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Introduction

Fall Semester 2011, Provost Robert Sternberg appointed a taskforce charged with developing recommendations for the evaluation of instruction. The taskforce was convened December 2, 2011 and held monthly meetings from January through May 2012. The task force is comprised of faculty members recognized for excellence in teaching from each college at Oklahoma State University. One non-university member, whose background is human resources, public relations and development, was appointed. Ex-officio members were also appointed because of their expertise related to various topics reviewed by the task force.

The goal of the 2012 Taskforce is to recommend the best practices for the collection of data that can improve instruction at Oklahoma State University-Stillwater. While student surveys of instruction are used at most universities as one data source, the 2012 Taskforce recommends several other best practices. The four data sources (best practices) studied are:

1. Student Survey of Instruction (SSI or Student Ratings)
2. The Teaching Portfolio
3. Peer Review of Instruction
4. Student Focus Groups

The Taskforce reviewed policies and procedures for annual performance review and promotion and tenure at 8 land grant universities comparable to OSU-Stillwater. The criteria for judging the quality of individual faculty performance in teaching is summarized by institution in Attachment 1: Information from Institutions. All institutions reviewed require item 1 and some form of item 2. Three institutions, University of Arkansas, North Carolina State University, and Texas A&M University, require peer review of instruction and 2 others (University of Georgia and Iowa State University) suggest its use but do not mandate it.

Student Survey of Instruction

Data collected from department heads at Oklahoma State University indicates that student survey of instruction (SSI) utilizing the form and process from University Assessment and Testing is the primary source of data required in the evaluation of instruction. Some departments utilize different evaluation instruments and some augment the SSI form with course or program-specific questions.

The current Student Survey of Instruction (SSI) system has been in place for many years. A university taskforce to study the evaluation of instruction was appointed in 1999 and their final
report was issued in February 2002. That group focused on student surveys. Their executive summary is reprinted here:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Force to study evaluation of instruction was formed to investigate the following aspects of the student evaluation of instruction: purpose, process, reliability and validity, and support for the instrument.

Purpose: The purposes of the evaluation of instruction are to enhance the effectiveness of the teaching, to improve the course, and to contribute student evaluation data that departments may choose to use for promotion, tenure and award decisions. Based on these purposes the Task Force recommends that:

- The evaluation data with student comments be made available in a timely manner so that instructors can improve their teaching before the next semester begins.
- Proven, discipline-based mentors be utilized to assist developing faculty to attain higher teaching quality, particularly for faculty who consistently receive low teaching evaluations.
- Appropriate statistical analysis of the student evaluation data be provided to instructors and administrators, including summary statistics accompanied by instructions for interpretation of the results of the analysis.

Process: To improve the process the Task Force recommends that:

- The Student Survey of Instruction (SSI) be automated through the use of a secure link on the Student Information System (SIS) student system.
- The on-line form contain minimal global questions (perhaps four or five) to be used University wide, other questions chosen by the Instructor, Department, Unit and/or College and that text boxes are provided on the form for specific questions the instructor may wish to pose about certain aspects of the course or the teaching.

Reliability and Validity: To enhance the reliability and validity of the Student Survey of Instruction the Task Force recommends that:

- Reliability on the common items will be computed biannually and reported to the Faculty Council. Aggregated data will not be provided at the college or departmental level to preclude cross departmental and cross college comparisons or inappropriate uses in promotion and tenure.
- A process be put into place which handles submissions of survey information in such a manner to minimize errors.
- To enhance the students' perception of worth of the survey the Task Force recommends that students be informed how evaluations are utilized.
- Academic Departments be given responsibility for developing questions beyond the minimal University-wide group of four or five that will assess teaching and other course attributes in a way that will be useful to those who are expected to use the results.

Support for the Instrument: The Task Force recommends that support for the SSI Instrument from the academic units and the colleges be demonstrated in the following ways:
• Deans be assigned responsibility to ensure that all academic units within their purview prepare questionnaires, and to monitor use of these instruments

Appendices are provided detailing
  a. A Proposal for an Automated Student Survey of Instruction: SSI on SIS
  b. Possible Survey Questions: Global and Department-Specific

The 2012 Taskforce reaffirms these recommendations as the basis for improving student surveys.

The Taskforce also reviewed:
1. Current survey of instruction (SSI) (see Attachment 2)
2. Proposal to enhance current SSI system (see Attachment 3). The following issues have been identified with the current system:
   a. Cumbersome and slow
   b. A large number of forms are incorrectly completed
   c. Little flexibility for addition of questions that are program specific
   d. University Assessment and Testing (UAT) has archive of scores for past 3 years but no archive for written comments.
   e. The paper and pencil process is expensive, time consuming and not environmentally friendly.
3. Examples of student survey of instruction forms with departmental enhancements (Attachments 4, 5 and 6)

Best Practices 1: We recommend that the University adopt a new Student Survey of Instruction instrument that focuses on student learning and effort rather than on teacher performance (see attachment 7).
1. Oversight resides in the Office of Academic Affairs and implementation resides with University Assessment and Testing. We recommend that oversight be assigned to the Instruction Council for development, implementation and review of student survey of instruction instruments.
2. Survey questions should be reviewed at least every 3 years for relevancy to the instructional mission of the university
3. The survey should be conducted using the best on-line technology to secure good response rates from students
4. Survey instruments should allow departments to add questions specific to their programs and courses
5. Incentives should be developed to increase student participation. Institutions that implement on-line surveys report a decrease in student response rates compared to in-class paper evaluations. Various strategies to improve response rates include:
   a. Instructors give extra credit
   b. Public disclosure of responses to key questions
   c. Games and prizes
   d. Persistence in reminding students
   e. Instructor promotion and enthusiasm for the program
6. Consideration should be given to public disclosure of results to a few (3-5) general questions. Some state legislatures, Missouri for example, have mandated the public
disclosure of survey results. Other land grant universities have voluntarily implemented similar programs (North Carolina State University for example).

