

Senate Approved Evaluations Ad-Hoc Committee
April 24, 2006
Minutes

Present: Mary Hazeldine, Chair; Bryan Griffin; Doug Johnson; Abby Lynes, student working with Doug Johnson; Bob Cook; David Robinson; Leslie Furr

1. Old Business

The following is a list of recommendations/thoughts to forward to the Senate. We will meet again at the beginning of the Fall 2006 semester and finalize these recommendations.

- Low response rates for on-line evaluations
- The mode of evaluation (on-line/face to face) should match the teaching environment.
- May hold grades until students complete on-line evaluations (could be a button on the screen to fill out the evaluation or to decide not to fill out the evaluation). If students decide not to fill out the evaluations, they will still be given their grades.
- Send reminders to students to fill out evaluations.
- Frame reminders positively.
- No company external contracts—we can write the programming code for on-line evaluations.
- Charge a learning assessment committee with preparing and improving the evaluation instrument, e.g. appointed by Senate or Provost.
- Do not use written comments in the formal P&T faculty evaluation (only for summative purposes or for decision making).
- No handwritten comments should be given to the faculty member.
- If on-line evaluations, check to ensure written comments are not verbatim or very similar.
- Improve the name of the student evaluations. For example, change the name to student ratings form.
- Develop a way to assess faculty and learning independent of the student evaluations.
- Student evaluations should not be used for rank ordering faculty for promotion and tenure.
- Use cohort/discipline for comparison purposes if used to rank faculty. Otherwise, it is difficult to see absolute differences.
- Remind administrators that 4.0+ is good. (Caution—may reflect easiness of course.)
- Do not use numerical rankings outside the college for promotion and tenure. Use descriptions.
- Give students control over a question or two to make results public if the faculty member allows that.
- Include a statement of the importance of the evaluations in the instructions for administration.
- Make evaluation responses available to students.
- Make evaluations available to the faculty to administer within the last third of the semester.
- Make results available to the faculty before the start of the next semester.
- Consider not rating every course, every semester (possibly based on tenure status).
- Make course assessment be consistent with departmental learning outcomes.
- Consider department specific items with standard items.
- Ensure minimum response rate is met in order to use numerical ratings.
- Add questions on the student evaluations related to study habits.
- Consider adding peer evaluations to the process; compare peer evaluations to student evaluations.
- On-line evaluations produce less paperwork, are easy for students to fill out, saves secretaries work, and saves money due to the paperless nature of the evaluations.
- Recommendations from Griffin's May 2000 study:
 - “Have trained observers attend several classes and then correlate student ratings with observers' ratings.
 - Compare student achievement as measured by a common test across sections of one course to determine whether faculty with higher ratings had students with higher achievement.
 - Follow students' change-of-major decisions over time and link these to faculty ratings in introductory courses in those majors. It is possible that better instructors, as judged by students, are likely to guide more students into a given major areas of study.”

Meeting adjourned at 9:27 a.m.