

DRAFT SET Task Force Implementation Proposal to Faculty Senate

From page 2 of the DRAFT final report:

The proposal presented by the SET Task Force is to implement a flexible, formative student assessment of teaching tool (SAT) in place of the current summative student evaluation of teaching form (SET), with the idea that a more comprehensive, diverse, summative evaluation of teaching be implemented as part of the annual review process. As part of the annual review process faculty would be expected to discuss the frequency and type of formative assessments conducted in each class as well as what actions were taken to improve their teaching. As a final note of critical importance, because formative assessments identify deficiencies in classroom instruction, responses should be solely under the control of faculty. However, to prove that assessments were in fact conducted, it is recommended by the SET Task Force that administrators have access to a list of the items used in each assessment and the timeline/frequency that the assessment were conducted.

Given the broad range of information referenced during the past two years, the SET Task Force sees that the primary purpose of student feedback questionnaires is for improving instruction. Furthermore, the SET Task Force sincerely believes that student feedback to faculty for purposes of improving teaching needs to be *completely independent* from student feedback to administrators for purposes of faculty evaluation. The two major reasons for this change being (1) the perverse incentives created by using responses from student feedback questionnaires for use in evaluation and comparison of faculty, and (2) the potential inherent bias in student evaluation items. Recall, for example, that comparing a summative number to a unit wide or college wide median (or mean) gives experienced faculty an incentive to reduce their quality of teaching in order to help junior faculty get promoted. Furthermore, when such a comparator is used potential bias inherent in the evaluation forms may tend to hinder OSU's progress on diversity.

During the February 2012 Faculty Senate meeting concerns were raised by a couple of unit leaders about losing the summative tools that they currently use for identifying teachers in need of improvement. We have addressed this concern by providing a few options for unit leaders to gain student feedback for purposes of faculty evaluation. A couple options have been specifically cited as ways to gain summative information while simultaneously reducing inherent bias with student questionnaires, as they are currently conducted. Furthermore, by eliminating a summative score, there is no longer a number by which faculty can be compared, which significantly reduces perverse incentives as well as reducing inequities in evaluations resulting from inherent biases. To ascertain whether the perceived benefits of improving instruction and proposed mechanism for identifying instruction in need of improvement are satisfactorily, the SET Task Force suggests implementing the proposed formative assessment tool in a small-scale pilot study.

Below is an outline of how the SET Task Force proposes to proceed.

1. Contact Catherine Williams from OSU Enterprise Computing Services to get back in touch with CollegeNet and double-check CollegeNet's ability and willingness to develop the proposed formative tool (Student Assessment of Teaching: SAT).
2. Contact Carrie Watson from Iota Solutions, who has contacted Bill Loges and Deb Pence a couple of times regarding their online student input tools. Along with Catherine Williams, the SET Task Force could assess what options/ideas they may have for OSU in going forward with SAT.
3. Work with CollegeNet and/or Iota during summer 2012 to develop pilot study. Utilize lessons learned during implementation of ESET (Fall 2011).
4. During summer 2012, meet with Jon Dorbolo from Technology Across the Curriculum to develop technology related items.

5. Two-term (Fall 2012/Winter 2013) trial run (pilot study) using proposed formative tool *in lieu of* existing summative feedback (SET) mechanism. Feedback received from the pilot study would provide the basis for defining the proposal for cross-campus adoption/implementation of SAT (i.e. final proposal). It is anticipated that the final cross-campus adoption proposal would be presented to the Faculty Senate in Spring 2013.
 - a. Who might participate in the pilot study? Ideally at least three diverse units would participate. Four suggestions are provided here:
 - i. College of Education
 - ii. Department of Physics (in the College of Science)
 - iii. Department of Biomedical Sciences (in the College of Veterinary Medicine)
 - iv. Cascades Campus
 - b. How might participation be sought for pilot study?
 - i. Need assurance from university administrators (Vice Provost Warner) that participation will not negatively impact promotion/tenure of individuals in units piloting the study (i.e. lack of SET data).
 - ii. SET Task Force would provide guidelines for faculty regarding how to use SAT tool
 - iii. SET Task Force would provide suggestions for unit leaders regarding:
 1. ways to gain *summative information* regarding teaching. Four options are provided here:
 - a. Student feedback forums (i.e., sit downs with unit leaders and students to get general feedback of courses offered by a unit – not specific for each faculty member)
 - b. Exit interviews by students in the major
 - c. Non participation of faculty (items and frequency sent to unit leader – student responses will not be sent to unit leader)
 - d. Faculty portfolio for PROF
 2. appropriate use of student input (i.e., reminders that anonymous feedback cannot be placed in a faculty members' personnel file)
 - c. What will be considered/studied in pilot study? It is hoped that Assistant Director of Assessment and the Director of Center for Teaching and Learning can assist in assessing effectiveness of:
 - i. Improved learning (as well as input regarding student satisfaction)
 - ii. Improved teaching (as well as input regarding faculty/instructor satisfaction)
 - iii. Summative feedback (as well as input regarding administrator satisfaction)
6. Assess trial run (Winter - Spring 2013).
7. Report back to FSEC and FS with report on trial (Spring 2013)
8. Return to Faculty Senate with formal proposal to:
 - a. Replace existing summative tool (SET) with formative tool (SAT)
 - b. Provide provisions for summative options lost with elimination of current form (SET)
9. Work with CollegeNet and/or Iota to finalize SET for full fledged implementation (Summer 2013)

Note that items 5 through 9 would be added to the DRAFT final report as a “chapter” titled *Implementation* and placed between the existing “chapters” 4 and 5. The “chapter” labeled proposal to Faculty Senate would be changed in the first presentation (Spring 2012) to the faculty senate as a pilot study.