation system at Missouri S&T is to:

a) help instructors improve student learning in their courses,
b) provide information that may be used in cases of promotion and/or tenure,
c) provide an opportunity for anonymous constructive criticism from students,
d) provide data on instructor performance as required by state law, and
e) furnish data to those responsible for the annual review of overall instructor performance

... with the understanding that

1) student feedback is a valuable but incomplete measure of an instructor's effectiveness, and
2) those responsible for overall review of faculty performance should take other sources of evaluation into account.

Appendix B

2008-2009 Meeting Minutes

Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation

Thursday, 12/18/08 Minutes

Dear Committee Members,

The following is a summary of the discussion at our meeting last Thursday.

Attending: Neil Book, Steph Fitch, Steve Grant, Yue-Wern Huang, Kelly Homan, Kurt Kosbar, Bih-Ru Lea, Jim Martin, Dianna Meyers, Scott Miller, Chuck Morris, Allan Pringle
Not Attending: Mohamed Abdel Salam, Adam Potthast

1. Kurt Kosbar and Allan Pringle outlined the reasons for starting this committee as follows. The current Committee on Effective Teaching (CET) consists of Chancellor-appointed faculty members. Faculty Senate would like to institute a standing committee consisting of elected faculty members. In this way, the committee will be seen as representative. Officially, a standing committee cannot be instituted without a change in Faculty Senate bylaws, so this ad hoc committee was formed.

   The intent is for this ad hoc committee to become a standing committee. Our charge, however, is more broad than that undertaken previously. In addition to overseeing the administration of teaching evaluations and conferring teaching awards, this committee is charged with continuous improvement of our teaching evaluation system.

2. The majority of the meeting consisted of discussion of various items which could be considered by this committee:
   - Current evaluation questions are more teaching-centered than learning centered
   - Are the current questions evaluating what should be evaluated?
   - We have years of data; has this data been examined both for relevancy and for trends?
   - Do we want to change the questions on the evaluation?
   - Larry Gragg put together a document about the accuracy of teaching evaluations, how the results relate to grades (or not), and various other information. Alan emailed us each a copy after the meeting for our perusal; we may wish to consider the items in this document as we proceed

3. Allan offered to present the current evaluation process at our next meeting.

4. Steph Fitch was elected Chair of this committee.

Tentative meeting dates are the following Wednesdays, 3:00-4:00, in Fulton 117: 1/28, 2/11, 2/25, 3/11, 3/25, 4/8, 4/22, 5/6. I did my best to consider the schedules of everyone who volunteered for this committee. If you will be unable to attend the majority of the meetings and wish to be removed from this committee, please let me know. Agendas and reminders will be distributed via email prior to each meeting.

Thanks, everyone.

Steph

Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation

Wednesday, 1/28/09 Minutes

Attending: Mohamed Abdel Salam , Neil Book, Steph Fitch, Steve Grant, Yue-wern Huang, Kurt Kosbar, Bih-Ru Lea, Dianna Meyers, Scott Miller, Chuck Morris, Adam Potthast, Allan Pringle
Not Attending: Kelly Homan, Jim Martin

Old Business: Minutes from 12/18/08 were revised and approved.

New Business:

1. The first half of the meeting consisted of an overview of the current evaluation procedure by Allan Pringle, including a handout describing the step-by-step process. Flaws in the current process were pointed out and discussed:

   - Certain courses are difficult to evaluate – courses that end in mid-semester, team-taught courses, distance courses, co-listed courses
   - Person responsible for the course must be designated properly
   - Security concerns
   - More than one computer system is used and data must be transferred
   - Evaluations are sometimes not administered properly – use of incorrect envelope, return of blank sheets, incorrect class numbers used, etc.
   - Evaluations are sometimes not processed properly – some sheets are not scanned, some are scanned twice by mistake
   - About 15% of courses are not evaluated
   - Process may not be cost-effective

2. The second half of the meeting was reserved to set goals and priorities for the committee. Some general and some specific items were discussed:

   - Current evaluation procedure adjustment
   - Current evaluation content modification
   - How are the current evaluation results used? Can we insulate this process and results from being used improperly?
   - Do we want to modify the current evaluations, or start from scratch?
   - Should we investigate outsourcing this process?
   - Could an electronic format be feasible?
   - Consider other models used elsewhere
   - Could courses be weighted somehow – required or elective, class size, time of day taught, whether a course is "difficult to teach", and is it desirable to consider eliminating statistical outliers in individual evaluations?
   - Do instructors read the comments when they are returned?

