

UCT Meeting Minutes
Friday May 9th, 2008

Present: Sue Barrett, Chris Hepburn (Chair), Jackie Lerner, Bill Petri, Don Hafner, Pete Wilson, Ginny Reinburg, Pat DeLeeuw

The April minutes were approved with no changes.

Pat DeLeeuw reported that a former ERME student, Carolyn Fidelman, looked at the Online Evaluation Questions and commented on them. We made some deletions (1A), and changed the wording on some others. We also added a new question, 3F—"I learned a great deal in this course". Don made all the changes we discussed and distributed it to the committee later on May 9th.

We discussed what guidelines we should recommend for the release of the data.

- All the tabulated-quantified data could be released.
- Only the most recent evaluation of an instructor in a course should be available (i.e., not the last several times the course was evaluated).
- Data should not be released for the first time a course is given by an instructor unless they choose to release the data.
- Enhanced resources are needed to help faculty interpret the student evaluation data and to help faculty who want to improve their teaching

We had some discussion about what should be available and when it should be available. We decided that we need to talk with IT about what was possible, but that an evaluation should be available the last time an instructor taught a specific course and all courses taught by that instructor for the last two years. The evaluations would be up in March for Fall registration and in October for Spring registration. However, there was some discussion about how long to leave the data up on the web, and there was no decision made on this point. We will have time before it goes live to make these decisions.

The next agenda item involved what resources would need to be provided to help both students and faculty interpret and make use of the data. We decided that there were many complex issues to this, ones that we could work on next year. Some of them were

- Get information to students prior to the release to let them know what is going to be available.

- Generate ideas and supports for faculty, chairs, and deans as to how best use the information for faculty development
- Ask Larry Ludlow to come next year for a full discussion of what types of analyses can be done on the data.

Plans for next year:

- Full discussion about how to use the online evaluation data and what resources at the student, faculty and administrative levels are necessary to provide
- Move to a Faculty Teaching Award only (no research award anymore)
- Grade inflation- is it a problem, do we need to do something about it, and if so, what?

Submitted by: Jackie Lerner 5-11-08

UCT Proposed Teaching Evaluation Questions

(revised per UCT meeting of May 9, 2008)

Part A: Note to students: Responses to Part A are anonymously reported to the faculty member, the department chair, the deans, and made available in summary form to other students.

Instructor

1. Which of the following statements apply to this *instructor*?
 - a. The instructor was prepared.
 Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
 - b. The instructor was available for help outside of class.
 Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
 - c. The instructor returned assignments/tests conscientiously.
 Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
 - d. The instructor showed enthusiasm about the subject matter.
 Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
 - e. The instructor stimulated interest in the subject matter.
 Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
 - f. The instructor's explanations were clear.
 Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
 - g. The instructor treated students with respect.
 Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
2. How would you rate this *instructor* overall as a teacher?
 Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor

Course

3. Which of the following statements apply to this *course*?
 - a. The course was well organized.
 Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
 - b. The course generally followed the syllabus.
 Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
 - c. Class attendance was necessary for learning the course material.
 Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
 - d. The course was intellectually challenging.
 Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
 - e. Compared to similar courses (i.e. core, major, etc.), this course required:
 Much More Effort More Effort About the Same Effort Less Effort Much Less Effort
4. How would you rate this *course* overall?
 Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor

Part B. Note to students: Answers to these open-ended questions go only to the instructor, the department chair, and the deans.

1. What are the strengths of this course?
2. How could the instructor improve the course?
3. Would you recommend this course to other students, majors etc.? Why or why not?
4. Additional comments:

Part C. Faculty Prepared Questions. Note to students: Answers to Part C go only to the instructor.

Current Teaching Evaluation Questions

Part A.

1. What rating does this instructor deserve as a teacher?
Poor Acceptable Good Very Good Excellent
2. Regular class attendance was necessary for learning the required content.
Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
3. The course helped me to acquire factual information.
Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
4. The course helped me to understand principles and concepts.
Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
5. Instructor was available for help outside of class.
Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree
6. Compared to other courses having the same credits and hours, the time required for this course was: .
Much Less Less The Same More Much More

Part B. Note to students: Answers to these open-ended questions go only to the instructor.

1. What are the strengths of this instructor?
2. How could this instructor improve the course?
3. Additional comments:

Part C. Faculty Prepared Questions. Note to students: Answers to Part C go only to the instructor.

UCT Guidelines for the Potential Release of Electronic Course Evaluation Data to Students and the BC Community—5-9-08

The guidelines include:

1. The release would only be available to the BC community and be password protected.
2. The release would include all the tabulated material, but only the tabulated material, in a quantified format similar to that which a faculty member receives, perhaps without the Department and College averages.
3. The data would not be released for the first time an instructor gives a particular course, whether a new faculty member or an experienced faculty member giving a course for the first time, unless they choose to release the data.
4. Only the most recent evaluation of an instructor in a given course should be available as well as the data from the instructors other courses during the past two years (or four semesters of teaching).
5. The release would be at the time of advising and registration for courses, i.e., approximately mid-March for the spring registration period and Nov. 1 for the fall registration period. This data should be linked to other information about a course. For instance, if a student were to be interested in GE 132 taught by Prof. Hepburn, they could go to the web page listing the course description and the most recent syllabus. On this page would also be links to the student evaluation data. Link (A) would take the student to the most recent evaluation of GE 132 as taught by Prof. Hepburn (but not as taught by others). Link B would take the student to the evaluations of all Prof. Hepburn's courses during the past two years or four semesters. Note, since every course is not taught every year, it means that some data will need to be maintained in files for a couple of years. It would not be useful to provide data to students more than 4 or 5 years old if a course hasn't been taught in this time.
6. At the May meeting the UCT finalized its recommendation for a new student course questionnaire. Both Pat DeLeeuw and Don Hafner have this and I've attached a copy. The UCT recommends that, if possible, the new questionnaire be used for the fall evaluation period next December (2008). The new questionnaire has essentially the same format as the current form but with more questions. Thus, there shouldn't be any technical issues with it. We would then hope to be able to go online with the release of data to students using only the results of this new form starting next spring, i.e., about mid-March. Since there will be only a limited number of courses that are taught both spring and fall semesters, it will allow for the gradual implementation of the release system. Gradually, the database of student evaluations will be built up. We do not believe release of any data from evaluations previous to next fall (i.e., those using the old form) should be released.

7. Faculty will have to be informed prior to the fall semester evaluation period of the planned release of the data.

8. Enhanced resources may be needed to help faculty members interpret the student evaluation data and to help faculty who want to improve their teaching. The UCT plans to discuss this in more detail in the fall.