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Advancement of Teaching Committee

Standing Rules

The Advancement of Teaching Committee formulates and evaluates statements of policy that influence the teaching process, including (1) teaching effectiveness and efficiency, (2) support, (3) dissemination of information, (4) encouragement of innovation and experimentation, and (5) appropriate recognition of good teaching. The Committee seeks information and opinions from students, faculty, and administrators in formulating statements of policy, and presents to the Faculty Senate recommendations and perspectives useful to that body in determining appropriate actions and positions to be taken in support of the advancement of teaching. In addition, the Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to the L. L. Stewart Faculty Development Award, the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee, or to other committees or individuals as designated, in the granting of awards in the field of teaching. The full committee shall participate in the review and recommendations relating to the L. L. Stewart Faculty Development Award. A member of the Committee shall participate in the selection of the Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor Award, the OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Awards, the OSU Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award, and the Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Award. The Committee consists of five Teaching Faculty, three Students, one of whom must be a graduate student and one of whom must be an undergraduate student, and the Provost and Executive Vice President or designee, ex-officio.
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Scheduled Meetings 2013-2014

November 14 – 1:00-2:30 PM ~ 100 Furman Hall

December 10 – 1:00-2:30 PM ~ 300 Furman Hall
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Forums and Workshops

- Creating and Sustaining a Quality Learning Environment
ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING AT OSU: We Need You!

Good Input = Good Output

by

Faculty Senate Advancement of Teaching Committee

Academic Year, 2000/2001

1) AOT Committee’s premise: Assessment of teaching at OSU serves two primary functions:
   - to offer faculty feedback for the purpose of professional development;
   - to provide administrators on-going assessment of faculty teaching performance.

2) AOT is proposing a significant change in the tools used to assess your teaching. We ask you to do two things:
   - familiarize yourself with the brief proposal below.

Introduction:

The purpose of this faculty forum paper is to solicit faculty opinion about changing the current form used to assess teaching. The current form (widely used across most departments) provides information about student ratings of instruction. Both faculty and administrators have voiced concerns about the current form, questioning its focus (several questions contain more than one assessment factor); its validity (do questions measure what they were intended to?) and the appropriateness of the ways the information on it is used (statistical measurement requires responses across a minimum of seven, similar classes when decisions about faculty personnel matters are being made). In addition, concerns about interpretation and use of data have been expressed by faculty and administrators.

The Faculty Senate Advancement of Teaching Committee is suggesting contracting with the Office of Educational Assessment (OEA) at the University of Washington. The OEA has developed a series of forms that, while similar in format to the form OSU currently uses, have been designed to separate the developmental role and administrative role of assessment, to accommodate different types of class formats (lecture, laboratory, discussion, seminar, etc), and to certify their validity and statistical reliability.

Background:

Faculty sometimes express skepticism about teaching assessment at OSU, its validity and purpose, and its multiple uses for instructional development, P&T considerations, and/or to provide accountability to the public.

During Fall term 2000, AOT Committee members invited colleagues from the Honors College, Forestry, and Extension to describe their current assessment procedures and to suggest improvements in student evaluation of teaching at OSU. A major concern focused on whether the current OSU form has been tested for validity and statistically analyzed for reliability. These discussions led the AOT to research state-of-the-art teaching assessment practices recommended by Centers dedicated to the science of teaching assessment (Office of Educational Assessment at the University of Washington; the Idea Center at Kansas State University). In addition, selected members of the AOT committee read faculty generated white papers on evaluation of teaching from Northwestern University, Indiana University, Pennsylvania State University, and Virginia Tech. The AOT committee believes that the series of eleven scannable forms developed at the University of Washington would provide OSU a more flexible format and more accurate data in the assessment of teaching than we now have.

Proposed Evaluation Forms available from the Office of Educational Assessment at the University of Washington:
The Instructional Assessment System (IAS) is a program to collect and summarize student ratings of instruction at the postsecondary level. It is used to assess about 11,000 courses annually at the UW as well as being used at about 30 other universities. Eleven machine-readable course evaluation forms (reflecting various course formats and including open ended comment sections on the back) are used to assess teaching. As with OSU's current form, student responses are anonymous and "comment sheets" are forwarded to faculty, along with the scanned data, after final examinations. The forms also contain the sorts of demographic data available on OSU's current form. In addition, IAS is developing a distance learning assessment form.

These IAS forms differ from OSU's current form in that they are tailored to class format or types. **Forms A through E address five course types:** lecture-discussion (Form A), large lecture (Form B), seminar discussion (Form C), problem solving (Form D), and skill acquisition (Form E). **Forms F, G and H** were added for quiz sections taught by graduate teaching assistants (Form F), lecture courses emphasizing assignments and a textbook (Form G), and laboratory sections (Form H). **Form I** was developed to assess distance learning formats. **Form J** is for clinical rotations and studio work. **Form X** emphasizes student outcomes and teaching behaviors rather than methods of instruction.

In addition, forms separate responses into those used for developmental purposes and those used for administrative purposes (the first four questions on each form assess global characteristics of teaching and are considered as valid measures of teaching performance across disciplines and colleges for P&T or accountability purposes). The rating system uses a six-point Likert scale ranging from excellent to very poor.

**Questions on each assessment form are divided into 3 categories:**

1. **General Assessment Items.** The first four items on each form provide an overall rating of the course. Students are asked to rate the course as a whole, the course content, the instructor's contribution to the course, and his or her effectiveness in teaching.

2. **Form-Specific Items.** The focus of each course evaluation form is defined by items 5 through 22 relating to instructional processes (Forms A through I) and/or outcomes (Form X). A reduced set of items (5-14) is found on Form J.

3. **Academic Demand Items.** All forms, with the exception of Form J, contain five items (23-27) that ask students to indicate their expected grade in the course relative to other courses, the intellectual challenge of the course, the amount of effort they put into the course, the amount of effort necessary to succeed, and their involvement in the course. Four additional items (28-31) ask students to record the number of hours per week spent on the course, the number of valuable hours, their expected grade, and how the course fits into their academic program.

The back of the evaluation forms provide space for instructors to add up to 35 course specific questions. The responses will be in scannable format.

A separate non-scannable "comment sheet" asks four open-ended questions. Students are asked whether they found the course to be intellectually challenging, which aspects contributed most to learning, which detracted from learning, and what suggestions for improvement they might have. These sheets are simply returned to the instructor along with the summary reports for the scanned data.

Sample Forms: [Please use your menu bar above to return to this page; clicking "back" on the forms below will take you into the University of Washington site]

**Form A** is designed for small lecture/discussion courses. Items emphasize the clarity and quality of information transmitted, as well as the nature of the interaction between instructor and student.

**Form B** is designed for large lecture classes, with little or no in-class interaction between instructor and student. Items strongly emphasize the quality of course organization and information transmitted.

**Form C** is designed for seminar discussion classes which include a minimal amount of formal lecturing by the instructor. The items emphasize quality of discussion as well as course organization and interest level.

**Form D** is designed for those classes whose purpose is the teaching of problem-solving or heuristic methods. Clear explanations, dealing with student difficulties and quality of problems are emphasized.
Form E is designed for those classes which are skill oriented and in which students get "hands on" experiences related to future occupational demands. Such classes include clinical nursing, art studio, social-work field experience, etc.

Form F is designed for quiz sections. These are usually taught by graduate teaching assistants, in conjunction with a lecture section taught by a regular faculty member. Items focus on the ability of the quiz section instructor to interact with students and provide clear and useful explanations.

Form G is designed for use in large lecture classes (such as those in math) which rely heavily on homework problems and a textbook. Emphasis is on the instructor's ability to communicate with students, and the value of assigned problems and readings.

Form H is designed for lab sections generally taught in conjunction with classes in the physical sciences. Items emphasize the instructor's ability to introduce meaningful questions, assist students, and deal with unexpected problems.

Form I is designed to be used in distance learning (correspondence) courses. Items relate to the instructor's responsiveness and the quality of support material.

Form J is designed to evaluate instruction provided through clinical experience rather than traditional academic coursework. Such courses are often found in the health professions or the arts. Items focus on the instructor's ability to provide information, stimulate learning, and demonstrate skills.

Form X is designed to be used across all course types. It includes a reduced set of items relating to general educational processes and a unique set intended to assess educational outcomes.

The back of all IAS Forms (Forms A - J, and X) are identical and permit individual instructors to query students on any subject they think is appropriate to the course.

Comment Sheets solicit responses to four open-ended questions. Students are asked whether they found the course to be intellectually challenging, which aspects contributed most to learning, which detracted from learning, and what suggestions for improvement they might have. Students can answer additional, instructor-generated questions on the back of the IAS form.

NOTE: Efforts are currently underway to also include an assessment form that more closely suits the needs of Extension Service faculty.

Proposed action on diversity question:

AOT Committee members searched numerous university and Centers for Teaching Excellence and found no questions relating to diversity at present. Based on standard assessment and testing criteria associated with testing for validity and reliability, Committee members strongly encourage use of an open-ended question added to assessment questions for student response. An example might be "The instructor encouraged discussion and respect for diverse views, values, and beliefs with regard to gender, race, religion, sexual orientation, disability, and other forms of difference."
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Evaluation of Teaching

- Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)
- Citizen Evaluation of Teaching (CET)
- SET Recommendations - June 10, 2007
**Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET), Guidelines for Classroom Use**

**Goal:**
The Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) process is designed to complement self-assessment and peer review (both within and external to the department) of teaching at OSU. SET questions consider overall teaching quality and basic teaching functions or behaviors. The goal is for instructors and supervisors to identify teaching excellence as well as areas that may need attention.

**OSU SET policy:**
"Anonymous evaluations by all students in the class are required each term for each class the faculty member is teaching. A copy of tabulated results must be provided to the faculty member; a duplicate copy shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel records file" (http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/facrec/evals.htm). Extension faculty are expected to choose three events per year to evaluate teaching. Faculty teaching Extended Campus courses will use an electronic version of the SET form for all classes.

**The new SET form:**
The primary purpose of the revised SET form is to provide student feedback that confirms quality teaching or identifies topics for possible improvement. The first two questions are worded broadly to compare faculty across an entire campus, and were validated by the Office of Educational Assessment at the University of Washington (http://www.washington.edu/oea/describe.htm). Questions 3-12 were selected from validated instruments used at other universities to represent standard teaching functions and behaviors. All questions on the revised form were validated (AOT report, 2002) at OSU for use in most teaching situations including Extension Events and Extended Campus courses.

Faculty may add questions to the back of the form to assess personal teaching practices, measures of learning, facilities, or accreditation requirements. When adding questions to the back, survey research literature recommends that questions be worded carefully to assess only one item or concept at a time. Care must be exercised to avoid using synonyms such as "examples and illustrations" since they could mean different things to respondents.

**Photocopying:**
Alignment during photocopying is critical for accurate and complete scanning. Questions may be typed onto a master or a template (available in Microsoft® Word) and then photocopied onto the scan forms placed in the copy tray. Rather than photocopy questions onto the back, some faculty use overhead equipment to project the questions onto a screen while students respond on the back of the scan sheet.

**Confidentiality:**
To assure confidentiality, responses to narrative questions will be separated from demographic data. Faculty may provide questions on a separate page or ask respondents to answer questions on a separate paper.

**Narrative Questions:**
Examples of narrative questions are listed in the appendix.

**Interpretation of SET data**
Scanning and automatic generation of summary reports occurs at The Milne Computer Center. Because responses represent ordered qualitative data, medians, frequencies, and percentages will be calculated based on a 1-6 scale rather than ordinal numeric scales. Cross-tab data explained below will be a new feature for faculty and supervisors to consider. Responses to narrative questions will be separated and held within departments for study by instructors after grades are submitted.
The report consists of two pages; the first summarizes overall results of two questions and cross-tab data based on demographic summaries. These two questions are intended to compare faculty across an entire campus, referred to as norm referencing. It compares an instructor's or one faculty member's performance against the general level of performance by others in the department, college, or university. Thus, administrative reporting of one individual's teaching performance using medians, frequencies, and percentages for questions 1 and 2 are valid for promotion and tenure (P&T), awards, or merit comparisons. As with any survey or data set, clarity about what is being assessed is essential. For example, instructors involved with team teaching or other situations may require special explanations to avoid ambiguity while reporting results.

Cross-tab data summarized on the first page are based on correlations in SET literature or are intended to provide additional information for an instructor to consider for improving teaching within the discipline. For example, SET literature often accepts the correlation that compares questions 1 and 2 with "enrollment reason" (items 32 and 34 on the OSU SET form). Cross-tab data are included for student class status (level) and gender, but correlations are often very weak or lacking (except responses from graduate students) and therefore intended to clarify results with respect to demographics or to identify unanticipated concerns. Cross-tab data for class size and student status (level) are available to compare one class with others offered in the department or college.

The second page summarizes questions designed to improve teaching quality within the discipline. These include questions 3-12 and the questions designed by the instructor and represent criterion referencing in the literature. These data are meaningful only to the pertinent individuals and must be interpreted within the discipline. Although summary reports will be sent to both the instructor and the supervisor, the purpose is for teachers to consider strong or weak responses as indicators of quality teaching or as prompts for teaching improvement respectfully. Utilizing these indicators and changes over time may help confirm improvement and quality teaching for P&T or award documents by faculty or peers within the discipline. However, reporting median scores for criterion referenced data without disciplinary interpretation similar to norm referencing is invalid.

Using SET data to complement teaching improvement:
The science of teaching evaluation clearly reminds us that teaching is a tremendously complex activity that requires a similarly robust assessment process. SET represents the experiences or perceptions of students only. It must be complemented by self-evaluation, internal and external peer assessment, and the sciences of teaching, learning, and evaluation.

As you review SET data, note the practices and skills that should be continued or enhanced along with others that need improvement. Discuss results with peers to consider reasons and alternative methods. Develop ways to test these ideas the next time you teach this or other courses where you could try the approach, technique, or method. Attend seminars, search the literature, or ask a peer from your department or profession how they might improve one or more aspects of the course. Consider how you will assess this aspect of your teaching, how it might affect learning by students, and how it contributes to the curriculum within the discipline. How will these innovations in your teaching be communicated to peers and how will they interpret the results? Will it be necessary to consider postgraduation or post-school year surveys or other assessment techniques within the discipline? How do you feel about your teaching? Perhaps self-assessment is the most important aspect of teaching and teaching improvement at OSU.

SET Data and Accreditation:
Accreditation requirements for universities such as OSU are intended to improve and validate teaching performance by faculty and instructors. The SET process is intended to improve teaching within the discipline. Validating norm referenced teaching competencies within colleges requires aggregate data from questions 1 and 2 reported to deans and the Assistant Provost for Academic Programs. All other SET data are designed to assess teaching performance by individual instructors with reporting being restricted for this purpose only.

Instructions for Administering the SET
Instructions to students when distributing SET forms:
Research shows that it does make a difference what is said when asking respondents to complete the SET questionnaires. To improve comparability for individuals between terms and the possibility of comparisons within disciplines, a standardized set of instructions should be written for all instructors and courses. Since the SET process is intended to assess teaching skills and functions, it is imperative that the importance of this process be emphasized by instructions to the students in each class.

1. Teaching at OSU is an essential part of each instructor's responsibilities. Your responses to this questionnaire will help instructors identify quality teaching skills and methods or discover behaviors
that need improvement.

2. Please take the time to answer each question individually and add your comments on a separate sheet of paper.

3. Instructors will consider your comments carefully. Also, supervisors for each faculty or instructor will use this information to encourage teaching excellence.

4. Please hand your completed evaluations to ______________. This person has been instructed to seal the envelope and hand it to the departmental secretary to ensure privacy until grades are completed.

Drafted by the Advancement of Teaching Committee of the Faculty Senate, 2003.

- Ray D. William, Chair
- Paula McMillen,
- Ken Krane
- Margie Haak
- Molly Engle

Revised: John Morelock, 16 April 2003

**Appendix**

**Sample Questions To Be Photocopied To The Back Of The Scan Form**

**Assessing Instructor/Teaching**

The Office of Educational Assessment at the University of Washington (UW) [http://www.washington.edu/oea/iasforms.htm](http://www.washington.edu/oea/iasforms.htm) has multiple forms based on teaching approaches, instructor's skills and organization, and educational outcomes (Form X).

Kansas State University IDEA Center also displays standard assessment questions along with a dozen learning objectives with relationships to teaching methods [http://www.idea.ksu.edu/products/Sturatings.html](http://www.idea.ksu.edu/products/Sturatings.html)

Both Centers permit OSU faculty to select a modest number of questions from their surveys to copy on the back of the OSU form. These questions have been tested for reliability and validity.

**Assessing Student/Learner Responsibilities (examples):**

- Your performance in this course was?
- Your assessment of completing readings and homework was:
  - Inspired critical thinking?
  - Challenging?
  - Too much/not enough?
- Your assessment of learning new information was:
- Your attendance in class was:
- Your prior interest in this course was:

**Assessing Learning Resources/Environment**

- Quality of learning resources (books, media, visual aids, etc.)
- Quality of learning environment (seating, ability to see instructor, lighting, ventilation, noise, etc.) or (specialized equipment such as drawing tables, etc.)

**Sample Open-ended Written Questions:**

- The comment sheet from the UW might have questions relevant to your teaching [http://www.washington.edu/oea/iascmmt.htm](http://www.washington.edu/oea/iascmmt.htm).
- Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your participation in this class?
- Was this class intellectually stimulating?
  - Did it stretch your thinking?
    - Yes
    - No
  - Why or why not?
- What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?
- What aspects of this class, if any, detracted from your learning?
Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET), Guidelines for Classroom Use, Advancement of Teaching Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

- What suggestions do you have for improving the class?
- What aspects of presentation helped you most?
- What helped you least?
- What would improve the presentation?

**Open-ended Questions for Teaching Assistants:**

- What qualities of your TA do you regard as good or outstanding? Please be specific.
- Are there areas in which you feel your TA needs improvement? If yes, please be specific.
- Do you have any other comments you feel would be helpful about this TA's performance?
Introduction

As part of the effort to encourage participation in, and increase the efficiency of, the Oregon State University Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) process, the OSU Information Systems Administrative Computing (ISAC) has created this document.

Some of the benefits of the SET process include: valued feedback from OSU students and Extension attendees, generating a source of additional points of measurement on which an instructor could base improvement of teaching methods, creating additional sources of information about faculty members for the departments and colleges of the university, and providing timely credible information for analysis of performance.

It is to the credible part of the SET process that this document speaks. Because the SET form is one of the last pieces of paper a student sees for each class, it is imperative that the students be made aware that OSU is concerned with their input. The SET process can only remain a critical and valued part of the accreditation program, however, if a high degree of accuracy is maintained.

Form Scanning, Data Assimilation, and Report Generation

The data used to initiate the SET process for each class could be thought of as consisting of two parts: the first part (the "magenta form" or Instructor Header Sheet) identifies the class and instructor, and the second part consists of one, or more, completed student response forms (the "green form" or Student Assessment of Teaching response form). In Extension, attendees complete a purple Citizen Assessment of Teaching form submitted through their academic department. The appropriately matched sets of completed forms are transmitted to OSU Information Services Operations (ISOps) for processing.

Using a pair of NCS OpScan7 form scanners, the processing of the forms creates a machine-readable, fixed-format plain text file. The text file is then processed by an analysis program that transforms the data into useful information (percentages, frequencies, and, as appropriate, medians), which is presented in either a class-by-class report or a departmental or college level summary.

While the forms may be processed on a class-by-class basis, it is preferred that departments submit the forms in as few submissions as practical to aid in efficient use of operations resources. As forms are processed, the data are either stored in a newly created file (for initial submissions) or appended to an existing data file (corrected or revised forms or late submissions). ISOps will maintain the data files for the various departments. The data will be available for historical reference. The data will not be maintained on any database.

How to Fill In the Scan Form

1. Use only a standard Number 2 pencil - do not use ink pens, ballpoint pens, felt tip pens, highlighters, etc. These do not register with the mechanical reader at OSU, resulting in uncounted responses.
2. Fill in each response bubble completely - a check mark, a line or two lines through the response bubble, a few squiggles, or other partial fillers will not register with the mechanical reader and the response will not be counted.
3. Erase thoroughly - a partially erased entry might be readable by the mechanical reader causing a multiple-entry rejection for that response and the response will not be counted.
4. Fill in one, and only one, response bubble per topic - multiple responses void the count for that topic.

**Note: Instructions 1, 2, and 3 are critical because of the age and optical sensitivity of the OSU
scanners—the scanners will not read anything but standard Number 2 pencils.

**Common errors when filling in the scan forms (and their solution)**

1. Fields not completely filled out—e.g., filling in 203 when 203a is correct, using ENG when ENGR is correct. Use only valid, complete, and correct entries.
2. More than one bubble (the circular, oval, or elliptical response element) filled in for the same column—these get read and interpreted as more than one response, which causes the mechanical reader to invalidate the response because of the "no multiple responses" rule.
3. Erasures are not complete—reads an incomplete erasure and a valid response, causing the mechanical reader to invalidate the response because of the "no multiple responses" rule.
4. Answers not completely filled in—a single or a couple of lines will not do; the bubble must be filled in completely to be read.
5. Extra marks made on the form that can be read by the scanner—any response column with more than one machine-readable response is automatically read as a no-response column.
6. Using a felt tip pin, a ball-point pin, a highlighter, a colored pencil, or almost anything other than the generic Number 2 pencil—the mechanical reader might not see the mark.
7. Invalid, incorrect, or incomplete entries used—entries not recognized by the analysis program will be rejected and scan forms for that class will need to be resubmitted (This is new. The valid list of abbreviations will be distributed to the departments prior to the end of the 2003 Spring Quarter.).
8. Some letter fields were entered right justified (bubbles filled in starting from the right, leaving blank bubbles on the left)—fill in all nonnumeric response columns starting from the left column.

**The Effect of Incorrectly Filled In Scan Forms**

1. The OSU Student Assessment of Teaching Survey Instructor Header Sheet (IHS), "the magenta form" - all fields are valuable and critical parts of the AOT process.
   1. Instructor's Name - Required
      1. No analysis performed if the name is missing; returned to originator (with green forms) for correction and resubmission.
      2. Incorrect value (misspelled name is undetectable)-analysis will still be performed; department or college will have to determine correct instructor.
   2. Sex - Response is not required
   3. Dept Code - Required
      1. Missing value - No analysis performed if value is missing; returned to originator (with green forms) for correction and resubmission.
      2. Incorrect value - No analysis performed; returned to originator (with green forms) for correction and resubmission.
   4. Course Number - Required
      1. Missing value - No analysis performed if value is missing; returned to originator (with green forms) for correction and resubmission.
      2. Incorrect value - Analysis performed, possibility of null entry on report - value is dynamic on a term-by-term basis; too costly in terms of resources to provide list each term.
   5. Section Number - Required
      1. Missing value - No analysis performed if value is missing; returned to originator (with green forms) for correction and resubmission.
      2. Incorrect value - Analysis performed, possibility of null entry on report - value is dynamic on a term-by-term basis; too costly in terms of resources to provide list each term.
   6. Course Type - Required
      1. Missing value - No analysis performed if value is missing; returned to originator (with green forms) for correction and resubmission.
      2. Incorrect value - Analysis performed, possibility of null entry on report - value is dynamic on a term-by-term basis; too costly in terms of resources to provide list each term.
2. The OSU Student Assessment of Teaching, "the green form" - there are no required fields on this form. Even though there are no required fields, all responses are important for the analysis of the assessment. Please ask the students to provide their sincere response to each topic.

**Processing the Completed Scan Forms**
**Review for Correctness and Completeness** - The Instructor Header Sheet (IHS, also called the magenta form) needs careful review. Errors or omissions on this form will result in either no analysis report being created and the IHS and its corresponding green forms returned to the originator (department or college) for corrective action and resubmission or (possibly worse) an analysis report will be created under an erroneous instructor name, section number, or course number.

**Submit to Information Services Operations (ISOps)** - Once the IHS scan forms have been reviewed, it and the associated student response forms (the green forms) are delivered to ISOps (Room 206, Milne Computing Center). An AOT work order (the yellow form) is filled out to initiate the form scan operations, data analysis, and report generation phase.

**Reports and Returned Materials** - Upon completion of the ISOps operations, the completed AOT reports and exception reports are sent to the originating party.

- IHS forms with a missing instructor's name, missing or incorrect department code, missing course number, missing section value, or missing course type create exception reports.

- The originator will need to decide if the classes for which the IHS caused an exception report to be created are to be resubmitted. All data entries on the IHS are to be corrected prior to resubmission.

**Resubmitted Reports** - Classes for which resubmissions are made will automatically create updated summary reports along with the individual class reports.

**Final Reports** - There will be an option available whereby the report requested may be labeled "Final Report," and it will include the analysis of all data currently on file for that class, department, or college.

**Data Storage** - The files created by the scan form processing will be kept in electronic format and maintained by IS Administrative Computing. The data as kept is not in a format that would read sensibly to a person. It is in a machine-readable format and available for analysis processing and report generation. It becomes useful information after analysis processing. The files will be kept so as to provide a historical source for departments and colleges.
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SET Workshops

- Winter 2005
- Spring 2004
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Membership – 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam Stern '15</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Weiss (v. Borradaile) '14</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Peterson '15</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Reuter '16</td>
<td>OSU-Cascades - Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Rubel '16</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex-Officio: Provost's Representative (Kay Sagmiller)

Student Members –
- TBA
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison – Chris Bell

Student Evaluation of Teaching Task Force Liaison – TBA
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Membership -- 2012-2013

Minjeong Kim, Chair '13
Jon Dorbolo '13
Glencora Borradaile ‘14
Scott Peterson ‘15
Sam Stern '15

Design & Human Environment
Media Services
Electrical Engineering & Computer Sciences
Mathematics
Education

Ex-Officio: Provost’s Representative (TBA)

Student Members –
- TBA
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison – Donna Champeau

Student Evaluation of Teaching Task Force Liaison – Bill Loges
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Membership -- 2011-2012

Mario Magaña, Chair '12
TBA (v. Vannoy) '12
Jon Dorbolo '13
Minjeong Kim '13
Glencora Borradaile '14

Electrical Engr & Computer Sci
Nutrition & Exercise Science
Media Services
Design & Human Environment
Electrical Engr & Computer Sci

Ex-Officio: Provost's Representative (Susie Brubaker-Cole)

Student Members -
- TBA
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Donna Champeau
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Membership -- 2010-2011

Mario Magaña '12, Chair  
Nancy Rosenberger '11  
Jenny Vannoy '12  
Jon Durbolo '13  
Minjeong Kim '13  

Electrical Engr & Computer Sci  
Anthropology  
Nutrition & Exercise Sciencey  
Media Services  
Design & Human Environment

Ex-Officio: Provost’s Representative (Susie Brubaker-Cole)

Student Members -  
- TBA  
- TBA  
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Linda Bruslind
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Membership -- 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kurt Peters '10, Chair</th>
<th>Ethnic Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ron Metzler '10</td>
<td>English Language Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Rosenberger '11</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Magana '12</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Vannoy '12</td>
<td>Nutrition &amp; Exercise Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex-Officio: Provost’s Representative (Peter Saunders)

Student Members -
- Pete Salerno
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Joanne Sorte
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Membership -- 2008-2009

Susan Tornquist, Chair '09
Michelle Inderbitzen '09
Ron Metzler '10
Kurt Peters '10
Nancy Rosenberger '11

Veterinary Medicine
Sociology
English Language Institute
Ethnic Studies
Anthropology

Ex-Officio: Provost's Representative (Peter Saunders)

Student Members -
- Ron Atay
- TBA
- TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Joanne Sorte
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Membership -- 2007-2008

Ruth Vondracek '08
Susan Tornquist '09, Chair
Michelle Inderbitzen '09
Ron Metzler '10
Kurt Peters '10

Biomedical Sciences
Forest Resources
Sociology
English Language Institute
Ethnic Studies

Ex-Officio: Provost's Representative (Peter Saunders)

Student Members -
TBA - Pejmon Sadri (graduate)
TBA - Jamie Suter (undergraduate)
TBA

Executive Committee Liaison - Carol Mallory-Smith
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Membership -- 2006-2007

John Edwards '07, Chair
Lisa Sarasohn '07
Ed Jensen '08
Ruth Vondracek '08
Susan Tornquist '09

Psychology
History
Forest Resources
University Libraries
Biomedical Sciences

Ex-Officio: Provost’s Representative (Peter Saunders)

Student Members -
TBA
Zach Goodin (undergrad.)
Pejmon Sadri (grad.)