   Goals and priorities were not set at this time. Steph requested that each committee member email issues that should be considered.

Prep for Future Meetings: Our meetings so far have been informative, but not productive. In order to make progress, we must make some decisions.

Define the Purpose of Evaluations (topic for 2/11): Any actions or recommendations made by this committee must be informed by our basic understanding of and general agreement on the purpose of teaching evaluations. For the 2/11 meeting, please bring in a statement of what purpose such evaluations SHOULD serve. By the end of the meeting on 2/11, we will have a statement of the purpose of teaching evaluations that we can all accept, even if there is some difference of opinion.

21

Short-Term (topic for 2/11): For the current semester, should we institute changes in the current evaluation procedure, or the current evaluation content, or both, or neither? If we choose to make band-aid adjustments for now, we need to do it fast, so think about what you want for the current semester.

Long-Term (for future meetings): The general consensus at our meetings seems to be that the current system is not entirely satisfactory. Assuming that is the case (which may or may not be valid), we must carefully consider how to create a better system.

- Based on a suggestion at our meeting…Suppose you could create the "perfect" teaching evaluation system. Consider the following questions: What is the overall purpose of the system? How is the system structured (paper forms filled out in class, electronic, peer evals, videotaping…)? How is the system administered and how are evaluation results tabulated/achieved? Who sees the results, and what actions are taken based on these results?
- If we decide to start from scratch and create a new system, information from other sources will be a great help. We should start looking into other models at other places, electronic options, and potential outsourcing.

Meeting dates are the following Wednesdays, 3:00-4:00, in Fulton 117: 2/11, 2/25, 3/11, 3/25, 4/8, 4/22, 5/6.

Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation
Wednesday, 2/11/09 Minutes

Attending: Mohamed Abdel Salam , Neil Book, Margaret Cline, Steph Fitch, Steve Grant, Kelly Homan, Kurt Kosbar, Dianna Meyers, Scott Miller, Chuck Morris, Adam Potthast, Allan Pringle, Bob Schwartz, Henry Wiebe
Not Attending: Yue-wern Huang, Bih-Ru Lea, Jim Martin

Old Business:
1. Minutes from 1/28/09 were approved.

2. Margaret informed us that she has further information on the evaluation process currently used, perhaps in addition to that provided by Allan at the last meeting. If available, she will send this information to the committee electronically.

3. Neil described the origin of the evaluations, which came from a movement in Student Council. At the time, it was explicitly stated that the evaluations were not to be used in promotion and tenure decisions.

4. Faculty Senate (then Academic Council) made policy to begin using evaluations in December of 1988. The approval included allowing use of evaluations for the purposes of course improvement, annual review, and recognition/awards.

New Business:

1. The committee welcomed new members Margaret Cline, Bob Schwartz, and Henry Wiebe.

2. Everyone completed the "assignment" and brought their written definitions of "The Purpose of Teaching Evaluations" to the meeting. There was general agreement on the following:

    The Purpose of Teaching Evaluations is to provide

    - Feedback to instructors for course improvement
    - Annual review of faculty, both quantitatively and qualitatively
    - Feedback to faculty, administration, and students regarding whether student needs are being met
    - Recognition of effective teaching
    - A measure of student perception of teaching effectiveness

    In addition, several members stated that teaching evaluations:

    - Should emphasize learning, not teaching
    - Could include some sort of peer evaluation
    - Should be to the benefit, not detriment, of students and instructors
    - Could suggest changes in curricula
    - Could provide information for promotion and tenure applications
    - Can empower students (could be positive or negative)
    - Should include anonymous feedback from students

    There was much discussion on these items, and the committee may wish to revisit this topic at the next meeting to further clarify if needed.

3. The committee began to discuss ideas to improve the current implementation process for the evaluations. One simple change suggested is to return the bubble sheets to instructors rather than keep them in Parker Hall. This way, the instructor is responsible for deciding how long the sheets are physically kept. This and other possible process changes will be discussed at the next meeting.