Best Practices 2: We recommend that colleges, schools, departments, and units adopt and implement teaching portfolios.

Increasingly, universities are adopting teaching portfolios as a means to document instructional expertise of faculty. The information contained in teaching portfolios is important for the process of annual review and promotion and tenure of instructional faculty. Teaching portfolios might contain the following information:

1. **Personal Statement from the Teacher.** Write a single paragraph of prose that is open-ended without constraint, requirement or criteria. Include personal reasons for why one desires to teach; personal attributes where one might feel gifted for teaching; or personal experiences where one feels “led” to teaching.

2. **Philosophical Outline**
   a. State your overall objective in teaching. Include philosophical statements on teaching to both traditional classrooms and the graduate student/research student environment.
   b. Include an outline of what you consider important—philosophically and over-arching so that this discussion is NOT about individual courses.
   c. Describe the type of person you want our graduates to be.
   d. Describe the experiences from which we want our students to benefit.

3. **Content:**
   a. Listing of courses taught
      1) Course Number and Course Title
      2) Number of students enrolled
      3) Contact hours taught in lecture
      4) Contact hours taught in laboratory
   b. Syllabi for each course taught, including course objectives
   c. Statement of teaching philosophy for particular courses
   d. Summary of instructional design, delivery and grading practices
   e. Summary of student course surveys
   f. Copies of teaching resources
   g. Notes
   h. Copies of or links to presentation resources (Computer based programs, video captured lectures and other media)
   i. Scholarly publications or presentations related to teaching
   j. Evidence used by faculty member to gather feedback on teaching effectiveness
   k. Faculty course assessment
   l. Peer review reports
   m. Awards and other recognitions of excellence in teaching
Best Practices 3: We recommend the development of a University-wide peer coaching and review process for improvement of teaching and learning.

Peer review of instruction is an effective practice that enhances faculty development by providing constructive feedback. It is also a valuable way to assess course and curriculum effectiveness.

At Oklahoma State University, peer review of instruction is neither mandated nor widely practiced. In a recent survey at OSU, 2 departments report using peer review for faculty appraisal and development and for promotion and tenure decisions. Policy for the Center for Veterinary Health Sciences encourages peer review but it is not mandated. Several land grant universities mandate peer review of instruction. The procedures vary among institutions but the basic precepts are fairly uniform (see attachment 1).

Definition: Peer review of instruction might include the following components:

- Review of all instructional resources such as notes, media presentations, instructional (behavioral, learning) objectives, on-line teaching materials and examinations
- Review of the course syllabus
- In class review of presentations
- Review of video captured presentations
- Review of scholarly publications related to teaching
- Review of books, book chapters, and other published instructional materials
- Review of student ratings and student comments

Who Does the Review: Peer review of instruction is best accomplished by a faculty colleague (or faculty committee) that is knowledgeable of the discipline and is experienced with effective pedagogy and assessment. The reviewer(s) issues a written report to the department head/unit director and the faculty member. A standardized report can be developed which improves consistency of the review (see attachments 8, 9, and 10). We recommend that faculty involved in conducting peer reviews be recognized and/or compensated for their scholarly efforts.

Timing: Assistant professors and graduate teaching assistants should be reviewed annually. Tenured faculty should be reviewed at least once every 3 years. Review includes every course in which the instructor has assignment unless exempted by the department head.

Policies and Procedures: Policies and procedures for peer review of instruction are established by each department or unit. It is the responsibility of the department head or unit director to initiate the peer review process.

University Support: The Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence (ITLE) offers a broad array of faculty development programs addressing teaching and research topics. Beginning in Spring 2012, faculty have the option to pursue Certificate programs. Finally, ITLE offers a program that reviews instructors teaching materials and in class presentations. This program is not a substitute for peer review. We recommend that faculty support provided by the Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence (ITLE) be continued and enhanced.
Best Practices 4: We recommend that course directors, department heads and unit directors implement student focus groups to provide insight into the reasons and influences that underlie student ratings of instruction.

Student focus groups can be an effective way to gather data on courses, instructors, and curriculum. A recent article reported the effectiveness of student focus groups in veterinary medical education.\(^1\) Student focus groups provide greater insight into student perceptions of course objectives, format and content. When these findings are considered in the redevelopment of the course, student experiences and perceptions of the course format and content improve.

