

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Advancement of Teaching Committee](#) » Evaluation of Teaching

Advancement of Teaching Committee

Evaluation of Teaching

- [Student Evaluation of Teaching \(SET\)](#)
- [Citizen Evaluation of Teaching \(CET\)](#)
- [SET Recommendations - June 10, 2007](#)

| [Home](#) | [Agendas](#) | [Bylaws](#) | [Committees](#) | [Elections](#) | [Faculty Forum Papers](#) | [Handbook](#) | [Meetings](#) | [Membership/Attendance](#) | [Minutes](#) |

Faculty Senate, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-6203 · 541.737.4344

[Contact us with your comments, questions and feedback](#)

[Copyright](#) © 2008 Oregon State University | [Disclaimer](#)

Valid [xhtml](#).

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Advancement of Teaching Committee](#) » [Evaluation of Teaching](#) » Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)

Advancement of Teaching Committee

Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)

- [Final SET User's Guide](#)
- [Final SET Guidelines](#)

| [Home](#) | [Agendas](#) | [Bylaws](#) | [Committees](#) | [Elections](#) | [Faculty Forum Papers](#) | [Handbook](#) | [Meetings](#) | [Membership/Attendance](#) | [Minutes](#) |

Faculty Senate, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-6203 · 541.737.4344

[Contact us with your comments, questions and feedback](#)

[Copyright](#) © 2008 Oregon State University | [Disclaimer](#)

Valid [xhtml](#).

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Advancement of Teaching Committee](#) » [Evaluation of Teaching](#) » Citizen Evaluation of Teaching (CET)

Advancement of Teaching Committee

Citizen Evaluation of Teaching (CET)

- [Final CET User's Guide](#)
- [Final CET Guidelines](#)

| [Home](#) | [Agendas](#) | [Bylaws](#) | [Committees](#) | [Elections](#) | [Faculty Forum Papers](#) | [Handbook](#) | [Meetings](#) | [Membership/Attendance](#) | [Minutes](#) |

Faculty Senate, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-6203 · 541.737.4344

[Contact us with your comments, questions and feedback](#)

[Copyright](#) © 2008 Oregon State University | [Disclaimer](#)

Valid [xhtml](#).

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 than 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.

User's Guide For the Assessment of Teaching Scan Forms

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)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.

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 size² 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> 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 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/iascmmmt.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 the 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

Baker	BAKE
Benton	BENT
Clackamas	CLAC
Clatsop	CLAT
Columbia	COLU
Coos	COOS
Crook	CROO
Curry	CURR
Deschutes	DESC
Douglas	DOUG
Gilliam	GILL
Grant	GRAN
Harney	HARN
Hood River	HOOD
Jackson	JACK
Jefferson	JEFF
Josephine	JOSE
Klamath	KLAM
Lake	LAKE
Lane	LANE
Lincoln	LINC
Linn	LINN
Malheur	MALH
Marion	MARI
Morrow	MORR
Multnomah	MULT
NWREC	NWRE
Polk	POLK
Sherman	SHER
Tillamook	TILL
Umatilla	UMAT
Hermiston	HERM
Milton-Freewater	MILT
Union	UNIO
Wallowa	WALL
Warm Springs	WARM
Wasco	WASC
Washington	WASH
Wheeler	WHEE
Yamhill	YAMH

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.

COLLEGE	DEPT/ Prog. Leader		Staff Chair (county fac.)
Extension Admin. (EXAD)	CADM		Staff chair teaching
	EESC	Dept	NA
College Ag Sciences (CAS)	EXAD	NA	NA
Ag Resource Econ.	AREC	Dept	yes
Animal Science	ANSC	Dept	yes
Bioresource Engineering	BIOE	Dept	yes
Botany & Pl. Path.	BPP	Dept	yes
Crop & Soil Science	CSS	Dept	yes
Int Plant Prot Center	IPPC	Dept	yes
Fish & Wildlife	FW	Dept	yes
Food Sci & Tech	FST	Dept	yes
Horticulture	HORT	Dept	yes
Range Resources	RR	Dept	yes
Veterinary Med.	VM	Dept	NA
College Forestry (COF)	EXAD	NA	NA
Forest Engineering	FE	Dept/PL	yes
Wood Sci & Engineering	WSE	Dept/PL	yes
Forest Resources	FR	Dept/PL	yes
Forest Science	FS	Dept/PL	yes
College of Health & Human Sciences (CHHS)	EXAD	NA	NA
Family & Comm. Develop.	FCD	Dept/PL	yes
College of Education (COED)	EXAD	NA	NA
4-H & Youth Develop.	FHYD	Dept/PL	yes
Sea Grant (SEAG)	EXAD	NA	NA
Sea Grant ¹	SEAG	Dept/PL	yes

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>). **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>). 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.0)

Sample Narrative Written Questions:

- The comment sheet from the UW might have questions relevant to your teaching (<http://www.washington.edu/oea/iascmmmt.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 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?