23

Prep for Future Meetings:

Short-Term (topic for 2/25): For the Fall 2009 semester (or perhaps even Spring 2009), should we institute changes in the current evaluation procedure, or the current evaluation content, or both, or neither? Brainstorm ideas and bring them to the meeting on 2/25 for discussion – especially those related to the implementation process.

Long-Term (ponder these for future meetings): The general consensus at our meetings seems to be that the current system is not entirely satisfactory. Assuming that is the case (which may or may not be valid), we must carefully consider how to create a better system.

- Based on a suggestion at our meeting…Suppose you could create the "perfect" teaching evaluation system. Consider the following questions: What is the overall purpose of the system? How is the system structured (paper forms filled out in class, electronic, peer evals, videotaping…)? How is the system administered and how are evaluation results tabulated/achieved? Who sees the results, and what actions are taken based on these results?
- If we decide to start from scratch and create a new system, information from other sources will be a great help. We should start looking into other models at other places, electronic options, and potential outsourcing.

Meeting dates are the following Wednesdays, 3:00-4:00, in Fulton 117: 2/25, 3/11, 3/25, 4/8, 4/22, 5/6.

Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation
Wednesday, 2/25/09 Minutes

Attending: Neil Book, Steph Fitch, Kurt Kosbar, Dianna Meyers, Chuck Morris, Adam Potthast, Allan Pringle, Bih-Ru Lea
Not Attending: Mohamed Abdel Salam , Margaret Cline, Steve Grant, Kelly Homan, Scott Miller, Bob Schwartz, Henry Wiebe, Yue-wern Huang, Jim Martin

Old Business:
1. Minutes from 1/28/09 were reviewed and a minor change was made. The approval process was tabled until the next meeting as this meeting did not have a quorum.

2. The "Purpose of Teaching Evaluations" lists were reviewed. Adam suggested that a clear concise statement may be helpful to guide our future recommendations. He volunteered to work on the creation of such a statement and bring a draft to the next meeting for consideration.

New Business:

1. The question was raised as to how recommendations from this committee can be presented and implemented. Kurt advised that recommendations be presented to both the CET and RP&A, and that these groups can determine whether or not to implement them, send them to Faculty Senate for consideration, or take other action.

2. The following possible changes in the current evaluation process were discussed:

   a) After scanning, bubble sheets can be returned to instructors rather than kept in a central location. These sheets would then be invalid for use in the teaching award selection process. However, department chairs could determine whether to use these sheets in any cases where issues arise regarding validity of reported numerical scores or the existence (or lack) of said scores. Arrangement for storage and length of retention of the sheets would be the responsibility of the instructor. The committee agreed that this would be a positive change. Several methods of implementation were discussed, but more information is needed to determine the most efficient and effective method of return.

   b) The most frequent cause of error seems to be that the course number written on the scan sheets does not match the actual course number. Several ways of dealing with this issue were discussed: somehow programming the scanner with that number and then running sheets for that class only, having the temporary worker who scans the sheets check all the sheets ahead of time, having department staff open evaluation envelopes to be sure the right forms are in the right envelope and that the numbers are correct, etc. The committee agreed that again, more information is needed, including capabilities of the scanner, cost for the worker's time, and estimates on whether there would be delays in getting results.

   c) Most of the committee is of the opinion that the instruction sheets are not read in their entirety every time an evaluation is done. Perhaps a revamp of the instruction sheet is in order. As part of this, to help with item (b) above, the instructions could strongly emphasize that the course number must be correct on the bubble sheets.

   d) Some on the committee feel that the restrictions on the party administering the evaluations engender mistrust. It is unfortunate that it seems a bad apple has poisoned the barrel and made it difficult/awkward for some faculty to find someone to administer their evaluations. This can be difficult, especially for evening courses. The committee should discuss this facet of the process further and offer viable alternatives.

In light of (a) and (b) above, it was suggested that perhaps our committee would benefit from a "field trip" to view the scanner just to see how it works and what capabilities it has. In addition, Allan suggested that we consult with Dave Anderson and also Margaret (on our committee) regarding details of the scanning process. Steph will look into inviting Dave to our next meeting.

