

PLEASE POST FOR ALL FACULTY TO READ!

**EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
1994-1995 FACULTY SENATE**

The sixth regular meeting of the 1994/1995 Faculty Senate will be held on **Tuesday, 21 February 1995**, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

FULL AGENDA

- I. **Call to Order**
- II. **Approval of Minutes**
24 January 1995
- III. **Special Order of the Day**
 - A. Roll Call
 - B. Announcements
 - C. Richard Eakin, Chancellor
 - D. Tinsley Yarbrough, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 - E. James Hallock, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences
 - F. Richard Brown, Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs
Information Resources Coordinating Council
 - G. Dawn Clark, Faculty Assembly Delegate
Meeting of 3 February 1995
 - H. Election of Nominating Committee for Faculty Officers
- IV. **Unfinished Business**
- V. **Report of Committees**
 - A. Committee on Committees, Bob Woodside
Second Reading of Revisions to the Course Drop Appeals Committee Charge
(Attachment 1).
 - B. Admissions and Recruitment Committee, John Cope
Revisions to the *University Undergraduate Catalog* Concerning
Admission Policies (attachment 2).

- C. Credits Committee, JoAnn Jones
Revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual* and *University Undergraduate Catalog*
Concerning Grade Appeals (attachment 3).
- D. Teaching Effectiveness Committee, Parm Hawk
 1. Revised Student Opinion of Instruction Survey, for information only
(attachment 4).
 2. Revised Seven Principles to Guide the Use of the Student Opinion Data,
for information only (attachment 5).
- E. Unit Code Screening Committee, Bill Grossnickle
Revisions to the Department of Anthropology's Unit Code of Operations.
(A copy is available for review in the Faculty Senate office.)

VI. New Business

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT

Second Reading of Revisions to the Course Drop Appeals Committee Charge

1. Name: Course Drop Appeals Committee

2. Membership:

6 faculty members and 1 student member. Ex-officio member (with vote): The Chair of the Faculty. Ex-officio member (without vote but with all other parliamentary privileges): The Chancellor or an appointed representative.

3. Quorum: 4 elected members exclusive of ex-officio.

4. A. Committee Responsibilities:

The committee serves as an appeals board for students whose requests for course drops by exception have been denied by the Office of Undergraduate Studies. ~~who have been denied permission by the office of Undergraduate Studies to drop a course~~

B. To Whom The Committee Reports:

The committee reports appellate decisions to the office of Undergraduate Studies. The committee also notifies the Registrar if the decision is made to grant a student a drop by exception. ~~allow the student to drop a course or courses.~~

C. How Often The Committee Reports:

The committee reports to the Faculty Senate at least once a year and at other times as necessary.

D. Power Of The Committee To Act Without Faculty Senate Approval:

The committee is empowered to make appellate decisions in student course drop appeals, reporting to the office of Undergraduate Studies and the Registrar, as appropriate.

5. Standard Meeting Time:

The committee meets when a suitable number of student petitions has been received. ~~there is an appeal by a student.~~

ADMISSIONS AND RECRUITMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Revisions to *University Undergraduate Catalog* Concerning Admission Policies (Additions are underlined)

Replace pages 32 and 33, Section 3: Admission, beginning with the paragraph entitled Nondegree and going through the end of the paragraph entitled Visitors, with the following:

"NONTRADITIONAL STUDENT ADMISSION POLICY

Individuals whose high school class graduated three or more years prior to the expected date of entry may be permitted to enroll in the university under a performance-based admission policy that specifies retention stipulations provided they meet one of the following conditions:

1. have had no previous college experience or
2. have had previous college experience but have not been matriculated within the past year and are eligible to return to the previous institution but do not meet all stated university admission requirements or
3. have had previous college experience, are ineligible to return to the previous institution, and have not been matriculated at the collegiate level for at least three years prior to the expected date of entry.

In order to continue enrollment as degree-seeking students, nontraditional students must satisfy all regular admission requirements or achieve a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.2 and meet all retention stipulations by the end of the semester in which the twenty-eighth semester hour of degree creditable work is attempted. Failure either to meet the GPA requirement or to satisfy the retention stipulations will result in the student's being ineligible to continue enrollment at ECU. (See Section 5, Readmission)

Students enrolling under this policy must comply with all university policies regarding the payment of tuition and fees and must comply with NC state law concerning health and immunization.