Focus groups used during the course can provide instructors valuable information regarding things that might be altered to improve course and teaching effectiveness (see Attachment 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>Information (websites; policies and forms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Arkansas</td>
<td><strong><a href="http://fulbright.ualr.edu/resources/documents/hist_personnel.pdf">http://fulbright.ualr.edu/resources/documents/hist_personnel.pdf</a></strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria for Annual Performance Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each year the chair will evaluate the professional record of the department faculty. This evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>will include a specific evaluation of each faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service according to the general standards described in the College Personnel Document. Where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate, both quality and quantity will be considered in all three categories. Visiting and adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faculty will be evaluated by the same standards used to evaluate all other faculty. Non-classified staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>will be judged according to the functions they perform and the responsibilities they bear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria for judging the quality of individual faculty performance in Teaching will include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. student evaluation of classroom teaching assignments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. peer evaluation of classroom teaching assignments when allowed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. supervision of graduate student dissertations or theses, special graduate student tutorials or research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>projects;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. supervision of honors theses, senior theses or independent study projects;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. development of new courses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. student advising;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. other special pedagogical efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Georgia</td>
<td><strong><a href="http://www.ctl.uga.edu/teach_asst/TAHandbook/concludingthecourse.html#evaluatingteacherperformance">http://www.ctl.uga.edu/teach_asst/TAHandbook/concludingthecourse.html#evaluatingteacherperformance</a></strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSESSING AND EVALUATING TEACHER PERFORMANCE**

One assessment of teaching effectiveness is student ratings. While faculty members often question the validity of student ratings, over 2,000 studies have shown a correlation between student ratings and average scores on achievement tests. Although students are not particularly good judges of a teacher's knowledge of the subject, they are very capable of assessing an instructor's preparedness, organization, availability, and fairness.

At the University of Georgia, specific policies and procedures for all facets of course evaluation are generally determined at the division or department level, but each class should conclude with some form of student evaluation of the course and the instructor's performance. Students should complete course evaluations well before the last day of class if possible, and those evaluations should remain sealed until after you have posted your final grades.
In addition to the end-of-semester evaluation, you can have your students evaluate your course and your teaching at mid-term or even earlier. In many ways, mid-term evaluations are better because you can use the feedback you get from students to address concerns they have and perhaps change aspects of the course or teaching. A mid-term evaluation can be as easy as asking students to answer anonymously the following items: (1) What are one or two specific things your instructor does that help you learn in this course? (2) What are one or two specific things your instructor does that hinder or interfere with your learning? (3) Give your instructor one or two specific, practical suggestions on ways to help you improve your learning in this course (Angelo and Cross).

When you get the opportunity to view the student evaluations for a class you are teaching or have just completed, prepare yourself. Teaching is an intensely personal matter for most teachers, and many approach the first evaluation of their teaching with trepidation. Even the most experienced teachers sometimes feel this uncertainty at evaluation time. Even the most accomplished teachers admit having to fight occasional feelings of defensiveness when negative aspects are mentioned in an evaluation of their teaching. This response is perfectly natural. If you believe you are doing your best, it hurts to discover that you still have shortcomings—until you realize that the knowledge of your shortcomings gives you the insight and opportunity you need to improve.

Besides student evaluations, there are other assessments of teaching effectiveness, such as peer reviews, critiques by your supervisor or major professor, video recordings, and teaching portfolios. Used together, these different forms of assessment provide opportunities for reflection on teaching that is one of the most consistent characteristics of the most effective teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iowa State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISU does not have a set policy/procedure for evaluating teaching. Although it does state in the faculty handbook that student teaching evaluations will be considered as part of the promotion and tenure review process. Each department approaches it in their own way and in some cases using an evaluation tool unique to the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One exception is the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. They have a college wide student evaluation of teaching used by each department. There does seem to be 2 universal questions that I've seen on evaluations university wide: Instructor overall and Course overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advisory board for our Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching completed an extensive review of student evaluation of teaching a couple of years ago and we've posted much of their findings to our Center's website <a href="http://www.celt.iastate.edu/set/effective.html">http://www.celt.iastate.edu/set/effective.html</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kansas State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University Handbook is online (<a href="http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/hbbook">http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/hbbook</a>). General university policies related to faculty evaluations are in Section C, specifically C30.1 - C31.8. General statements about the evaluation of teaching are in C32.2 - C32.3. The university's expectations regarding the use of student ratings of classroom instruction are in C34.1 - C34.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each academic department is responsible for the development of criteria, standards and guidelines for the evaluation of faculty, including the evaluation of their teaching. The departmental documents are posted online by the Office of Academic Personnel (http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/add).

Kansas State University offers two student ratings systems for faculty and graduate teaching assistants -- the IDEA System and the TEVAL System. Both were developed at Kansas State and are administered by the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL). Information about both systems is on the CATL website (http://www.k-state.edu/catl/ratings.html). IDEA was developed in the early 1970s and has been made available to other institutions through The IDEA Center since 1976. TEVAL is used only at Kansas State. Both systems have an electronic version.

We do not have a form used for class observations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Univ. of Nebraska</th>
<th><a href="http://www.unl.edu/syc/caa/teaching@unl/opportunities.shtml">http://www.unl.edu/syc/caa/teaching@unl/opportunities.shtml</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals will be evaluated according to norms established for them related to the faculty's collective responsibility to teach, to advise, to engage in research and creative activity, to make research findings and new knowledge known through publication or equivalent demonstration, and to provide public and institutional service......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each unit shall refine these broad criteria in areas of teaching, research, and service in ways that reflect the discipline and its mission. The refined criteria shall be applied to all faculty members in ways which equitably reflect each one's particular responsibilities and assignments. How the unit criteria apply to a faculty member's own set of duties should be made clear at the time of appointment and reviewed in the annual evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 All courses delivered by faculty of NC State University must be evaluated by students each time each course is taught except as indicated in 3.5 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Faculty or a departmental designate must explain to students how evaluations will be administered for their class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Peer review is to be conducted for all faculty with teaching assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.1 Peer review of professors must be completed every five years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 Peer review of associate professors must be completed every three years.