3. Concerns were raised regarding the use of a single question on the evaluation as the rating used by both the CET for awards and by administrators to represent an instructor's teaching quality. This makes all of the other questions seem to be just informational. Perhaps we should consider an overall rating that takes other questions into account. Such a change could not be implemented quickly, but should be considered in future discussions about restructuring the form, changing questions, etc.

4. Meeting dates were discussed for March for various reasons. We were originally scheduled to meet on 3/11 and on 3/25. These meeting dates are now CHANGED to 3/4 and 3/18. Updates will be emailed to the committee and also sent through Outlook.

Prep for Future Meetings:

Short-Term (topics for 3/4): Adam will bring drafts of a statement on the Purpose of Teaching Evaluations to this meeting for discussion. Continue to brainstorm ideas for making the evaluation process more accurate and efficient – implementation changes only, folks. These should be things we can implement for at least the Fall 2009 semester, if not sooner. We hope to have Dave Anderson in attendance to assist us in considering possible evaluation implementation changes from an IT perspective.

Long-Term (continue to ponder these for future meetings): The general consensus at our meetings seems to be that the current system is not entirely satisfactory. Assuming that is the case (which may or may not be valid), we must carefully consider how to create a better system.

- Based on a suggestion at our meeting…Suppose you could create the "perfect" teaching evaluation system. Consider the following questions: What is the overall purpose of the system? How is the system structured (paper forms filled out in class, electronic, peer evals, videotaping…)? How is the system administered and how are evaluation results tabulated/achieved? Who sees the results, and what actions are taken based on these results?
- If we decide to start from scratch and create a new system, information from other sources will be a great help. We should start looking into other models at other places, electronic options, and potential outsourcing.

Meeting dates are the following Wednesdays, 3:00-4:00, in Fulton 117: 2/25, **3/4*, 3/18***, 4/8, 4/22, 5/6.
*These dates have been CHANGED from those originally scheduled.

Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation
Wednesday, 3/4/09 Minutes

Attending: Neil Book, Steph Fitch, Steve Grant, Kurt Kosbar, Jim Martin, Dianna Meyers, Scott Miller, Chuck Morris, Adam Potthast, Allan Pringle, Bob Schwartz, Henry Weibe
Not Attending: Mohamed Abdel Salam , Margaret Cline, Kelly Homan, Yue-wern Huang, Bih-Ru Lea
Invited Guests: Dave Anderson, Jerry Hammons, John Bax

Old Business:

1. Minutes from 2/11/09 and 2/25/09 were reviewed and approved.

2. The "Purpose of Teaching Evaluations" draft statements are not yet ready for review, but will be brought forward at a future date.

New Business:

1. Between last meeting and this, Steph met with Dave Anderson from IT to get a better understanding of how the scanner used for evaluations works and what might be possible, and prepared ideas for the committee to discuss.

2. The evaluation process was again reviewed, this time with technical input from IT. The committee viewed an example of dataset output from the scanner to further our understanding. The committee brainstormed ways to improve the implementation process with our guests from IT. The following possible changes in the current evaluation process were discussed:

    e) Scan sheets could easily be run with either a blank sheet or an identifying sheet at the beginning and/or end of each packet. All class numbers within that packet should be the same, and missing or non-matching numbers could potentially be changed to the number in the packet that occurs most frequently. IT already assumes a number in some cases when that field is left blank. We would need to consult with CET regarding this, since their feeling (as far as we can tell) is not to "change" anything a student has written on the forms, including the class number if one is given.

    f) As previously suggested, scan sheets could be returned to instructors after scanning.

    g) Potential use of a different, possibly faster, scanner was discussed. Cost of such a scanner was estimated by one member to be about $1500, but IT suggested it may be more like $5000 for a more durable scanner meant for large volume. The committee could investigate scanners in various locations on campus – the Admissions Office and the Alumni Office may both be looking into such a purchase, and perhaps one scanner could be used for multiple applications across campus as a cost-saving measure.

    h) The committee agreed that one major yet straightforward change is to revise the instruction sheet. This revision must be done by 3/20 if we want implementation in the current cycle. This will be the topic of the next meeting.

Prep for Future Meetings:

Immediate (for meeting on 3/18): Review the instruction sheet provided with evaluation packets. At our next meeting, we will revise this sheet or perhaps create an additional sheet for the packet (depending on input from CET).