Nontraditional students are assigned for advisement and registration to the University College. After satisfying retention stipulations, they are reassigned to the General College or to the school/department of their intended major.

An individual admitted under the nontraditional student admission policy may not declare a major, compete in intercollegiate athletics, or participate in student exchange programs until all retention stipulations specified in his or her admission letter have been satisfied.

NONDEGREE ENROLLMENTS

Individuals may be allowed to enroll in the university on a space-available basis as either nondegree or visiting students if they qualify under one of the categories listed below. For advisement and registration purposes, these individuals are assigned to the University College.

Nondegree

Many individuals desire to take courses for valid reasons such as certification, needs arising from the workplace, and self-satisfaction. Often such plans do not require working toward a baccalaureate degree. Individuals who have not earned a baccalaureate degree and who desire to participate in this program should contact the office of Undergraduate Admissions for additional information. Individuals admitted as nondegree, undergraduate students can apply

ADMISSIONS AND RECRUITMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Revisions to *University Undergraduate Catalog*

Concerning Admission Policies (continued)

no more than 28 semester hours earned in this status toward an undergraduate degree at East Carolina University. Individuals who have earned a baccalaureate degree desiring to enroll as nondegree students should contact the Graduate School for a nondegree graduate application and additional instructions.

Visitors

Students attending another accredited college or university may desire to attend East Carolina University for a limited period of time and then return to their original institutions. Such applicants must complete a visitor's application and have the dean or other appropriate official at the parent institution verify that the applicant is in good standing. This official should specify the courses to be taken at East Carolina University. The student should enroll in only specified courses and then only if the required prerequisite courses or their equivalents have been completed. Enrollment as a visitor will be limited to no more than 28 semester hours earned at East Carolina University. Credit earned as a visiting student cannot be used to establish eligibility for admission to East Carolina University."

Replace page 45, Section 5: Academic Regulations, Auditing Courses, with the following:

"AUDITING COURSES

Auditing a course consists of attendance at classes and listening but taking no part in the class. Auditors are not required to take entrance examinations, nor are transcripts required. An auditor is not responsible for any assignments, nor is he or she allowed to take any tests or examinations. However, in order to have the audited course recorded on the official transcript, a student must attend classes regularly. An auditor may not enroll in a participation course (art classes, laboratories, etc.). Under no circumstances will a grade be assigned, evaluations be made, or performance reports be issued on a student auditing a course. Auditing a course, or part of a course, is contingent upon the approval of the instructor and the appropriate departmental chairperson or school dean. Students may not register to audit a course until the last day of the drop/add period.

Persons not currently enrolled who wish to attend university classes without earning credit must be high school graduates and must be admitted to the university before seeking approval to audit any course. Individuals admitted as nondegree students will be assigned to the University College for assistance with registration. The applicants shall then complete the prescribed procedure for registering through the office of the Registrar and pay the auditing fee to the cashier's office before attendance in classes is permitted.

Students regularly enrolled in the university wishing to audit course(s) must initiate the approval process with their adviser."

Replace page 62, Section 6: Undergraduate Studies, University College, with the following:

"UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

Individuals admitted under the nontraditional student admission policy as well as nondegree students and visitors are assigned to the University College. The University College functions to advise students assigned to it until such time as they have satisfied the retention stipulations specified in their letters of admission, convert from nondegree to degree-seeking status, or return to their home institutions. (See Section 3, Admission, University College).

The program of the University College is varied. Some students are in a degree-seeking status and have specific retention stipulations that must be satisfied while taking courses that will apply toward the major. Other students are engaged in study for enrichment or are completing courses to be applied toward degree requirements at their home institutions.

ADMISSIONS AND RECRUITMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Revisions to *University Undergraduate Catalog*

Concerning Admission Policies (continued)

A University College student who is admitted in a degree-seeking status is eligible to transfer either to the General College or to a school or department upon submission of appropriate documents and satisfaction of all retention stipulations. The student's record will be reviewed, and upon acceptance he or she will be assigned to the appropriate unit."