Executive Committee Liaison - Lani Roberts
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Membership -- 2005-2006

Lisa Sarasohn '07, Chair
Tina Bull '06
John Edwards '07
Ed Jensen '08
Ruth Vondracek '08
History
Music
Psychology
Forest Resources
University Libraries

Ex-Officio: Center for Teaching & Learning (Peter Saunders)

Student Members -
Emily Gonzalez (undergrad.)
Molly Phipps (grad.)
Pejmon Sadri (grad.)
Leandra Swanner (grad.)

Executive Committee Liaison - Lani Roberts
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Membership -- 2004-2005

Margie Haak '05, Co-chair
Tina Bull '06, Co-chair
Molly Engle '05
Lisa Sarasohn '07
Ken Winograd '07
Chemistry
Music
Public Health
History
Education

Ex-Officio: Academic Affairs Rep. (Mina McDaniel)

Student Members -
Molly Phipps (grad.)
Pejmon Sadri (grad.)
- TBA (undergraduate)

Executive Committee Liaison - Lynda Ciuffetti
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Membership -- 2003-2004

Paula McMillen '04, Co-chair
Margie Haak '05, Co-chair
Ray William '04
Molly Engle '05
Tina Bull '06

Valley Library
Chemistry
Horticulture
Public Health
Music

Ex-Officio: Academic Affairs (Robert Burton)

Student Members -
- TBA (grad.)
- TBA (undergraduate)
- Brett Palama

Executive Committee Liaison - Maggie Niess
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Membership -- 2002-2003

Ray William '04, Chair
Ken Krane '03
Paula McMillen '04
Molly Engle '05
Margie Haak '05

Horticulture
Physics
Valley Library
Public Health/Extension OPOD
Chemistry

Ex-Officio: Academic Affairs (Robert Burton)

Student Members –
– TBA (grad.)
– Shannon Wong (undergraduate)
– TBA

Executive Committee Liaison – Maggie Niess
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Membership -- 2001-2002

Ray William '02, Chair
Elaine Pederson '02
Ken Krane '03
Paula McMillen '04
TBA (v. Walker) '04

Horticulture
Apparel/Interiors/Housing & Merchandising
Physics
Valley Library

Ex-Officio: Robert Burton

Student Members –
- Elizabeth Thompson (grad.)
- TBA
- Blue Key Rep. (TBA)

Executive Committee Liaison – Dan Arp
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Membership -- 2000-2001

Hans van der Mars '01, Chair
Elaine Pederson '02
Ray William '02
Ken Krane '03
Laura Rice '03

Exercise & Sport Science
Apparel/Interiors/Housing & Merchandising
Horticulture
Physics
English

Ex-Officio: Robert Burton

Student Members –
- Evan Coate
- TBA
- Blue Key Rep. (TBA)

Executive Committee Liaison – Vicki Tolar Burton
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2014 Agendas

- February 12, 2014
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2013 Agendas

- November 14, 2013
- December 10, 2013
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2010 Agendas

- April 28, 2010
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2009 Agendas

- February 19, 2009
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2007 Agendas

- October 21, 2008
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2007 Agendas

- October 11, 2007
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2005 Agendas

- October 25, 2005
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2003 Agendas

- November 12, 2003
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2002 Agendas

- September 24, 2002
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2001 Agendas

- May 17, 2001
- April 19, 2001
- March 21, 2001
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2000 Agendas

- November 27, 2000
- October 9, 2000
- September 19, 2000
Advancement of Teaching Committee

1999 Agendas

- September 29, 1999
- March 30, 1999
Advancement of Teaching Committee

1998 Agendas

- November 18, 1998
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2013 Minutes

- November 14
- December 10
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2008 Minutes

- October 21, 2008
- January 28, 2008
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2007 Minutes

- November 15, 2007
- October 11, 2007
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2006 Minutes

- April 26, 2006
- January 17, 2006
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2005 Minutes

- November 16, 2005
- October 26, 2005
Advancement of Teaching Committee

2004 Minutes

- July 13, 2004
- June 18, 2004
- April 22, 2004
- March 17, 2004
- March 12, 2004
- February 12, 2004
Minutes

2003 Minutes

- November 12, 2003
- September 22, 2003
- April 28, 2003
- January 19, 2003
- January 6, 2003
Minutes

2002 Minutes

- **September 22, 2002**
- **March 8, 2002**
- **January 24, 2002**
Minutes

2001 Minutes

- September 28, 2001
- September 8, 2001
- May 17, 2001
- January 18, 2001
Minutes

2000 Minutes

- October 9, 2000
- September 19, 2000
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Annual Report 2012-2013

Advancement of Teaching Committee Members for 2012-2013
Minjeong Kim, Design and Human Environment ‘13, Chair
Glencora Borradaile ‘14, Electrical Engineering & Computer Science
Jon Dorbolo ‘13, Teaching Across the Curriculum
Scott Peterson ‘15, Mathematics
Sam Stern ‘15, Education
Ex-Officio – Kay Sagmiller, Director, Center for Teaching & Learning

Student Members
TBA (Graduate)
TBA (Undergraduate)
TBA

1. The Advancement of Teaching Committee is charged with formulating and evaluating policy that influence the teaching process, including (1) teaching effectiveness and efficiency, (2) support, (3) dissemination of information, (4) encouragement of innovation and experimentation, and (5) appropriate recognition of good teaching.

2. The Advancement of Teaching Committee is charged with reviewing L.L. Stewart grant proposals and making recommendations for funding.

3. Committee members participate in the selection of recipients of several awards for excellence in teaching.

Activity Report

In the 2012-2013 year, the Committee met October 8, November 27, and February 25.

1. In the first committee meeting on October 8, 2012, the committee reviewed the proposed revisions to the AOT Standing Rules. Although there was general consensus, the committee did not get to move forward with formally approving the proposed changes.

2. Between the first and second AOT committee meeting, the committee revised and refined the L.L. Stewart Faculty Development Fund Proposal guidelines and selection criteria to improve clarity of the application materials, strengthen the quality of proposals through constructive and specific feedback, and identify successful proposals to promote innovative teaching strategies supported by L.L. Stewart Faculty Development fund.

   There were four major changes to the proposal requirements:
   - Specific assessment plans of the proposed curriculum/teaching changes or innovation on professional practice and ultimately student learning.
   - Articulation of plan to sustain the proposed changes.
   - Clarification of why the proposed activities are beyond normal expectations of teaching responsibility.
   - Reinforcement of final report.

3. During the November and February meetings, the committee reviewed L.L. Stewart Faculty Development proposals and made recommendations for funding of selected proposals.
- October funding round: 6 out of 14 proposals were funded. Several rejected proposals were given feedback for resubmission.
- January funding round: 9 out of 14 proposals were funded. Continue to reinforce the specific assessment plans, plans for sustained changes, and final report.

Submitted by Minjeong Kim, Chair, on behalf of the Committee
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Annual Report 2011-2012

Advancement of Teaching Committee Members for 2011-2012
Mario Edgardo Magana '12, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Chair
Jon Dorbolo '13, Teaching Across the Curriculum
Minjeong Kim '13, Design and Human Environment
Glencora Borradaile '14, Electrical Engineering & Computer Science
Ex-Officio – Susie Brubaker-Cole, Interim Director, Center for Teaching & Learning
   New member: Kathleen Stanley, Sociology Department
Student Members
TBA (Graduate)
TBA (Undergraduate)

1. The Advancement of Teaching Committee is charged with formulating and evaluating policy that influences the teaching process, including (1) teaching effectiveness and efficiency, (2) support, (3) dissemination of information, (4) encouragement of innovation and experimentation, and (5) appropriate recognition of good teaching.

2. The Advancement of Teaching Committee is charged with reviewing L.L. Stewart grant proposals and making recommendations for funding.

3. Committee members participate in the selection of recipients of several awards for excellence in teaching.

In the 2011-2012 year, the Committee met on October 8, 2011; November 15, 2011; December 14, 2011; January 31, 2012; March 6, 2012; April 23, 2012; and May 18, 2012.

AGENDA
1. Discussion of LL Stewart Faculty Development Fund proposals for October 2011 and January 2012 resulting in recommendations for funding of selected proposals.

2. Mario Magana submitted his resignation on March 23, 2012 via email to Jeanna Towns, CTL administrator, and to the Faculty Senate Office. Jon Dorbolo agreed to act as interim chair until September, at which time Minjeong Kim will begin her position as chair person for 2012-2013.

3. New standing rules, will discuss with new president of the Faculty Senate, Kevin Gable – his vision, insight, etc.

4. Ideas survey for faculty forum, ways to collect data to meet their needs and teaching resources.

5. Response to Stefani Dawn, Assistant Director of Assessment’s, request of April 19, 2012 for recommendations in establishing the confidentiality of Students who participate in the Evaluation of Teaching (SET).

AOT committee members were provided the following documents:
- Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Guidelines for Classroom Use
- User’s Guide For the Assessment of Teaching Scan Forms
- Faculty Senate Executive Committee 4 page analysis (CONFIDENTIAL)

Discussions centered on the existing language in the above referenced documents. Specific attention was given to the significance of confidentiality for students, the guiding principles in the SET guidelines and the
Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Guidelines for Classroom Use

"Based on the literature review done by the AOT Committee, correlations of these ratings with class size and/or student status (e.g. 100 to 400 level courses) can justify interpretation and slight adjustments in scores within the discipline." p2, ¶3

User’s Guide For the Assessment of Teaching Scan Forms

Summary Reports – "There will be an option available whereby the report request may be labeled "Departmental Summary" or "College Summary". The report will include the analysis of all data currently on file for the term for that department or college. Summary reports can be requested by grade level (100, 200, etc. level courses), and summary by class size (<= 25 students, > 25 students)." p4, last ¶

Faculty Senate Executive Committee (CONFIDENTIAL)

Protection of student anonymity

- "In terms of anonymity and our responsibility to students, is there a difference between a course with ONLY 3 students, versus a large course with smaller sections?"
- "In winter term, there were 505 courses with 4 or fewer students (183 with 1 student; 132 with 2 students; 100 with students; 90 with 4 students – impacting potentially 1,107 students in winter term alone)." p2

Recommendations of the Advancement of Teaching Committee:

1. Prerequisites for administering the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) to a classroom mandates the class size must be < 5 students.
2. Summary Reports to be available inclusively with all comments summarized together, not individually, in order to prevent identification.

Submitted by M. Magana, Chair, on behalf of the Committee

1 Historically, the correlation with class size (<=25 or >25 students) was summarized for departments and colleges, but based on number of SET forms scanned. The new version will improve accuracy by accessing actual enrollment data from Banner similar to computations for Ecampus courses.
1. The Advancement of Teaching Committee on Committees is charged with formulating and evaluating policy that influences the teaching process, including (1) teaching effectiveness and efficiency, (2) support, (3) dissemination of information, (4) encouragement of innovation and experimentation, and (5) appropriate recognition of good teaching.

2. The Advancement of Teaching Committee is charged with reviewing L.L. Stewart grant proposals and making recommendations for funding.

3. Committee members participate in the selection of recipients of several awards for excellence in teaching.

4. In the 2008-2009 year, the Committee met in October 2008 and conducted other business by email discussion.
   The October meeting included introductions and discussion of how to solicit student members of the committee.
   The remainder of the meeting was devoted to discussion of LL Stewart grant proposals and resulted in recommendation for funding of selected proposals. There were 18 proposals for review and each was discussed and a recommendation was made.
   Questions regarding this process that may need to be addressed in the future include the following:
   - Can a single proposal include a request for funding for more than one faculty member?
   - Can a proposal include a request for funding for travel by an undergraduate or graduate student to a meeting?
   - Can a proposal for buying equipment (e.g. computer-related items) be funded? The philosophy on this question appears to have shifted over the years.
   - With costs for travel and salary buyouts increasing, should the limit for funding requests be increased?

5. The committee reviewed stipulations proposed by ASOSU regarding an electronic student photo roster project. This discussion occurred via email and a recommendation was sent to the Faculty Senate.

6. Members of the AOT participated in selection of teaching excellence awards.

7. The committee was asked to provide a member to serve on the Faculty Senate committee to review the Student Evaluation of Teaching. Peter Saunders volunteered to represent the AOT.

Advancement of Teaching Committee members for 2008-2009:

Susan Tornquist, Biomedical Sciences, Chair
Michelle Inderbitzin, Sociology
Ron Metzler, English Language Institute
Kurt Peters, Ethnic Studies
Nancy Rosenberger, Anthropology
Ron Atay, student member

Submitted by S. Tornquist, Chair, on behalf of the Committee
Annual Report 2007-2008

July 1, 2008

1. The Advancement of Teaching Committee is charged with formulating and evaluating policy that influence the teaching process, including (1) teaching effectiveness and efficiency, (2) support, (3) dissemination of information, (4) encouragement of innovation and experimentation, and (5) appropriate recognition of good teaching.

2. The Advancement of Teaching Committee is charged with reviewing L.L. Stewart grant proposals and making recommendations for funding.

3. Committee members participate in the selection of recipients of several awards for excellence in teaching.

4. In the 2007-2008 year, the Committee met in October, November, January and February. The October meeting was primarily centered around a discussion of the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) as requested by the Executive Committee. No response had been received from the Executive Committee to a memo sent from the Advancement of Teaching Committee the previous spring, so no new recommendations were proposed. The November and February meetings were devoted to discussion of LL Stewart grant proposals and resulted in recommendation for funding of selected proposals. The January meeting was another discussion of the SET, including a recommendation from a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Education Council for changes. After a lengthy discussion, the Advancement of Teaching committee felt that they could not make recommendations on the SET because they did not have sufficient understanding of the intended purpose of this evaluation. A memo to this effect was sent to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

5. Members of the AOT participated in selection of teaching excellence awards.

Advancement of Teaching Committee members for 2007-2008:

Susan Tornquist, Biomedical Sciences, Chair
Ruth Vondracek, Forest Resources
Michelle Inderbitzin, Sociology
Ron Metzler, English Language Institute
Kurt Peters, Ethnic Studies

Student Members
Pejmon Sadri (Graduate)
Jamie Suter (Undergraduate)

Submitted by S. Tornquist, Chair, on behalf of the Committee
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Annual Report 2006-2007

Date: July 20, 2007

To: Mike Quinn, Faculty Senate President

From: John Edwards, Chair, Advancement of Teaching Committee

Re: Advancement of Teaching Committee Annual Report 2006-2007

The major responsibility of the AOT Committee this year was the continued discussion regarding student evaluations of teaching. The AOT chair met with the Executive Committee in February to discuss the future of the SET process. The primary recommendation was to make no changes for the time being, in part because the SETs were recently changed and further changes may undermine faculty faith in the SETs. It is the committee chair’s opinion that efforts toward further enhancing teaching assessment at OSU are probably better put towards developing other assessment procedures that can be used in conjunction with SETs (e.g., objective measures of learning; a more formalized system of peer assessment).

In May, the AOT was asked by Mike Quinn to provide recommendations regarding some proposals from a student group (Leaders for Positive Innovation). Specifically, they proposed the online completion and posting of teaching evaluations. The AoT discussed these proposals. A report of this discussion was sent to the Executive Committee. To summarize, it was recommended that online completion of SETs be explored if we could be confident that the response rate issue could be resolved. It was recommended that we pilot a procedure in which students do not get online access to their grades unless they complete the online evaluation. The posting of teaching evaluations on the internet was not recommended for a variety of reasons. Note that the 1998 AOT committee also recommended against this practice.

The AOT Committee completed two review cycles of the L.L. Stewart Advancement of Teaching Award; 13 grants were awarded in the Fall cycle and 11 in the Winter.

AOT Committee members helped the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee review nominees for various awards. The AOT chair was part of the Provost’s Council on Student Engagement, which made recommendations to the provost regarding the improvement of student engagement at OSU.

2005-2006 Membership:
Lisa Sarasohn ’07
Susan Tornquist, ’09
John Edwards ’07, Chair
Ed Jensen ’08
Ruth Vondracek ’08
Ex-Officio: Center for Teaching & Learning (Peter Saunders)

Student Members:
Pejmon Sadri (grad.)
Zach Goodin (undergrad.)
Annual Report, Advancement of Teaching Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Faculty Senate

Advancement of Teaching Committee

Annual Report

Date: June 17, 2006

To: Bill Boggess, Faculty Senate President

From: Lisa T. Sarasohn, Professor of History; Chair, Advancement of Teaching Committee

Re: Advancement of Teaching Committee Annual Report 2005-2006

The major responsibility of the AOT Committee this year was a survey of the level of satisfaction with the Student Evaluation of Teaching form. The results of the Survey are attached to this report here. Our recommendations follow the report. The problems with the form appear to be as much about process as the content of the form itself. I'll leave it to the EC to decide what to do with this information.

In addition to composing and compiling the results of the Survey, the AOT Committee handed out 20 Stewart Awards (the names of the recipients can be found in the minutes of the committee for December 1 and April 26). A couple of changes were made to the criteria for receiving this award: advisors as well as instructors are eligible and two of the grants may be for up to $4400.

There were many lively discussions this year about the evaluation and assessment of teaching and learning. I suggest that the Faculty Senate make sure that undergraduates are represented on the AOT Committee. I also suggest that if the Senate contemplates making another attempt at a teaching evaluation form, a statistician be included on whatever committee receives this responsibility.

Thanks you for the opportunity for serving on this Committee. It has been an enlightening experience.

2005-2006 Membership
Lisa Sarasohn '07, Chair
Tina Bull '06
John Edwards '07
Ed Jensen '08
Ruth Vondracek '08
Ex-Officio: Center for Teaching & Learning (Peter Saunders)

Student Members
Emily Gonzalez (undergrad.)
Molly Phipps (grad.)
Pejmon Sadri (grad.)
Leandra Swanner (grad.)
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Annual Report

Date: July 2005

To: Jeff Hale, President OSU Faculty Senate

From: Margie Haak & Tina Bull, Co-Chairs, Advancement of Teaching Committee

Re: Advancement of Teaching Committee Annual Report 2004-2005

Advancement of Teaching Committee summary of activities:

1. **LL Stewart Grant Proposals.** AOT completed two review cycles (October 2004 and January 2005) and recommended proposals for funding to the Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs. Review comments added detail and suggestions to help faculty improve the proposal for possible resubmission in the following granting cycle.

2. **University Awards representative.** AOT members represented teaching interests for the Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor Award, the OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Award, the OSU Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award, the OSU Distinguished Professor Award, and the Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Award.

3. **Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) forms.** AOT continued to monitor and respond to instructor feedback on use of the revised SET forms. We also met with Jeff Hale who asked that an evaluation of the SET be conducted. After some discussion, the committee raised strong concerns: We felt that the scope and request regarding the campus-wide evaluation of the SET/CET is beyond the capacity of our committee. It is our recommendation that we divest ourselves and suggest that the EC turn over this request to an outside committee. Not only do we have a vested interest in this tool, by virtue of having spent so much time developing it, but we also felt there would be an ethical conflict of interest for us to be in charge of collecting data that could be influenced by our bias.

From feedback we have received from a number of departments it appears there is great interest in having the results of the SET reported electronically. Many departments currently have staff taking the results from the paper forms and putting it into an electronic form.

**Goals for 2005-06 include:**

- Explore and implement the most effective means to electronically communicate results of the revised SET to individual instructors and department heads.
- Determine the feasibility of conducting student evaluations of teaching online for both resident and online courses.
- Continue to monitor faculty responses associated with SET/CET forms and make improvements as needed.
- Develop SET questions for non-lecture format courses
- Create a bank of questions for faculty to draw from to customize the SET to meet their informational needs

Committee members for the 2004/05 academic year included:
Margie Haak, Chemistry (05) - Co-Chair
Tina Bull, Music (06) - Co-Chair
Molly Engle, Public Health (05)
Ken Winograd, Education (07)
Lisa Sarasohn, History (07)
Pejmon Sadri, Graduate Student
Molly Phipps, Graduate Student
Lynda Ciuffetti, Executive Committee Liaison
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Annual Report - 2003-2004

Date: July 2004
To: Stella Coakley, President OSU Faculty Senate
From: Paula McMillen & Margie Haak, Co-Chairs, Advancement of Teaching Committee

RE: Advancement of Teaching Committee Annual Report 2003-2004

Advancement of Teaching Committee summary of activities:

1. **L.L. Stewart Grant Proposals.** AOT completed two review cycles (October 2003 and January 2004) and recommended proposals for funding to the Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs. Review comments added detail and suggestions to help faculty improve the proposal for possible resubmission in the following granting cycle. New this year was a separate review of applications for funding improvements in student advising.

2. **University Awards representative.** AOT members represented teaching interests for the Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor Award, OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Award, OSU Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award, OSU Distinguished Professor Award, and the Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Award.

3. **Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) forms.** AoT continued to monitor and respond to instructor feedback on use of the revised SET forms. Representatives of AoT also met with the chair of the Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to discuss concerns. Based on this input, we initiated further consultation with the Office of Educational Assessment at the University of Washington (Nana Lowell, Gerald Gillmore, & Debbie McGhee). Subsequently, we proposed a revised calculation of medians in order to provide greater discrimination. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee heard and approved our proposal. We then sought funding from the Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to do the necessary reprogramming and plan to have this in place by fall 2004. Additionally, AoT recommends that all earlier results of the revised SET be recalculated. We also propose that, based on discussions with DPD faculty and other campus diversity constituents, diversity questions not be included in this particular assessment tool. We will submit all work-to-date on this project to the OSU Libraries Archives as a permanent record.

Goals for fall 2004-05 include:

- Revise wording and title of Extension based Evaluation of Teaching form based on Executive Committee and Extension faculty feedback.
- Explore and implement the most effective means to electronically communicate results of the revised SET to individual instructors and department heads.
- Determine the feasibility of conducting student evaluations of teaching online for both resident and online courses.
- Continue to monitor faculty responses associated with SET/CET forms and make improvements as needed.
- Conduct research, using the revised SET form, on students who drop courses before completion.
- Develop SET questions for studio courses.
- Create a bank of questions for faculty to draw from to customize the SET to meet their informational needs.

**Committee members for the 2003/04 academic year included:**

Margie Haak, Chemistry (05) - Co-Chair
Faculty Senate

Advancement of Teaching Committee

Date: July 2003

To: Bruce Sorte, Faculty Senate President

From: Ray D. William, AOT Chair

RE: AOT Annual Report for Academic Year 2002/03

The Advancement of Teaching Committee accomplished the following highlights:

1. **LL Stewart Grant Proposals.** AOT completed two review cycles (October, 2002 and January, 2003) and recommended proposals for funding to the Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs. Review comments added detail and suggestions to help faculty improve the proposal and resubmit during the following granting cycle. With the leadership of Bob Burton, AOT reviewed the submission instructions and forms to help faculty complete the required information with emphasis on achieving the goals and expectations of the grant program.

2. **University Awards representative.** AOT members represented teaching interests for the Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor Award, the OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Award, the OSU Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award, the Herbert F. Frolander Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistant Award, and the Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Award.

3. **Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) forms.** AOT pilot tested and validated the revised SET form and questions for consideration by Faculty Senate. Senators passed the motion to adopt the revised form and questions. AOT worked closely with the Milne Computer Center to print new forms and develop a revised report form that complements the guidelines for faculty use in spring quarter, 2003. During the transition phase, AOT has responded to a half-dozen queries from faculty, secretaries, or department heads. Extension faculty pilot tested a similar form and questions (Citizen Evaluation of Teaching - CET) that was validated for expected use in fall, 2003. AOT drafted six "diversity" questions to supplement SET. However, faculty who teach a majority of the diversity courses expressed serious concerns that the proposed questions may elicit unintended consequences. AOT will continue this effort in conjunction with the "campus climate survey" planned for fall 2003. The AOT Report to the Senate, the Guidelines, and the Scan Instructions are being finalized for posting to the FS website and to archive in the Valley Library.

Goals for fall 2003 include: collaborating with leaders of the "campus climate survey", implementing the CET form and questions among Extension faculty, and evaluating the LL Stewart Grant applications. Depending on results from the survey, AOT expects to complete its efforts at developing one or more diversity questions within the context of student assessment of teaching. AOT will continue to monitor faculty responses associated with SET/CET forms and make improvements as needed.

Committee members for the 2002/03 academic year included:

Ray William, Horticulture (replaced Jeff Walker 04)
Ken Krane, Physics (03)
Paula McMillen, Library (04)
Molly Engle, Public Health (05)
Margie Haak, Chemistry (05)
Maggie Niess, (ex-officio for FSEC)

AOT recommended to the FSEC that Paula McMillen and Margie Haak co-chair the committee for the 2003/04
academic year.

Each year, this committee achieves a remarkable working relationship, both within the committee and beyond, that champions teaching at OSU. It is with great pride that AOT submits both this report and our accomplishments for the academic year, 2002/03.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Date: July 15, 2002

To: Nancy Rosenberger, Faculty Senate President

From: Ray D. William, AOT Chair

RE: Annual Report for Academic Yr. 2001/02

The Advancement of Teaching Committee accomplished the following highlights:

1. **Completed two review cycles (October, 2001 and January, 2002) of the LL Stewart Grant Proposals.** AOT members acknowledge significant improvement in proposals addressing the grant criteria during the past three years. Perhaps 80% are recommended for funding while reviews specify suggestions for authors to improve and resubmit weak proposals.

2. **Served as reviewers of nominations for selected University Awards during spring, 2002.** These included the Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor Award, the OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Awards, the OSU Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award, the Herbert F. Frolander Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistant Award, and the Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Award.

3. **Discussed with Bill Oye concerns about plagiarism and student conduct.** AOT reviewed options and actions proposed by Bill for consideration at OSU.

4. **Continued the process of improving the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) forms.** Gordon Matzke (past Senate Pres.) and the FS Exec Council asked AOT in spring, 2000 to add a question(s) about "diversity" to the existing student evaluation form. During 2001/02, AOT determined that: other universities are conducting campus "climate" surveys to understand the complexity and nature of the concept, that at least 3 questions on the current form fail to meet survey research standards, that current scanning programs at Milne Computer Center are obsolete, and that a similar looking form should be developed for assessing teaching among faculty responsible for resident instruction, Extension, and Distance Education. Progress during 2001/02 included:

   - At the September FS, AOT recommended that OSU purchase SET forms designed to assess eleven teaching pedagogies (eg, labs to lectures) from the University of Washington (UW). Senators expressed concerns about cost and frequency of assessment. AOT listed criteria to select validated questions from UW and Kansas State University forms (with permission) and developed an adaptable backside of the form for faculty questions and accreditation requirements. Scanning options for both sides of the form have been discussed with the Milne Computer Center.