Short-Term (future meeting, but soon): Adam will bring drafts of a statement on the Purpose of Teaching Evaluations to this meeting for discussion. Continue to brainstorm ideas for making the

evaluation process more accurate and efficient – implementation changes only, folks. These should be things we can implement for at least the Fall 2009 semester.

Long-Term (continue to ponder these for future meetings): The general consensus at our meetings seems to be that the current system is not entirely satisfactory. Assuming that is the case (which may or may not be valid), we must carefully consider how to create a better system.

- Based on a suggestion at our meeting…Suppose you could create the "perfect" teaching evaluation system. Consider the following questions: What is the overall purpose of the system? How is the system structured (paper forms filled out in class, electronic, peer evals, videotaping…)? How is the system administered and how are evaluation results tabulated/achieved? Who sees the results, and what actions are taken based on these results?
- If we decide to start from scratch and create a new system, information from other sources will be a great help. We should start looking into other models at other places, electronic options, and potential outsourcing.

Meeting dates are the following Wednesdays, 3:00-4:00, in Fulton 117: **3/18***, 4/8, 4/22, 5/6.
*This date has been CHANGED from that originally scheduled.

Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation

Wednesday, 3/18/09 Minutes

Attending: John Bax (for Margaret Cline), Neil Book, Steph Fitch, Steve Grant, Kelly Homan, Bih-Ru Lea, Adam Potthast, Allan Pringle, Bob Schwartz, Henry Weibe
Not Attending: Mohamed Abdel Salam , Yue-wern Huang, Kurt Kosbar, Dianna Meyers, Scott Miller, Chuck Morris

Old Business:

1. Minutes from 3/4/09 were reviewed and approved with a minor correction to the attendance list.

2. The committee voted to make a change in the "class number" procedure used during scanning of evaluation sheets. A cover sheet with asterisks will be run at the start of each class section's run in the scanner. A consistent class number will be assumed for all sheets in between; the most frequently occurring class number will be used for all of these sheets. The committee voted unanimously for this change.

New Business:

1. A copy of the current instruction sheet used to administer evaluations was distributed. The committee noted numerous errors in the sheet and agrees that a revision is needed. Revision of this sheet should be done prior to administration of evaluations for Fall 2009.

2. The committee developed a single page checklist to be printed on brightly colored paper and to be included with the evaluation packet. This page has been provided to Bob Schwartz's office and will be included in the packets for evaluations taking place in Spring 2009.

3. It would be interesting and probably useful to correlate teaching evaluation scores with some objective measure of learning (look at teaching scores of courses with multiple sections, compare with scores on common final, etc.)

4. Jim Martin submitted his resignation from this committee prior to this meeting due to time conflicts.

Prep for Future Meetings:

Short-Term:

- Review the instruction sheet provided with evaluation packets. This sheet needs to be revised soon; we could complete this by the close of the current semester.

- Adam has been working on drafts of a statement on the Purpose of Teaching Evaluations. When available, the committee will discuss potential statements. Consensus on such a purpose statement will give us a guide as we develop ideas for changing/improving our process.

- Consider whether there are other changes we could implement quickly (for use in Fall 2009) in order to improve our evaluation process.

Long-Term : The general consensus at our meetings seems to be that the current system is not entirely satisfactory. Assuming that is the case (which may or may not be valid), we must carefully consider how to create a better system.

- Based on a suggestion at our meeting…Suppose you could create the "perfect" teaching evaluation system. Consider the following questions: What is the overall purpose of the system? How is the system structured (paper forms filled out in class, electronic, peer evals,

29

videotaping…)? How is the system administered and how are evaluation results tabulated/achieved? Who sees the results, and what actions are taken based on these results?

- If we decide to start from scratch and create a new system, information from other sources will be a great help. We should start looking into other models at other places, electronic options, and potential outsourcing.

Meeting dates are the following Wednesdays, 3:00-4:00, in Fulton 117: 4/8, 4/22, 5/6.

Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation

Wednesday, 4/8/09 Minutes

Attending: Neil Book, Margaret Cline, Steph Fitch, Steve Grant, Dianna Meyers, Scott Miller, Chuck Morris, Adam Potthast, Henry Wiebe
Not Attending: Mohamed Abdel Salam , Kelly Homan, Yue-wern Huang, Kurt Kosbar, Bih-Ru Lea, Allan Pringle, Bob Schwartz

Old Business:

1. Minutes from 3/18/09 were reviewed and approved with one addition and a spelling correction.

2. There was discussion regarding possible comparison of teaching evaluation scores with some objective assessment of learning and how that could take place – through common finals of several sections of a course, etc.

3. Accomplishments for the semester were reviewed:

   a) A change in scanning (cover/separator sheets) will be used to separate class sections and make sure reference numbers are consistent.
   b) An instruction checklist has been printed on bright paper and placed in evaluation packets for the current semester.

New Business:

1. Short-term tasks for the remainder of the semester were discussed:

   a) Revise current instruction sheet for evaluation packets (finish before 11/09, Scott?).
   b) Create a statement of The Purpose of Teaching Evaluations (Adam?).
   c) Keep the idea of a new scanner in the forefront – the cost savings from printing our own forms could make the purchase cost-effective quickly. However, if we move towards electronic evaluations, a new scanner may not be needed. (Library and Admissions are considering scanner purchases – but not the type we need, according to Margaret; John Bax could come up with alternatives for us if we recommend purchase of a new one).

2. Longer-term tasks were undertaken:

   a) An informal poll of the committee showed that a majority of members are interested in implementing an electronic evaluation system (with caveats).

   A subcommittee (Adam, Dianna, Chuck) was formed to look into how other institutions implement teaching evaluations. Electronic evaluations are the main focus, but other evaluation methods can be investigated as well.

   Neil suggested that a pilot electronic evaluation could be done with faculty volunteers. This would be a good way to illustrate potential issues, and perhaps may alleviate objections which may arise.

   Steph suggested that members could do an informal poll of their own departments to discover what objections or possible issues could come up if electronic evaluations were implemented. This should assist the subcommittee as they collect information.

3. Other comments from the committee:

   a) To encourage students to complete surveys, faculty must stress their importance to the students. Also, "closing the loop" will show the students that the evaluation results are taken seriously – suggestions made are used to improve courses.
   b) The name "Teaching Evaluations" may be a misnomer. The title "Student Evaluation of Teaching" was suggested instead in order to reflect that this evaluation is only one part of how teaching is evaluated. The title on the evaluation instruction sheet is "Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness."
   c) Margaret encouraged committee members to attend the Teaching and Learning Educational Technology Conference in the Havener Center, starting at 2:30 on Thurs 4/9 and running through Friday (register online). The keynote speaker has done much work in online assessments.

Prep for Future Meetings:

- Review the current evaluation instruction sheet – we will discuss revisions at the next meeting.
- Review the drafts of a statement on The Purpose of Teaching Evaluations – we will discuss this at the next meeting.
- Check with your colleagues to discover what sorts of issues may be of concern in regard to electronic evaluations.
- Consider whether or not you are available/inclined to meet during the summer.

Meeting dates are the following Wednesdays, 3:00-4:00, in Fulton 117:   4/22, 5/6.

Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation

Wednesday, 4/22/09 Minutes

Attending: Neil Book, Margaret Cline, Steph Fitch, Steve Grant, Bih-Ru Lea, Dianna Meyers, Scott Miller, Adam Potthast, Allan Pringle, Bob Schwartz
Not Attending: Mohamed Abdel Salam , Kelly Homan, Yue-wern Huang, Kurt Kosbar, Chuck Morris, Henry Wiebe

Old Business:

1. Minutes from 4/8/09 were reviewed and approved with two minor changes.

New Business:

1. There was a discussion and clarification of how the expected passage of the new Faculty Senate Bylaws will affect this committee. The most likely outcome will be that this ad hoc committee will become a standing FS committee (unfortunately named the Committee for Teaching Effectiveness) with elected departmental representatives, and many current committee members will continue. It is not known at this time whether or not the current chancellor-appointed CET will continue in its current capacity. In the interim, this ad hoc committee will continue to function in its current capacity.

   Some specifics of the CET processes were discussed. Allan informed us that simply being a member of the CET does not disqualify one from being award-eligible. Evaluation data is only seen at meetings, and no names are attached. After the meetings, all copies of this information are shredded.