Add to Page 51, Section 5: Academic Regulations, following the paragraphs entitled Special Readmission (Forgiveness) Policy and before the paragraphs entitled Class Attendance Regulations, the following:

"NONTRADITIONAL STUDENT READMISSION

Individuals admitted under the Nontraditional Student Admission Policy who fail either to meet the GPA requirement or to satisfy the retention stipulations may not continue enrollment at East Carolina University except under the following conditions:

1. Students may attend summer school at East Carolina University to satisfy retention stipulations;
2. Students may be readmitted under the provisions of the Special Readmission (Forgiveness) policy to resume progress toward satisfying retention stipulations;
3. Students may be readmitted after completing at an accredited college or university 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours of transferable work with a minimum grade of "C" on all transferable work.

Duplicate credit would not be granted under any circumstances. In all cases the stipulations specified at the time of initial admission must be satisfied.

Note #1: In the case of readmission after completing 30 sh or 45 gh of transferable work that also satisfies all subject matter deficiencies, the student would return as a traditional student with the pre-existing grade point average.

Note #2: Individuals who were originally admitted as nontraditional students who are returning under the Special Readmission (Forgiveness) Policy will have no more than 19 semester hours to satisfy the retention stipulations specified at the time of admission to East Carolina University."

CREDITS COMMITTEE REPORT

Revisions to *ECU Faculty Manual* and *University Undergraduate Catalog* Concerning Grade Appeals

Revise the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Page 29, Part III. Academic Information, Posting Grades by adding the following paragraph at the end of the section:

"A student wishing to contest a course grade should first attempt to resolve the matter with the instructor who determined the grade. The student may appeal the instructor's decision by submitting a written appeal to the instructor's chairperson or dean not later than the last day for undergraduate students to drop semester-length courses during the next regular semester. The chairperson or dean shall review the student's request with the faculty member and either concur with the grade or request that the faculty member reassess the grade. The final decision shall rest with the faculty member responsible for the course grade."

Revise the *University Undergraduate Catalog*, Page 52, Section 5: Academic Regulations by adding the following paragraph as a new section after Policy on Posting Grades:

"GRADE APPEALS

A student wishing to contest a course grade should first attempt to resolve the matter with the instructor who determined the grade. The student may appeal the instructor's decision by submitting a written appeal to the instructor's chairperson or dean not later than the last day for undergraduate students to drop semester-length courses during the next regular semester. The chairperson or dean shall review the student's request with the faculty member and either concur with the grade or request that the faculty member reassess the grade. The final decision shall rest with the faculty member responsible for the course grade."

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT

Revised Student Opinion of Instruction Survey (No Action Necessary At This Time)

The following proposed revisions to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey are being presented to the Faculty Senate at this time for information only. Comments are to be directed to members of the subcommittee formulated by the Teaching Effectiveness Committee (SOIS Subcommittee listed at the end of this report) no later than 13 March 1995. The Subcommittee will then present a report to the Teaching Effectiveness Committee. Following discussion, the Teaching Effectiveness Committee will formulate a final report to the Faculty Senate for approval. Faculty are encouraged to discuss this report with their colleagues.

INTRODUCTION

The Student Opinion of Instruction Survey (SOIS), in its present form, was first administered in Fall semester, 1985, with a commitment to ongoing validation. Fall semester, 1990, the Teaching Effectiveness Committee (TEC) formed a subcommittee to assess the validity and reliability of the instrument, and to consider alternative instruments.

In Spring semester, 1991, the Faculty Senate approved co-administration of the Educational Testing Service's Student Instructional Report (SIR) (Resolution #91-12):

"If ECU's current form does not discriminate as well as the SIR form, can ECU's form be modified or can the data from the form be processed in such a way as to make ECU's form more discriminatory?"

In Fall semester, 1991, the SIR and the SOIS were co-administered to students and in Spring and Fall semesters, 1992, the Teaching Effectiveness Committee completed a comparative analysis and prepared a report to the Faculty Senate. In Spring semester, 1993, the committee submitted a report on the relationship between the SOIS and the SIR to the Faculty Senate and included in their report:

"The SOIS and SIR have a high correlation indicating that the two instruments are measuring similar constructs. The present form of the SOIS should be reviewed and modified to eliminate some questions and to develop new items that offer more useful information to the faculty member for developmental purposes."

