

2007-2008 Student Rating of Faculty Instruction Committee report

The committee met once to consider a request from Karen Adsit that some of the questions on the new survey document be evaluated as to whether they were relevant to online courses. The committee considered the questions, then voted to retain them with some additional clarification/explanation added for each of the four Karen asked about. Karen volunteered to write the additional text and submit it to the committee for review. She has not yet done so. So technically, nothing has changed with regard to the document or procedure. It was intended all along for any changes we approved to be incorporated into next year's evaluation form, assuming they were approved by the Senate.

Karen Adsit is also to pull copies of other evaluation forms, both commercially produced and those developed by other academic institutions for the next committee to examine for comparison purposes.

The committee did develop a list of questions it would like to see next year's committee address.

1. Why is there such a delay in getting results back to faculty members?
2. Is it possible to evaluate every semester rather than only once a year?
3. Is it possible to change the focus of instrument in such a way as to evaluate the creation of a learning environment in the class rather than on the instructor alone?
4. What does the return of such a high percentage of "above average" evaluations say about the instrument or the process?
5. There was a question regarding the number of questions on the survey. Who decided on the number and why? Is there some significance to this number? Would changing the number of questions have any significant impact on the validity of the survey?

Submitted by
Mike Bell
Committee Chair