3.3.3 Peer review of assistant professors must be completed annually.

3.3.4 Peer review of non-tenure track faculty with 0.75 FTE or greater must be completed annually for the first three years and then every three years.

3.4 In addition to student evaluations and peer review, faculty evaluations may include other measures of teaching effectiveness such as teaching portfolios, exit interviews, and alumni surveys. For additional resources related to the peer review of teaching see departmental guidelines and the NC State Guide on Peer Review of Teaching.

3.5 Courses that have enrollments too low to insure anonymity of student evaluations (n ≤ 4) or that do not present course material (e.g., undergraduate and graduate research, internships, independent study, supervised teaching) will not be evaluated using the university evaluation instrument. Other exemptions must be approved by the Provost.

4.1 Student Evaluation Instruments

The university instrument for evaluation of instruction (ClassEval) consists of a set of core closed-ended and open-ended questions, and a section(s) for optional approved questions that may be added by the teacher, department or college.

4.2 Peer Evaluation Instrument

The development of an instrument(s) for documenting peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness is a departmental responsibility. However, the instrument used in the evaluation must contain the general requirements specified below.

4.2.1 The instrument must address the wide range of strategies, media and materials used in achieving learning objectives.

4.2.2 The instrument must include categories such as instructor organization, instructional strategies, choice of content, mastery of content, presentation skills, instructional materials and/or media, interaction with students and additional items appropriate for laboratory, clinic, studio or field settings.

4.2.3 The instrument must include a section for comments and other observations relevant to the discipline or type of class. Examples of peer evaluation instruments, including some for distance education courses, may be found in references listed in related information above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty Members. Tenured faculty have proven their ability to contribute significantly in their discipline and to work independently and productively in their field. In this document we affirm and strongly defend the importance of tenure at the University of Missouri. By fostering creativity and protecting academic freedom, tenure safeguards faculty from unfair dismissal based on arbitrary or discriminatory practices, thus encouraging the constant search for truth that is the hallmark of the University. Under this policy or any other university policy, academic tenure should be revoked only with just cause, and may only be done in accordance with the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University, section 310.020 C.1. However, tenure does not protect faculty from the consequences of not performing satisfactorily their duties to the University. It is in the best interest of the faculty as a whole to ensure that each faculty member contributes fully to the institution throughout that individual's career.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Performance Review of Tenured Faculty Not Holding Full-Time Administrative Positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The tenured faculty of each department or unit will develop and publish minimum standards for overall satisfactory performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Every tenured faculty member, including those with part-time administrative positions, will submit a signed annual report describing her/his activities in research, teaching and service. The annual report will be reviewed by the chair. In this document the term chair will be used to mean the appropriate unit director (e.g., chair, unit administrator, area coordinator, etc.) or evaluation committee of the unit following normal unit practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Texas A&M | The current policy and procedure for evaluating teaching at TAMU is set in our University’s T&P guidelines (http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/tenure_promotion/DOF_Tenure_Guidelines.pdf). It requires (1) peer evaluation of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods, as part of the determination of the scope, rigor, and quality of the candidate's course offerings; (2) student ratings of teaching, with comments on these evaluations by peers: Complete longitudinal summaries (chronological and in tabular form) of the student ratings must be presented, with numerical data set in the context of departmental standards and norms; and (3) peer evaluation of other teaching contributions of value to the department, such as the direction of graduate students and undergraduate researchers, participation in student development programs, curriculum development, development of new courses or |

| | |
substantial revision of existing courses, pedagogical publications, textbook and other instructional materials, participation in honors programs, awards or recognition for distinguished teaching, and other teaching-related activities. See page 14 of the guideline.

We are in the process of improving the process for evaluating teaching based on the recommendations of the Committee on Faculty Teaching Performance Evaluation of the Faculty Performance Evaluations Task Force (http://provost.tamu.edu/initiatives/councils-task-forces-folder/councils-task-forces/faculty-performance-evaluation/faculty-performance-evaluation-task-force). A general framework (in the form of a matrix) for faculty teaching performance evaluation was developed based on the literature, experiences of peer institutions, and our own experience. The matrix identified components of teaching to be evaluated and recommended indicators associated with each component, as well as recommended sources of data including student, peer, administrator, and self evaluations. This framework is to be customized for use by individual departments and colleges.

The Center for Teaching Excellence under the Office of Dean of Faculties is conducting a multi-year study funded by the Texas A&M Association of Former Students through the Provost's Office to develop and test a framework and associated tools for effective practice of peer review of teaching along with a discipline-based approach for implementation that promotes faculty buy-in and sustainability. The project is in its second year and conducting pilot studies with selected departments. A Peer Review of Teaching Guide (http://learning.tamu.edu/resource/peer-review-teaching-guide) is available on the Texas A&M faculty Teaching and Learning Portal. It contains a few sample forms that departments can customize.