In Fall semester, 1993, the Teaching Effectiveness Committee established a sub-committee to implement the recommendation to revise the SOIS. The sub-committee assessed the SOIS, comparing each question to the SIR and to categories reported by Herbert W. Marsh in "Students' Evaluations of University Teaching: Dimensionality, Reliability, Validity, Potential Biases, and Utility." The group revised questions and the scaling for responses on ECU's SOIS. One objective of the revised survey is to assess effectiveness of instructors based on criteria assessed by the SIR, Marsh, and the ECU SOIS. Questions which did not specifically assess the instructors' effectiveness, and questions which students would not be able to accurately observe and assess were eliminated. In addition to the questions which assess instructors' effectiveness, questions were developed to assess course difficulty, course workload, and students' characteristics such as the amount of time they spend on the course outside of class, their class levels, their reasons for taking courses, and their expected grades.

At the end of Fall semester the revised survey was co-administered with the SOIS in a convenience sample of classes. A factor analysis of these surveys' results revealed that the instrument provided reliable measures of two factors: instructor effectiveness and course workload/difficulty. Several

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT

Revised Student Opinion of Instruction Survey (continued)

questions on the first revision were not strong indicators of these factors and those questions were deleted. At the end of the second summer session, 1994, the revised survey was piloted by faculty, on a voluntary basis, to all classes with an enrollment between 6 and 35 students. In Fall semester, 1994, a second factor analysis of the revised SOIS was completed for the results of the summer session surveys. Final revisions were made based on this analysis and the revised SOIS with recommendations for administration of the survey were presented to the Teaching Effectiveness Committee.

The Teaching Effectiveness Committee is submitting the revised survey and implementation proposal report to the Faculty Senate in Spring 1995 with recommendations that the form be used Fall semester 1996.

PROPOSAL FOR ADOPTION

1. Adopt the instrument as developed and tested by the committee.
2. Develop a set of results for each course surveyed which contains the following:
 - a. A frequency distribution of the responses to each of the 28 items.
 - b. A mean, median, and standard deviation for items 1 through 24.
 - c. A summed score for items 1 through 22, a measure of teaching effectiveness. Include unit and university norms.
 - d. A summed score for items 23 and 24, a measure of course difficulty. Include unit and university norms.
3. Under the existing criteria all courses are evaluated each semester except courses with enrollments less than six, student teaching courses, team taught courses, and courses in the School of Medicine. A proposed change to the existing criteria is to allow evaluation of courses taught by two instructors as a team. For each of these courses the office of Planning and Institutional Research (PIR) will send two sets of SOIS forms. PIR will not distribute SOIS forms to evaluate courses with more than two instructors, however, units may independently evaluate these courses, for example, using copies of SOIS forms or other student evaluation forms. Faculty members may ask PIR to make exceptions.
4. Continue to have the office of Planning and Institutional Research coordinate the administration of the survey in terms of its distribution to the units, the collection of completed surveys, and the distribution of its results as described in 2. The management of the open ended comments section of the survey will be the responsibility of the unit within the following guidelines. All comments will be kept confidential; it will be up to the discretion of the faculty member to share these. After the students complete the SOIS forms the designated SOIS classroom administrator will separate the comment sheets from the responses to questions 1 through 28 and place each in two separate envelopes which will then be sealed and returned to the designated unit administrator. The unit administrator will send the envelope with responses to questions 1 through 28 to PIR and will retain the envelope containing written comments. After PIR completes and returns the analysis of questions 1 through 28 (See 5. below), the unit administrators simultaneously will distribute the comments, still in sealed envelopes, to the instructor.
5. Send sets of results, as described in 2, to instructors, through their units, after grades have been posted. Copies of the results will also be sent to the unit heads.
6. Require each unit head receiving results to attend a training seminar. The training will be the joint responsibility of PIR, the Teaching Effectiveness Committee, and the office of Faculty Development. Additional training seminars will be held as needed for new unit heads. The following issues will be covered in the training:
 - a. Unit head examination of the results on a course by course basis for each instructor. Professors will be rated as individuals against standards appropriate for the courses they teach. For example, standards may differ for graduate vs. undergraduate classes, extremely difficult vs. less difficult courses, classes with large vs. small enrollments etc. Instructor to instructor comparisons will not be made.
 - b. The correct interpretation of the summed scores.
 - c. The consideration of items 25 through 28 in relation to other items.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT
Revised Student Opinion of Instruction Survey (continued)

- d. Justification for discontinuing cross-course summary statistics for individual questions and substituting unit and institutional norms of the summary scores of effectiveness and difficulty. Justification for discontinuing instructor summaries.
- e. The importance of looking at data over a number of semesters to determine instruction trends. Space permitting, the report will include summary statistics from prior semesters in which the instructor taught the same course(s).
- f. The incorporation of revised principles to guide the use of the student opinion data.
- 7. Files containing student opinion of instruction form data, without instructor identifications, for the first four semesters of implementation (as a minimum), will be available for research. For example, the data may be analyzed to determine whether relationships exist between effectiveness and difficulty or whether course level effects evaluation.

