

Faculty Senate Resolution #12-24

Approved by the Faculty Senate: February 21, 2012

Approved by the Chancellor: March 14, 2012

Recommendations for revisions to the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey

Recommendations are noted in **bold** print.

Executive Summary

In Spring of 2009 a six-member SOIS subcommittee was appointed by Associate Provost for Accreditation and Assessment Dr. David Weismiller to review the currently used Student Opinion of Instruction Survey (SOIS). There had been growing faculty concerns about how the SOIS was used in evaluation of faculty teaching as well as the response rate following the University's switch from a paper-and-pencil survey to an online survey. This Committee (the "SOIS I Committee") recommended that the University revise the current SOIS.

The present committee (the "SOIS II Committee") was appointed following the report of the SOIS I Committee. The Committee's charge was to develop a "home grown" student opinion of instruction survey to replace the SOIS instrument currently in use. This committee met 16 times over a period of two academic years. The Committee reviewed the SOIS I Report and the criticism of the currently used SOIS that has centered on the misuse of the survey in evaluation (e.g. using small and statistically insignificant differences in scores to make merit pay and other personnel decisions and overreliance on the use of a single item [item 19] in critical decisions). The Committee made a recommendation to Faculty Senate on the interim use of the current SOIS survey in October, 2009 which was adopted.

The Committee reviewed the literature on effective teaching and developed a series of potential questions to ask on a student opinion of instruction survey. After developing several drafts of potential questions the committee held two on-campus open discussions on student opinion of instruction and requested that a group of faculty and students provide feedback on the potential questions. There was significant agreement between student respondents and faculty respondents on the importance and relevance of the proposed questions. The committee reviewed each of the recommended items in light of the feedback received from the two open forums and the student and faculty surveys. Final adjustments were made in the wording of the items and the number of items and the Committee recommended 22 items for the Student Perception of Teaching Survey. In addition to the 22 items the Student Perception of Teaching Survey will include space for students to make open-ended comments about the course. The Committee strongly believes in the value of providing the opportunity for students to make written comments as part of the process.

The Committee makes a number of recommendations that aim to improve the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. These recommendations include:

- 1. The use of the Student Perception of Teaching Survey (see Appendix E) to replace the Student Opinion of Instruction Survey currently in use;**
- 2. The university policies on faculty evaluation should emphasize the necessity of collecting a variety of data about teaching when unit administrators evaluate teaching (such as classroom visitation/observation, self-evaluation, and the review of teaching materials);**
- 3. Unit administrators and personnel committee members in units should have training;**
- 4. More attention to the use of information about teaching effectiveness in improving teaching (i.e. use of results for formative rather than only summative evaluation);**

Student Perception of Teaching Survey (face-to-face courses)*
Item Correspondence to Peer Evaluation Categories

Organization

1. The instructor cancelled class fewer than 3 times.
2. The instructor consistently started and ended class on time.
3. The course was well organized.

Presentation

4. The instructor showed enthusiasm for the course content and student learning.
5. Presentations and other activities were usually engaging.
6. The instructor stimulated my interest in the course topics.
7. Instructional technology used in this course contributed to my understanding of the course material.
8. The instructor's speech was understandable.
9. The pace of instruction allowed me time to take notes.

Respect/Rapport

10. The instructor encouraged questions during class sessions.
11. The instructor was available to help if I asked for assistance.
12. The instructor was encouraging about my ability to learn course material.
13. The instructor treated students respectfully.

Evaluation Methods

14. The instructor made it clear what was expected on graded assignments.
15. Tests and graded assignments were on material covered in the course.
16. Tests and assignments were evaluated and returned in time to be useful to me for future assignments.

Class Content

17. The topics presented in course were covered as stated in the syllabus
18. The readings and assignments covered the course content.
19. The instructor's explanation of course content was clear.