In addition we are looking at replacing our student teaching evaluation tool. We have discussed this issue with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate and they are leaning toward a tool we pointed to them called IDEA. The IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction of IDEA Center (http://www.theideacenter.org/node/5) seems to be a superior validated question set for evaluating and improving teaching and learning and it offers opportunity for providing a norm and comparing to peer institutions. Using their standard web-based system is not entirely appealing and we are looking into using our newly acquired Blackboard Learn that comes with a system (without validated question set) for doing student evaluation. Not sure if they've done this with other institutions, but it seems this could be an appealing business approach for IDEA Center to recruit more institutions and make their database more powerful.
STUDENT SURVEY OF INSTRUCTION – OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Student surveys are conducted for every instructor and course at Oklahoma State University. Information gained from this survey will be useful to the instructor, the department, students, and administrators responsible for instruction at OSU. You are asked to give some information about yourself, then your views of the INSTRUCTOR and then your views of the COURSE. The reverse side of this form has space for written comments.

All questions below are to be answered by blackening with #2 pencil the appropriate answer space at the bottom of the page. Please make broad pencil marks that completely fill the area indicated. Do not mark beyond the edges of the circles, and erase any pencil marks you wish to delete.

Items 1 through 5 mark your responses in answer spaces 1 through 5 below.

1. My college is: A Agriculture B Arts and Sciences C Business D Education E Engineering F Graduate G Human Environmental Sciences H School of Technology I Veterinary Medicine J None of these

2. Classification: A Freshman B Sophomore C Junior D Senior E Graduate or Special

3. Purpose for taking course: A Major B Related to major C General Studies D Elective

4. Course was required: A yes B no

5. Type of course: A Lecture B Lab C IPI D Short Course E Other

Items 6 through 12 RANK THE INSTRUCTOR using this scale:

6. Preparation and organization
7. Effort devoted to teaching
8. Presentation of material
9. Knowledge of subject
10. Ability to explain subject matter
11. Positive attitude toward students
12. Overall INSTRUCTOR appraisal

Items 13 through 19 give your views of THE COURSE using this scale:

13. I learned a lot in this course.
14. The workload was appropriate for the hours of credit.
15. Assignments were relevant and useful.
16. Testing and evaluation procedures were good.
17. Students were adequately involved.
18. This course was worthwhile to me.
19. Overall, this was a good COURSE.

After marking your remarks on this side of the form, please add any additional comments on the reverse side.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information about yourself</th>
<th>Rank the INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>Views of the COURSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABCDEFGHIJ</td>
<td>ABCDE</td>
<td>ABCDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1111111111</td>
<td>6 11111</td>
<td>10 11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCDE</td>
<td>ABCDE</td>
<td>ABCDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 11111</td>
<td>7 11111</td>
<td>11 11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCD</td>
<td>ABCDE</td>
<td>ABCDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1111</td>
<td>8 11111</td>
<td>12 11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>ABCDE</td>
<td>ABCDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 111</td>
<td>9 11111</td>
<td>16 11111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III. Please add any comments you wish about the following:

1. Course

2. Instructor

3. Instruction

4. Teaching assistants

5. Laboratory, practicum, or discussion section

6. Work Load

7. Examinations

8. Grading

9. Textbook

10. Other comments

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
Overview of the Current System
The current Student Survey of Instruction (SSI) system has been in place for many years. The steps of the process are as follows:
1. Prior to the start of the semester, UAT orders materials from Scantron and customizes any changes from the prior year.
2. The Provost sends a memo reminding administrators and faculty members about the process.
3. Department decides whether it will use the university form (SSI) or use its own, departmentally-developed form. Departments using departmentally-developed forms must either support this process entirely internally or work out an arrangement with UAT (on a fee-for-service basis).
4. UAT requests a list of all course sections and enrollments from IRIM after the drop/add period.
5. This list is sent to representatives in each college (primarily associate deans) who are asked to report whether or not each course section will need a SSI packet created.
6. These lists are sent back to UAT for compilation.
7. UAT formats the list and arranges with University Mailing Services to pick up materials for envelope printing, stuffing, and delivery.
8. University Mailing Services prints the course information on each envelope, stuffs the appropriate number of materials into each envelope, and delivers them to the departments.
9. Department secretaries deliver the packets to faculty members along with instructions.
10. Faculty members administer the surveys to their courses near the end of the semester. A student returns the packet to the departmental office.
11. Departmental representative checks the packet for completeness, and delivers all packets to UAT for scanning.
12. UAT scans packets and troubleshoots (instructor sheets that are missing, incorrectly filled out, do not match a course in the database, etc.).
13. UAT attempts to reconcile scanned packets and the course data list received at the beginning of the semester. Incongruities that cannot be resolved are returned to the departments for clarification.
14. Text data is taken from the scanner, and converted to the appropriate format for scoring.
15. Data file is sent to IRIM for scoring. IRIM returns text printout and printout of errors to UAT and to a university print shop for printing.
16. University print shop prints the scores in triplicate and delivers the scores to Academic Affairs.
17. Academic Affairs sorts the printouts and has them delivered to the departments.
18. After ensuring the scoring is as accurate as possible, UAT asks University Mailing Services to return the packets back to the departments for distribution.
19. Departments receive the packets and the scoring documents and distribute them to the faculty members.

