

Attending: Mary Handley, Ming Ivory, Zack Bortolot, Morgan Benton, Joe Marchal

We discussed the list of recommendations from the March 26 meeting and Ming's email follow up to that meeting, clarifying what we want to send up to Eric. Mary will send a complete draft of our final report to all members for comment, and will then report to Eric. This was the last meeting of the committee for this semester, but members agreed that they are willing to meet next semester to complete work on recommendation 1.

#### Final Report outline/draft

Introduction (Mary): our committee's charge, some info about our meetings and timeline, what the final report represents.

Some questions to refer to in the introduction:

- A student perception of teaching instrument isn't a one way tool. It sends a message to the students about what we value. What message do we want to send?
- Can student evaluations of teaching facilitate our program assessment? What program characteristics do we want to evaluate?

Intro to the university SPOT process (Morgan): some background info on the university committee's process and how it has impacted the work of this committee.

#### **Recommendation 1. Develop a new end of course assessment instrument.**

**Add: continue this to Fall when univ. items are available**

**Add: items to reflect student actions (Ming #8)**

There most likely will not be university-mandated items for student evaluation of teaching. The university group will be developing a bank of good items that are reliable, valid, and based on literature best practices. Each department can draw from this bank as they select items for their evaluations. We recommend the following:

- a. ISAT will select items after the university committee's item bank becomes available.
- b. The unique needs and culture of the ISAT department (and its four programs) should be considered as items are selected.
- c. Some items should be mandatory for all courses in every program. Programs, academic teams, course teams, and individual instructors will be able to include additional items on the evaluation.
- d. All items should focus on things that students are competent to evaluate (based on literature)
- e. There should not be a separate "lab" portion of the instrument—our teaching methods do often include hands-on work in "lecture" sections.
- f. We should focus on items that are relevant to a wide range of content and teaching methods

#### **Recommendation 2. The end of course student evaluations of teaching should be administered in a way that ensures fair, consistent, and reliable assessment.**

- Administering the end of course student evaluations should include (at least) the following elements:
  - Online administration with the Blue Response system adopted by JMU
  - Consistent practices for informing students when, why, and how to complete the evaluations.
  - End of course evaluations should be inclusive of the whole program, including special topics, capstone, and senior project classes
- Most of this administration will be handled at the university level.

- We should investigate possible ways to evaluate courses with low enrollment in each section, but multiple sections (like ISAT 492, 493). While the results would not be useful for instructor evaluation they could be very valuable for program evaluation.
- Timing: On-line courses will use the software in Summer 2012; Fall 2012 will have some volunteers use it for their courses. University-wide will be no earlier than Spring 2013 and probably more likely Fall 2013.  
Add: we will volunteer to be early adopters/ Morgan will keep us informed.

**Recommendation 3. Faculty should be encouraged to use multiple methods of evaluating teaching in addition to the end of course evaluation.**

- The CFI Teaching Analysis Poll (TAP) is a good model for the mid-semester evaluation; other methods are also available
- Some instructors may want to coordinate a mid-semester survey with the end of course evaluation, to monitor improvement. The Blue Response software may be able to do this.
- Additional ISAT faculty should be trained to lead TAPs. Younger faculty should be encouraged to use CFI-led TAPs so they get “credit” for participation at that level.

**Recommendation 4. Clarify how end of course evaluation data will be used, reported, and accessed.**

- In Blue Response, items that are added by individual instructors will only be visible to the instructor.
- Courses with low enrollment will need special handling to preserve student privacy. It will be possible to strip out instructor data and combine sections to get program level data for courses like ISAT 492, 493.
- Data for Items required at dept. and program level will be accessible to instructor, DH, and PAC. Items added by teams, course teams, or individuals will only be visible to individuals.
- Now we have all evaluation stats available to DH, PAC, instructor. But PAC tells candidates to self-report their stats.

**Recommendation 5. Multiple reporting formats and groupings should be developed.**

JMU will have some standard report formats, and we might be able to create our own reports. The software can handle team teaching. Some ideas for reports and groupings are:

- Possible course and student related sub-groupings for comparison include:
  - Course level (100, 200, etc.)
  - Majors/non-majors
  - Class size
- Possible peer comparisons—by academic level? By program?
- Additional reporting elements that would be useful:
  - Multiple years
  - Student comment
  - Box and whisker plots
  - Reliability of measures

**Recommendation 6. Anyone who will use course evaluation data to make decisions (PAC, Department head) should be trained.**

This recommendation “closes the loop” on the summative assessment aspect of SPOT evals

Add: PAC should be told how to interpret these measures. May need to look at PAC guidelines and procedures, criteria for teaching and standards for presenting.

Add: possible resources for this are IR, CFI, CARS, the university committee, social scientists in ISAT

- Develop training modules for new PAC members (similar to IRB?) that are based on best practice
- Training should include how to evaluate multiple measures of teaching effectiveness as well as how to interpret the end of course evaluations
- Clarify how evaluations will be used in decision making.
- Clarify what information will be given to PAC—should faculty control what is sent or have all data/reports go directly to the PAC?

**Recommendation 7. Faculty should receive training and information about teaching evaluation**

**Add: This recommendation “closes the loop” on the formative assessment aspect of SPOT evaluations.**

Evaluation of teaching includes a much broader context than just student perceptions on an end of course survey. The university committee report will have a lot of this information. We should evaluate their report for applicability to ISAT.

- Elements of good teaching
- Possible measures for evaluation of teaching
- Strengths and limitations of the possible measures
- How to locate and implement evaluation measures
- How to evaluate yourself
- How to document your teaching and prepare packets for promotion/tenure

**Recommendation 8. Improve mentorship of new and part-time faculty**

- Consider training mentors
- Assign mentors according to the goals and expectations of the new faculty member