   - At the December, 2001 FS meeting, Senators initially passed a motion to accept the proposed SET form. However, concern about question #2 for those faculty who team-teach courses resulted in rescinding the motion. Both to resolve this issue and to validate questions, AOT requested faculty from the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Engineering and the Extension Service to pilot test the proposed forms and questions.

   - In March, AOT co-hosted Nana Lowell, Director Office of Instructional Assessment at UW to facilitate a Faculty Forum on "diversity" and how it might be assessed. One idea that emerged involved creating 12 questions addressing aspect of the OSU Mission Statement, classroom behaviors and attitudes, and links with campus of life-long learning. AOT will complete
discussions and make recommendations to the Senate this next year.

- In spring 2002, faculty involved with 7 courses in Liberal Arts, one team-coached class with multiple faculty, several Extension events, and an undetermined number of Engineering courses pilot tested the proposed SET form and questions.

Goals for AOT this fall include: completing the analysis of proposed SET questions from spring pilot test, inviting faculty to review the proposed diversity questions and use by faculty, and presenting motions about SET forms to FS for consideration. If passed by the Senate, AOT will liaison with the Milne Computer Center to develop new scanning programs for a 2-sided form and to ensure that quantities are available for faculty. Also, AOT will complete the charge to liaise with FS Promotion & Tenure and the Awards committees to improve appropriate reporting by faculty of SET data.

Committee members for the 2001/02 academic year included:

Ray William, Horticulture (02)
Elaine Pedersen, AIHM (02)
Ken Krane, Physics (03)
Paula McMillen, Library (04)
Elizabeth Thompson (Grad rep)

Due to other committee assignments, Paula and Ken requested FS EC to replace the vacant (04) position on the committee with Ray William in order to most efficiently complete the SET revisions. Ray received and accepted the invitation to chair AOT, 2002/03.

Similar to last year, this committee achieved a remarkable working relationship and progressed toward redesigning and improving the SET form based on survey research procedures and adaptable use by faculty to encourage improvement of teaching at OSU. Completing the "diversity" charge from spring 2000 is expected this year.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

July 16, 2001

To: Henry Sayre, Faculty Senate President

From: Hans van der Mars, AOT Chair

Re.: Annual Report for Academic Yr. 2000-2001

This past year the Advancement of Teaching Committee has had a productive year, by involvement in both standard committee duties, as well as special projects. They included:

1. Co-drafted a Position Description for the new "Director for Enhancement of Teaching and Learning." Funding for this position had been approved late Spring 2000.

2. Organized the 2nd Annual Teaching Fair in the Fall of 2000. A three-hour workshop where campus faculty were offered the opportunity to share their expertise on teaching on a variety of topics. Members of the committee served as presenters as well.

3. Co-sponsored the 2nd Annual Forum "Creating and Sustaining A Quality Learning Environment." with the Center for Excellence in Teaching in the College of Liberal Arts. Members of the committee served as presenters as well.

4. Completed the two review cycles (October, 2000 and January, 2001) of the LL Stewart Grant Proposals. The committee recommended that authors of exemplary proposals be approached to see if it would be permissible to post them on the Faculty Senate website, as examples of good quality proposals.

5. Served as reviewers of nominations for selected University Awards during the spring of 2001. These included the, Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor Award, the OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Awards, the OSU Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award, the Herbert F. Frolander Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistant Award, and the Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Award.

6. Initiated the process for changing the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Form. This task was taken on as directed by Prof. Gordon Matzke (Past-President FS).

This process has included discussions and activities related to:

- Clarification of the purpose of the SET instrument.
- How the information gathered is used (i.e., who has access to what portion of the information?)
- Seeking instruments in use on campuses across the nation.
- Careful review of the University of Washington (UW) menu of instruments.
- Cost analysis comparing current process and instrument with UW's services.
- Seeking advice and input from more expert colleagues on OSU's campus.
- Seeking input from Extension Faculty to assure appropriate instrument is available for this faculty.
- Providing updates and seeking input from both Deans Council, President's Cabinet, and Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.
- Development of a Web-based prompt for faculty input on proposed new SET forms.
- Attending individual department faculty meetings during spring of 2001 to update faculty and invite reactions to proposal as outlined in Web prompt.
The goal is for the AOT to present a formal recommendation to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in the Fall of 2001 to contract with the University of Washington Office of Education Assessment. Furthermore, the AOT committee will continue efforts to further streamline the process of assessment of teaching on campus, as well as improve the consistency in how the SET-based information is used.

Committee members for the 2000-2001 for this past year included:
Ken Krane (Science) ('03),
Elaine Pederson (AIHM) ('02),
Laura Rice (English) ('03),
Ray William (Horticulture) ('02), and
Hans van der Mars (HHP) ('01).

Ray William was nominated, and has agreed to serve as Chair of the AOT in the coming year. I have completed my membership of this committee, and Laura Rice will not be on the committee, because of a scheduled sabbatical leave. On a personal note I would like to add that this committee has had a remarkable working relationship, and as a result can look back on a very productive year.

Respectfully submitted on July 16, 2001
May 31, 2000

To: Gordon Matzke, President, Faculty Senate  
From: Chris Anderson, chair, Advancement of Teaching Committee  
Re: End of year report

This was a successful and productive year for the committee and praise should go to each member.

First, in October we collaborated with Anita Helle and the CLA Center for Excellence in Teaching in hosting a well-attended panel discussion on teaching techniques and teaching problems. Several faculty from CLA participated on the panel. I facilitated.

Second, we continued to administer the Stewart grants, reading close to 30 applications and making awards both fall and winter totaling around $30,000.

Third, we hosted a public talk and two faculty workshops given by educational theorist Parker Palmer. Over 500 attended the public lecture, over 100 faculty participated in the workshops, and enthusiasm and interest was generally quite high.
Fourth, in April we offered the first "Teaching Fair," arranging for nearly 20 faculty members from across campus to make presentations about their teaching individually or in groups. This took place over the course of an afternoon in a number of rooms at the Memorial Union. Though sparsely attended, the fair suggests a good model for sharing the wisdom and experience of people actually on campus.

Finally, with Leslie Burns and Anita Helle I have met twice this spring with interested faculty to explore the idea of starting several faculty support groups next year following the Parker Palmer model of "communities of congruence."

Greg Thompson and I leave the committee for next year. Hans van der Mars will be the new chair.

Again, it's been a fine and productive and collegial committee, and I commend all its members.

1999-2000 Advancement of Teaching Members

Chris Anderson '00, Chair
Greg Thompson '00
Hans van der mars '01
Elaine Pedersen '02
Ray William '02
Advancement of Teaching Committee did the following work this academic year 1998-1999:

--In response to the senate's charge, we hosted and facilitated four faculty forums, involving nearly 200 faculty,

on the topic of "Effective Teaching." These were held in February and March, and our summary of responses

will be forwarded shortly.

--In response to the senate's charge, we drafted a job description for the Director of the Center of Teaching Excellence and forwarded it to Provost Arnold.

--We made arrangements to bring nationally known educational theorist Parker Palmer to OSU February 2000.

--We reviewed and awarded Stewart Foundation grants, once in the fall and once in winter.

--Individual members helped the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee review nominees for various awards.

The members of this committee--Vreneli Farber, Hans van der Mars, Greg Thompson, and Hung Yok Ip--are to be congratulated for their steady and collegial and productive work. I also appreciate the help and support of Leslie Burns. In my view, it was a very successful year.
To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From: Advancement of Teaching Committee

Date: March 23, 1998

Subject: Report on Student Assessment Form

Members of the Committee for 1997-98

Robin Rose, Chair 7-6580 roser@fsl.orst.edu
Greg Thompson 7-1337 thompsgr@ccmail.orst.edu
Chris Anderson 7-1653 canderson@orst.edu
Hung-Yok Ip 7-1260 hip@orst.edu
Bonnie Eiser 7-3519 bailey@ucs.orst.edu
Dianne Erickson 7-1821 ericksod@ucs.orst.edu

Committee Objective

The objective of the Advancement of Teaching Committee (AOTC) over the past two years has been
(1) find a replacement for the student teaching assessment form now used campus wide (see Appendix I), (2) suggest ways to improve student feedback to teaching that is useful to the teacher, and (3) provide a list of potential questions teachers might ask students in order to assess their teaching performance.

Historical Perspective

The AOTC's role did not start out to achieve the current objectives. Originally, in the fall of 1996 the committee was to revamp the current student assessment form. This came about as the result of a discussion between Leslie Davis Burns and Robin Rose in the summer of 1996 prior to his becoming Chair of the Committee. What started out as a straight forward assignment for a small committee led to the evolution of The Task Force on Teacher Evaluation for promotion and tenure.

In the fall of 1996 the committee found itself dead-locked on how to approach the issue of changing the current assessment form with its one page of questions. Numerous issues stall the committee's work:

1) Changing the form would certainly impact the process of promotion and tenure at Oregon State University.

2) While the form is used for all sorts of courses, the committee found it to be wholy inadequate to assess web-based courses, small classes, labs, and many other types of classes taught on and off campus.

3) Given the wide range of courses being taught it was felt that a range of assessment forms would need to be made to better reflect to a promotion and tenure committee the actions of a teacher. Of course, a wide range of courses was hardly feasible.

In late fall of 1996 Robin Rose, the Chair, wrote a letter to Maggie Niess, then President-elect, outlining the issue, problems and the dilemmas of the original assignment. It was finally decided that a task
force would be needed and it would set to work deciding the issue of how student evaluations would fit in the context of promotion and tenure. At the same time Robin Rose in conjunction with Ken Krane, then President of the Senate, and others decided that the AOTC would develop a new set of questions and concept for obtaining student input that served both the students and the teacher in whatever kind of class was offered. This new system would permit teachers to tailor make their own evaluation forms or fall back to the old one if they were satisfied with it.

In the winter and spring of 1997 the AOTC identified evaluation systems used at other universities, thinking that there must be a superior one out there. The committee did not find a superior form or a superior system. It did find a lot of good questions and it did find some systems that were expensive to administer, assuming a teacher could get students to sit and fill in the bubbles for an hour! By the spring of 1997 a great deal of progress had been made.

**Justification for Teaching Assessment**

It was odd indeed that the committee had one preliminary problem discovering where the policy for teaching assessment originated (see Appendix for policy letter by Graham Spanier). It seemed that few faculty were clear about the origination of the policy, much less when it actually came into being. Faculty were also unclear as to the necessity of doing an assessment of teaching for every class each time it was offered, once a year, or once every few years.

The OSU Faculty Handbook includes the following statement in the section on peer and student teaching evaluations (page 37):

"Anonymous evaluations by all students in the class are encouraged each term for each class the faculty member is teaching."

The word "encouraged" is obviously subject to discussion and debate regarding its meaning. A memorandum from Graham Spanier to Academic Deans, with a copy to Gary Tiedeman, President of the Faculty Senate at that time, contains the following statement in its final paragraph:
"This memorandum, therefore, establishes as university policy that teaching evaluations should be conducted by all faculty members each term for all courses that they teach. This new policy is to take effect Fall Term 1989." (Appendix III)

There is no record of any subsequent communications from Provost Spanier or from any other administrator rescinding or modifying this policy.

A copy of the actual letter of June 22, 1989 RE: Teaching Evaluations can be found. It is interesting that the first sentence of the second paragraph states: "The primary purpose of teaching evaluations is for faculty development:". The last sentence states that "evaluation of faculty is a secondary purpose of teaching evaluations." The question naturally arises as to how this standing policy letter impacts using student numbers from evaluations in promotion and tenure documents at all and why they have been used since the time of the policy letter.

Another issue also comes up when interpreting the expression in the final paragraph which is "evaluations should be conducted" Should in no way means mandatory, although that could be implied. The expression "will be conducted" makes it very clear evaluations must be conducted.

Findings and Recommendations

1) There was unanimous agreement that the current student assessment form is inadequate for many classroom situations. Instead of printing up a mass number of forms as has been done for years, the committee suggests faculty invent their own forms within the context of their College or Department.

2) The committee is in full agreement that a non-promotion and tenure-based teacher evaluation system would help many faculty. The committee felt there was a need to remove the onus of promotion and tenure from the communication system between faculty member and student so faculty could focus on what needed to be done better.

3) The committee was in full agreement that there are many different kinds of class structures at OSU
and each needs a different set of questions to be determined by the teacher. In terms of class sizes on campus we identified:

- **small**: 15 or less
- **medium**: 15-35
- **large**: 35-75
- **x-large**: 75-150
- **xx-large**: 150 or more

The kinds of classes on campus are:

- lab, lecture, reading and conference, recitation, seminar, internship/practicum,
- workshop, web, projects (courses numbered 406), field experience (courses numbered 410),
- study tour, independent study (courses numbered 402), research, skills classes (e.g. physical education, dance, painting, photography, language, music)

Given the fact that there are so many different kinds of classes offered on and off campus, the committee recommends allowing faculty to make their own forms to suit their needs.

4) In order for faculty to get the best kind of feedback it seems prudent to allow for both bubble and written answers to questions as is done in some colleges already. (See Appendix for an example)

5) Contrary to what "researchers" may say, the committee felt that students do use the form in less than objective ways both for and against instructors. The committee also recommends that teacher evaluations intended for teacher feedback NOT be performed more than once per year unless considered necessary by the faculty member.

6) The committee recommends that the faculty look over the attached list (Appendix) of questions broken down by category with the idea of using them to some advantage in the classroom.

7) The committee feels that it could be very useful in some situations to have this list of questions put into a make your own' program in something like Quest Writer so that faculty could tailor make
survey forms with ease.

**General Concerns and Suggestions**

1. The Spanier letter needs to be revisited by the Faculty Senate and the Administration to redefine and refine the teaching evaluation expectations put on faculty. (See Appendix)

2. The committee discussed on many occasions the issue of publishing student evaluations and found the idea wanting. While on the surface the issue seems worthy, the fear is that this will turn course rigor upside down in favor of putting pressure on teachers to be "popular" as compared to colleagues. The value of publishing evaluations does have some merit, but not if faculty are to be compared via a numbering system like 2.9 vs 3.2 out of 5. It is also a problem when less than 50% of a class fill out a form. Others are free to come to their own conclusions. The students are also free to fill out forms generated by the ASOSU and publish those. It is not felt that the faculty should get involved in running a popular teacher contest. Too often the teacher who drove the students the hardest is the least liked in the short run, but much remembered and valued long after the degree was earned.

3. All evaluation answers should not be set up in such a manner that a student can merely draw a line down through all of the bubbles in a row and provide exactly the same answer for every question. The committee felt that too often for the sake of expediency some students mark everything in one place to get out of really looking over the questions.

4. Some faculty might find it useful to provide an opportunity to get written feedback from the students if they hold a particularly positive or negative view of some aspect of a class.

5. Faculty are encouraged to do more than one student evaluation in a class. A student assessment at the end of the 3rd and 7th weeks might be useful to understanding student opinions at the final assessment.

6. Promotion and tenure concerns need to be kept entirely separate from faculty driven student evaluations. However, faculty driven evaluations as they might be used in a teaching portfolio
might actually help faculty in promotion and tenure by showing the challenges faced over time and how those teaching challenges were solved. The current bubble system as well as some others has no way of showing improvement other than by averaging numbers.

7. The evaluation of teaching for promotion and tenure should take a direct approach toward teaching by getting direct signed input from in-class peer review, signed student letters after they have been out of the class a year, and at the teacher's option a teaching portfolio demonstrating the challenges faced in the classroom. The suggestion put forth here is to provide teachers the opportunity to include their own case for the quality of their teaching.

8. Teachers are greatly encouraged to write their own questions in order to gain understanding of unique aspects of their teaching style. Asking about how well the class "understood the lectures" might not identify the fact that the teacher's accent or speech patterns were hard to decipher. While the teacher is thinking of lecture information the student's perspective is how well s/he could hear the teacher from the back of the room.

Appendix

I: Student Evaluation Questions

Below is a list of potential questions to be used by instructors in a myriad of classrooms and circumstances. The committee is all too aware of the different ways in which these and other questions can be interpreted by faculty and students. Individual words such as enthusiasm can evoke different interpretations. We leave it up to the individual instructor to decide what is appropriate for them. We also hope that these questions may help instructors to produce other questions that are highly specific to their students, teaching style, discipline, and classroom environment.

Enthusiasm Entries

Enthusiasm questions are considered suspect for evaluations since they put an "entertainment"
burden on the instructor.
The instructor was enthusiastic.
Is enthusiastic about his/her subject.
Seemed enthusiastic about the subject matter.
Positive attitude toward students.
The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content.

**Overall Entries**

Overall, this was an excellent course.
Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.

**Student Accountability**

I attended class regularly.
I missed _____ classes during the term due to other conflicts.
This class met at a (bad) (good) time for me.
I devoted ___________ hours per week to this class (give an estimate).
I participated in class activities.
I completed assignments.
I gained a good understanding of the concepts and principals in this class.
I learned to apply principles from this course to new situations.
I learned to identify main points and central issues in this field.
I developed the ability to communicate clearly about this subject.
I developed an ability to conduct research in this area.

**Workload**

The workload for this course was (5=LIGHT...1=HEAVY)
Graded assignments reflected the material covered.
The course requirements were clearly defined.
The workload in this class was fair and reasonable.

**Critical Thinking**

I was able to grasp the main concepts in this course.
I was required to justify a recommendation with reliable and valid information.
I was required to evaluate and synthesize information from a number of sources in order to come to a conclusion about a situation.
I was required to justify a recommendation or conclusion about a situation based on a synthesis of information from a number of sources.
As a result of taking this course, I have increased my ability to synthesize and integrate new ideas.
The instructor has provided me with the opportunity to think creatively to solve complex problems.
As a result of taking this course I have increased my ability to analyze complex situations.
As a result of taking this course I find that my ability to create and articulate answers to complex (integrative, cross-disciplinary) questions has improved.

**Testing**

The tests in this class reflected what we learned in class and from readings.
The exams and assignments are graded and returned in a timely fashion.

**Instructor**

I was very satisfied with the educational experience this instructor provided.
Was your understanding of material ever hindered by language difficulties?
The instructor explained material clearly and understandably.
The instructor handled questions well.
The instructor gave clear explanations.
The instructor made good use of examples and illustrations.
The instructor treated students with respect.
The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.
The objectives of the course were clearly explained.
The instructor set high standards for students.
The grading system was clearly explained.
How can the instructor improve the teaching of this course?(written)
Which aspects of this course did you like best?(written)
Which aspects of this course did you like least? (written)
How would you change this course? (written)
Clearly stated the objectives of the course.
I would like to take another course from this instructor.
Gives interesting and stimulating assignments.
Explains clearly.
Is well prepared.
Has interest in and concern for the quality of his/her teaching.
Is accessible to students out of class.
Has an interesting style of presentation.
Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor? (written)
The instructor was well prepared for classes.
Through reading, lectures, and assignments, the instructor encouraged the development of reasoning and skills.
The instructor showed respect for the students.
Examinations enabled students to demonstrate understanding of the assignments and exams.
The examinations and assignments were graded and returned in a timely fashion.

What are some of the strengths of this instructor?
What is an area that you would suggest for improvement for this instructor?
What would you add or change to improve this course?
The extent to which course responsibilities of students were clarified:
My instructor stimulates interest in the course.
My instructor displays enthusiasm when teaching.
My instructor has stimulated my thinking.
The grading system was clearly explained.
Overall, this course is among the best I have ever taken.
Rate the instructor's enthusiasm about the subject matter.
Your understanding of what is expected of you in this course.
How would you rate the physical environment in which you take this class, especially the classroom facilities, including your ability to see, hear, concentrate, and participate?
What did you specifically like or dislike about the course?

Student Information

The statements marked with * are the items that could be added to Section II of the general student evaluation form:

The reason you are enrolled in this course-
a. it is required   b. it is an elective

The grade you expect to receive in this course-
A  B  C  D  F  sat/pass  unsat/no pass  audit  Other

Class status-
a. freshman  b. sophomore  c. junior  d. senior  e. graduate student  f. other

Is this course in your major-
yes  no

Percent of the class you attended-
a.0-20%  b.21-40%  c. 41-60%  d. 61-80%  e. 81-100%

Overall grade point average
0-1.49  1.50-1.99  2.00-2.49  2.50-2.99  3.00-3.49  3.50-4.00

1st quarter freshman

Sex-
M-male, F-female

*What is your major: a. science  b. liberal arts  c. engineering  d. business

*Do you know any other languages in addition to English?
  a. yes-what is it?______________________       b. no

*Have you (in either high school or at college level) taken classes in foreign cultures?
  yes-what classes are they?_________________________     no

*Have you had any teachers/professors who are foreigners?
  yes-what classes__________________________      no

*What do you think of the course offerings in cultural diversity at OSU?
In what ways are they useful to you?  In what ways are they not? -(open question)

IV: MIT Course Evaluation, 1991

******************************************************************************

This was taken from MIT's Course Evaluation Guide, Fall, 1991. Student evaluations are not without
their humorous side so long as you are not the instructor.
******************************************************************************

The Best and Worst Comments Received:

"Text is useless. I use it to kill roaches in my room."

"He teaches like Speedy Gonzalez on a caffeine high."

"In class, the syllabus is more important than you are."

"Help! I've fallen asleep and I can't wake up!"

"Text makes a satisfying 'thud' when dropped on the floor."

"The class is worthwhile because I need it for the degree."

"His blackboard technique puts Rembrandt to shame"

"Textbook is confusing...someone with a knowledge of English should proofread it."

"Have you ever fallen asleep in class and awoke in another? That's the way I felt all term."

"This class was a religious experience for me...I had to take it all on faith."

   The recitation instructor would make a good parking lot attendant.

   Tries to tell you where to go, but you can never understand him."

"Problem sets are a decoy to lure you away from potential exam material."

"Recitation was great. It was so confusing that I forgot who I was, where I was, and what I was doing--It's a great stress reliever."

A favorite:

"He is one of the best teachers I have had...He is well-organized, presents good lectures, and creates interest in the subject. I hope my comments don't hurt his chances of getting tenure."

"I would sit in class and stare out the window at the squirrels. They've got a cool nest in the tree."

"The absolute value of the TA was less than epsilon."

"TA steadily improved throughout the course...I think he started drinking and it really loosened him up."

"Information was presented like a ruptured fire hose--spraying in all
directions--no way to stop it."

"I never bought the text. My $60 was better spent on the Led Zeppelin tapes that I used while doing the problem sets"

"What's the quality of the text? 'Text is printed on high quality paper.'

"The course was very thorough. What wasn't covered in class was covered on the final exam."
Creating and Sustaining a Quality Learning Environment

All faculty and teaching assistants are invited to a teaching and learning professional development forum to reflect on the principles, ideas and strategies used to create and sustain a quality learning environment in classes. The forum will be held October 2 from 3:30-5:00 in Memorial Union 206. Faculty are encouraged to bring ideas about teaching and learning conversations that should be initiated or continued as part of professional development for 2000-01. This event inaugurates the second yearlong series of professional development activities on teaching and learning at OSU.

The panel will consist of the following members who will introduce and illustrate an idea, strategy or practice that promotes learning:

Leslie Burns - Apparel, Interiors, Housing and Merchandising
'Recognizing Various Student Learning Styles'

Hans van der Mars - Health and Human Performance
'Strategies for Assessment: How Do We Know if They Know?'

Rebecca Warner - Sociology
Lani Roberts - Philosophy
'Understanding Cultures and Classrooms'

Barbara Bond - Forest Science
'Mentoring Students as Teachers and Researchers'

Anita Helle - English, Moderator

There will also be announcements of resources and events -- teaching support groups, teaching fair, Student Conduct and Mediation Workshop, Center for Writing and Learning, and others.

This event is co-sponsored by the CLA Center for Teaching Excellence and the Faculty Senate Advancement of Teaching Committee.
Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET), Advancement of Teaching Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University
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Citizen Evaluation of Teaching (CET)

- Final CET User’s Guide
- Final CET Guidelines
Date:  June 10, 2007

To:   Mike Quinn  
       Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From:  John Edwards, Chair  
       Advancement of Teaching Committee

Re:  Student Evaluation of Teaching Recommendations

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee had asked the Advancement of Teaching Committee to consider two recommendations from the student group Leaders for Positive Innovation. The AoT met to consider these recommendations on Wednesday, May 30th. John Edwards, Ed Jensen, and Pejmon Sadri were in attendance.

1) The first question we were asked to address was whether OSU should administer its Student Evaluation of Teaching forms online. Universities that have done this typically do so because of the cost savings associated with online as compared to paper and pencil administration of SETs. Online administration also frees up valuable course time that is currently used to administer the SETs. The primary issue with online SETs is response rate. In the absence of incentives to complete the SETs, other universities have seen response rates as low as 10% when they’ve moved to online SETs. Use of incentives (e.g., extra credit in the class, raffle entries) can move the response rate as high as 50%, but such incentives typically don’t raise it above 30-40%. These numbers are lower than our current response rate (which is chiefly driven by course attendance). Some research suggests the possibility of bias in who completes online SETs (women, juniors and seniors, and those with higher GPAs are more likely to do them). Some schools resolve this issue by making SET completion mandatory – students get an I in the class until they do them (e.g., UCLA med school). One advantage to online SETs, noted by one university, is the possibility of more detailed written comments.

The AoT committee feels that online course evaluations should not be done unless we can resolve the response rate issue. Mandatory completion has problems which we believe preclude its use at OSU. A suggestion that we recommend (thanks to Pejmon for this) is to give students grades, but not allow them online access to the grade until they’ve completed the SET. We also feel that students should be given the ability to “opt out” of doing the evaluation if they wish. We recommend that such a system be piloted, preferably across a range of class types, before full implementation.

2) The second question we were asked to address was whether OSU should post the results from its SETs online. The committee was unanimously opposed to this for a number of reasons. First, there is the possibility that doing this will reinforce the already low opinion many faculty have of the SET process, such that they believe it to be more of a popularity contest that either a true evaluation of teaching or a formative exercise. Related to this is the possibility that web posting undermines one goal, perhaps the chief goal, of SETs, which is formative rather than evaluative.
Second, online course evaluation information is useless and possibly misleading in the absence of comparative information (typically departmental/college/university averages). Simply posting scores online, as U of O does, really communicates little by way of accurate information. Choosing appropriate comparison points is actually quite complex, since one wants to equate only similar sorts of classes. Even with comparison information, some statistical knowledge (especially what constitutes a significant difference between scores) is necessary to evaluate them properly. Because this information changes over time, it is hard to imagine a system where appropriate comparison information can be communicated to consumers of SETs posted on the internet.

Third, posting SETs online reinforces the bad practice of assuming that SETs are the “gold standard” of teaching evaluation, and the related notion that they are the only type of evaluation of teaching that is necessary. Although SETs certainly have a role in evaluation of teaching, they are only one component of a proper evaluation of teaching (and not one of more valid ones at that).

Fourth, this practice can be seen as inherently unfair to new instructors, who, among other things, do not yet have the experience at OSU to get high SETs.

Fifth, the reason for doing this wasn’t clear to us. We can imagine two possibilities. One is to help students choose among courses based on instructor teaching ability. Points # 2 and 3 above suggest that an internet SET may be a bad tool for this purpose. In our current environment, we suspect that students have little flexibility in choosing courses anyway – how often is the same course taught by different instructors in the same term, at equally convenient times? Note that online resources (e.g., ratemyprofessor.com) already exist for this purpose, which limits the “added value” of OSU's expenditures on such an endeavour. The other reason for posting SETs online may be accountability, the notion being that online postings will somehow embarrass instructors into performing better. We believe that such accountability concerns are far better handled in a formal administrative fashion. Note that information other than SET forms, such as number of course drops, may be much more informative regarding teaching problems.