Why Consider Enhancements?
- Current system is cumbersome and slow. This is particularly an issue for the fall course evaluations because many faculty members need the evaluation data for their tenure packets early in the spring.
- Too many instructor information forms are incorrectly completed. UAT has modified the form again this fall to decrease the number of errors, but too often course evaluation data cannot be linked to the correct course.
- There is no flexibility in the current system for the addition of questions or modification of questions at the course or department level (other than departments using completely different forms).
- UAT has an archive of scores from the last three years. No archive is available for students' written comments. Requests for data from the archive have to go through me and a manual process for sharing those data.
- The use of paper forms, envelopes, mailing, printing, and staff time for completing this process is expensive.

Project Tasks
Identify desired qualities in a course evaluation system.
Examine external vendors and internal capabilities for course evaluation systems.
Select system(s) for a pilot.
Evaluate the pilot and make recommendation on whether or not a new system should be implemented.
Present recommendation to appropriate committees and councils for consideration.
Determine timeframe for roll-out of new course evaluation system.
MUSIC ENSEMBLE EVALUATION FORM

Please indicate your response by filling in the circle on the answer sheet below the appropriate letter for each question. Use only a #2 lead pencil.

1. Classification: A. Freshman; B. Sophomore; C. Junior; D. Senior; E. Graduate or Special Student
2. My major is in the Department offering this course: A. Yes; B. No; C. Major undecided
3. My overall grade point average at the present time is approximately: A. 3.5 or above; B. 3.0 to 3.4; C. 2.5 to 2.9; D. 2.0 to 2.4; E. less than 2.0
4. The average number of hours I practice weekly in preparation for this ensemble: A. 1/2 to 1 hour; B. 1 to 1 1/2 hours; C. 1 1/2 to 2 hours; D. More than 2 hours; E. Not Applicable
5. My efforts to use the instructor’s suggestions were: A. Excellent; B. Good; C. Average; D. Fair; E. Poor
6. The extent to which I have assumed responsibility for the success of the ensemble by exerting maximum effort has been: A. Excellent; B. Good; C. Average; D. Fair; E. Poor
7. The number of rehearsals I have missed was: A. None; B. One; C. Two; D. Three; E. Four or more

Instructor Evaluation

Please answer questions 8-19 using the rating criteria listed below:

A. Excellent
B. Good
C. Average
D. Fair
E. Poor

8. Evaluate the conductor’s knowledge of the score and his/her preparation for rehearsal.
9. Evaluate the conductor’s attention to individual parts and details of the score.
10. Evaluate the conductor’s efforts to make you aware of musical considerations that relate to the performance of the literature.
11. Evaluate the conductor’s ability to express himself/herself clearly.
12. Evaluate the conductor’s ability to offer constructive suggestions.
13. Evaluate the conductor’s ability to maintain a positive relationship with the group.
14. Evaluate the conductor’s technique (gestures, etc.).
15. Evaluate the conductor’s promptness in beginning and ending rehearsals as well as following an announced schedule.
16. Evaluate the conductor’s ability to use rehearsal time efficiently.
17. Evaluate the conductor’s preparation of the ensemble for public performance.
18. Evaluate the extent to which the conductor demonstrates genuine interest in and respect for students.
19. Evaluate the extent to which the conductor maintains appropriate ensemble discipline.

20. Were you given adequate advance notice of all public performances: A. Yes; B. Usually; C. No
21. Was rehearsal time adequate? A. About right; B. Too much time; C. Not enough time
22. Please write on the back of this sheet any other comments that might be helpful to this faculty member in evaluating teaching activities. You may include your assessment of the aesthetic experience, your opinion of the literature, your opinions concerning the rehearsal atmosphere, your suggestions for improvement, and any other pertinent comments. Responses will be typed and kept confidential until after final grades have been posted.
APPLIED MUSIC EVALUATION FORM

Please indicate your response by filling in the circle on the answer sheet below the appropriate letter for each question. Use only a #2 lead pencil.

1. Classification: A. Freshman; B. Sophomore; C. Junior; D. Senior; E. Graduate or Special Student
2. My major is in the Department offering this course: A. Yes; B. No; C. Major undecided
3. My overall grade point average at the present time is approximately: A. 3.5 or above; B. 3.0 to 3.4; C. 2.5 to 2.9; D. 2.0 to 2.4; E. less than 2.0
4. I expect my grade in this course to be: A. A; B. B; C. C; D. D; E. F
5. The average number of hours I practice daily in preparation for this course: A. 4 hours or more; B. 2-3 hours; C. 1-2 hours; D. 1 hour or less
6. The extent to which I have assumed responsibility for the success of lessons by my asking questions and exerting maximum effort has been: A. Excellent; B. Good; C. Average; D. Fair; E. Poor
7. My efforts to utilize the instructor’s suggestions were: A. Excellent; B. Good; C. Average; D. Fair; E. Poor
8. The number of lessons I have missed was: A. None; B. One; C. Two; D. Three; E. Four or more

Instructor Evaluation

9. The number of lessons missed by the instructor for which no make-up lessons was scheduled: A. None; B. One; C. Two; D. Three; E. Four or more
10. Was the instructor on time for your lessons? A. Always; B. Usually; C. Seldom

Please answer questions 11-25 using the rating criteria listed below:
   A. Excellent
   B. Good
   C. Average
   D. Fair
   E. Poor

