

Student Rating Review Team Meeting  
Sept 30, 2015 Minutes

Present:

Elizabeth Yost Hammer (CAT+FD, Convener)  
Steve Salm (Rank & Tenure)  
James Bartkus (Business)  
Andrea Edwards (MAPS)  
Harris McFerrin (BPHS)  
Jeremy Tuman (FAH)  
Jay Todd (CAT+FD)

Absent:

Michael Homan (Faculty Association)  
Renee Akbar (Education & Counseling)  
KiTani' Parker Lemieux (COP)  
Suki Pramar (VPAA Planning Council)  
Karen Nichols (Online/Distance Ed)

The meeting began at 2:08 pm.

### **CLASSROOM CLIMATE**

Dr. Hammer will announce the option to have Fall 2015 evaluations done online at next Tuesday's University Academic Assembly. This will merely be an option for faculty interested in trying out the online evaluation system, Classroom Climate, available through Blackboard. This version of online evaluations will be no different in terms of content from the current paper evaluations.

### **QUESTION MAPPING**

Drs. Salm and Edwards presented a report based on the question mapping completed by the team members since the last meeting. The report was compiled by Dr. Edwards based on the responses she received from members of the team. The group spent the remaining meeting time to begin discussing which categories seemed most important and what language best reflected the information being sought.

The group agreed that a final step will be ensuring consistency of language and question structure. It was also agreed that providing strong, positive statements and asking students the extent to which they agree with the statements will be the most effective approach.

### **PREPARATION**

The group agreed that any question about how prepared an instructor seems is made redundant by asking how well that instructor communicates course materials to students.

**Eliminated.**

### **TIME MANAGEMENT**

Questions about time management are difficult, as students can interpret them in numerous ways. Also, of the schools whose evaluations the group has studied, only Xavier asks about the instructor's time management.

**Tabled.**

### **AVAILABILITY**

The group agreed that removing a specific reference to "scheduled office hours" made the question currently asked on Xavier's evaluations more meaningful.

**"The instructor's availability for consultation with students was ...".**

#### COMMUNICATION

The group agreed that this language best captures effective teaching in a variety of formats, while also suggesting effective preparation and time management:

**"Explained course material clearly and concisely".**

#### PUNCTUALITY

Of the schools whose evaluations the group has studied, only Xavier asks about the instructor's punctuality.

**Eliminated.**

#### CONNECTIONS/CRITICAL THINKING

The group agreed that the term "critical thinking" is both too technical and too general to elicit meaningful data. However, suggesting that all teachers in all classes must find ways to show connections between class materials and "the real world" may be too specific. The group agreed to use some variation of the following language:

**"The instructor encouraged me to apply subject matter (improve thinking, problem solving, personal expression?, skills development?)"**

#### ENTHUSIASM

The group agreed that the term enthusiasm itself can be problematic in how students interpret it. The question needs to focus on how the teacher inspires students rather than on how enthusiastic the instructor may seem in class. Gauging the instructor's ability to motivate students has been found to be a critical component of effective teaching, though (see Bains, *What the Best College Teachers Do*, and Ambrose et al, *How Learning Works*).

The group agreed on the following language:

**"The instructor motivated (or inspired) me to learn."**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00.

The next meeting will be on Wednesday, October 14, at 2:00 in the Mellon Seminar Room.