We suspect that part of the motivation for this has more to do with a lack of trust in the system – students don’t believe that SETs influence personnel decisions. In our experience, SETs are probably more influential than they should be rather than less so. Indeed, many departments use SETs as their only real evaluation of teaching. This suggests that rather than posting SETs, the appropriate action would be a dialogue about SETs and accountability with students.
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SET Workshops - Winter 2005
Dates, PowerPoint Presentation and Faculty Survey

- January 19, 2005 - 2:00-3:00; ALS 4000
- January 20, 2005 - 10:00-11:00; ALS 4000

- PowerPoint Presentation
- HTML Version Presentation
- HTML Version Survey
Advancement of Teaching Committee

SET Workshops - Spring 2004

- April 22, 2004 - noon - 1 pm; ALS4000
- April 23, 2004 - noon - 1 pm
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Membership

- 2013-2014
- 2012-2013
- 2011-2012
- 2010-2011
- 2009-2010
- 2008-2009
- 2007-2008
- 2006-2007
- 2005-2006
- 2004-2005
- 2003-2004
- 2002-2003
- 2001-2002
- 2000-2001
Faculty Senate

Advancement of Teaching Committee

Agendas

- 2014
- 2013
- 2010
- 2009
- 2008
- 2007
- 2005
- 2003
- 2002
- 2001
- 2000
- 1999
- 1998
Advancement of Teaching Committee

February 12, 2014 Agenda

February 12, 2014 ~ 2:00-4:00 PM
303 Furman Hall
Agenda

1. Approval of December 10, 2013 Minutes

2. Review of L.L. Stewart Applications

3. Discussion of Revisions to Committee Standing Rules

4. Committee Representation on University Committee to Select New LMS (learning management system) See http://blogs.oregonstate.edu/elearnosu
   - Message from Lois Brooks re: Learning management at OSU
November 14, 2013 Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Review and Discuss L. L. Stewart Applications
3. Review AOT Standing Rules
4. Discuss Potential Committee Activity for 2013–2014 year
5. Wrap-up and Schedule Next Meeting
Advancement of Teaching Committee

December 10, 2013 Agenda

December 10, 2013 ~ 1:00–2:30 PM
300 Furman Hall

Agenda

1. Review of Committee Standing Rules

2. Consideration of Possible Committee Activity

3. Discuss L.L. Stewart Award Amount Limits
1. Online SET Implementation
   - Review and be prepared to discuss the request from Leslie Burns to address implementation issues related to administering the SET electronically.
   - Also attached is a proposal (referred to in the above message) outlining the savings, actions and challenges related to SET automation.
February 19, 2009 Agenda

Advancement of Teaching Committee

February 19, 2009 Agenda

1. Discuss previously received L.L. Stewart applications
October 21, 2008 Agenda, Advancement of Teaching Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

Advancement of Teaching Committee

October 21, 2008 Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Student Members
3. Review LL Stewart Faculty Development Award applications and select recipients
Advancement of Teaching Committee

October 11, 2007 Agenda

1. Introductions

2. Begin a discussion of the student evaluations of teaching
Advancement of Teaching Committee

October 25, 2005, Agenda

- 2pm
- Faculty Senate Conference Room
- Evaluation of the SET instrument.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

November 12, 2003, Agenda

Minute taker?

- Letter of support for Ray’s application?
  - What position & aspects of his work does he want us to address?
- Update on SET worksheet / report edits
- Meeting with Faculty Senate Chair (Stella Coakley)
  - Discuss AoT activities for the coming year and any problems?
- Role of AoT vis a vis the new Ctr. for Teaching, Learning & Collaborative Research
- Assessing support for diversity in the classroom - status report
- LL Stewart Applications review / recommendations
Advancement of Teaching Committee  

September 24, 2002, Agenda  

207 Gilkey  
Noon to 1:30  

- Introductions and ideas for 2002/03; introduce annual AOT activities  
- SET report (sent campus mail); actions for FS Executive Committee and timeline for Senate  
- Diversity Questions (Review criteria for creating suggested questions; critical review; develop policy; send to reviewers; actions for FS EC and Senate)  
- Other (including next meeting time)
May 17, 2001, Agenda, Advancement of Teaching Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

SELECT NOTE TAKER

1. Overview of Web based responses to date
2. (From Ray W.’s email):
   
   Review of issues/questions that AOT will need to consider as we move forward:
   
   a. Diversity (both committee and epistemology)
   b. Adaptable forms for Extension; Music; Team taught courses
   c. ABET accreditation; also other college accreditations
   d. Facilities for Art, Distance Ed
   e. How might these added questions be reviewed by survey specialists and/or
   f. validated for reliability and stats inferences?
   Guidelines for course eval to Admin for consideration
   
   a. Frequency and timing of course evaluations to improve teaching; P&T; and STUDENT RESPONSE?, etc
   b. Form length (required minimal # questions, etc)
   c. Written comments policy; changeable?
   d. Forestry and Honors continue current forms or required to change??
   e. Eval teaching and/or learning (Cordray et al).
   f. Student access to course/instructor eval information
   Capstone/exit assessment (AREC does; Music and Env/Molecular Tox asked) Suggest to Admin options
   for contractiong forms and scanning including added questions on back; printing OSU forms for
   comparability and scanning at UW with possibilities to print for specific College needs, etc;

3. Focus and content of AOT Discussion item at June FS meeting.
SELECT NOTE TAKER

1. Overview of meetings with Cabinet, Deans Council and FS Exec. Committee (van der Mars)
2. AOT Web Prompt update (van der Mars)
3. UW response to including Extension-friendly form (William)
4. Next steps: (van der Mars)
   - Analysis of faculty feedback
   - Presentations to FS in June meeting
   - Draft proposal form to FS President
5. AOT Membership for next year (Chair?)
6. Review teaching award dossiers
7. Other ??
Advancement of Teaching Committee

March 21, 2001, Agenda

1. L.L. Stewart Wrap-up
2. Next quarter's meeting times
3. Overview of meetings with Sabah Randhawa; the Deans Council and President's Cabinet; and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
4. Next steps to get web prompt ready for public access:
   - Clarify the purpose of the Assessment of Teaching instrument.
   - Add brief comment that summarizes some of the research in support of the use of s.e.t.'s.
5. Extension's Participation (Molly Engel)
6. Additional promotion of our effort (FS meeting informational item; and OSU This Week).
7. Diversity Council's effort at developing "diversity question(s)" (diversity as subject matter vs. how the course/students were treated).
8. Other ??
Faculty Senate

Advancement of Teaching Committee

November 27, 2000, Agenda

Agenda Items

1. Student Teaching Evaluation Form Development progress update/next steps.
2. Next meeting /Next Quarter meeting time.
3. LL Stewart Proposals Evaluation
4. Other items.
Agenda Items

1. LL Stewart procedures, check in.

2. Teaching Fair Prep. Update

3. Position Description of "Director for Enhancement of Teaching and Learning."

4. Revision of Student Evaluation of Teaching form.
Agenda

Advancement of Teaching Committee
Agenda
September 19, 2000

1. Member introductions

2. Participation on the search committee for new "Director for Enhancement of Teaching and Learning."

3. Fall events: CLA Workshops; Our second Teaching Fair (Oct. 30: 12pm - 3pm)

4. LL Stewart Grants (2 cycles)

5. Revision of Student Evaluation of Teaching form (set up a process with timeline)
Suggested people to invite input from:
- Bob Schwartz (Developer of current tool)
- Becky Johnson (fr. Forestry)
- Robin Rose
- Molly Engel
- Leslie Burns
- Mark Merickel (Web Instr.)
- Mark Dinsmore (Information Services)
Agenda

Advancement of Teaching Committee
Agenda
September 29, 1999 -- 2:00 PM
Faculty Senate Conference Room.

--introductions

--an outline of our required or basic work for the year:

(1) administering the Stewart Grants (a volunteer?)

(2) serving on various awards committees at the end of the year (each of us)

(3) organizing one or two faculty forums for winter (volunteers?) possible topics:
   -dealing with large classes,
   -lecturing well,
   -creating a healthy and respectful atmosphere in class
   -coordinate with Leslie Burns (Undergraduate Programs), Susan Shaw (Women's Studies), Bill Oye (Student Conduct and Mediation), Anita Helle (CLA Center for Excellence in Teaching)

(4) publicizing and organizing the visit of Parker Palmer, February 7-9 (me and a subcommittee of several others on and off campus)

--report on the position of Director for the Center for Teaching Excellence (no funding)
--other possible work for the committee this year (Ray: facilities?)

--regular meeting times for the rest of the term and year
Agenda

Advancement of Teaching Committee
Agenda
March 30, 1999 -- 8:00 AM
Faculty Senate Conference Room.

(1) 45 minutes: sketching out a job description for the Teaching Coordinator position.

As you remember, the Senate accepted the Task Force recommendation to create a center for teaching excellence on campus and to hire someone from within to run it. Ken Williams recently asked me to have the AOT committee draft the position description--and then Leslie Burns asked for our thoughts, too, right away, since she has to forward a tentative budget next week.

Leslie will be at the meeting and can help us get focused. The main things she needs to know from us:

--will the position be .5 FTE or 1.0?
--will it need clerical support, graduate assistants, or student workers?
--any other special programming budget items?

If we zero in on these questions maybe we can actually rough out a job description in that hour, which I can then refine and forward to Roy Arnold.

(2) 15 minutes:

- deciding how we want to go about shaping the feedback we've gotten from the forums
- deciding if we want to meet every other week for an hour this term

We're done with the forums now and have some breathing space--there's no special hurry on when we actually forward our results, as long as we do it by the end of spring term. (The job description is more immediate).

So what I'd like to do in the remaining time of this meeting is decide how many more meetings we need to
develop the forum feedback, how we should prepare for these meetings, and just exactly what we're going to do with this stuff. It seems to me that at least we should agree to meet April 13th (at 8?), with nothing but this on the agenda.

There are several other items we need to take care of before the end of spring term, including who might want to chair the committee next year. I'm willing to continue, but I'm also very glad to have someone else do it (as I've said). Robby Robson of the PASS project also wants to meet with us this spring.

I'm thinking, too, that it would be a good idea to get everything done early in the term while we're still more or less fresh. Who knows, maybe we can finish our work in just a couple more sessions.
November 18, 1998, Agenda, Advancement of Teaching Committee, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University

3:15 PM

Faculty Senate Conference Room.

3:15-3:30 check ins: how things are going in general

3:30-4:00 discussion of speakers, and particularly now, in light of the interest of the Interaction Project, the possibility of bringing Parker Palmer--Interaction and the Provost's office have agreed to split the $10,000 fee. I don't want to force this issue. I really don't. It's just that the Parker Palmer thing is out there now, and we need to make a decision one way or the other at this meeting.

4--4:30 Discussion of Stewart applications Please have all the applications read by the time we meet. And Hung-Yok, would you please collate our responses to see where the disagreements are, so we can focus our discussion? And also add up the total amount of money of the proposals that might be approved?

4:30-5 Final comments on the forum prompt and hand off to Hans and Greg to begin planning the forum structure, with Leslie Burns--including the Leslie Burns sheet? Hans and Vreneli have been good enough to circulate the draft on e-mail, and it would be terrific if we could have this more or less decided before the meeting. And all of you should have gotten the sheet from Leslie Burns entitled "Avoiding Burnout," by Zulauf--came campus mail today.

I know this agenda makes for a long meeting, but do we have quite a bit to get accomplished. We could always agree to postpone any of these agenda items for a December meeting, if we want to finish this one in an hour or so--but if we push it, maybe we can skip the December meeting altogether. On the other hand, there may just be too much here to get done in a single meeting. Maybe my sense of how much time each thing will take isn't realistic.

Let me know what your thoughts are on the agenda and the timing, and anything else you think we should or shouldn't be doing.

Thanks.

Chris
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November 14, 2013
Minutes

Voting members present: Ron Reuter (via phone), Deborah Rubel, Sam Stern, Paula Weiss
Committee members absent: Scott Peterson
Ex-officio member present: Kay Sagmiller (via Skype)
Guests: Robin Pappas (Center for Teaching & Learning), Jeanna Towns (Center for Teaching & Learning),

Introductions
Committee members introduced themselves and included a description of their interests in serving on the committee.

Review and Discuss L. L. Stewart Applications
Discussion of the 26 L. L. Stewart applications with recommendations to the Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL) staff as to which applications should be funded, which should be funded after recommended revisions, and which should not be funded at this time.

CTL staff will send letters to all applicants.

Next Meeting
The committee will meet next in early December to review the AOT Standing Rules and discuss potential activity for the year.

Membership Roster
Advancement of Teaching Committee

December 10, 2013
Minutes

Voting members present: Scott Peterson, Ron Reuter (via phone), Sam Stern, Paula Weiss
Voting members absent: Deborah Rubel
Ex-officio members absent: Kay Sagmiller (Center for Teaching & Learning)
Guests: Robin Pappas (Center for Teaching & Learning), Jeanna Townes (Center for Teaching & Learning)

Review of Stewart award process and notifications
The process of providing feedback to applicants and encouraging them to resubmit created considerable work for the Center for Teaching & Learning staff. The committee requested a clear statement indicating that applications would not be considered from applicants who had received prior awards, but had not submitted a final report. The Committee also requested that the guidelines make it clear that a single applicant may receive up to $2,200 and joint applications from more than one individual may receive up to $4,400.

Review of Stewart award process and notifications
The committee reviewed the standing rules, which were last revised in 2002. The committee recommended that the standing rules be revised to clarify the relationship between the committee and the Center for Teaching and Learning and not identify specific activities/tasks such as specific scholarships, but instead identify outcomes such as encouragement of innovation and experimentation and recognition of outstanding teaching.

Action: Sam Stern will contact the Faculty Senate Office to clarify the process for making revisions to the standing rules.

Next Meeting
The committee will meet next in February to review L. L. Stewart applications and continue the discussion of revisions to the standing rules.

Membership Roster
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October 21, 2008
Minutes

Members Present: Michelle Inderbitzen, Ron Metzler, Kurt Peters, Nancy Rosenberger, Susan Tornquist

Guest: Evelyn Reynolds

1. Committee members were introduced.
2. Recruitment of student members for the committee was discussed. Members are to encourage possible undergraduate and graduate student members to apply for committee membership.
3. The committee reviewed 18 LL Stewart grant proposals for possible funding and recommendations were made. The committee feels that there are several aspects of the guidelines and the selection process that should be reviewed with the Faculty Senate, or perhaps an advisory subset of the Senate. They include the following: can proposals include funding for more than one faculty member (e.g. a single request for four faculty members to attend a meeting/workshop)? Can they include funding for travel/meetings for graduate and undergraduate students? Is it appropriate to fund a piece of equipment (technology?). In the face of rising costs for things like travel and salary buyout, should the limit for funding requests be raised?
4. The next meeting will be scheduled for winter quarter.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

January 28, 2008
Minutes

Members Present: Michelle Inderbitzen, Ron Metzler, Kurt Peters, Pejmon Sadri, Jamie Suter, Susan Tornquist, Ruth Vondracek

The committee discussed the Student Evaluation of Teaching with some emphasis on the Undergraduate Education Council (UEC) subcommittee’s recommendations for changes. Committee members expressed a variety of opinions about the SET and its usefulness and implementation. The consensus seemed to be that the committee did not fully understand the purpose of the SET and that limited their ability to evaluate its usefulness. If the purpose can be explained, the committee would be better able to comment on proposed changes or whether the SET should be discontinued. A memo was drafted to send to the UEC and Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

The next meeting will be in mid-February to discuss the new set of LL Stewart award applications which are due Jan. 31, 2008.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

November 15, 2007
Minutes

Members Present: Ron Metzler, Kurt Peters, Jamie Suter, Susan Tornquist, Ruth Vondracek

The only agenda item for this meeting was review of the LL Stewart grant proposals. Members Michelle Inderbitzin and Pejmon Sadri had submitted their review/opinions of the proposals in advance of the meeting. The committee voted approval of funding for 8 proposals and did not approve 4 proposals.

Committee members were encouraged to review the documents regarding student evaluations of teaching that were previously electronically submitted.

The next meeting will be scheduled for winter quarter.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

October 11, 2007
Minutes

Members Present: Susan Tornquist, Michelle Inderbitzen, Ruth Vondracek, Ron Metzler, Pejmon Sadri, Jamie Suter

Members of the committee introduced themselves to each other and the committee standing rules, membership, and a copy of the 2006-2007 committee annual report were distributed. In addition, a copy of the memo from last year’s chair, John Edwards, to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee regarding the committee’s recommendations on the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) was distributed to each member.

The major discussion was of the committee’s evaluation of the SET. This was accomplished in May, 2007 with a recommendation sent to the Executive Committee. The AOT committee has not gotten any feedback on their recommendations. Before the AOT considers this any further, they would like to hear a response from the Executive Committee to the memo sent in May, 2007.

The AOT committee would like to sponsor some guest speakers or workshops on cutting edge teaching methods this year. It was recommended that this be accomplished in cooperation with Peter Saunders and the Center for Teaching and Learning which already puts on these types of workshops. Committee members are encouraged to review the web-site for the Center for Teaching and Learning to see what speakers and topics are already being covered and to then put forward suggestions for other speakers and topics. There was a suggestion that a workshop on teaching technology for instructors might be helpful as some instructors apparently come into enhanced (or other) classrooms without a working knowledge of how to use the available resources. A workshop on using blogs in teaching was another suggestion.

The next meeting will be scheduled for sometime after the LL Stewart proposals are distributed.
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April 26, 2006
Minutes

PRESENT: John Edwards, Emily Gonzalez, Molly Phipps, Pejmon Sadri, Lisa Sarasohn (chair), Peter Saunders, Leandra Swanner

ABSENT: Tina Bull, Ed Jensen, Ruth Vondracek

GUESTS PRESENT: Gina Shellhammer

A. SET Survey

a. The committee decided to remove the second sentence (highlighted) on the introductory page of the surveys due to concerns raised by Ed Jensen and John Edwards.

The Faculty Senate is seeking to learn your opinion of the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) form. The quantifiable questions on the SET form provide information on teaching effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses in teaching, and success in accomplishing student learning outcomes. Questions 1 and 2 become part of the instructor's Promotion and Tenure dossier. Your response is vital in evaluating the form's success in achieving these goals.

b. The Student survey questions were felt to be too vague. The following were generated to provide more specific information.

Q1) The SET form is an effective tool for students to provide feedback on course quality.
Q2) The SET form is an effective tool for students to provide feedback on Instructor performance.
Q3) A ranking question where student provide information on what they would like to see addressed on a SET form.
Q4) Open ended question??

(Note: After checking with the system, ranking questions would not be possible. An option would be to provide all the choices and have students mark the relative importance of each using a Likert scale. For example: Please mark the relative importance, from very important to not important, of the following topics that may appear on a SET form.
(List)

B. Information Items –

a. The changes to the LL Stewart application and guidelines will be incorporated and posted for the next round of LL Stewart awards.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

January 17, 2006
Minutes

Members Present: Lisa Sarasohn, Tina Bull

Guests: Mina McDaniel, Gina Shellhammer

Liaison: Lani Roberts

Most of this meeting was devoted to discussing the AOT evaluation of the SET form. Tina told us that this process began to try to add a diversity question to the form, which did not happen. Lani agreed to contact the Faculty of Color Association to see where they stood on this issue.

Lisa emphasized that we need to develop the survey this quarter. We discussed the philosophical problems associated with the Student evaluation of Teaching form: What is the purpose of the SET? Is the same form appropriate for evaluating teaching effectiveness, identifying strengths and weaknesses in teaching and assessing student learning? We agreed that the same form can be used for these different purposes if questions on the back of the form address assessment issues. The committee would like to know more about how the form is used in the P & T process. Lisa will try to meet with Becky Johnson to discuss these issues.

The committee developed six possible questions for a survey of faculty and administrative responses to the SET form:

1. The SET form is effective in evaluating teachers for P & T decisions. (scale from very effective to not effective)
2. The SET form is an effective method of evaluating teaching performance. (scale from very effective to not effective)
3. The SET form is effective in identifying strengths and weaknesses in teaching. (scale from very effective to not effective)
4. The SET form is effective in assessing student learning. (scale from very effective to not effective)
5. In order to evaluate teaching performance, how would you improve this form? (open-ended question)
6. In order to better assess student learning, how would you improve this form? (open-ended question)

The committee decided that this survey should also be sent out to Department Heads and Deans. Lani suggested that we look at the Honors College assessment form for guidance in how another form has been used. Gina mentioned that they have the software in Mina's office to fashion the survey. Lisa agreed to send the questions to her.

Gina reminded us that another round of Stewart Awards is coming up. Applications have to be in by Jan. 31 and the committee will meet on February 15 (time to be determined) to decide who receives an award.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

November 16, 2005
Minutes

Members Present:
Lisa Sarasohn (Chair), Ed Jensen

Members Absent:
Tina Bull, Ruth Vondracek

Guests:
Peter Saunders (Center for Teaching and Learning), Janine Kobel (Student Success), Mina McDaniel (Academic Programs), Gina Shellhammer (Academic Programs), Leandra Swanner (prospective graduate student committee member), Emily Gonzalez (prospective graduate student member)

Primary Topic:
LL Stewart Faculty Development Awards

Discussion prior to decisions:
1. Graduate student members need to be registered to be official. Check with Vickie for details. Action items:
2. Gina distributed list of past award amounts.
3. The following questions were raised and discussed very briefly prior to making the awards:
   - Should we increase the $ value of individual awards (above $2200)? It was suggested that we increase the amount to that of a faculty buy-out for one term. No decision was reached.
   - Is it OK to include advising and advisors for this award? We agreed, Yes.
   - Do awards really need to be used within 6 months of the awarding? In practice, the answer to this is no, so we should move to clarify this.
   - How well is "assessment" addressed in the current proposals? We agreed that it was highly variable, but generally not treated very thoroughly, but that we should move in future award cycles to strengthen this requirement.

Award Decisions:
1. Arasatatanam, Speech. Yes.
4. Brooke, Geosciences. No
5. Brudvig, Music. Yes
7. Dowling, ELI. Yes.
8. Vladhena, Institute for Marine Resources. Yes
10. Kollath, Statistics. No, but ask to strengthen implications for students and re-submit next round.
12. O'Malley, Education. No.
13. Rowe, OSU Extension. No.

Total amount awarded: $17,194.

Next Meeting: Either 11/29 at 3:30 or 12/1 at 4:00. Proposed topic: process for assessing SET
Advancement of Teaching Committee

October 26, 2005
Minutes

Present: Tina Bull, Lisa Saransohn, Peter Saunders, Leandra Swanner

Lisa welcomed Peter Saunders and Leandra Swanner, graduate student, to the AOT committee and reviewed some of the committee’s work in the recent years. Tina brought the old and new SET/CET forms (blank and data results) and the committee made comparisons of both questions and data. The committee also reviewed its purposes and functions as an advisory body to the faculty senate. Each member received a handout of these purposes.

Lisa reported that Jeff Hale has charged the committee with gathering feedback to the SET/CET forms currently in place. After some discussion, the committee agreed that the best starting point would be the formation of focus groups consisting of students, faculty, and administrators to gather initial feedback. From there, a questionnaire could be developed (with help from an expert) and made available online to the University community at large. We may decide to give members of the focus groups alternative questions to determine those that the members feel would be most helpful. Peter recommended we use someone from marketing to help create the campus wide questionnaire and to determine a stratified sample of focus group participants.

Leandra asked whether it would be possible to administer a course evaluation halfway through a course so that students could feel that their feedback might be immediately beneficial and meaningful. There might be more student motivation to evaluate the course if they could experience some immediate positive responses by the faculty. The committee was interested in this possibility.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m. The next meeting will be November 9, 2005 at 2:00 p.m. to review LL Stewart proposals. See e-mail regarding the coordination of the LL Stewart proposal notebook so it can be read by all members prior to the November 9 meeting.

Review and approval of annual report draft.

Archiving report from Ray and Paula: Paula will integrate Ray's materials and forward to University Archives.

Ray's report on visit to University of Idaho:
- Met w/ Jason Meyers
- They had only 65% response rate on paper forms
- Faculty want students to report on own responsibility in course before evaluating teacher
- Tina noted that U of Illinois also (like U of Idaho) allows faculty to choose questions beyond the core items
- Students get automatic e-mail (weekly) until they complete evaluations for their courses
- Faculty also get e-mails asking them to remind their students
- Results of evaluations available 2 days after grades are submitted via e-mail and Banner
- Willing to share coding for reporting

Priority: We need to meet with Mina McDaniel & Becky Johnson re the programming for recalculation of the median and reanalysis of SET data for last year (4 quarters). Also talk to them about electronic collection of data and reporting of results. Margie will set up meeting.

Molly & Ray will go ahead with revisions to wording of EET.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

June 18, 2004
Minutes

Attendance: P. McMillan (PM) (co-chair), M. Haak (MH) (co-chair), R. William (RW), M. Engle (ME) (scribe).

P. McMillan (PM) called the meeting to order at 11:04pm.

1. SET/CET activities
   The committee discussed several topics related to SET/CET activities.
   - Email from Linda Sather requesting clarification of "Help" menu for the SET on line version. R. William asked for feedback and clarification for the statements provided by L. Sather. **ACTION:** RW will respond to L. Sather.
   - Changing the computation of the median. RW reported that reporting results by paper form would cost about $2000+/-.. There is an option of reporting electronically via email with results in a spreadsheet or a word document. The form can be simplified by only reporting percentages (to make it look more like the U. Washington form). The consensus was to avoid the use of quartiles. **ACTION:** The committee will agree on concrete (recalculate the SET from fall 2003 through spring 2004 with median with decimal by fall 2004) plan; get cost estimates from E. Lee, and take package to Sabah.
   - RW reported that Idaho has 62% response rate on-line. OSU has 25% on line and 54% + 7% for paper over all. The response rate for lecture only is not known at this time. **ACTION:** RW will talk to U Idaho re: electronic reporting; AoT will propose an electronic data collection and reporting approach to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as an information point; PM will communicate to Paula Minear re: e-campus reporting before grades are posted.
   - RW will draft a report that explains all the SET/CET activities for 2003-2004.
   - ME proposed a small research project to determine what difference exists between the results from students who complete the course and students who drop the course for undergraduate courses, both upper and lower division. This could be done electronically.
   - Discussion about the extension version.
     - Change the name to Extension Evaluation of Teaching
     - Change the wording of number 1 to "As a whole the educational event led by this faculty was..."
     - Keep original wording for number 4 (Clarity of)
     - Change wording to, "...help me think more deeply..."
     - Change wording to, "Instructor's response to my questions was..."
     - RW and ME requested to present to Extension Faculty at annual Extension conference in September
     - Link names on headers to email addresses
   - Change P&T guidelines from "Mean" to "Median" and establish common language.
   - RW discussed archiving AoT files for the development of SET/CET. **ACTION:** RW and PM will meet with Larry Landis and/or Elizabeth Neilson in archives at OSU Valley library to determine format. Documents will also be on AoT site as much as possible.
   - PM discussed AoT annual report. Discussion points included the status of a bank of questions for studio/performance classes. Suggestion to make bank an appendix to the AoT on line documents and encourage faculty to submit questions used in departments. AoT agreed that the diversity concerns for teaching were best addressed by the campus climate survey and will not be included in the SET/EET. **ACTION:** PM will edit draft as discussed and distribute to committee.