Attached is a copy of the proposed Student Opinion of Instruction Survey which, if approved, would be implemented Fall 1996.

Members of the SOIS Subcommittee:

Judith Hunt	Business	GCB
Paul Knoke	English	GCB
Bonnie Mani	Political Science	Brewster
Claudia McCann	PIR	Spilman
Havva Meric	Business	GCB
Ken Wilson	Sociology	Brewster

Student Opinion of Instruction Survey

Please rank the following set of statements on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). If a statement is not applicable to this course or instructor or if you have no opinion about the statement, please fill in the Not Applicable/No Opinion bubble. Please read each item carefully and fill in one bubble for each item.

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1. | The instructor has created an atmosphere of helpfulness. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 2. | The instructor has informed students about criteria used for grading. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 3. | The instructor has inspired my interest in the course material. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 4. | The instructor has made the objectives of this course clear. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 5. | The instructor has been well prepared for each class. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 6. | The instructor has shown enthusiasm in teaching this course. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 7. | The instructor course evaluation methods (quizzes, exams, papers, etc.) have been fair. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 8. | The textbooks used have been appropriate to the course. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 9. | This class has challenged me to learn course material, concepts and skills. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 10. | The instructor's syllabus has clarified the expectations of this course. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 11. | The instructor has provided the opportunity to ask questions | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 12. | The instructor has encouraged class participation. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 13. | The instructor has allowed students to present relevant opinions. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |
| 14. | The assignments, including readings and projects, have contributed to my understanding of the subject. | Strongly Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | Strongly Agree | N/A No Opinion |

PENDING FINAL APPROVAL

Do not mark outside this line

15. The instructor has been available to students outside of class.

Strongly Disagree
 1 2 3 4 5 6

Strongly Agree N/A
 7 No Opinion

16. The instructor has been reliable in meeting classes.

Strongly Disagree
 1 2 3 4 5 6

Strongly Agree N/A
 7 No Opinion

17. This instructor has provided useful feedback when returning tests and assignments.

Strongly Disagree
 1 2 3 4 5 6

Strongly Agree N/A
 7 No Opinion

The next set of statements ask you to rate aspects of this course on the same 7 point scale but, with different labels on the end points. Please read each statement carefully before answering. Again if a statement is not applicable to this course or instructor or if you have no opinion about the statement, please fill in the the Not Applicable/No Opinion bubble. Please fill in only one bubble for each item.

18. The instructional materials (films, overheads, article, books, etc.) have contributed to my understanding of the subject matter of the course.

Not at all
 1 2 3 4 5 6

As much as possible N/A
 7 No Opinion

19. The instructor has demonstrated respect for me.

Not at all
 1 2 3 4 5 6

As much as possible N/A
 7 No Opinion

20. When applicable, the instructor has provided differing points of view toward the subject.

Not at all
 1 2 3 4 5 6

As much as possible N/A
 7 No Opinion

21. The instructor has tested on the materials emphasized.

Not at all
 1 2 3 4 5 6

As much as possible N/A
 7 No Opinion

22. The instructor's speech is clear and audible.

Not at all
 1 2 3 4 5 6

As much as possible N/A
 7 No Opinion

23. The content of this course has been:

Very easy
 1 2 3 4 5 6

Very difficult N/A
 7 No Opinion

24. The amount of work/reading assigned in this course has been:

Not Demanding
 1 2 3 4 5 6

Very Demanding N/A
 7 No Opinion

The following items are designed to help the instructor to know the types of students taking their course. Please answer as honestly as you can. Fill in only one bubble per item.