11. Evaluate the extent to which the objectives of the course have been made clear to you.
12. Evaluate the extent to which the instructor encourages you to express yourself freely and openly.
13. Evaluate the instructor’s fair and consistent treatment of you.
14. Evaluate the instructor’s demonstration of genuine interest in and respect for students.
15. Evaluate the accessibility of the instructor outside of lessons, by appointment, or during office hours.
16. Evaluate the instructor’s explanation of repertoire assigned (style, form and harmony, musical terms, language, historic performing conditions, etc.).
17. Evaluate the instructor’s explanations of the workings (mechanism, design, capabilities, acoustics, etc.) of your performing medium.
18. Evaluate the instructor’s attempt to inspire you (to greater technical or musical mastery, to practice more, etc.).
19. Evaluate the effectiveness of the instructor’s criticisms and suggestions.
20. Evaluate the instructor’s ability to prepare you for the experience of public performance.
21. My overall rating of this instructor is:
Following questions to be answered only by students who have completed at least two semester of applied study on this instrument.
22. The extent to which the lessons are based on high musical standards.
23. The extent to which the instructor diagnoses the student's musical/technical problems effectively and offers viable approaches for solutions.
24. The extent to which the instructor demonstrates knowledge of the literature.
25. The extent to which the instructor demonstrates understanding of style and interpretation.

26. Please write on the back of this sheet any other comments that might be helpful to this faculty member in evaluating teaching activities. You may include your assessment of the aesthetic experience, your opinion of the literature, your opinions concerning the studio atmosphere, your suggestions for improvement, and any other pertinent comments. Responses will be typed and kept confidential until after final grades have been posted.
STUDENT SURVEY OF INSTRUCTION – OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY – BOONE PICKENS SCHOOL OF GEOLOGY

All questions below are to be answered by blackening with #2 pencil the appropriate answer space at the right of the page. Please make broad pencil marks that completely fill the area indicated. Do not mark beyond the edges of the circle. Erase any pencil marks you wish to delete.

1. My college is:  
   1 Agriculture  
   2 Arts & Sciences  
   3 Business  
   4 Education  
   5 Engineering

2. Classification:  
   1 Freshman  
   2 Sophomore  
   3 Junior  
   4 Senior  
   5 Grad or Special

3. Purpose for taking course:  
   1 Major  
   2 Related to major  
   3 General Studies  
   4 Elective

4. Course was required:  
   1 Yes  
   2 No

5. Type of Course:  
   1 Lecture  
   2 Lab  
   3 IPF  
   4 Short Course  
   5 Other

6. My attendance record for class is:  
   1 100%  
   2 99 to 79%  
   3 74 to 50%  
   4 Less than 50%

7. How many hours a week did you spend studying/preparing for this course?  
   1 0-2  
   2 2-4  
   3 4-6  
   4 More than 6

8. Did you read the course text and/or other assigned reading?  
   1 All the time  
   2 Often  
   3 Rarely  
   4 Never  
   5 F (U)

9. Do you think you had sufficient academic preparation to take this course?  
   1 Yes  
   2 No

10. In your opinion, how much are students responsible for their learning?  
    1 100% to 75%  
    2 74 to 50%  
    3 74 to 50%  
    4 Less than 50%

11. What is your projected grade in this course?  
    1 A(+)  
    2 A  
    3 C  
    4 D  
    5 F (U)

For Items 12 through 18 GIVE YOUR VIEWS OF THE COURSE using the following scale:  
    1 Poor  
    2 Below Average  
    3 Average  
    4 Above Average  
    5 Excellent

12. Work required was appropriate for college-level credit earned

13. Assignments and homework in this course were useful

14. Pace of the course was reasonable

15. Level of difficulty was reasonable

16. Students were given ample opportunity to actively participate in the course

17. Testing and evaluation procedures in this course were representative of lectures and assigned readings

18. Given my level of attendance and participation, I learned a lot in this course

For Items 19 through 25 RANK THE INSTRUCTOR using the following scale:  
    1 Disagree Strongly  
    2 Disagree Somewhat  
    3 Neutral  
    4 Agree Somewhat  
    5 Agree Strongly

19. The instructor had high expectations for student performance in this course

20. The instructor makes clear how course grade will be determined

21. The instructor graded fairly

22. The instructor was well prepared and organized

23. The instructor demonstrated expertise and professionalism in this course

24. The instructor had a positive attitude towards this course

25. The instructor stimulates thinking about course content

After your remarks on this side of the form, please make additional comments on the reverse side.
Please write additional comments below. Constructive comments will be used by instructor to improve the course.

Indicate what you particularly liked or disliked about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Course:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Instructor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Instruction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Work Load:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Examinations and Grading:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Textbook:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any specific suggestion for improvements of the course and/or instructor's method of presenting the course?
### Short Form - Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses

**Institution:**

**Instructor:**

**Course Number:**

**Time and Days Class Meets:**

**Important!**

Twelve possible learning objectives are listed below, not all of which will be relevant in this class. Describe the amount of progress you made on each (even those not pursued in this class) by using the following scale.

1. No apparent progress
2. Slight progress; I made small gains on this objective.
3. Moderate progress; I made some gains on this objective.
4. Substantial progress; I made large gains on this objective.
5. Exceptional progress; I made outstanding gains on this objective.