Meeting adjourned at 12:28pm.
Respectfully submitted.

Molly Engle
Scribe.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

April 22, 2004
Minutes

Present: Margie Haak (co-chair), Paula McMillen (co-chair & recorder), Ray William, Molly Engle, Tina Bull

Agenda:

1. Follow up on funding request for reanalysis of SET data using the UW OEA recommended procedure for calculating means.
   Our meeting with Bob Burton (see summary of that meeting appended below) and follow-up phone calls has resulted in a request from Burton to meet with Phil Brown of Milne Computing to sort out some details of how data is displayed (addition of headers, etc). Burton also requested that an additional measure of distribution, such as display of the 1st and 3rd quartiles, accompany the revised median calculation. He wants to pursue providing the results of SET via Blackboard. Bull is meeting with Jackson Cassidy today and can talk with him about feasibility. We discussed what questions she could ask -- William reminded us that we need to revise the guidelines in accordance with the new median analysis and provide explanatory information on the web site. We also discussed the wisdom of keeping a permanent record of the materials the committee has accumulated on student evaluations, etc., during the course of this task. McMillen suggested the University Archives as the most appropriate place to keep these.

   Action items:
   - McMillen will respond in the affirmative to Bob Burton's e-mail.
   - McMillen will contact Alice Tucker and ask her to set up a meeting as soon as possible between Bob Burton and Phil Brown and then let AoT know so available members can attend.
   - Bull will talk with Jackson Cassidy about issues surrounding display and retrieval of SET data online.
   - William has volunteered to work on revising the guidelines over the summer.

2. Committee responsibilities on teaching award reviews
   Haak has already received a request to review applications for a GTA teaching award. It was noted that we will probably all need to be available before the end of the quarter to participate in similar reviews for other teaching awards
   Action items: none at this time

3. Need for new Chair
   McMillen and William will both be leaving the committee this summer. There was general discussion about how new members are added and remaining members' interest in serving as chair. We agreed that having co-chairs with one person more senior than the other allows for smoother transition of duties if the less senior person continues as co-chair with a new person the following year.
   Action items: none at this time

4. Future meetings
   There was agreement to schedule another meeting next month and discussion of members' dates of availability
   Action items:
   - Next meeting set for May 28 (Friday) at 1:30 pm. Haak will contact Nunnemaker to reserve the room.
Summary of meeting on 4/9/04 (referred to in #1 above):

Several points were raised by AoT for Bob's consideration, specifically with a view to finding monies to do reprogramming projects for the analysis and reporting of SET/CET results:

- recalculation of the median statistic to use an interpolation procedure which calculates a result with up to 2 decimals.
- rerunning of SET/CET data since the new tools were launched in Spring 2003.
- adding a new field to the header so that areas within departments can be identified.
- a new header sheet for CET which reflects more accurately the work of the Extension faculty.
- creating a 2-sided report to save paper.

Bob would like a couple of days to consider the alternative calculation of the median we proposed.

Ray recommended that we have a discussion with Milne about rerunning all the SET/CET data as a batch job instead of having individual faculty or departments request reruns, as a way to save money. Bob would like to join this conversation.

Bob will investigate the possibility of providing SET/CET reports electronically, perhaps through Blackboard, as an alternative to reprogramming for 2-sided printouts. All agreed that this met the goals of being more ecologically responsible and also addressed the expressed desire by some departments to have these reports provided in an electronic format for easier internal calculations without the need to manually enter data into spreadsheets. This would also be consistent with the university's general direction of moving more functions online, such as grading.

If we move ahead with the reprogramming, AoT will need to rewrite the relevant sections of the User Guidelines. As a committee we need to determine what information needs to be banked and where so that when Ray leaves the committee this summer, the knowledge and information he has accumulated can be accessible to future committee members.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

March 17, 2004
Minutes


Teleconference with UW Office of Educational Assessment: Nana Lowell, Gerry Gillmore, Debbie McGhee. Our phone conference began with introductions and an overview by Paula.

1. How did you introduce, market, and sell the use of medians to faculty when reporting results of student evaluations?

Gerry: Let me start with two essential facts
   1. We went to medians because of faculty desire. Given how skewed the results are with means, mostly high ratings being skewed by relatively few low ratings. The few low ratings have a big impact on the mean. So, we moved to medians because of faculty complaints.
   2. When we actually correlate means and medians, the correlation is about .99. Medians bring it up a tiny little bit, but for all regular purposes it makes no difference.

We asked if Gerry could send us a white paper about that. Paula asked if we could have the data, but Gerry wasn't certain he still had it. He quickly checked and decided that they could, in fact, send us their data correlating means and medians.

Paula: Our faculty feel that means provide more discrimination and we get complaints about having just the whole number or .5 of the median scores.

Gerry: We haven't had that complaint. The only problem is with a small scale of 5, 6, or 7, we have to interpolate the data in a complicated way. The scale is basically continuous. And I had a statistician telling me we didn't know what we were doing and I had to show him references. But, faculty are just not used to this particular method and a little knowledge can be dangerous. Believe me, if we gave you means, the discrimination would be almost identical.

Molly: Faculty want an indicator light and they like the decimal points after the whole number in means.

Nana: Typically we report medians to one decimal point, is that what you're doing?

Molly: It's usually a whole number.

Nana: We interpolate and report to one decimal and we have determined how to make comparisons means to medians.

Gerry: If you're not using our system, I may be giving you bad information. You can reference our web site and statistics books will help do that interpolation. You take everyone who marks a 4, assume they're equally distributed between 3.5 and 4.5, then count up to 50th percentile, and if that's 3/4 of the way between 3.5 and 4.5, then that would be a median of 4.25.

Nana: Over time it's become more common to report the median as a whole number and that's not what we do.

Gerry: If you just reported whole numbers, medians would be a bad idea. Almost everyone would get the same score.

Paula: Means would be better in that case?
Gerry: Yes, if your computer people can't program medians in this way.

Nana: The bottom line is, if you can compute medians this way, it is your best option. If not, you should use means.

Deb: Whether you use means or medians, there's a tendency to over-interpret that single decimal place, and that has nothing to do with means or medians, but with understanding the precision of the data. What we found is that a 4.3 is not really different than a 4.4. Faculty want to make meaningful distinctions in those. But, you really need a difference of about .3 or so for it to be a significant difference. (She will send us this data as well).

Paula: How did the adjusted medians arise?

Nana: It was a response to faculty requests. Various complaints arose, and one was that there may be a correlation between a student's grade in the course and their ratings. Easier courses got higher ratings. Students with higher grades tend to give higher ratings. I should let Gerry talk about this.

Gerry: We all know grades correlate with ratings. Do high grades yield high ratings? Is it because when they learn more they get higher grades and give higher ratings? We did research and are convinced that grades make a little difference. Adjusted medians arose from this and that we can adjust based on factors outside of the instructor's control: Grade, size of class, and why students are taking the class. We present both median and adjusted median and don't recommend which one is interpreted. Faculty and departments make their own cases as to which is most appropriate for them. Chemistry and math have ratings inflated a bit, others may not. It's pretty swishy.

Molly: You report both in your report? How much difference is there?

Gerry: The two measures correlate about .87 as I recall. We can find a range of plus or minus .5.

Tina: Do your students circle a whole number on the evaluation, or can they select some distance between 4 and 5, for example?

Gerry: They choose a whole number.

Ray: We seem to have individuals who think we can make distinctions between medians of .1 and others who don't. Do you have a reference we can distribute on interpreting those numbers?

Nana: Yes. We have quite a bit of data. When you're talking about what the meaningful difference is, it depends on the reliability of your questions. So, it varies from place to place and system to system, but I can send you those references.

Ray: We're trying to get our faculty to consider what these numbers mean. They want to use them as dashboard indicators and have an easy number available for their P & T files. So, even if the systems are not exactly the same, we'd like to give them some references.

Nana: But, it would be good to do a study using your own data. (Note: This is something the AOT will work toward implementing when we have collected enough data and have adjusted the statistical formulae for taking medians to .1).

Paula: Can we move to what makes sense to show dispersion?

Gerry: Within an individual class?

Molly: Yes

Gerry: We do not present any kind of measure of dispersion for these reasons: a) no one understands it, and b) the actual distribution of the data is right in front of the faculty in the score distribution. I think you can just look at that and see how the students are dispersed. If you put a standard deviation or inter-quartile range, people will ignore it because they don't know what it means.

Paula: Do you show a graphic form of the distribution?

Gerry: No.
Nana: It's just the data. We show the percentages.

Molly: We find that faculty don't look at the spread of frequencies and response rates. They want this little number. "A five means I'm not doing real well because I'm used to getting 6's," for example.

Paula: We were wondering if a graphic representation of distribution would be better.

We explained our new forms to the UW people, describing the fact that we changed the entire evaluation and the basis on which the data was constructed. And faculty are not entirely happy with the changes.

Ray: Overall we've improved the form a lot. I think had we calculated a decimal, we may not be having this conversation.

Molly: Be sure to send that reference to Ray.

Gerry: We constructed the evaluation so that we have some diagnostic items and some general ones. Do you do that?

Molly: Yes, we borrowed that from you.

Gerry: When we took norms off the form, we had a column empty. We tried printing the percentage of students who responded above "good." But, it was a waste - that was already easy to see. So, we calculated a standard score for each item and ordered them highest to lowest. The idea, you could look at the items and go to the lowest rated item and determine what one might focus one's efforts on for teaching improvement. It puts a little emphasis back on using these for teaching. We know faculty use them more for P & T and pay raises.

Paula: We feel too much emphasis is put on this one measure and we're trying to de-emphasize that.

Gerry: Of course - it's a nice number that doesn't take much effort to arrive at and apply.

Paula: Moving on to the last set of questions - do you have experience using these for distance education or extension?

Nana: We have an on-line system used for on-line classes that is relatively new. (Couldn't hear the rest). The idea is that response rates are low for them, too.

Ray: We try to modify the questions for each. We get a low rate of response for on-line courses.

Nana: Yes, it's typically a low response rate. How did they do this? The professor took them all into the computer lab. It's an on-line struggle - somehow require it. The response rate has been an ongoing problem for distance education over all the years, even when it was paper forms.

Ray: Our paper form is 2%.

Deb: You don't want to coerce the students into filling out the evaluations or they'll ding you.

Ray: In residential classes, the faculty hand them out and explain why it's important, they leave, and a student collects the forms and takes it to the office. There's an expectation set up with time for the students to complete them. I'm not sure if we can craft a similar situation for E-campus with that expectation, rather than a coercive sort of approach.

Deb: That's something we talked about doing here. I don't know how else to do that, other than creating an opportunity when they're there already there and have nothing else to do. We get a higher response rate when faculty are invested in the result. They sell that point.

Paula gave the UW team our thanks and expressed our deep appreciation for their help.

Molly: You'll send the papers and references to Ray? They agreed.

Ray: Gerry, I want you to know that I've read many of your papers on-line and appreciate them.

Gerry: Thank you! You're all half my audience. (everyone laughs)
Ray: We appreciate it very much.

We closed the telephone interview and moved on to the next steps.

Ray and Molly will talk with Edie about reprogramming the system to include a decimal (better differentiation) in the median scores. We decided we should include this new data in the faculty presentation. Paula suggested re-running the data prior to evaluating the new SET. The committee decided we should get our ducks in a row and find out what it will take to make these changes, then report to the senate executive committee.

We also discussed sending out general notification that we're looking at ways to make the data from the SET more precise. Ray said we should perhaps need to find out who needs to look at this data. He asked if we need to go back to the faculty senate with a new motion. The committee decided not to because this is just an adjustment.

Action list:
Get Papers from UW via Ray
Read them
Ray talks to Edie Lee regarding feasibility
Someone talks to Bob Burton about our conversation and needing to re-run the data
Re-run data and distribute to faculty
Talk to Senate EC
Paula will send a general inform e-mail draft
Present to faculty when ready
Report the UW correlations between means and medians
Cancel the currently scheduled sessions with faculty
Ray wants to post the validation report with modifications to the new median and references.
Paula suggested we demonstrate our responses to faculty concerns.
Paula suggested we talk with Joe Kerkvleit in Economics as a resource for the median statistics processes. This source came from Sociology.
We also want to discuss the significance of differences between .1 and .2.
Ray wants to talk with some concerned faculty about this process as well.
Ray will invite Paula Minear to a meeting in regards to setting up the E-campus SET.
Molly and Paula will work on the new section of the power point presentation, definition of terms primarily.

The next meeting will be with the Faculty Senate EC (Molly, Paula, and Margie).
The next AOT meeting will be April 22 at noon.
Meeting adjourned at 11:17 a.m.

Scribe: Tina Bull
Advancement of Teaching Committee

March 12, 2004
Minutes

Present: Paula McMillen, Margie Haak (co-chairs), Tina Bull, Ray William, and Molly Engle

Reviewed statistics relevant for the SET and discussion of the various comments sent in by faculty about the presentation outline.

Major complaints focus on lack of dispersion, less discrimination provided by medians than means. Means may reflect inappropriate dispersion because affected by outliers.

Molly feels there are no good measures of variation for medians, unlike means which have standard deviation. We’ll include this question in conversation with UW OEA. Bob Burton is promoting the box and whiskers reporting of data when using medians; this surrounds the median with the inter-quartile range (2nd and 3rd quartile = box) and the high and low scores (= whiskers). Would this address faculty concerns? We also discussed providing a frequency graphic for each item, e.g., a bar graph.

We could ask Bob Burton for money to rerun a random sample (10%) of the data with these enhanced statistical reports.

Our validation of SET/CET included:

- Content validation based on soliciting expert opinion from within and without OSU
- Construct validation which showed the results were highly intercorrelated
- Criterion validation was not done at OSU

Through a fair and equitable process, it was decided that Paula and Margie would accompany Molly to the FS EC meeting on March 29th at 3:30 to provide an outline of our presentation and plans for soliciting feedback.

Need to remind faculty & administration that SET/CET should be only one component for evaluating teaching.

Action items

- Committee will meet on March 17, 2004 for teleconference with UW OEA staff
- Committee members will continue to send out comments received from faculty who are reviewing the SET/CET presentation outline
- Paula & Molly will meet again to revise the PowerPoint presentation
- Tina will find out about possible room in Owen for our presentation on the 23rd of April
- Ray will talk to Bob about funding a revised statistical report for a 10% sample of SET/CET data already collected
- Molly, Paula & Margie will meet with FS EC on March 29th
Advancement of Teaching Committee

February 12, 2004
Minutes

Attendance: P. McMillan (co-chair), M. Haak (co-chair), R. William, T. Bell, S. Brown (student member), B. Palama (student member), M. Engle (scribe).
P. McMillan (PM) called the meeting to order at 12:00pm.

1. L L Stewart awards.
   There were 15 applications—all teaching related. The Committee recommended funding 9 teaching-related awards. The committee recommended conditional funding an additional 2 teaching awards if funds were available. The committee did not recommend funding the remaining 4 teaching awards.

2. SET/CET activities
   PM circulated an email from Stella Coakley (SC), President, Faculty Senate (shown below). It listed the scope of work for the AoT and Stella’s response to each point.

   Dear Paula and Margie: Thank you for your time today. I'm pleased to have met you and to have you sharing the responsibility for this very important committee. Below are a few notes and action items for us:

   1. Committee plans to hold some workshops for faculty on how they can get the most out of the new evaluation tool.

   2. Committee plans to conduct an assessment of the new evaluation tool during spring term 2004; by that time, there will be a full year (four quarters) of data and a chance to see what is working well and what is not. Stella suggested that the AOT committee engage the faculty in both setting up the assessment process and in being sure they engage in it once it is launched in spring term.

   3. Stella proposed that the committee decide on a few questions (3) they might ask the faculty in winter term (by e-mail) to help set up the type of assessment the committee will do in the spring.

   4. Stella requested that AOT come to Faculty Senate Executive Committee by early February to provide us with what assessment plans have been made; a draft survey instrument would be useful for this discussion.

   5. The goal is to have the process of reviewing the new form completed no later than Spring term and a progress report to the Faculty Senate at the June 2004 meeting. It is important that any problems with the evaluation form be fixed as quickly as possible; if "repeated" issues come up before the assessment is completed, early fixes may be possible. Exactly what will require approval of the full senate versus the FSEC to fix is unclear at this point.

   6. The AOT would like to be involved in the development of the Center for Teaching and Learning and perhaps also the Center for Student Advising and Success; this might be as a representative to the advisory committee(s) or in some other capacity. To date, there has been NO consultation with this committee on this.

   Stella: is it possible to get someone from AOT onto the search committees for the director of the Center for Teaching and Learning? At least formally involved in the interview process.
Stella will ask Sabah/Tim about this.

7. The question of adding the elusive diversity question to the evaluation of teaching form has been set aside until after the pending "Assessment of the climate on Campus" is completed.

8. In general, the committee believes its workload is reasonable and manageable.

Let me know if any changes to these notes need to be made. Thanks again for your time.

Stella

NOTE: The numbers of the following paragraphs relate to points in the above email.

1. Workshop on the SET/CET. The committee agreed that it would be valuable to conduct at least 2 workshops for faculty in the spring, using a format similar to the web-grading workshops. They would include an accompanying power point presentation and an “assessment” of faculty’s reactions to the new SET/CET. The committee agreed to work up one or two power point slides for review.

2. The AoT plans to conduct an assessment of the new evaluation tool during the spring term 2004. SC suggested that the AoT committee engage the faculty in both setting up the assessment and in being sure they engage in it once it is launched in the spring. The AoT agreed to pilot test the instrument developed and to be revised by Ray William (RW) and Molly Engle (ME) with a random sample of faculty to solicit faculty involvement. By including the survey/assessment in the workshops, faculty will be engaged in the process.

3. SC proposed that the AoT decide on a few questions (3) they might ask faculty in winter term (by email) to help set up the type of assessment the committee will do in the spring. RW and ME are revising the initial draft (see attached—original version).

4. SC requested that the AoT come to the Faculty Senate (FS) Executive Committee (EC) by early February to provide the EC with what assessment plans have been made; a draft survey instrument would be useful for this discussion. The AoT agreed that RW and ME would revise the instrument and circulate it electronically to committee members.

5. Progress report to the FS at the June 2004 meeting. The summary of the survey/assessment would also be posted to the AoT web site along with the power point presentation.

The AoT did not specifically address points 6, 7, 8 in the SC memo.

Meeting adjourned at 1:28pm.

Next meeting, February 26, 2004, 12:00-1:30pm, Gilkey 109.

Respectfully submitted.

Molly Engle
Scribe.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

November 12, 2003 Minutes

Attendance: P. McMillan (co-chair), M. Haak (co-chair), R. William, T. Bell, S. Brown (student member), M. Engle (scribe).

P. McMillan called the meeting to order at 1:00pm.

1. R. William explained the position at the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Collaborative Research and his interest in the Director position. It was agreed that although not necessary, the committee is willing to endorse his candidacy and that P. McMillan will draft a letter to that effect.

2. The role of the Advancement of Teaching Committee to the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Collaborative Research and the Center for Academic Success was discussed. The committee agreed that we would propose two possibilities to Stella Coakley, Faculty Senate President Elect: 1) to serve as an external advisory group to the two centers, and 2) to receive reports of Center activities and functions. The suggestion was made that perhaps a recommendation from the Faculty Senate Executive Council would assist in this matter.

3. Suggestions for scope of work for AoT for 03-04 included II above and continuing monitoring the use and concerns of the SET and the CET. Specifically, the committee will continue to respond to concerns as they arise. The CET is being distributed through the Extension Program Leaders and Department Chairs in Ag. New forms will need to be ordered for both the SET and CET this year. A new header form for the CET will need to be created. Suggestion was made for a FAQ web page about the SET and CET as well as a structured scheduled seminar on the SET/CET much like the web-based grading. In addition, an evaluation in the spring, of the SET was proposed. Close out the topic of the diversity question (see IV).

4. The original charge of the "diversity" question was discussed and agreement was reached that the AoT would not address this topic until after the Campus climate survey was conducted in the spring of 04.

5. Summarizing the scope of work was to close out the topic of the diversity question until after the campus climate survey, determine the role of the AoT with the two new centers, and monitor the SET/CET use.

6. L L Stewart awards.

There were 16 applications-3 advising and 13 teaching related. The Committee recommended funding 6 teaching related awards and 1 advising award. The committee recommended funding an additional 4 teaching awards and 1 advising award if funds were available. The committee did not recommend funding the remaining 3 teaching awards and 1 advising award.

Respectfully submitted,

Molly Engle
Scribe
Advancement of Teaching Committee

September 22, 2003
Minutes

Present: Margie Haak, Paula McMillen (minutes), Ray William, Tina Bull, Edie Lee (guest from Milne computer Center)
SET / CET

Ray introduced Edie Lee who's been working on the programming of the SET analysis and results since August.

Edie had several recommendations and questions:

- Include a department code field on the Instructor Header Sheet
- Ensure that faculty could easily find guidelines if they did a search on the OSU web. Discussion on this issue included where links to the guidelines might be placed and adding metatags of common search terms to the guidelines web pages. WebWorks can probably provide assistance. Also include the URL on the Instructor Header Sheet (and on the Work Order for Operations).
- Provide an example of a completed instructor head sheet on the web site
- Include an example of a completed work order form on the web site
- Revise the work order form to facilitate departments asking for partial reports, e.g., only reports by class level. Suggested to use check boxes for the options available.
- Include a FAQ (frequently asked questions) page on the web site
- Change SET report form to print front and back. (CET to print on back if we have demographic data.)
- Add a parameter for job submission, to designate whether it's a lecture, lab or recitation. This would provide an additional option to the current practice of getting individual feedback on TA's by name. It would allow a look at all the TA's in a department or college, if only TA's taught all the labs or recitations in a department or college. It would also allow summary reports which would be comprised of TA's only, if only TA's taught all the labs or recitations in a department or college.

Other suggestions included:

- Drop instructor gender from future forms
- Include the term "honestly" in the instructions to students
- Drop the term "behaviors" from the instructions to students
- Add definitions of 'criterion referenced' and 'norm referenced' in footnotes on the guidelines
- Develop a 'bank' of questions, created by departments with consultation by AoT.
- Include a reminder in guidelines to faculty reusing all the data provided, including frequency distribution, instead of looking only at the median.
- Include an elaboration on the nature of medians to show less variability/fluctuation than means might.
Action items:

- Ray and Edie will work on revising the work order form with reporting options; they will submit a new work order to Bob Burton to fund completion of the following activities; completed forms and user's guide will be developed by Edie and reviewed by Ray with input from AOT.

- Ray will review suggested edits to the guidelines, instructions to students, etc.

- Ray will contact WebWorks about the web site and search process for SET/CET information.

- What is the follow-up plan for suggestions re: adding fields for department and type of instruction venue, as well as dropping instructor gender from future forms? Upon reflection, AOT should revise the Header page in preparation for eventual reorder.

- Tina and Margie are both interested in working on a bank of test questions. Tina will draft questions for music and contact Art. Margie will contact Physics to see what they have already developed.

- Margie will follow up with her undergrad student and talk again to Edith Gummer re: a grad student as possible additions to the committee.

- Margie will send an e-mail in a week or so re: scheduling the next meeting(s). We need to meet mid-November and possibly in October.

- Ray and Paula will draft a memo to the FS EC re: Molly's important contributions on the science of evaluation for the committee's work.

- Send suggested agenda items for upcoming meetings to Margie and Paula.

- Ray will draft summary of SET including website, etc., to Inform faculty middle of fall quarter.
SET Report:

1. At the next Senate meeting, the previous motion regarding reporting of SET results will be brought from the table for action.
2. The reporting form (designed by John Morelock and previously distributed to AOT by e-mail) is similar to the present reporting form and should make for a relatively seamless transition.
3. The use of an on-line form for e-courses will continue to be a topic of discussion. How can we get a sufficiently large and statistically significant sample? We need to find out what other schools with on-line forms do to ensure participation.

L.L. Stewart Awards (Bob Burton):

1. Overall the Stewart program is going well.
2. What is the role of advising in the Stewart awards? Even though advising may be considered a form of teaching, that seems not to be the original intent of the Stewart family; the donors were interested primarily in classroom teaching.
3. Academic Affairs will locate another source of funds to establish an advising award, at about 10% of the present Stewart awards (that is, 1 or 2 awards per competition). The present Stewart program will be focused only on classroom teaching (where "classroom" is defined broadly so as to include extension courses but not one-on-one research supervision).
4. Questions should be added to the Stewart award application forms asking the applicant to describe specific ways that the proposed project will affect (a) content and (b) pedagogy or method of delivery.
5. AOT will continue to review the Stewart award applications and will also review the applications for the new advising award.

OSU 2007 (Bob Burton):

1. More resources will be put into faculty development.
2. Some Academic Affairs support functions will be spun off into the new Arts and Sciences cluster.
3. It is considered best not to have a centralized teaching and learning center. Rather, there will be an effort to work collectively in 5 areas: (1) classroom effectiveness; (2) writing – WIC, etc.; (3) diversity – DPD, etc.; (4) technology; (5) advising.
4. Each group will be led by a half-time person; research-based implementation groups will work for about one year to set up programs.
5. Question (Paula): Where does information literacy fit into this structure? Answer (Bob): It should be incorporated into all 5 categories.
6. Comment (Ray): Perhaps the leadership positions should rotate periodically, so faculty could return to their units. How to maintain institutional history with rotating appointments? Maybe overlapping terms?

Faculty Senate Awards
Recommendations for Faculty Senate Awards will be made by Margie (Frolander GTA and Extended Education), Paula (OSU Faculty Teaching) and Ken (Ritchie).

This will be the last meeting of the 2002-2003 academic year. Margie is willing to serve as chair next year. The committee expressed its appreciation to Ray for his extraordinary service as chair for the past 2 years.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

January 19, 2003
Minutes

Present: Ray William (chair), Ken Krane, Margie Haak, and Paula McMillen (minutes).

Agenda
Review of L.L. Stewart grant applications
Review of motion for Faculty Senate
Discussion of report to be developed by Milne Computing Center for the SET
Diversity assessment update and planning

L.L. Stewart grant applications were discussed before Paula arrived and Margie will summarize the recommendations and send to Bob Burton.

Motion put forward by Ray for Faculty Senate re SET was:
AoT moves that SET questions 1-12 summaries to faculty and supervisors based on the following:
- Q 1 & 2: designed to report means and compare for P & T, merit, and awards
- Q 3-12 designed to improve teaching; reporting requires interpretation within the discipline
- Q on back meant for and report to faculty only

Ray proposed taking the motion to Maggie Niess for review also before presenting to FS since she has a lot of experience with the FS process. It was suggested that some clarifications be made about the reporting of Q 3-12. Ken would also like to see us explicitly recommend how the reports are to be used.

Suggested revisions:

"Q 1 & 2 will be reported to the department supervisor and will become part of the employee's permanent record. Q 3-12 will be available for review by the supervisor but will NOT become part of the employee's permanent record."

AoT's goal is that these 'formative' questions (3-12) not be used in any punitive fashion for those faculty who are trying out new teaching pedagogy. It was decided that we will add a paragraph to the Guidelines document recommending how the report information is to be used.