25. On the average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course outside of class?

0 - 2 hours 3 - 4 hours 5 - 6 hours 7 - 8 hours 9 or more hours

26. What is your current class level?

Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate Other

27. Which reason best describes why you have taken this course?

It is an elective course.
 It is a choice among required options.
 No other options available.
 It is specifically required.

28. What grade do you expect to earn in this course?

A B C D F Incomplete

PENDING FINAL APPROVAL

Please note that the following COMMENTS section will be sent to the instructor after grades have been posted.

COMMENTS

What do you feel are the strengths of this course?

What would you change to improve the course?

Additional Comments:

PENDING FINAL APPROVAL

PENDING FINAL APPROVAL

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT

Revised Seven Principles to Guide the Use of the Student Opinion Data (No Action Necessary At This Time)

The following proposed revisions to the Seven Principles to Guide the Use of the Student Opinion Data are being presented to the Faculty Senate at this time for information only. Comments are to be directed to members of the subcommittee formulated by the Teaching Effectiveness Committee (SOIS Subcommittee listed at the end of this report) no later than 13 March 1995. The Subcommittee will then present a report to the Teaching Effectiveness Committee. Following discussion, the Teaching Effectiveness Committee will formulate a final report to the Faculty Senate for approval. Faculty are encouraged to discuss this report with their colleagues.

The Faculty Senate, when it approved the use of the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey in 1985, adopted seven principles to guide its use. The original seven principles are given below with additions in bold and deletions over-lined.

- Principle 1: That student opinion of instruction be only one of the ways to evaluate teaching. Unit heads **,and others who evaluate teaching,** should seek additional ways **such as peer reviews, reviews of course syllabi, and other methods** depending upon their particular needs and interests.
- Principle 2: That the new form be administered in all courses at the University. This is necessary in order to ensure completeness and reliability of data. Units would be free, of course, to develop other instruments for use in addition to the TEC form and, in accord with Appendix C, to use only data from those other instruments.
- Principle 3: That the new form be administered every semester.
- Principle 4: That data from the new form be processed in such a way that both individual faculty and ~~department~~ unit heads know the following:
- a. the ~~University~~ mean, **median,** and standard deviation for **items 1 through 24 for each course.** ~~each statement on the form by the level of the course (e.g., for all 1000 level courses surveyed in the university during the past three years); and~~
 - b. ~~the unit mean and standard deviation for each statement by the level of course (e.g., for all 1000 level courses surveyed in the unit during the past three years)~~
 - b. **A frequency distribution of the responses to each of the 28 items.**
 - c. **A summed score for items 1 through 22, a measure of teaching effectiveness. In addition, unit and institutional means, medians and standard deviations of the effectiveness score will be included for all courses of the same level taught at the university that semester. For example, statistics will be provided for all 1000 level courses if the course evaluated is a 1000 level course, for all 2000 level courses if the course evaluated is a 2000 thousand level course, and**

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT

Revised Seven Principles to Guide the Use of the Student Opinion Data (continued)

so on up to all 6000 level courses if the course evaluated is a 6000 level course.

- d. A summed score for items 23 and 24, a measure of course difficulty. In addition, unit and institutional means, medians and standard deviations of the difficulty score will be included for all courses of the same level taught at the university that semester. For example, statistics will be provided for all 1000 level courses if the course evaluated is a 1000 level course, for all 2000 level courses if the course evaluated is a 2000 thousand level course, and so on up to all 6000 level courses if the course evaluated is a 6000 level course.

~~Principle 5: That individual units request specific means and standard deviations for particular kinds of courses (e.g., for all freshman and sophomore level lecture courses designed primarily for General College students).~~

~~Principle 6: That administrative analyses of student opinion pay attention only to data that indicate a statistically high or statistically low performance when compared to responses for similar courses. the standards (see 6. a. and f. of the proposal for adoption of a new Student Opinion of Instruction Survey) This means that basic satisfactory competence must be assumed whenever the student response to a statement is less than one standard deviation below the mean for similar courses in a unit. [Example: if the unit mean for a question is 4.1 and the unit SD is 0.8, an instructor will be assumed to be basically and satisfactorily competent (with respect to that question) unless his or her item mean is lower than 3.3]~~

~~Principle 7: That, except in the case of new faculty, administrative evaluations be based not on course-by-course or semester-by semester data but on patterns established over the past several semesters in all courses taught by a faculty member.~~