**Progress on:**

1. Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)
2. Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories
3. Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)
4. Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course
5. Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team
6. Developing creative capacities (writing, inventing, designing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.)
7. Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)
8. Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing
9. Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
10. Developing a clearer understanding of. and commitment to, personal values
11. Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view
12. Acquiring an interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers

**For the remaining questions, use the following code:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Definitely False</th>
<th>2 = More False Than True</th>
<th>3 = In Between</th>
<th>4 = More True Than False</th>
<th>5 = Definitely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. As a rule, I put forth more effort than other students on academic work.
14. My background prepared me well for this course's requirements.
15. I really wanted to take this course regardless of who taught it.
16. As a result of taking this course, I have more positive feelings toward this field of study.
17. Overall, I rate this instructor an excellent teacher.
18. Overall, I rate this course as excellent

**Extra Questions**

If your instructor has extra questions, answer them in the space designated below (questions 19-38).

19.
20.
21.
22.
23.

24.
25.
26.
27.
28.
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Use the space provided on the back of this form for your comments.
IN-CLASS TEACHING EVALUATION
DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT PATHOLOGY
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Name of teacher evaluated: ________________________________

Course 3: ____________________ Title: ________________________________

Date(s) class was visited (use separate forms for theory _____ and laboratory _____ sessions)

Name of Evaluator: ____________________________________________

A. PREDOMINANT TEACHING METHOD(S) USED IN THIS CLASS
   Lecture ______ Case History ______ Discussion ______ Demonstration_____

B. EFFECTIVE USE OF THE PREDOMINANT TEACHING METHOD(S) (Comment briefly on each of the following)
   Is the teacher well organized?

   Are learning expectations and purpose of assignments communicated clearly to students?

   Are goals of presentations/discussions/demonstrations effectively communicated?

   Are questions from students welcomed and answered clearly?

   How does the teacher display a positive attitude toward students and their success?

C. LEVEL OF STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE IN-CLASS LEARNING PROCESS
   How are students encouraged to participate in in-class learning?

   Are discussion exercises designed effectively for student participation?

   Overall, what is the level of student involvement in the in-class learning process?
D. EFFECTIVE USE OF VISUAL MEDIA AND/OR OTHER AIDS FOR IN-CLASS PRESENTATIONS

What visual media and/or other approaches are used to promote learning?

Are these presentations of high quality and readily understood?

Are these presentations integrated well with overall in-class teaching method(s)?

E. OVERALL RATING ON IN-CLASS PRESENTATIONS

Highly effective Effective Satisfactory Unacceptable

Comments:
Peer Review of Instruction
Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences
Center for Veterinary Health Sciences
Oklahoma State University-Stillwater

Name of Teacher Evaluated: 

Course: 

Name of Evaluator: 

In Class Evaluation: Yes _____ No_____ If yes, list dates: 

Review of Video Capture Presentations: Yes _____ No _____ If yes, list dates of presentations reviewed 

Review of Instructional Materials:
1. Notes: Yes_____ No_____ NA ______
2. Power Point Presentations: Yes_____ No _____ NA ______
3. Videos: Yes_____ No_____ NA ______

Review of Tests: Yes_____ No _____ NA ______

A. Predominate Teaching Method(s) Used in Class
Lecture _____ Case Study _____ Discussion _____ Demonstration _____
Comments:

B. Instruction Style and Methodology
Is the instructor well organized?

Are goals and learning objectives communicated clearly to students at the start of each presentation?

Are questions from students welcomed and answered clearly?

Does the instructor demonstrate enthusiasm for the topic?

Does the instructor display a positive attitude toward students and their success?

Does the instructor use a variety of teaching methods in class?
Does the instructor speak clearly?

Does the instructor avoid distracting mannerisms or gestures?

Does the instructor close the presentation with key points and future assignment?

Does the instructor make effective use of technology?

C. Instructional Materials
   1. Are notes provided that are well organized?
   2. Are written learning objections provided?
   3. Is the syllabus up to date and easily followed?
   4. Does the instructor make effective use of Moodle?

D. Examinations
   1. Are examinations of proper length compared to time available?
   2. Do questions reflect emphasis of core concepts?
   3. Are questions clearly presented?
   4. Are questions too difficult?
   5. Are questions too easy?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor:</th>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer:</td>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instructional Process

#### Pre-Class
- [ ] Attendance
- [ ] Announcements
- [ ] Distribution of Materials

#### Instruction
- [ ] Enthusiasm
  - [ ] Student Motivation
  - [ ] Teacher's Behavior
- [ ] Clarity
  - [ ] Explanations
  - [ ] Expectations
  - [ ] Assignments
- [ ] Variability
  - [ ] Teaching Methods
  - [ ] Instructional Materials
  - [ ] Voice
  - [ ] Movement
  - [ ] Gestures
- [ ] Structure
  - [ ] Objective(s)
  - [ ] Task-oriented
  - [ ] Focused
- [ ] Interaction/Engagement
  - [ ] Discussion
  - [ ] Questions (cognitive level)
  - [ ] Feedback
  - [ ] Reinforcement

#### Summary/Closure
- [ ] Key Points
- [ ] Assignments
- [ ] Responses to Questions
- [ ] Dismissal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What do you like most about the instructor’s teaching approach?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do you view as the instructor’s greatest strength?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are there aspects of the instructor’s teaching you would recommend that he/she improve?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is your overall impression of the instructor’s performance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>