Ray informed the committee that 100K copies are printed and waiting for distribution. The Guidelines document will accompany new orders for forms coming from departments. New forms will be implemented this Spring quarter. Paula agreed to work with Ray on incorporating wording changes.

Ray informed the committee that 100K copies are printed and waiting for distribution. The Guidelines document will accompany new orders for forms coming from departments. New forms will be implemented this Spring quarter. Paula agreed to work with Ray on incorporating wording changes.

Programmer will be Ming Hu (sp?). It's agreed that frequency and percentages will be reported for all categories of each question. AoT agreed that means and standard deviations are also important to have, including demographic data. We would also like to have means and standard deviations by demographic categories in items # 13, 15, 16, and 19. Ray will work with Molly to formulate a specific proposal and research justification. Report already provides data on the evaluations by class level (e.g., 100 level, 200 level, etc.) for the departments and colleges. Ray and Molly will make a recommendation regarding the
continuation of this level of reporting and communicate to the committee by e-mail. Programming for the reports to be generated will be completed this spring.

**Diversity assessment**
Ray and Molly met with AFPAC on Feb. 13. Commonly expressed concern by members was that those teaching DPD courses would get excessively negative evaluations from students who are required to take the courses. Many also felt that the most useful information would come from narrative responses rather than likert scales. Ray suggested that we postpone implementation until the completion of the Campus Climate Survey and that we substitute the following question for the previously suggested form:

"Diversity involves course content, beliefs/attitudes, feelings, and actions including respect for your neighbors, colleagues, peers, and citizens. Please comment about any aspect of diversity that you observed (in yourself, class members, and/or instructor) that affected learning while participating in this class. Word your comments in respectful and helpful ways."

AoT agreed to the timing and the narrative approach as a good first step in the process. All faculty/instructors would be asked to solicit this information from students for their classes during one quarter and all responses would go only to the faculty involved.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

January 6, 2003
Minutes

Present: Ray William (chair), Molly Engle, Paula McMillen, Ken Krane, and Margie Haak

Agenda

- Approve SET/Ext forms for printing: The SET/Ext forms were approved for printing. There was discussion about the Diversity form – it was felt that the wording of the diversity statement at the top of the form needed revision. We will consider rewording the statement at the next meeting.

- Reporting and use of data from SET forms: Means, frequencies, and standard deviations will be reported for Questions 1-12. Q1 and 2 used for P&T considerations. Q3-12 can be used at the discretion of the faculty member, not the administration.

- Diversity survey: Pilot diversity survey to be given spring term 2003. Data can then be analyzed over the summer and revisions made. More discussion needed on which classes will give Diversity survey. Paula will summarize question about sampling and send to Molly for review.

- Reporting of SET results: Ken questioned whether faculty should receive the actual SET forms back. It may be possible in some classes to determine who submitted a particular form by looking at demographic information (e.g. a female in a predominately male class, or a black student in a class with only one or two black students). We will need to revisit this.

- Reporting SET results for Accreditation: Q1&2 could be useful and would be available for this purpose. Q3-12 do not measure student learning so would be of no use for accreditation and should not be used for this purpose.

- Stewart Grants: Margie will coordinate review of proposals. Decisions will be made at next AoT meeting

Next Meeting: 1:00 – 2:30 pm February 12, Ray will send location
Advancement of Teaching Committee

September 24, 2002
Minutes

Present: Ray William (chair), Paula McMillen (minutes), Ken Krane, Margie Haak, Molly Engle, and Bob Burton (ex-officio)

Introductions and ideas for the committee's continued work:
Haak expressed interest in having AoT look at ways to provide more consistent training for new GTA's who are in teaching roles. Krane shared information about what physics currently does and pointed out that GTA's in different colleges would need different types of preparation because they do different work. He also talked about a program for developing graduate students interested in teaching undergraduates which involves seminars, followed by shadowing and apprenticeship and then full responsibility for instruction. All agreed that efforts to improve the preparation of GTA's for teaching was a worthwhile goal and within our purview.

Paula expressed interest in promoting faculty development opportunities within the University for teaching and, again, this generated discussion and general agreement. Burton talked about the loss of money for a Center for Teaching. His goal is to bring some of these functions into expanded WIC and DPD programs. He is working with IS to sponsor some technology training for faculty. William also mentioned some alternatives the committee had previously discussed about possible short-term buyouts of faculty to fill such a development role on short-term bases.

SET revisions and strategies for presentation
There was general satisfaction with the results of the pilot study. A small number of students expressed some confusion about questions 7 & 12. There was discussion about the value of retaining # 7 which asks about varying teaching techniques to address different learning styles. Bob feels this may be a transitional question that will gain clarity as this idea becomes more commonplace and the general consensus was to retain the question, thereby promoting the consideration of such accommodation to learning styles. There was discussion about the findings for the team taught class; William shared that he thought the results showed that the students appropriately discriminated the contributions of individual faculty. It was agreed that clearly stated policies, and perhaps training around administration of the SET, can address many of the concerns that have been raised. Engle and William addressed concerns about the statistical measures used to address the tool's psychometric properties.
Burton suggested that the FSEC and the FS be presented with the choice of using the improved instrument vs. the present, unvalidated instrument. Clearly, this will not be the last assessment tool the university ever uses, but it is superior to what is currently used.
William would like the committee members to review the report and offer any edits prior to October 1 so that he, and perhaps Molly, can take it to the FSEC and get it on the agenda for the November Faculty Senate meeting.

Diversity Questions
There was a lot of discussion particularly about the number of questions and the distribution of the results from the questions. There is agreement that the questions are primarily intended to provide useful information for the individual faculty member. There was disagreement about how many questions should be used. William asked all committee members to review the questions carefully and to perhaps survey colleagues about the most important questions to retain and get that information to him also by October 1.

Other
Burton asked that the committee consider whether or not the role of advising was within our charge to address. This will be a future discussion item.
He would also like to tie our assessment efforts into his plans to develop a general assessment plan for the educational programs at OSU. A plan is needed by next spring.

Next meeting
Scheduled for October 21, Monday, from 8:30 - 10 am; William will notify us of the location.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

March 8, 2002
Minutes

Present: Ray William, Chair; Gary Beach, Elaine Pedersen, Elizabeth Thompson.

- **Highlights of Nana’s visit:** Ray discussed Nana’s visit including a discussion of the integration of diversity into teaching, extension, research, and other university activities moving toward the 2007 plan. Also Beth Rietveld is advocating for a campus climate survey using a consultant from Pennsylvania State University who specializes in developing operational action plans with local faculty.

Committee discussed the involvement in diversity regarding the 2007 plan. In the future, an office of assessment is needed; there has been the suggestion of at least a ½ time, if not full time, individual. Ray encouraged committee members’ involvement.

- **SET Pilot test:** Ray discussed his work with the Statistics Department and the Faculty Senate. He is working on a stratified sample for the pilot test, and will visit the Dean’s council when sample decisions are made. He will be meeting with extension program leaders to re-craft the questionnaire. Distance Education is ready to implement the questionnaire.

There was discussion among the committee members as to the location of the comparative questions (top or bottom). The University of Washington has them at the top to be consistent among the many different forms. Placing them at the bottom tends to improve the overall score; Nana recommended placing them at the bottom. Ray will email Ken and Paula and ask their opinion.

Nana suggested grouping the items from the 10 formative questions that were similar to one or the other comparative questions (i.e., 3 to 5 and 6 to 12). These would not be used for P & T but could be useful in the interpretation of the results.

- **Diversity:** Ray shared a diversity question that could be placed on the evaluation questionnaire (possibly instead of the “respect for all students” question), either: “This class provided a welcoming environment for underrepresented groups” or “The environment for integration of underrepresented groups was . . .” Underrepresented groups may need to be defined or possibly “for all” could be substituted.

Nancy Rosenberger feels that the diversity issue is important and should not be hurried.

Possibilities include using the 2007 diversity sub-group to evaluate the proposed diversity questions, or Larry Roper’s groups might be helpful. Committee could develop question(s) and have them evaluated and reviewed.

Senate changed the Standing Rules to “underrepresented” rather than “minority.”

If questions could be developed prior to the next AOT committee meeting they could be evaluated by committee members and then sent to one or more of the above groups for review.

Elizabeth and Ray will brainstorm on possible diversity questions prior to the next meeting.

- **Team Taught Courses:** Ray has contacted individuals in Botany and Science about team taught courses. Discussion is ongoing. He has asked Lynda in Botany to develop something.

- **Likert Scale:** Discussed the issue of how many categories students can answer responsibly. Currently
is a 5 point scale. Molly Engel suggests 6 for a forced choice. Currently, each column has words; they are evenly spaced. This issue is still under discussion. Could be part of the pilot test using large class; have \( \frac{1}{2} \) the forms with 5 point scale and the other half with a 6 point scale. There could be a specific question on the evaluation of the form part of the pilot test related to the scale.

- **Student Input:** Gary asked if there had been any student input on the evaluation form? There has been none due to what the literature stated regarding work on evaluation forms at other institutions. Discussed need to have student input. Elizabeth volunteered to work on involving students.

- **Other:** Discussed the inconsistency across campus regarding when the evaluation forms are given (i.e., week 8, 9, and 10). Also is inconsistency regarding who distributes the forms. After the form is finished and approved, the committee will need to work on the process for using the forms. It will also be important to have an archive of the development process for the future.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

January 24, 2002
Minutes

Attending: Ray William, Ken Krane, Elaine Pedersen, Elizabeth Thompson, Bob Burton, Paula McMillen (minutes)

Agenda:

- Next meeting time
  After some discussion, this was set for Feb 14, Thursday, from 4-5pm.

- SET
  1. Summative questions
     Top placement parallels UW form which implies validation.
     Robert Mason, formerly of the OSU Survey Research Center (SRC), also recommends top placement due to their importance and the effects of ordering bias.
     Nana Lowell concurs.
     Some EC members feel they should be placed at the bottom reflecting the fact that they should be the result of logically thinking through the responses to previous questions.
     AOT members didn't think this generally reflected the process used by students when completing evaluations.
     Recommend: 2 summative items be placed at the beginning of the evaluation

  2. Likert scale - should it be 5 or 6 points?
     This necessarily included discussion of whether or not there should be a neutral mid-point response.
     The research reviewed indicated that all points should have verbal labels and that it is generally better not to include a neutral mid-point.
     Again, having a 6-point scale parallels the UW structure with its implied validation.
     Have more points 'spreads' the responses more and provides more information in the statistical analyses according to Robert Mason.
     A "Doesn't Apply" option should be included to the far right, separate from the rating scale.
     The scale will be structured with negative responses on the left moving to positive on the right, again based on recommendations from SRC staff.
     Recommend: 6 point likert scale with negative on the left and positive on the right. All points should be labeled. A 'not applicable' option is placed to the far right, separate from the rating scale.

  3. Should the revised form be tested Winter quarter?
     Robert Mason recommends that we use a minimum n=100.
     Ray's secretary has agreed to enter the data by hand for analysis since these will not be on scan forms.
     Elaine volunteered one of her large (60 students) classes.
     Ken also volunteered to find out about having a physics intro class taught by an instructor as beta testers.
     Analysis would be 'inter-factor correlation analysis' with which we would expect to find the 2 summative questions correlated and possibly some other factors emerging from the remaining 10 items.
     Suggestions were also made that students could be asked to respond with their comments, evaluations, etc., of the form itself (on the back) OR that the old and new form be randomly distributed in large classes and compared.
     Recommend: that a beta test of the revised SET instrument be completed Winter quarter by administering it to classes from varied disciplines and then utilizing inter-factor correlation
4. Should we pursue creating and testing an electronic version of the SET?
There have been several suggestions that we move in this direction. Concerns by committee that it would be difficult to 'make' students complete an electronic form which they would have to do outside of class. It was noted that Penn State follows this procedure and it would be interesting to find out how they implement this. Formatting may differ between print and electronic versions. Concerns were expressed about trying to change too many things at once and about committee membership changes in the summer. DCE will implement their version electronically anyway and we may be able to follow up on their work.
Recommend: that the print revision be our primary focus and that, once this is successfully implemented, we will investigate the modifications needed for an electronic version.

5. Does the revised form meet the needs to evaluate team taught classes?
Some concerns have been expressed by faculty that the old form does this better than our new form. While the special needs of team taught classes definitely should be addressed in the future, the consensus was that the proposed form is superior to the old form for evaluating instruction. Recommend: no changes be made to the items in the proposed form at this time.

6. Diversity concerns addressed?
Again, the consensus is that this is too complex an issue to be addressed with 1 or 2 questions on this form. Ray has had conversations with Beth Rietveld from the Women's Center who is seeking to do a campus climate survey. They agreed that the 2-day forum with Nana Lowell in March was the appropriate venue in which to try and develop some response to these concerns.
One suggestion was made to offer an additional form to complete either in print or electronically if students felt there were discrimination issues in their class(es). Recommend: the proposed SET will not contain questions addressing classroom climate, diversity, etc at this point. The campus climate forum in March will seek ways to address these concerns.

7. Redundancy of questions
This appeared to no longer be an issue after the latest revisions to wording.

Center for Teaching, Learning and Advising: the money for a permanent half-time director will not be available. Bob would still like to find a way to capitalize on faculty input by possibly having a rotating position filled by faculty who are 'bought out' of other responsibilities for a time. Proposes $6-7K per quarter for half-time work and an agreement with the relevant department chair that the faculty's scholarship component be reduced during this time without penalty to P & T considerations. This would provide a risk free way to try on some administrative responsibilities and also maintain some important communication channels between faculty and administration. All the best teaching innovations at OSU have come from the front lines and the goal would be to facilitate this happening in the future.

Ken discussed the teaching workshops run by the American Physical Society which focuses on relatively new faculty. They are brought to 4-day workshops and involved in very interactive sessions which present verified best practices for teaching that can be readily implemented in the classroom. Talked about the 'interactive classroom' currently in use in the Physics department; noted it is very popular with the students and provides a lot of information to the instructors.

Ken is also aware that other specialties offer similar opportunities, e.g., math and engineering.

Committee would like to continue this discussion at the next meeting.

Bill Oye will be invited to attend our Feb 14 meeting to initiate the discussion on plagiarism and what role he would like the AOT committee to play.

Respectfully submitted: Paula McMillen
Advancement of Teaching Committee

September 28, 2001
Minutes

Present: Ray William, Chair; Paula McMillen, and Elaine Pedersen.

The 2001-2002 charge to the committee was discussed; item seven, working with Bill Oye to establish faculty forums on detecting plagiarism, is a recent addition. Ray will contact Bill Oye to discuss this charge. Ray mentioned the charge to participate in the search for Director for Enhancement of Teaching and Learning.

Ray and Elaine reviewed the work done on teaching assessment during the 2000-2001 academic year. Factors influencing the work on changing assessment forms included: lack of evidence on reliability and validity of current form, difficulties with use of current form related to both use of form for P & T and by awards committees and use of form for teaching improvement, current form has items that ask about more than one subject.

After investigating other university's evaluation instruments, the committee recommended using the University of Washington's forms. There are multiple forms designed for different types of teaching environments. The instruments have been tested for reliability and validity. There are four questions that can be used for comparison with other faculty members' evaluations.

Ray reported that since the cost of using the U of W forms was considerably more than current costs, with the current budget situation it may not be possible to adopt these forms. What may be possible is to use the format of the current OSU evaluation instrument but to substitute current evaluation items for items which have been tested for reliability and validity.

One of the other issues related to evaluation is the frequency of use of the evaluation instrument. This impacts the cost of evaluation for the university. If GTAs use the form, the cost is also influenced. It has been suggested that new faculty, prior to tenure, would need to assess all courses prior to going up for tenure. Faculty seeking promotion might want to assess their courses the two years prior to the intended promotion. All faculty would need to evaluate their courses or representative courses once every 5 years for post-tenure review.

Ray will present the recommendations from the Advancement of Teaching Committee to the Faculty Senate on October 4. He will use the sticky note process to gather additional information from Faculty Senators as they leave (consists of asking questions and having respondents post answers with sticky notes on tear sheets).

The committee also discussed a planned upcoming forum that will probably take place the week of November 12. Nana Lowell, UW/OEA Research Director, will be on campus to spend a day with OSU faculty, staff, and students working on diversity and evaluation of diversity to consider how to approach the topic of evaluating diversity. The day will start out with Lowell sharing issues and key topics based on research at the UW. Participants will then break into groups and develop action plans/scenarios/options on how to approach diversity and diversity evaluation. The third part of the forum will consist of the large group rejoining to discuss their ideas.

The committee discussed the committee’s charge relating to its role in reviewing L.L. Stewart applications and making recommendations. The charge is to revise the Standing Rules to include this L.L. Stewart Award participation. Elaine volunteered to be responsible for the revision. She will share her initial revision with Nancy Rosenberger and then bring it back to the committee.
Ray discussed the need to change the time of the committee meetings; it was thought that mid-day on Mondays might work. He will email the committee regarding this change.

Respectfully submitted,
Elaine Pedersen
Advancement of Teaching Committee

September 8, 2001
Minutes

Present: Ray William, Chair; Bob Burton; Ken Krane; Paula McMillen, Elaine Pedersen; Elizabeth Thompson.
Introductions were made for Elizabeth Thompson, graduate student member of the committee.

Update on Student Assessment: Ray met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. They would like to see the current questions no. 6 -8, and 10-12 moved to the optional questions list with room on the front of the assessment form for optional questions and up to half of a page on the back of the assessment form for qualitative questions. Members of the EC also feel that all of the remaining six questions on the front should be made available to department heads/chairs to help with their work with faculty in showing need for improvement and for documentation about making improvements in their teaching. There was some discussion whether information on all six questions should be forwarded for tenure and promotion. This is a decision that can be made at a later date when the committee works on the instructions for the use of the new form. The EC was also concerned about the breadth of the form (i.e., used for on campus, extension, and extended education). So there may be separate forms developed for extension and extended education. Ray will be sending us the revised form soon for our comments; this revised form needs to be in the hands of the EC by November 21.

Review of L. L. Stewart awards: Not all of the committee members had reviewed the applications. Committee members who were present made arrangements as to obtaining the notebook for review. Elaine will contact Jeff with regard to his review of the applications. Elaine will then synthesize comments and recommendations and get back to the committee if discussion is necessary for any of the applicants.

Nana Lowell visit, March 6 and 7: The current plan is that Nana Lowell will be on campus for a day and a half. She will bring from the University of Washington research on diversity their findings on the relevant research questions. Individuals attending the session(s) will work in groups to discuss a plan for how to assess campus and classroom climate with regard to diversity. The groups will report back at the end of day one and the second day the reports will be reviewed, critiqued and a plan of action developed.

Plagiarism discussion: The committee will meet with Bill Oye either during winter or spring term to discuss the current climate of plagiarism on campus; it appears to be on the rise.

Other: Discussed the current status for the Director of Teaching, Learning and Advising on campus. That position, like others, is frozen due to the current budget situation. The committee then discussed other approaches regarding teaching development, especially for new faculty and for tenured faculty who need assistance in improving their teaching. Ken mentioned that he is involved in such workshops for Physics faculty across the country, and he is aware of some other fields who do similar activities. The committee discussed developing such workshops at OSU. Ken volunteered to email department heads to find out if the department or the field of study has such programs. The idea is to develop a campus-wide workshop using OSU individuals with such expertise. Leslie Burns and Anita Helle were suggested as appropriate individuals to contact.

Respectfully submitted,
Elaine Pedersen
Committee Members Present: Hans, Van Der Mars, Chair; Ken Krane, Elaine Pedersen, Laura, Rice, Ray William, and Bob Burton, Ex-Officio Member.

The committee members looked at the narrative responses from the Web Site on evaluation and the proposed use of the University of Washington evaluation forms.

There appears to be some concern over the number of responses. Committee discussed need to be clear on first four questions as comparative questions to be used for such purposes as promotion and tenure and awards considerations and the need to develop process to accompanying change in evaluation forms. There was discussion that if the forms were to be used for improvement of teaching faculty might consider using the forms midway through the term. Results and suggestions for improvement could then be discussed and implemented with the class instead of the next time the course is taught.

Committee also discussed possibility of creating a shorter version to meet specific criteria for specialized programs/courses. Additional discussion included: difficulty of managing the diversity of forms at the department level - who decides which form will be used, who distributes; will need to be ready for transition to new forms as positive responses are different on O.S.U. forms; a benefit of the U of W forms are that they use word responses instead of numerical responses.

Learning assessment was discussed. This discussion included whose responsibility it was to assess and at what point - grades are viewed as one type of learning assessment, success in workplace might be considered by some, discussing learning during exit interviews might be useful depending upon who receives this information.

Hans will be presenting the proposal to use the U of W evaluation forms as a discussion item during the June faculty senate meeting. Committee needs a general approval to continue working toward adoption of the forms during the 2001-2002 academic year. During the 2001-2002 year the committee may want to consider a pilot application of the different U of W forms. The current O.S.U. forms are purchased in December or January so time frame is short. Departments will need to look at the U. of W. forms and consider what types of forms they will want to use and in what quantity. Committee will also want to dialogue with the P & T and Awards committee concerning which part of the forms are appropriate.

Considerations about process will include the issues of how many courses per faculty member should be evaluated, how often, and when should the evaluation take place.

The issue of defining and evaluating diversity was also discussed: whose responsibility to define, how to define, at what level should diversity be considered, diversity related to content of course as well as management of course.

The committee also discussed whether the L. L. Stewart Awards were for teaching only or was advising considered part of teaching. This will need a fuller discussion prior to the next award cycle.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Minutes
January 18, 2001

Committee Members Present: Ken Krane, Elaine Pederson, Laura Rice, Hans van der Mars.
Absent: Ray William.

1. Review schedule for second cycle of LL Stewart Proposals

Elaine will/has scheduled review of the new proposals that are due in by the end of January. It appears that all but Laura will be able to review the proposals, however, only Ken, and Hans will be able to meet on the 22nd of Feb. to summarize the recommendations. Please send detailed reviews to Hans prior to the Feb. 22 meeting.

2. Assessment of teaching Form Development progress update/next steps

* Select group of campus faculty were asked for feedback. Only two had responded so far. Laura and Elaine will prompt again for additional input.

* Point was raised over how data from Teaching assessment by students can be used (i.e., who has/should have access to the data). Ken has contacted the university's legal office to investigate what the rules say about use of student assessment of teaching data.

* This prompted a point that OSU should strive for more consistency in terms of both how the forms are used (i.e., what/ how much information gets distributed to the faculty member after forms are submitted for analysis; who gets to see the info).

* Concern was raised over the draft "diversity" question about its appropriateness. It appears other campuses are not including such a question either. Group consensus was that adding this question would not "solve the problem" Hans will inform G. Matzke, and H. Sayre that AOT is choosing not to add a question to the new assessment form. If needed both will be invited to future meeting.

* Ken voiced reduced enthusiasm over the UW form (w. regard to how the form supposedly designed for Large Lecture classes still did not capture what we know good teaching can look like in such classes. However, as a whole the committee views positives of the UW scheme by far outweigh what we currently have on OSU's campus.

* Ray will be asked to contact UW and get more comprehensive overview of the cost involved for OSU if OSU were to contract w. them (i.e., production-input-output). As well, he will check to see how much flexibility there is for OSU to customize UW forms by adding question from for example the Penn State forms, and also.

* The prompt developed by Laura and Ray that has been on the FS website will be pared down (and questions will be added for people to respond to) and used for campus-wide input via electronic highway. This approach is planned in lieu of doing open face-to-face faculty forums which historically are poorly attended.

* Faculty will be directed to send feedback to FS Office.
* Hans and Ray will update Leslie Burns, Sabah Randhawa, and Deans Council on where we are at with this process and invite input.

3. **Next meeting:**
   February 22nd 2001 @ 3:30PM.
Advancement of Teaching Committee

Minutes
October 9, 2000

Committee Members Present: Elaine Pederson, Laura Rice, Ray William, Hans van der Mars.
Absent: Ken Krane.

1) LL Stewart procedures, check in.

Hans reviewed the procedures for reviewing the binder with LL Stewart Proposals. Elaine will coordinate with Gigi Bruce on getting the binder. The binder will have a scoring template for each committee member to make comments. Once all member have reviewed we will use one meeting to discuss our positions. Then we will forward our recommendations. Elaine will set up a system to keep track of proposal topics (for purpose of targeting potential future presenters at teaching workshops and forums.

2) Position Description of "Director for Enhancement of Teaching and Learning."

Hans distributed the draft position description of this new position. Names of committee members have been forwarded. Hans will serve as member. Ken will be asked to serve as Chair of the committee. Hans noted that Leslie Burns is the lead person for getting the search process going. Ray indicated continued interest in serving on the committee as well

3) Teaching Fair Prep. Update

Elaine and Ray discussed various issues related to getting the Teaching Fair organized. Issued discussed included: advertising, refreshment, Session titles etc.
Hans will forward the PowerPoint template of the flyer to Elaine.

4) Revision of Student Evaluation of Teaching form.

Members discussed what committee members’ view is on the purpose of using the SET form. There appeared to be consensus that the primary purpose should be to assist faculty (a development orientation), as opposed to primarily an accountability mechanism. It was recognized that Dept.’s and College will also use it for the latter reason however.
Hans shared concern about limitation of any type of rating scale as an assessment tool for teaching (bias, validity, purely opinion-based). Elaine reiterated her concern about what happens to our efforts after we are done. Hans is scheduled to meet with FS Pres. Elect Henry Sayre and will bring this up.
Hans shared responses from Robin Rose (on sabbatical in Taiwan), as well as a copy of the AOT committee report on previous efforts to change the SET, and noted the importance of educating the faculty AND students about the importance of doing the assessments and the purpose.
Ray and Laura will meet with authors of newer forms currently already in use in parts of campus & extension (e.g., forestry) to get their view on how their instruments might be adapted for use campus wide. They will report back during the next meeting. Then we will invite input from selected people previously targeted previously (e.g., Maggie Niess; Mark Dinsmore, Mark Merickel).
Hans will draft Demographics section of the new SET instrument.
5) **Next meetings (@ FS Office):**

- Nov. 6 Main Focus: Teaching Assessment Form
- Nov. 27 Main Focus: LL Stewart Proposals.

Minutes submitted
October 11, 2000
Advancement of Teaching Committee

September 19, 2000
Minutes

Committee Members Present: Ken Krane, Elaine Pederson, Laura Rice, Ray William, and Hans van der Mars

1. **New members**
   Ken Krane and Laura Rice were welcomed and introduced to returning committee members.

2. **Committee Meeting time:**
   For Fall Quarter 2000, a best common meeting time was set at Mondays, 2pm. in the Faculty Senate Meeting Room.

3. **New Position created:**
   van der Mars informed the committee about the approval of funding for a “Director for Enhancement of Teaching and Learning.” A search committee is being formed and an AOT member is sought to serve as Chair. Ken Krane and Ray William indicated a willingness to serve in that capacity.

4. **Two Fall events, (co-sponsored by AOT) focusing on teaching are scheduled at this point:**
   1. The 2nd Annual Forum “Creating and Sustaining A Quality Learning Environment”. Slated for October 2nd, MU 206, 3:30-5:00PM.
   2. The 2nd Annual Teaching Fair. Organized by AOT, slated for October 30th from 12:00-3:00PM, in the MU. Elaine and Ray are in the process of recruiting presenters.