2. The committee reviewed the Teaching Evaluation Instruction Sheet with the editing work from Scott. A few additional changes were made for clarity's sake (instructions regarding the number of instructors, number of faculty recognized). Scott's changes and other changes were approved. Steph will revise the document to include these changes and send it to the CET with our recommendation to adopt.

3. Adam's models for the purpose statement were reviewed and discussed. The committee's clear preference was model II, the "purpose with understood limitations" model. Various options for wording were discussed, and a revised statement will be presented at the next meeting. Discussion included the following:

   a. Use of evaluation data for tenure and other purposes with instructor permission in either individual or aggregate fashion
   b. Student feedback is valuable but not all-encompassing as a measure of teaching effectiveness; other sources of information should be incorporated into an overall evaluation process; teaching evaluations should consist of a packet of information, with student feedback as an important piece. It was mentioned that in some cases, the evaluation process could be seen as an inappropriate power relationship of students over instructors
   c. Do the evaluation results reflect actual learning; pretest and post test measures could be used to help determine this, as could some measure using multi-section courses, perhaps common exams
   d. It will be important to consider how to implement (a) in the purpose statement (…help instructors improve student learning in their courses).

4. The Evaluation Research Subcommittee has not yet met and did not make a report.

Prep for Future Meetings:

- Review the revised version of The Purpose of Teaching Evaluations – we will discuss this at the next meeting.

- Evaluation Research Subcommittee (Adam, Dianna, Chuck) will report at the next meeting.
- Check with your colleagues to discover what sorts of issues may be of concern in regard to electronic evaluations.
- Consider whether or not you are available/inclined to meet during the summer.

Our last meeting of the Spring semester is Wednesday, 5/6, 3:00-4:00, in Fulton 117.

Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation

Wednesday, 5/6/09 Minutes

Attending: Steph Fitch, Steve Grant, Dianna Meyers, Scott Miller, Chuck Morris, Adam Potthast, Allan Pringle, Bob Schwartz, Henry Weibe
Not Attending: Mohamed Abdel Salam , Neil Book, Margaret Cline, Kelly Homan, Yue-wern Huang, Kurt Kosbar, Bih-Ru Lea

Old Business:

1. Minutes from 4/22/09 were reviewed and approved with minor changes.

2. The revisions made at the last meeting to The Purpose of Teaching Evaluations statement were considered. Two minor changes were made, and the statement was adopted unanimously by the committee.

New Business:

1. The Evaluation Research Subcommittee reported that they held a meeting. They produced a list of comparator schools, and will set up an online shared document ("wiki") listing each comparator school along with five questions regarding evaluations at each institution:

    a) What are evaluations like?
    b) Are electronic evaluations used, and how do they work?
    c) When and how often are evaluations completed?
    d) Besides in-class evaluations, what other methods of evaluation are used?
    e) What questions are asked on evaluations?

   This online shared document will be accessible by all members of the full committee, and over the summer the subcommittee requests that members assist in collecting this information from comparator institutions. Adam will email the committee with details about accessing the shared document. It was suggested that Margaret Dunderson (speaker from the teaching technology conference) may be able to assist us in collecting data. We may also consider collecting data internationally.

2. There was discussion regarding the validity of survey questions. Henry offered information about a survey his office did regarding the VCC and equipment/teaching technology, and suggested Dan Chernushka as a possible resource for question development. The group agreed that before implementing a new evaluation, we should ask a survey expert to review the questions to ensure their objectivity and that the results will be valid.

3. Bob suggested that we set up a Scholarly Archive at the library to collect various research articles and other information on teaching evaluations. Suggested items include research from Larry Gragg, information from Purdue's Department of Engineering Education, and the book "Declining by Degrees." The group agreed that such an archive would be useful as a resource. Steph will get this set up and let the group know when it's ready and how to access it.

4. Steve and Bob volunteered to serve on a yet-to-be named subcommittee to discover if there is a correlation between survey results and actual learning. Suggested resources include Eric Mazur (Physics, Harvard), and Jackie Bichsel (Psych, S&T).

5. Henry asked that we consider how evaluations could be used for team-taught courses as we proceed.

6. Steph will produce a committee report and will send it for the committee's review before submitting it to Faculty Senate.

Future Meetings: None currently scheduled, but we may meet once or twice this summer depending on the progress of the action items above and availability of the membership.