I. 2013 Review of FSH 2700 Student Evaluation of Teaching
   A. Review and revisions to FSH 2700 were last approved on April 28, 2008. Item B-8 states that: “The Office of Academic Affairs, in conjunction with the Teaching and Advising Committee, will review the student evaluation of teaching forms and processes periodically, at least every five years.”
   B. Per this policy, the Teaching and Advising Committee has begun a review in 2013 using the following outline for this process:
      1. PURPOSE:
         a. “...student evaluations assist individual instructors in improving their own teaching...”
         b. “...they assist academic administrators in counseling instructors about their teaching...”
         c. “…and they are weighed as a factor in judging the teaching component in tenure, promotion, and salary determinations.”
         d. Reflection on the teaching and learning at the University of Idaho
      2. CONTEXT:
         a. Noted changes since the 2008 review including the implementation of the 2011-2015 University of Idaho Strategic Plan and its Teaching and Learning Goals.
         b. Given: 2000-2001 included the change from paper to on-line evaluations. It is assumed that the change away from an on-line system is not up for consideration.
         c. Identified current research/perspectives on approaches to, effectiveness of, and best practices for evaluations of teaching in higher education. Committee member, Shannon Gill, provided a research outline summary on the topic. Below are some excerpts (the full outline is available on-line through the Faculty Senate website, Teaching and Advising Committee):
            i. It is vital that both teachers and students understand the purpose and uses of the student evaluations.
            ii. Questions are best if they refer to specific teaching behaviors and should be designed to measure separate components of teaching effectiveness. Global or overall ratings cannot adequately represent the multidimensionality of teaching. They are also more susceptible to context, mood, and other potential biases.
            iii. Consider creating variations on structure for different types of classes/departments. Examples of course “templates” (for large lecture, seminar, lab, etc.) were found at other universities.
3. PERSPECTIVES:
   a. Identified key groups involved in review process (administrators, faculty and students)
   b. Distributed an informal questionnaire in spring 2013 for gathering feedback from these various constituents
   c. Committee sought information and ideas re:
      i. Policy level review topics
      ii. Procedural review topics
      iii. Format and use of evaluation data
   d. At initial review, feedback was mostly related to the procedural, not policy-level aspects of the evaluations and fell within two primary categories:
      i. Administering of evaluations (timing, response rates, format, etc.)
      ii. Content of evaluations (type and quantity of questions, etc.)

4. NEXT STEPS:
   a. A working group has been identified to review the questionnaires received and provide a summary for the committee’s follow-up next year.
   b. Current committee will provide initial recommendations to next committee. Some early thoughts include:
      i. Develop and distribute a “Best Practices” guide for the administering of SET including possible content for syllabi.
      ii. Consider identifying a specific week during each semester (perhaps the week prior to Dead Week) as “Evaluation Week”, much as was done with paper evaluations. All evaluations are expected to be planned for and administered during this week (might be noted in course schedules)
      iii. The TEAC is always soliciting additional topics, perspectives and ideas related to the review of FSH 2700. Feedback may be submitted to: mirandaa@uidaho.edu

Submitted by Miranda S. Anderson, Teaching and Advising Committee Chair