5. **L.L. Stewart grant proposal reviews:**
   Elaine offered to coordinate the review process. This year’s due dates are: October 31, 2000 & January 31, 2001

6. **Development of new S.E.T. forms:**
   This will be the big task for the AOT in the 2000-2001 year.
   > Ray suggested that during the next meeting we clearly identify what we see as the main purpose(s) of the instrument, and only then invite key people to offer input. Ken reminded members about the importance of separating assessment for the purpose of P&T and professional development. At the first meeting we will try to get Robin Rose to join as well.
   > Ken also noted that we ought to consider the development of an instrument to assess the teaching by TA’s (now required under the labor agreement between the University and Graduate Student Union). Hans will check with Gordon Matzke and Sally Francis on their perspective.
   > Ken also suggested that forums need to be set up to allow for campus-wide input, and input from the Deans and Department Chairs would be appropriate.

7. Next meeting: October 9; 2:00-3:30PM.
   Main agenda:
   >>> Teaching Fair preparations
   >>> SET form revision.
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To: Bill Boggess, Faculty Senate President  
From: Lisa T. Sarasohn, Chair, Advancement of Teaching Committee  
RE: Survey of Satisfaction with the SET (Student Evaluation of Teaching Form)  
Date: June 13, 2006

Dear Bill,

Here is the data collected on instructor, student, and administrator responses to the SET form. The numbers of responses were relatively small, and perhaps represent a census rather than a survey of opinion. Nevertheless, there were some striking patterns. Both students and instructors have real doubts about the reliability of the form. The recommendations of the Committee, based on this information, follow the summation of the survey.

**Report on the Responses to the SET Survey**

This report will summarize the instructor, student, and administrator responses to the survey conducted by the Advancement of Teaching Committee about the SET survey.

**Instructor Response**

257 members of the faculty responded to the Survey. The response was overwhelmingly negative:

1. The SET form evaluates teaching performance effectively.
   - 153 disagree
   - 75 agree
   - 26 neither agree nor disagree
2. The SET form identifies teaching strengths and weaknesses effectively.
   - 162 disagree
   - 72 agree
   - 19 neither agree nor disagree
3. The SET form enables instructors to improve their teaching.
   - 135 disagree
   - 76 agree
   - 44 neither agree nor disagree
4. The SET form reveals whether student learning outcomes were accomplished.
   - 201 disagree
   - 35 agree
   - 18 neither agree nor disagree

Summary of most prevalent themes in the open-ended question.

Many instructors view the SET as a kind of popularity contest. They believe that students take revenge for bad grades in giving low student evaluation scores. They believe that the form only reflects the entertainment value of the class, rather than whether anyone learned anything.
Another repeated theme was dissatisfaction with the use of the “median” rather than a mean on the form. There were several comments on how useless this measure is. Many responses suggested returning to the old form, which was based on a mean.

There were problems with the types of questions asked. Many instructors felt that a quantitative measure of teaching effectiveness would be more helpful in improving teaching. Some suggested that open-ended questions immediately follow each of the quantitative questions. Some suggested that the questions were too general and did not reflect the many differences in the kinds of classes that are offered. Some suggest that we develop more course-specific questions. One comment suggested that the same course be evaluated over time, rather than compared with others in the academic unit.

Several people pointed out that question number 7 on the form (Instructor's use of different learning techniques to accommodate different learning styles in teaching) resulted in classes being dumbed down. The form simply measures student comfort levels. In a similar vein, some people objected to the idea that students should evaluate teaching – they do not have the ability to do so.

Some instructors want the diversity question addressed more specifically on the form.

**Student Response**

The response to the SET by students was more mixed. 172 students responded. The majority of students thought the SET gives good feedback on course quality and instructor performance, but they overwhelmingly disagree that the SET leads to improvement of teaching.

1. The SET form is an effective tool for students to provide feedback on instructor performance.
   - 53 disagree
   - 97 agree
   - 19 neither agree nor disagree
2. The SET form is an effective tool to provide feedback on instructor performance.
   - 49 disagree
   - 103 agree
   - 13 neither agree nor disagree
3. The SET form leads to improvement of teaching
   - 103 disagree
   - 65 agree
4. Rating the different aspects of the course. (This grid was very difficult to read.) I believe the qualities were ranked in the following order:
   1. Learning centered
   2. Organization
   3. Enthusiasm
   4. Disclosure
   5. Responsiveness
   6. Clarity
   7. Use of Technology
The other factors were ranked below and were negligible.

Comments from students:
The overwhelming student response is no one – instructors, administrators, and even other students - takes the SET form seriously. As a result, there are no changes in teaching and the whole effort is a waste of time. They would like more specific, qualitative and open-ended questions. They would very much like the results to be public. They favor taking the form online and earlier in the quarter, so that their comments would have some effect (instructors also agree with this).

Administrator Response

Administrators seem to rank the SET form more highly, although the written comments were largely negative. 53 administrators responded.

1. The SET form provides valuable information for P & T decisions.
   - 18 disagree
   - 19 agree
   - 8 neither agree nor disagree
   - 8 N/A
2. The SET aids in identifying strengths and weaknesses in teaching.
   - 16 disagree
   - 20 agree
   - 9 neither agree nor disagree
   - 7 N/A
3. The SET provides aid in assessing whether learning outcomes were accomplished.
   - 16 disagree
   - 5 agree
   - 11 neither agree nor disagree
   - 7 N/A

Comments from administrators:
Several comments suggested that the tool does not measure whether learning outcomes were accomplished and suggest that this lack should be addressed if the form is redone. Some people wonder whether the form addresses style rather than the success or failure of the course. One person suggests going back to the old form. Another suggests that we just keep it.

Committee Recommendations

We felt that there were two real problems with the current SET process of evaluating teaching: 1. there is quite a lot of misinformation about the reliability of the form; and 2. the results of the process are unknown. Both instructors and students fail to take it seriously. Instructors think the form simply reflects the grade a student is receiving in the class. Students believe that there is no accountability for poor teaching. Instructors are not aware that current studies of the reliability of student evaluation forms find there
is no correlation between poor grades and a negative rating of professors. Instructors are not aware that the form is taken seriously by administrators.

We suggest that a way to address this problem is to inform both students and instructors of the importance of the form. Part of the answer would be a fuller explanation of the role the SET plays in evaluating teachers when the form is given out in class. We suggest that the form be given at the beginning of class rather than at the end, thus giving the students more time to fill out the form in a serious way. The instructor should emphasize the importance of a thoughtful response that will be taken seriously in an effort to improve teaching.

It is the feeling of the Committee that part of the problem with the form is that it is summative rather than formative. We suggest that the form should be only one part of a broader Teaching Portfolio. Professors should be encouraged to develop their own questions to add to the back of the form to elicit information about whether the learning outcomes for the course have been successfully completed.

Another suggestion is that assessments of teaching take place mid course. Such a review would be formative rather than summative, and should remain confidential and not be included in the instructor's file. An outside facilitator would review the class with the students, and that information could be used by the instructor to address problems. While this information would be confidential, the process itself would reinforce the perception that teaching is important, and that student input is vital.

Both instructors and students need to feel confidence in the evaluating process. Currently not all instructors leave the room or commission a student to turn in the forms. It must be emphasized that the results of the SET itself are confidential and that instructors do not see the results before the end of term. We considered whether the results of the SET should be published after the term is over, so students have this information when registering for classes. It was the consensus of the Committee that this information not be public. We do think it would facilitate the process if the SET was given online, although there would have to be some form of incentive (win an IPOD) for students to take the time to do this.

In short, the Committee does not necessarily believe that there is anything wrong with the form itself; we do not know if another committee could produce yet another form which would result in greater satisfaction. However, there does seem to be significant problems with the process of evaluating itself. The culture of the University needs to change, so that all members of the community will feel that teaching is important and is taken seriously.
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Introduction

As part of the effort to encourage participation in, and increase the efficiency of, the Oregon State University Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) process, the OSU Information Systems Administrative Computing (ISAC) has created this document.

Some of the benefits of the SET process include: valued feedback from OSU students, generating a source of additional points of measurement on which an instructor could base improvement of teaching methods, creating additional sources of information about faculty members for the departments and colleges of the university, and providing timely credible information for analysis of performance.

Because the SET form is one of the last pieces of paper a student sees for each class, it is imperative that the students be made aware that OSU is concerned with their input. The SET process can only remain a critical and valued part of the accreditation program, however, if a high degree of accuracy is maintained.

Form Scanning, Data Assimilation, and Report Generation

The data used to initiate the SET process for each class consists of three parts: the first part is complete work order, the second (the "magenta form" or Instructor Header Sheet) identifies the class and instructor, and the third part consists of one, or more, completed green Student Assessment of Teaching response forms submitted by departments or colleges to the Milne Computer Center. The appropriately matched sets of completed forms are transmitted to OSU Information Services Operations (ISOps) for processing.

Using a pair of NCS OpScan7** form scanners, the processing of the forms creates a machine-readable, fixed-format plain text file. The data in this file is inserted into a database table. Then an analysis program accesses the table to transform the data into useful information (percentages, frequencies, and, as appropriate, medians), which is presented in either a class-by-class report and a summary report, or in a departmental or college level summary.

The forms are processed on a first-come, first-serve basis as time permits. The data are available for analysis processing, report generation, and historical reference for departments and colleges. Data will be kept for a minimum of five terms (similar to registration records in Banner).
How to Fill In the Scan Form

1. Use only a standard Number 2 pencil. Do not use ink pens, ballpoint pens, felt tip pens, highlighters, etc. These do not register with the scanner, resulting in uncounted responses.
2. Fill in each response bubble totally making heavy, black marks, or the response may not be counted.
3. Erase thoroughly. A partial erasure might be readable as a response, and cause rejection due to a multiple response.
4. Fill in one, and only one, response bubble per topic. Multiple responses will not be counted.
5. Avoid stray marks on the scan form. These marks may invalidate the whole form, and no responses will be counted.

Instructor Header Sheets

The OSU Student Assessment of Teaching Survey Instructor Header Sheet (IHS), "the magenta form" — all fields are valuable and critical parts of the evaluation process. The fields on the IHS are:

1. Field 1 – Required - Instructor’s Name. The name should be entered in last, first, middle initial sequence.
2. Field 2 – Optional – Sex.
3. Field 3 – Required - Subject Code. This field is mislabeled on the IHS. This is the subject, not the department, of the course being evaluated.
4. Field 4 – Required - Course Number.
5. Field 5 – Required - Section Number.
6. Field 6 – Required - Course Type. Lecture, recitation, or lab.

Student Evaluation of Teaching Form

Even though there are no required fields on this form, all responses are important for the analysis of the evaluation. Please ask respondents to provide their sincere response to each topic. Examples of instructions are described in SET Guidelines.
Processing the Completed Scan Forms

**Review for Correctness and Completeness** — The Instructor Header Sheet (IHS, also called the magenta form) needs careful review. Errors or omissions on this form will result in either no analysis report being created or the creation of an analysis report under an erroneous instructor name, subject code, course number, or section number.

**Submit to Information Services Operations (ISOps)** — Once the IHS scan forms have been reviewed, it and the associated SET forms are delivered to ISOps (Room 206, Milne Computing Center). A work order (the yellow form) is completed to initiate the scanning operations and report generation.

Since the scan forms are processed sequentially, it is important that the Instructor Header Sheet is placed before the stack of SET scan forms for the each class. Otherwise, ratings for one class will be combined with the ratings for another class, and there may be no ratings for classes lacking header sheets or header sheets lacking SET scan forms.

**Reports and Returned Materials** — Upon completion of the ISOps operations, the completed SET reports are sent to the originating party.

If the scanner rejects the scan forms, the forms will be returned to the originator. The forms will need to be corrected and resubmitted.

**Summary Reports** — There will be an option available whereby the report requested may be labeled “Departmental Summary” or “College Summary”. The report will include the analysis of all data currently on file for the term for that department or college. Summary reports can be requested by submitting a work order form. The college summary report includes summary reports for each department. Each set of summary reports includes an overall summary, summary by grade level (100, 200, etc. level courses), and summary by class size (<= 25 students, > 25 students).
Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)\textsuperscript{1}  
Guidelines for Classroom Use

Goal: The Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) process is designed to complement self-assessment and peer review (both internal and external to the department) of teaching at OSU. SET questions consider overall teaching quality and basic teaching functions. The goal is for instructors and supervisors (Dept Heads, Chairs, or instructors responsible for Teaching Assistants) to identify teaching excellence as well as areas that requires improvement.

OSU SET policy: "Anonymous evaluations by all students in the class are required each term for each class the faculty member is teaching. A copy of tabulated results must be provided to the faculty member; a duplicate copy shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel records file" (http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/facrec/evals.htm). Extension faculty are expected to choose three events per year to evaluate teaching. Faculty teaching Extended Campus courses will use an electronic version of the SET questions.

The new SET form: The primary purpose of the revised SET form is to provide student feedback that confirms quality teaching or identifies themes for possible improvement. The first two questions are worded broadly to compare faculty across an entire campus, and were validated by the Office of Educational Assessment at the University of Washington (http://www.washington.edu/oea/describe.htm). Questions 3-12 were selected from validated SET forms used at other universities to represent standard teaching functions and behaviors. Questions on the revised form were validated statistically at OSU (AOT report, 2002).

Faculty are encouraged to add questions to the back of the form to assess personal teaching practices or improvements, measures of learning, facilities, or accreditation requirements. When adding questions to the back, survey research literature recommends that questions be worded carefully to assess only one item or concept at a time. Care must be exercised to avoid using synonyms such as "examples and illustrations" since they could mean different things to respondents.

Photocopying: Alignment during photocopying is critical for accurate and complete scanning. Questions may be typed onto a master and photocopied onto the scan forms placed in the copy tray. When copying, avoid stray marks and lines that may abort the scanning process.

To save copy costs, most faculty use overhead equipment to project the questions onto a screen while students respond on the back of the scan sheet.

\textsuperscript{1} The current “Student Assessment of Teaching” form will be changed to Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) at next printing.
Confidentiality: To assure confidentiality, instructors are expected to leave the room while forms are being completed. Respondents should be asked to complete narrative questions on a separate sheet of paper. Students should place completed forms in an envelop with someone designated to seal and deliver the contents to the departmental office, where they will be held until grades are submitted. The Instructions (see box) are intended to protect confidentiality while improving the quality of responses based on students believing in your commitment to improve teaching at OSU.

Narrative Questions: Examples of narrative questions are listed in Appendix 1.

Interpretation of SET data: Scanning and automatic generation of summary reports will occur at The Milne Computer Center. Reports summarize percentages, frequencies, and medians as measures of central tendency. SET medians are calculated from a 1-6 scale anchored by word descriptors (ie. poor to excellent) known as ordered qualitative data, distinct from ordinal numeric data used to calculate arithmetic means. Medians show less distortion from high or low values in the data set. As described below, SET is intended to complement several sources of information about quality teaching and possible improvement rather than differentiating general teaching performance between good and poor instructors.

A new feature of SET summarizes the results of two norm-referenced questions that assess general teaching quality and that are relevant in most instructional situations. Ratings you receive for questions 1 and 2 can be compared to the norm or standard set by other instructors at OSU. As a result, ratings for these questions are valid for promotion and tenure (P&T), awards, or merit. Based on the literature review done by the AOT committee, correlations of these ratings with class size\(^2\) and/or student status (eg. 100 to 400 level courses) can justify interpretation and slight adjustments in scores within the discipline. As with any survey data set, clarity about what is being assessed is essential. For example, instructors involved with team teaching or other non-traditional teaching approaches may require special explanations to avoid ambiguity when reporting results.

Evaluating teaching quality or improvement also requires criteria specific to the discipline, known as criterion referenced questions in the literature. The purpose is for teachers to consider strong or weak responses to questions 3-12 as indicators of quality teaching or as prompts for teaching improvement, respectively. Interpreting these indicators within the discipline may provide insights or document teaching quality to complement the norm-referenced data (questions 1&2) used in P&T or faculty awards.

Many instructors rely on narrative questions to add clarity and meaning to median data reported in SET. Faculty expressed a preference for narrative responses because of the detail, ideas, and constructive suggestions provided by this form of feedback.

---
\(^2\) Historically, the correlation with class size (<=25 or >25 students) was summarized for departments and colleges, but based on number of SET forms scanned. The new version will improve accuracy by accessing actual enrollment data from Banner similar to computations for Ecampus courses. Header sheets must have the correct course and section numbers. If incorrect or omitted, summary data from your class will not be computed in departmental or college summaries.
**Using SET data to complement teaching improvement:** The science of teaching evaluation clearly reminds us that teaching is a tremendously complex activity that requires a similarly robust assessment process. SET represents the experiences or perceptions of students only. It must be complemented by self-evaluation, internal and external peer assessment, and the sciences of teaching, learning, and evaluation.

As you review SET data, note the practices and skills that should be continued or enhanced along with others that need improvement. Discuss results with peers and your supervisor to consider possible enhancements, alternative methods, or new approaches. Develop ways to test these ideas the next time you teach this or other courses. Attend seminars, search the literature, or ask a peer from your department or profession how they might improve one or more aspects of the course. Consider how you will assess this aspect of your teaching, how it might affect learning by students, and how it contributes to the curriculum within the discipline. How will these teaching innovations be communicated to peers and how will results be interpreted? Will post-graduation or post-school year surveys or other assessment techniques be required? Finally, how do you feel about your teaching? Self-assessment and personal satisfaction are the most important aspects of teaching and teaching improvement at OSU.

**SET Data and Accreditation:** Accreditation requirements for universities such as OSU are intended to improve and validate teaching performance by faculty and instructors. Validating norm referenced teaching competencies within colleges requires aggregate data from questions 1 and 2 be reported to Deans and the Assistant Provost for Academic Programs. All other SET data are designed to assess teaching performance by individual instructors with reporting being restricted for this purpose only.

Summarized by the Advancement of Teaching Committee of the Faculty Senate, 2003.

Ray D. William, Chair
Paula McMillen,
Ken Krane
Margie Haak
Molly Engle
Instructions for Administering the SET

Research confirms that respondents take SET evaluations seriously when instructors express a sincere desire to consider their input on teaching quality and performance. To improve comparability for individuals across the university, a standard set of instructions should be used for all instructors and educational events.

1. Teaching at OSU is an essential part of each instructor's responsibilities. Your responses to this questionnaire will help the instructor identify quality teaching or discover aspects that need improvement.

2. Please take the time to answer each question honestly and add your comments or suggestions on a separate sheet of paper.

3. Instructors will consider your comments carefully. Also, supervisors for each faculty or instructor will use this information to encourage teaching excellence.

4. Please use a number 2 pencil to mark your response. Otherwise, the scan machine will not read your responses.

5. Please hand your completed evaluations to ____________. This person has been instructed to seal the envelope and hand it to the departmental secretary to ensure confidentiality until grades are completed.
Appendix 1

SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR POSSIBLE USE ON THE BACK OF THE FORM

Assessing Instructor/Teaching:

Office of Educational Assessment at UW [http://www.washington.edu/oea/iasforms.htm](http://www.washington.edu/oea/iasforms.htm) has multiple forms based on teaching approaches, instructor's skills and organization, and educational outcomes (Form X). Kansas State University IDEA Center also displays standard assessment questions along with a dozen learning objectives with relationships to teaching methods [http://www.idea.ksu.edu/StudentRatings/index.html](http://www.idea.ksu.edu/StudentRatings/index.html). Both Centers permit OSU faculty to select a modest number of questions from their surveys to copy on the back of the OSU form. These questions have been tested for reliability and validity.

Assessing Student/Learner Responsibilities (examples):

- The teacher’s performance in this course was?
- Your assessment of completing readings and homework was:
  - Inspire critical thinking?
  - Challenging?
  - Too much/ not enough?
- Your assessment of learning new information was:
- Your attendance in class was:
- Your prior interest in this course was:

Assessing learning resources/environment:

- Quality of learning resources (books, media, visual aids, etc)
- Quality of learning environment (seating, ability to see instructor, lighting, ventilation, noise, etc) OR (specialized equipment such as drawing tables, etc)

Sample narrative questions:

- The comment sheet from the University of Washington may have questions relevant to your teaching ([http://www.washington.edu/oea/iascmmt.htm](http://www.washington.edu/oea/iascmmt.htm)).
  - Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your participation in this class?
  - Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking?
    - Yes  
    - No  
    - Why or why not?
  - What aspects of this class contributed/detracted most to/from your learning?
  - What suggestions do you have for improving the class?
  - What aspects of presentation helped you most/the least?
  - What would improve the presentation?
Open-ended questions for Teaching Assistants:

1. What qualities of your TA do you regard as good or outstanding? Please be specific.

2. Are there areas in which your TA needs improvement? Please be specific.

3. Do you have any other helpful comments about this TA's performance?
User's Guide for the Evaluation of Teaching Scan Forms

Extension

Complete Work Order Form & Mail to:
Milne Computer Center, Room 206
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
Introduction

As part of the effort to encourage participation in, and increase the efficiency of, the Oregon State University Citizen Evaluation of Teaching (CET) process, the OSU Information Systems Administrative Computing (ISAC) has created this document.

Some of the benefits of the CET process include: valued feedback from citizens who attend OSU Extension events, generating a source of additional points of measurement on which an instructor could improve teaching methods, creating additional sources of information about faculty members for the departments and colleges of the university, and providing timely credible information for analysis of performance.

Form Scanning, Data Assimilation, and Report Generation

The data used to initiate the CET process for each teaching event consists of three parts: the first part is completing a work order, the second (the "magenta form" or Instructor Header Sheet) identifies the event and instructor, and the third part consists of one, or more, completed purple Citizen Evaluation of Teaching forms submitted by individual faculty to the Milne Computer Center. The appropriately matched sets of completed forms are transmitted to OSU Information Services Operations (ISOps) for processing.

Using a pair of NCS OpScan7** form scanners, the processing of the forms creates a machine-readable, fixed-format plain text file. The data in this file are inserted into a database table. Then an analysis program accesses the table to transform the data into useful information (percentages, frequencies, and, as appropriate, medians), which is summarized for each event or aggregated for each faculty, department, program, or college summaries.

The forms are processed on a first-come, first-serve basis as time permits. The data are available for analysis processing, report generation, and historical reference for the individual. Data will be kept for two calendar years.

How to Fill In the Scan Form

1. **Use only a standard Number 2 pencil.** Do not use ink pens, ballpoint pens, felt tip pens, highlighters, etc. These do not register with the scanner, resulting in uncounted responses.

2. **Fill in each response bubble totally making heavy, black marks, or the response may not be counted.**

3. **Erase thoroughly.** A partial erasure might be readable as a response, and cause rejection due to a multiple response.
4. Fill in one, and only one, response bubble per topic. Multiple responses will not be counted.

5. Avoid stray marks on the scan form. These marks may invalidate the whole form, and no responses will be counted.

**Instructor Header Sheets**

Instructor Header sheets have been modified for use in Extension until new forms are printed. At that time, a header sheet for Extension will be created based on feedback and improvement of this form.

All fields on the Instructor Header Sheet must be filled in for reports to be produced correctly, beginning from the left column. You may leave some blank columns at the right of a field.

If not satisfied with the report, you may submit a new work order, indicating a different instructor, county, college or program, department, or year. This change will select different data from the database for reporting.

The fields on the Instructor Header Sheets are:

1. Field 1 has been split into three required fields. First, the instructor’s name must be identified. Second, two fields consisting of four digits identifies county (Table 1) and College or Program (Table 2).
2. Field 2 has been cancelled.
3. Field 3 represents Departmental Code (Table 2).
4. Field 4 identifies an Extension event. For example, the first, second, and third events taught in a given year would be 1, 2, and 3.
5. Field 5 identifies the calendar year. For example, 03 indicates that the course was taught in 2003. **Without this field, the program will abort, no data can be stored in the database and no reports can be generated.**
6. Field 6 is cancelled.

Two copies of CET reports will be sent to instructors or offices where the forms originated. The people receiving these reports should send the extra copy to their immediate supervisor, as indicated in Table 2. The Faculty Senate approved summary reports being interpreted within the discipline and distributed to immediate supervisors only.

Please consult the Citizen Evaluation of Teaching (CET) Guidelines for Extension to interpret questions 1&2 and data for questions 3-12 intended to improve teaching before reporting in P&T, awards, merit, or Prof. Reviews in Extension.

**Citizen Evaluation of Teaching Survey Form**

Even though there are no required fields on this form, all responses are important for the analysis of the evaluation. Please ask respondents to provide their sincere response to each topic. Examples of instructions are described in CET Guidelines.
Processing the Completed Scan Forms

Review for Correctness and Completeness — The Instructor Header Sheet (IHS, also called the magenta form) needs careful review. Errors or omissions on this form will result in either no analysis report being created or the creation of an analysis report under an erroneous instructor name, county, college or program, department code, or year. Also, summary data for individual instructors or programs can only be generated if data are entered exactly the same except for the variable such as event or year. Otherwise, incorrect data will be reported. Results may be unpredictable, depending upon data already entered in the database.

Submit to Information Services Operations (ISOps) — Once the IHS scan forms have been reviewed, it and the associated CET forms are delivered to ISOps (Room 206, Milne Computing Center). A work order (the light purple form can be copied or ordered from Milne) is completed to initiate the scanning operations and report generation.

Since the scan forms are processed sequentially, it is important that the Instructor Header Sheet is placed before the stack of CET scan forms for each event. Otherwise, ratings for one event will be combined with the ratings for another event, and there may be no ratings for events lacking header sheets or header sheets lacking CET scan forms.

Reports and Returned Materials — Upon completion of the ISOps operations, the completed CET reports are sent to the originating party.

If the scanner rejects the scan forms, the forms will be returned to the originator. The forms will need to be corrected and resubmitted.

Summary Reports — There will be an option available whereby the report requested may be labeled "Summary Report," and it will include the analysis of all data currently on file for the year for that person. The Summary Report can be requested by filling in the instructor name on the work order exactly as it was filled in on the IHS, including any blank spaces. Send the request to Milne Computer Center.
Table 1. County Designators for Completing CET Header Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Designator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>BAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>BENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>CLAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clatsop</td>
<td>CLAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>COLU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coos</td>
<td>COOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook</td>
<td>CROO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry</td>
<td>CURR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschutes</td>
<td>DESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>DOUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>GILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>GRAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney</td>
<td>HARN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood River</td>
<td>HOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>JACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>JEFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine</td>
<td>JOSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath</td>
<td>KLAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>LAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>LANE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>LINC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn</td>
<td>LINN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>MALH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>MARI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>MORR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>MULT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWREC</td>
<td>NWRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>POLK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>SHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillamook</td>
<td>TILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla</td>
<td>UMAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermiston</td>
<td>HERM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton-Freewater</td>
<td>MILT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>UNIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallowa</td>
<td>WALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Springs</td>
<td>WARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasco</td>
<td>WASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>WASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>WHEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamhill</td>
<td>YAMH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. CET Guidelines for Completing Instructor Header Forms with College/Program Designators and sending summary reports to immediate supervisors.

County faculty should send summaries to Staff Chairs and either Program Leader or Dept. Head; Specialists should send summaries to Dept. Head or Program Leader (PL) as described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEPT/ Prog. Leader</th>
<th>Staff Chair (county fac.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension Admin. (EXAD)</td>
<td>CADM</td>
<td>Staff chair teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EESC</td>
<td>Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| College Ag Sciences (CAS)                    | EXAD                | Dept                       |
| Ag Resource Econ.                            | AREC                | Dept                       |
| Animal Science                               | ANSC                | Dept                       |
| Bioresource Engineering                      | BIOE                | Dept                       |
| Botany & Pl. Path.                           | BPP                 | Dept                       |
| Crop & Soil Science                          | CSS                 | Dept                       |
| Int Plant Prot Center                        | IPPC                | Dept                       |
| Fish & Wildlife                              | FW                  | Dept                       |
| Food Sci & Tech                              | FST                 | Dept                       |
| Horticulture                                 | HORT                | Dept                       |
| Range Resources                              | RR                  | Dept                       |
| Veterinary Med.                              | VM                  | Dept                       |
| College Forestry (COF)                       | EXAD                | Dept                       |
| Family & Comm. Develop.                      | FCD                 | Dept/PL                    |
| College of Health & Human Sciences (CHHS)    | EXAD                | Dept/PL                    |
| College of Education (COED)                  | EXAD                | Dept/PL                    |
| Sea Grant (SEAG)                              | EXAD                | Dept/PL                    |

1 Repeat SEAG for both college and department designator on Header Sheet, unless you are evaluating teaching as an administrator.
Citizen Evaluation of Teaching (CET)\(^1\)
Guidelines for Extension Use

**Goal:** The Citizen Evaluation of Teaching (CET) process is designed to complement self-assessment and peer review (both internal and external to your disciplinary expertise) of Extension teaching at OSU. CET questions consider overall teaching quality and basic teaching functions. The goal is for instructors and your immediate supervisor/s (see Table 2, User’s Guide) to identify teaching excellence as well as areas that may need attention.

**OSU policy:** "Anonymous evaluations by all students in the class are required each term for each class the faculty member is teaching. A copy of tabulated results must be provided to the faculty member; a duplicate copy shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel records file" ([http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/facrec/evals.htm](http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/facrec/evals.htm)). **Extension faculty are expected to choose three events per year** to evaluate teaching.

**The new CET form:** The primary purpose of the revised CET form is to provide citizen feedback that confirms quality teaching or identifies themes for possible improvement. Another purpose is to integrate the evaluation of teaching among all teaching faculty at OSU. As a result, questions and forms look similar and will be reported similarly across the entire OSU campus.

Note that the first two questions are worded broadly to compare teaching across disciplines, and were validated by the Office of Educational Assessment at the University of Washington ([http://www.washington.edu/oea/describe.htm](http://www.washington.edu/oea/describe.htm)). Questions 3-12 were selected from validated instruments used at other universities to represent standard teaching functions and behaviors. All questions on the Extension form were validated using statistical procedures at OSU (AOT report, 2002).

Faculty are encouraged to add questions to the back of the form to assess personal teaching practices or improvements, measures of learning, facilities, or other parameters of interest. When adding questions to the back, survey research literature recommends that questions be worded carefully to assess only one item or concept at a time. Care must be exercised to avoid using synonyms such as "examples and illustrations" since they could mean different things to respondents.

**Photocopying:** Alignment during photocopying is critical for accurate and complete scanning. Questions may be typed onto a master and photocopied onto the scan forms placed in the copy tray. When copying, avoid stray marks and lines that may abort the scanning process.

---

\(^1\) The current “Citizen Assessment of Extension Teaching” form will be changed to Citizen Evaluation of Teaching (CET) at next printing.
To save copy costs, many faculty use overhead equipment to project the questions onto a screen while citizens respond on the back of the scan sheet.

Confidentiality: Teaching evaluations must be conducted to ensure confidentiality. The key is avoiding identification of individuals or small groups attending your educational events, either by their ratings or hand-written comments. At the same time, procedures that ensure integrity of sample sizes and results will enhance validity when peers consider your teaching skills. The Instructions (see box) are intended to protect confidentiality while improving the quality of responses based on citizens believing in your commitment to improve teaching at OSU.

Narrative Questions: Faculty report that narrative questions provide more information and ideas than standard CET questions. Examples of narrative questions are listed in Appendix 1 for your consideration.

Interpretation of CET data: Scanning and automatic generation of summary reports will occur at The Milne Computer Center. Reports summarize percentages, frequencies, and medians as measures of central tendency. CET medians are calculated from a 1-6 scale anchored by word descriptors (ie. poor to excellent) known as ordered qualitative data, distinct from ordinal numeric data used to calculate arithmetic means. Medians show less distortion of data from high or low values. As described below, CET is intended to complement several sources of information about quality teaching and possible improvement rather than differentiating general teaching performance between good and poor instructors.

A new feature of CET summarizes the results of two norm-referenced questions that assess general teaching quality and that are relevant in most instructional situations. Ratings you receive for questions 1 and 2 can be compared to the norm or standard set by other instructors at OSU. As a result, ratings for these questions are valid for promotion and tenure (P&T), awards, or merit. Eventually, cross-tab data representing correlations between Questions 1&2 and demographic data will be available (requires development of a demographic scan form for Extension). As with any survey or data set, clarity about what is being assessed is essential. For example, instructors who teach jointly or in tandem with others during Extension workshops must clarify who is being evaluated to avoid ambiguity or confusion.

Evaluating teaching quality or improvement also requires criteria specific to the discipline. This is known as criterion referenced questions in the literature. The purpose is for teachers to consider strong or weak responses to questions 3-12 as indicators of quality teaching or as prompts for teaching improvement, respectively. Interpreting these indicators within the discipline may provide insights or document teaching quality to complement the norm-referenced data (questions 1&2) used in P&T or faculty awards.

Adding narrative questions often enhances detail, ideas, and constructive suggestions by attendees. When confidentiality is not an issue, instructors may wish to glance at
responses to the 12 questions and narratives prior to sending the scan sheets to the Computer Center since a slight delay is expected before results will be returned.

**Sending report summaries to supervisors:** The clear intent of the Advancement of Teaching (AOT) committee and the Faculty Senate focuses CET on improving teaching combined with a minor role to confirm teaching performance for P&T, awards, or merit. AOT and the Senate recognize the need to report to immediate supervisors (see Extension User’s Guide for a list) while preventing “raw” or non-interpreted data from entering into Prof Reviews, personnel files, or Administrative channels.

**Using CET data to complement teaching improvement:** The science of teaching evaluation clearly reminds us that teaching is a tremendously complex activity that requires a similarly robust assessment process. CET represents the experiences or perceptions of respondents only. It must be complemented by self-evaluation, internal and external peer assessment, and the sciences of teaching, learning, and evaluation.

As you review CET data, note the practices and skills that should be continued or enhanced along with others that need improvement. Discuss results with peers and immediate supervisor/s to consider possible enhancements, alternative methods, or new approaches. Develop ways to test these ideas the next time you teach this or other educational events. Attend seminars, search the literature, or ask a peer from your department or profession how they might improve one or more aspects of your teaching. Consider how you will assess this aspect of your teaching, how it might affect learning by citizens, and how it contributes to Extension teaching within the discipline. How will innovations in your teaching be communicated to peers? Will it be necessary to consider additional surveys or other assessment techniques within the discipline? Finally, how do you feel about your teaching? Self-assessment and personal satisfaction are the most important aspects of teaching and teaching improvement at OSU.

**CET Data and Program Review:** Program reviews are similar to accreditation requirements for universities such as OSU and are intended to improve and validate teaching performance by faculty and instructors. The CET process is intended to improve teaching within the discipline. Valid *norm referenced* teaching competencies within colleges requires aggregate data from questions 1 and 2 be reported to Program Leaders and other Administrators at OSU. All other CET data are designed to assess teaching performance by individual instructors with reporting being interpreted within the discipline only.

Summarized by the Advancement of Teaching Committee of the Faculty Senate, 2003.

Ray D. William, Chair
Paula McMillen,
Ken Krane
Margie Haak
Molly Engle
**Instructions for Administering the CET**

Research confirms that respondents take CET evaluations seriously when instructors express a sincere desire to consider their input on teaching quality and performance. To improve comparability for individuals across Extension or within departments, a standard set of instructions should be used for all instructors and educational events.

1. Teaching at OSU including the OSU Extension Service is an essential part of each instructor's responsibilities. Your responses to this questionnaire will help me identify quality teaching or discover aspects to consider for improvement.

2. Please take the time to answer each question honestly and add your comments on a separate sheet of paper.

3. Please answer question #1 from the point of view of the individual instructor asking you to complete the form.

4. **Please use a number 2 pencil. Otherwise, the scan machine will not read your responses.**

5. Please hand your completed evaluations to ______________. This person has been instructed to seal the envelope and hand it to the appropriate person to ensure confidentiality.
Appendix 1

SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR POSSIBLE USE ON THE BACK OF THE FORM

Assessing Instructor/Teaching:

The Office of Educational Assessment at the University of Washington (UW) 
http://www.washington.edu/oea/iasforms.htm has multiple forms based on teaching 
approaches, instructor’s skills and organization, and educational outcomes (Form X).

Kansas State University IDEA Center also displays standard assessment questions along 
with a dozen learning objectives with relationships to teaching methods 
http://www.idea.ksu.edu/StudentRatings/index.html .

Both Centers permit OSU faculty to select a modest number of questions from their 
surveys to copy on the back of the OSU form. These questions have been tested for 
reliability and validity.

Assessing Student/Learner Responsibilities (examples):

• The instructor’s teaching performance in this Extension event was?
• Teaching in this Extension event inspired critical thinking?
• The teacher challenged my understanding of the subject?
• Your assessment of learning new information was:
• Your attendance during this event was:
• Your prior interest in this topic was:

Assessing Learning Resources/Environment:

• Quality of learning resources (books, media, visual aids, etc.)
• Quality of learning environment (seating, ability to see instructor, lighting, 
  ventilation, noise, etc.) or (specialized equipment such as drawing tables, etc.)

Sample Narrative Written Questions:

• The comment sheet from the UW might have questions relevant to your teaching 
  (http://www.washington.edu/oea/iascmmt.htm).
  • Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your participation in this 
    class?
  • Was this class intellectually stimulating?
    o Did it stretch your thinking?
      ▪ Yes
      ▪ No
      ▪ Why or why not?
  • What aspects of this class contributed most to or distracted from your learning?
• What suggestions do you have for improving the class?
• What aspects of presentation helped you most/least?
• What would improve the presentation?

Open-ended Questions for Teaching Assistants:

• What qualities of your TA do you regard as good or outstanding? Please be specific.
• Are there areas in which you feel your TA needs improvement? If yes, please be specific.
• Do you have any other comments you feel would be helpful about this TA's performance?
Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)
Citizen Evaluation of Teaching (CET)

Overview of SET/CET
Faculty Senate
Advancement of Teaching Committee

First | Previous | Next | Last
OBJECTIVE 3
SET/CET Evaluation

For the next 12 slides,
please answer each question indicating the utility
of each question to help you improve your teaching.
From: Brooks, Lois [mailto:Lois.Brooks@oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2014 3:50 PM
To: Dewitt, Christina; Stern, Sam
Cc: Greenough, Lynn
Subject: Learning management at OSU

Professors,

We've undertaken a decision cycle at OSU about whether to replace Blackboard. You'll hear a lot more about this in the coming weeks as we launch the information campaign and call to participate. Briefly, it's a university-wide process to look at what's available in the market as it relates to OSU's needs, try some systems, and choose the one that best meets our needs in the future. The project is being documented at http://blogs.oregonstate.edu/elearnosu/ and the FAQ page might be particularly helpful http://blogs.oregonstate.edu/elearnosu/faq/

The reason I'm writing to you is to ask your help in the decision making process. We are seating a group of University leaders to oversee the process and make the final recommendation for how to proceed. Dan Edge will participate in his capacity as faculty senate president, and asked that we invite liaisons from the two committees you chair (Advancement of Teaching and Online Education) to participate at this level as well. The liaisons might be you or might be other committee members. We can support remote connections so the participants don't need to be on the Corvallis campus.

Lynn Greenough, the project manager, or I would be happy to follow up with you to talk in more depth, or to attend a committee meeting if that's a better option.

Thanks for considering this, and please don't hesitate to let me know what other information or discussion would be helpful to you.

Lois

Lois Brooks
Vice Provost, Information Services
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon
**Advancement of Teaching Committee**

**Standing Rules**

The Advancement of Teaching Committee formulates and evaluates statements of policy that influence the teaching process, including (1) teaching effectiveness and efficiency, (2) support, (3) dissemination of information, (4) encouragement of innovation and experimentation, and (5) appropriate recognition of good teaching. The Committee seeks information and opinions from students, faculty, and administrators in formulating statements of policy, and presents to the Faculty Senate recommendations and perspectives useful to that body in determining appropriate actions and positions to be taken in support of the advancement of teaching. In addition, the Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to the L. L. Stewart Faculty Development Award, the Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee, or to other committees or individuals as designated, in the granting of awards in the field of teaching. The full committee shall participate in the review and recommendations relating to the L. L. Stewart Faculty Development Award. A member of the Committee shall participate in the selection of the Elizabeth P. Ritchie Distinguished Professor Award, the OSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Awards, the OSU Extended Education Faculty Achievement Award, and the Richard M. Bressler Senior Faculty Teaching Award. The Committee consists of five Teaching Faculty, three Students, one of whom must be a graduate student and one of whom must be an undergraduate student, and the Provost and Executive Vice President or designee, ex-officio.

(03/02)
Dear Advancement of Teaching Committee,

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, I would like to provide you with an update and ask for your assistance in implementation of an new electronic/automated Student Evaluation of Teaching form.

First, an update:

Catherine Williams and Deb Pence (Chair, Faculty Senate Task Force for SET) were asked by provost Randhawa to implement the many benefits (environmental, costs, consistency of implementation, etc.) of computerizing our current Student Evaluation of Teaching without lessening the quality and integrity of the student evaluation of teaching process. The Faculty Senate Task Force for SET worked with Catherine to see if they could incorporate their revised SET into this automation task. After discussion they agreed that the Task Force should not rush their revisions to meet the cost savings deadline. They decided to automate the current process and then revise the computerized process when the Task Force’s work on content was ready. This proposal was reviewed by Sabah and the IT Budget Committee and approved on November 20, 2009. (The proposal is attached below) The Faculty Senate Task Force for SET conducted a pilot test of the electronic version during Winter Term 2010 and there are individuals from the Task Force who are willing to conduct another pilot test for Spring Term 2010. The original implementation deadline was Spring 2010.

Our request:

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate met with Catherine and Sabah last Friday to discuss next steps in the implementation. The decision was made to postpone the implementation until Fall 2010. There are a number of implementation questions that we believe the AOT could provide important input and guidance. I’ve copied Deb Pence on this email since she and others were involved with the pilot test and can provide results and insights to the process. In addition, she can provide you with names of the individuals who are willing to pilot test the process this term.

1) Therefore, please work with Catherine Williams to address the following questions:
   • It is imperative that students understand the importance of responding to the SET and that the electronic SETs get as good a response rate as possible.
     o What instructions should be given to students to encourage them to complete the form and to assure confidentiality?
What types of incentives are needed? e.g., UO uses this same process and they withhold students’ grades until they have completed or indicated that they do not want to complete the SET for the course. Are there other incentives for students?

- How will the information be disseminated to instructors and supervisors? Current policy is that any written comments go only to the instructor. Other tabulations are provided to supervisors and instructors. How will this policy be assured?
- Other questions that the AOT comes up with as implementation plans are undertaken.

2) In addition, we’d like to ask you to develop a communication plan for faculty and students to inform them of the upcoming change in process, assuring them of the integrity of the process. I will be announcing that this process is underway at this week’s Faculty Senate meeting. A website with information and examples might be useful and could be sent out to faculty this term and again in the Fall. The Faculty Senate office can assist in getting the word out to faculty. My experience is that with changes such as this, early, consistent, and on-going communications are important for faculty buy-in.

Kurt, as Chair of the AOT, please take the lead in connecting with Catherine and Deb to determine the best method for moving forward with this implementation process, with addressing these questions, and in assuring an effective communications process.

I appreciate all your work on this process! Please let me know if you have any questions or need clarity on any of this. Thanks!!

Leslie

Leslie Davis Burns, Ph.D. | Professor and Chair | Department of Design and Human Environment | President, Faculty Senate Oregon State University | Milam 224, Corvallis, Oregon 97331 T: 541.737.0983 | F: 541-737-0993 | Leslie.Burns@oregonstate.edu | www.hhs.oregonstate.edu/dhe/
Measure 11 – Automate Student Evaluation of Teaching

Savings Goals: Sustained savings of $150,000 per year.
$50,000 the first year with $100,000 additional in second year.

How the savings goal will be achieved

There are about 320,000 opportunities for evaluation per year, meaning about 100,000 per regular term and 20,000 for summer term. A conservative estimate of the cost per evaluation to the department is $.34. That includes the cost of the paper form and the time invested by department in distributing, collecting, forwarding and validating the forms.

The workload for the Operations Team within Enterprise Computing has been reduced through automation since implementing Appworx in May 2008. With the additional work load reduction by elimination of scanning the Student Evaluation of Teaching forms, the Operations Team could be reduced by 1.0 FTE.

Year 1 (FY10) Savings:
These estimates assume a spring 2010 implementation.

- Savings on forms processing: $40,800 (Spring and Summer term)
- FTE savings: $10,190 (May/June)

Initial start-up costs:
- CollegeNet Implementation fee: $37,950 (One-Time)
- CollegeNet maintenance: $19,000 (Annual)

In fiscal year 2010, the initial savings would be more than consumed by the start-up costs.

Year 2 (FY11) Savings:

- Operations FTE $61,134
- Forms 320,000 * .34 $108,800

- CollegeNet maintenance ($19,000)

Net Savings $150,934
Actions, responsibilities and deadlines:

Contract with CollegeNet  
Catherine Williams  
January 8, 2010

Define extract file for CollegeNet  
Academic Planning and Assessment  
January 15, 2010

Create extract file for CollegeNet  
Enterprise Computing Services  
January 22, 2010

Verify accuracy of CollegeNet implementation  
Academic Planning and Assessment  
March 19, 2010

Enter configurable web text  
Academic Planning and Assessment  
March 26, 2010

Create and disseminate informational material for students and faculty  
Academic Planning and Assessment  
April 2, 2010

Available for use  
April 9, 2010

Final work day for Operations Specialist  
April 30, 2010

Challenges:

The faculty Student Evaluation of Teaching task force is working on an initiative to transform the evaluation process. They will not have their new evaluation complete and approved until sometime after Fall 2010. Until there is a new form approved, the current form will be implemented.

There is some concern about maintaining the response rate with an electronic survey mechanism. However, CollegeNet reports that their customers experience an increase in response rate over paper forms, even with no incentive.

If an incentive is desired by the faculty Student Evaluation of Teaching task force, the University of Oregon has had a positive experience with withholding final grades until the Wednesday after the end of the term, unless the student completes their evaluations. Many instructors display grades in Blackboard, however the University of Oregon found that this did not seem to adversely effect the survey response rate. This incentive would require modifications to Banner On-line Services and would need to be calculated in the implementation timeline.
We can implement the current SET form with CollegeNet for the current and next academic year and incorporate the new evaluation when it is ready. This brings up two issues.

1. After the faculty Student Evaluation of Teaching task force agrees on a new form, there will be a cost from CollegeNet to substantially revamp the form. Without the new form, it is impossible to create an accurate estimate of this cost, but is expected to be less than $10,000.

2. The deeper issue is that if we invest in CollegeNet, the committee will be bound by the limitations of the software in planning the new form. They hope to substantially change the form and content of course assessment and a commercial product may limit them from achieving all of their goals.
TO: Undergraduate Education Council  
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Advancement of Teaching Committee

RE: UEC subcommittee recommendations on Student Evaluation of Teaching

DATE: January 28, 2008

The Advancement of Teaching (AOT) Committee was asked to review the UEC subcommittee recommendations for the Student Evaluation of Teaching. The committee had some electronic discussion of the recommendations prior to meeting, then had a meeting on Jan. 28, 2008, attended by all 7 committee members for further discussion.

Members of the AOT expressed a variety of individual opinions about the SET in general. These included:

- The SET asks the wrong questions at the wrong time. Feedback should be sought mid-quarter and at the end in a two-tiered approach. Most of the questions are not useful.

- A major flaw is that students don’t have enough time to carefully complete the SET in class; it should be done on-line outside of class time. This needs to be tied to a response incentive.

- A form of standardized student feedback can be useful, however, the SET should not be the only means of assessing teaching.

- The SET appears to be used differently by every department on campus, thus limiting its usefulness as a standardized method of teaching assessment.

- The questions don’t seem relevant and the response categories are ill-defined (comment by a student member of the committee).

- The SET is so flawed that it should be scrapped rather than adopting proposed changes.

In an attempt to find some consensus among committee members, we decided that a basic problem was that we did not understand the purpose of the SET. There seem to be four possible purposes that could be served:

- to facilitate mentoring of teaching faculty by identifying strengths and weaknesses,
- to evaluate worthiness for promotion and tenure,
- as a measurement of student learning
- to provide accountability, i.e. to identify poor teaching and intervene
The committee’s best guess is that the SET as it currently exists is most useful in assessing students’ satisfactions with their courses, which is obviously different from assessing how much they’ve learned or how effective the instructor is in teaching. If the purpose of the SET is to promote the advancement of teaching, or to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching, the committee could revisit the SET and come up with a more useful critique of the proposed changes or other suggestions for changing the form. If the purpose is something else, the committee would have different recommendations.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed changes.
Assessments are anxiety provoking...

1. Write a paragraph explaining the significance of Magellan's expedition.

A GAS MASK, A SMOKE GRENADE AND A HELICOPTER... THAT'S ALL I ASK.
Dissemination

- AOT committee will report results of this survey to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and post the report on the Advancement of Teaching Committee website.

AOT Committee
Margie Haak and Tina Bull, Co-Chairs
Molly Engle
Ken Winograd
Lisa Sarasohn

With special thanks to the following former members:
Ray William, Paula McMillen, Brett Palama, Shane Brown
OBJECTIVE 3
SET/CET Evaluation

Change in reported results

SET/CET data are ranked categories (ordinal) rather than continuous numerical (interval) data
OBJECTIVE 3
SET/CET Evaluation

SET: The class as a whole was...
CET: The educational event as a whole was...

- Not useful
- Moderately useful
- Very useful

Navigation has been disabled so you can complete this online evaluation. Please do NOT press the back button during the online evaluation.
...especially when the relationship to your work is not clear...
OBJECTIVE 2
Recommend reporting practices (cont.)

3. Note that neither measure of central tendency has accompanying measure of variability.
4. Means and medians can be graphed in a similar manner.
5. Include a statement about the change in forms in candidate statement.
OBJECTIVES

1. Identify changes in forms
2. Recommend reporting practices
3. Evaluated SET/CET forms
4. Provide faculty feedback
OBJECTIVE 2
Recommend reporting practices (cont.)

Changes in reported results
a. Previous form reported MEANS with frequencies and without a measure of variability/dispersion.
b. Current form reports MEDIANS with frequencies and without a measure of variability/dispersion.
All OSU instructors

SET/CET forms and questions are parallel for faculty in ~
- Resident instruction
- Extension activities
- E-campus courses
OBJECTIVE 2
Recommend reporting practices (cont.)

Responses for all new items are:
   a. Descriptive, i.e., words with numbers assigned for analysis purposes
   b. Ordinal not interval data
   c. Medians, not means, are the appropriate statistic for central tendency with ordinal data
OBJECTIVE 2
Recommend reporting practices (cont.)

New forms provide response templates for instructor and/or department specified items
a. To assess new teaching practice
b. To assess course-specific information
c. To provide evidence for accreditation
YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WILL HELP INSTRUCTORS CONFIRM QUALITY TEACHING AND IMPROVE TEACHING SKILLS AND METHODS.

1. The course as a whole

2. The instructor's contribution to the course

3. Clarity of course objectives or outcomes

4. Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements

5. Course organization

6. Availability of extra help when needed

7. Instructor's use of various instructional techniques to accommodate differences in learning styles among students

8. Instructor's interest in my learning

9. Instructor's ability to stimulate my thinking more deeply about the subject

10. Instructor's timely feedback to tests and other work

11. Instructor's ability to develop a welcoming classroom environment for all participants

12. Instructor's evaluation of student performance in accordance with course objectives

DEMOGRAPHICS.

13. THE REASON YOU ARE ENROLLED IN THIS COURSE:
   - IT IS REQUIRED
   - IT IS AN ELECTIVE

14. GRADE YOU EXPECT TO RECEIVE IN THIS COURSE:
   - A
   - SAT/PASS
   - B
   - UNSAT/NO PASS
   - C
   - AUDIT
   - D
   - OTHER

15. CLASS STATUS:
   - FRESHMAN
   - SOPHOMORE
   - JUNIOR
   - SENIOR
   - GRADUATE STUDENT
   - OTHER

16. IS THIS COURSE IN YOUR MAJOR?
   - YES
   - NO

17. PERCENT OF THIS CLASS YOU ATTENDED:
   - 0-20%
   - 21-40%
   - 41-60%
   - 61-80%
   - 81-100%

18. YOUR OVERALL GRADE POINT AVERAGE:
   - 0-1.49
   - 1.50-1.99
   - 2.00-2.49
   - 2.50-2.99
   - 3.00-3.49
   - 3.50-4.00
   - 1ST QUARTER STUDENT

19. GENDER:
   - MALE
   - FEMALE
Specific questions for which the instructor wants feedback to improve teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS</th>
<th>VERY POOR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>UNABLE TO RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative comments and suggestions.

On a separate piece of paper, please comment about ways to improve instruction. If you would like written comments to be placed in the instructor's personnel file, you need to write, sign and mail a letter to the appropriate Chair, Head, or Dean.
OBJECTIVE 2
Recommend reporting practices (cont.)

Questions 3 - 12
a. These are criterion referenced items (i.e., compare to a standard)
b. Formative rather than summative information
c. Designed to improve teaching practice
d. Interpretation should be to compare faculty with similar expertise
YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WILL HELP INSTRUCTORS CONFIRM QUALITY TEACHING AND IMPROVE TEACHING SKILLS AND METHODS.

PLEASE FILL-IN THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE, MARK ONLY ONE CIRCLE PER QUESTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The educational event as a whole was</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>UNABLE TO RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor's contribution to the educational event was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clarity of educational objectives was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clarity of how you might use this education was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teaching organization was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Instructor's use of examples was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Instructor's use of teaching aids (slides, overheads, charts, etc.) was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instructor's ability to stimulate my thinking more deeply about the subject was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Instructor's responsiveness to questions was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Instructor's use of participant discussion to enhance my learning was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Instructor's ability to develop a welcoming environment for all participants was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Instructor's skill in making the information useful to me was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your comments will be helpful to improve instruction.

Please comment:
Specific questions for which the instructor wants feedback to improve teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS</th>
<th>VERY POOR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>UNABLE TO RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide feedback on the following question.

If you would like written comments to be placed in the instructor's personnel file, you need to write and sign a letter to the appropriate Staff Chair, Department Head, or Dean.
OBJECTIVE 1
Identify changes in form

Changes in questions
a. New questions focus on teaching behavior
b. Questions address only a single behavior
c. Questions were validated at OSU & elsewhere
d. Space provided for class/discipline specific questions
OBJECTIVE 2
Recommend reporting practices

Questions 1 & 2
a. These are the only norm-referenced (i.e., to compare with others) questions
b. Appropriate to use in comparing across disciplines
c. Most appropriate responses to report for P&T, awards, merit
OBJECTIVE 1
Identify changes in form (cont.)

Changes in scale
a. Old scale was 0 - 4 with word anchors for 0 and 4 only; treated as interval data.
b. New scale is 1 - 6 with words for all numbers; is ordinal data.