

Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL)
Report to Senate (September, 2002-July, 2003)

For Information

S.04-11

Submitted by
Dr. Tom Grieve, Chair (term ended July/03), Bernard Roitberg (current Chair) &
Dr. David Kaufman, Director, LIDC

Membership and Terms of Reference

SCUTL is a standing committee of Senate. Its Membership and Terms of Reference are given in Appendix I, which also is available at: <http://www.reg.sfu.ca/Senate/SenateComms/SCUTL.html>.

Meetings

SCUTL met eleven times on a monthly basis between September, 2002-July, 2003, from 12:30-2:00pm, with occasional extensions to 2:30pm.

Guests

The following individuals met with SCUTL during this period:

Visitor	Date	Topic
Laurine Harrison Ombudsperson, Ombuds Office	Oct. 21, 2002	Report on Undergraduate Grading & Grading Practices at SFU
Drew Parker Associate Professor Faculty of Business Administration & President- SFU Faculty Association	Dec. 9, 2002	SFUFA Motion on Evaluation of Teaching at SFU
Bill Krane, Associate VP Academic (Chair) Phil Winne, Professor, Faculty of Education Laurie Summers, Director, Academic Planning	Feb. 17, 2003	SFU Surrey Long Term Planning Committee Report
Susan Stevenson	Feb. 17, 2002	SFU Task Force on Academic Honesty and Integrity
Christine Kurbis, Coordinator, Teaching Enhancement Programs	April 14, 2003	Adjudication of faculty proposals for presentation at SFU Symposium on Innovative Teaching (To be held May 12-15, 2003)
Bill Krane, Associate VP Academic Sue Roppel, Director- Academic Relations	May 26, 2003	Discussion of evaluation of teaching at SFU and motion passed at SFUFA meeting
Mark Fettes, Allan MacKinnon, Faculty of Education; members of Curriculum Implementation Task Force	June 9, 2003 and July 14, 2003	Discuss the design of the workshop planned for Sept./03 re writing intensive(W) courses

Highlights of Activities

This was a very busy year for SCUTL, providing advice and feedback to a variety of individuals and groups. These are listed below:

1. Developed faculty survey questions on teaching at SFU; this forms part of a larger survey to be administered by Sue Roppel and David Kaufman.
2. Provided feedback to Laurine Harrison on her report of grading practices at SFU.
3. Provided feedback to motion circulated by the SFU Faculty Association (SFUFA).
4. Provided advice to Cheryl Amundsen, Faculty of Education, on her proposal for a faculty workshop on 'Rethinking Teaching: A Course Design Workshop for Professors'. This week-long workshop is being offered for the first time at SFU from April 28-May 2, 2003. (It is a collaborative project among the Faculty of Education, LIDC, and McGill University; it has been offered successfully at McGill for a dozen years.)
5. Provided advice regarding the LIDC redesign of the SFU Teaching page.
6. Provided advice to Charlotte French in Student Services regarding the Student Services' Student Handbook entitled, 'Making the Grade'.
7. Provided feedback to the SFU Surrey Long Term Planning Committee.
8. Provided feedback to the Chair of the SFU Task Force on Academic Honesty and Integrity.
9. Provided advice to Tom Grieve, Chair of the SFU Writing Requirement Support Group.
10. Began the process of collecting teaching evaluation forms and procedures from departments and schools across the university.
11. Adjudicated the proposals submitted by SFU faculty and others for the SFU Symposium on Innovative Teaching scheduled for May 12-15, 2003.
12. Provided advice and assistance to the Director, LIDC.
13. It should be noted that the Terms of Reference of SCUTL were revised to reflect the organizational changes that have occurred, i.e., LIDC.

Activities to be Undertaken (2003-04)

Based on its discussions during the past academic year, SCUTL will engage in the following activities in the 2003-04 academic year.

Use of Web-Based Technology

1. Write to all departments and schools to encourage them to have as much information as possible on the web about their courses, and particularly course outlines, and to help them link these outlines directly to registration information so that students can access this information directly without searching. We will work with Sue Roppel, Director-Academic Relations to add this to her 'Best Practices' guide for Chairs and Directors.
2. Write to Student Services to offer assistance in redesigning the Student Handbook for placing on the SFU website, accompanied by a shorter and more 'user-friendly' print version prepared for students. The LIDC can provide design and web assistance.

Policies and Procedures

3. Write to each department/school to offer assistance in defining clearly the criteria for renewal, promotion and tenure, in the area of teaching.

4. Advocate for the teaching dossier/ portfolio as the primary tool used by faculty to present evidence of their teaching contributions and performance and by RTP committees to assess faculty's teaching.
5. Work with the LIDC to offer resources, e.g., website, printed materials, training, on how to develop a teaching dossier/portfolio and for RTP committees on how to evaluate teaching dossiers/ portfolios. Model dossiers/portfolios should be developed across various disciplines.
6. Work with the SFUFA and senior administration to have the motion approved by faculty at the meeting of the Faculty Association developed as University policy (see Appendix II);

APPENDIX I

Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL)

Standing (Reporting Category B)

Last updated 5 August 2003

Members	Conditions	Term	Expiry Date	Name
Faculty Member of SCUTL	Chair. Elected by members of SCUTL	2 years	May 31, 2005	Bernard Roitberg
Faculty Member (Applied Sciences)	Elected by Senate	3 years	May 31, 2004	Martin Laba
Faculty Member (Arts)		3 years	May 31, 2005	Tom Grieve
Faculty Member (Business Admin)		3 years	May 31, 2004	Anne MacDonald
Faculty Member (Education)		3 years	May 31, 2006	Cheryl Amundsen
Faculty Member (Science)		3 years	May 31, 2005	Bernard Roitberg
Undergraduate Student	Elected by Senate	1 year	May 31, 2004	Gisele Da Silva
Graduate Student		1 year	May 31, 2004	Jonathon Crago
Director, Learning and Instructional Development Centre	Secretary, Ex-officio (voting)			David Kaufman
Director, Student Academic Resources	Ex-officio (voting)			Charlotte French

Terms of Reference:

1. To provide advice on matters pertaining to Learning Outcomes and Prior Learning Assessment.
2. To review periodically, and provide advice on, grading practices and standards in the Faculties.
3. To review periodically, and to provide advice and guidance on, the appropriateness of teaching evaluation instruments in use in the University.
4. To review periodically, and to provide advice on, the instructional development needs of faculty, sessional instructors and teaching assistants.

5. To review and comment on the annual reports of the Learning and Instructional Development Centre, the Academic Computing Services, the Student Academic Resources office and the Lohn Lab, and annual undergraduate surveys.
6. To provide advice on the annual program of the Learning and Instructional Development Centre.
7. To provide advice on the efficacy of various teaching strategies in relation to changing teaching and learning environments.
8. To consider such matters, related to teaching and learning, referred to the Committee by Senate and its committees.

Quorum - 5 members

Reports to Senate annually in May.

APPENDIX II Motion Regarding the Evaluation of Teaching

Whereas student ratings of instruction have been used at SFU for about 15 years without a fully grounded and scientific basis for evaluation, or procedures for their implementation, and appear to have an undue influence on the overall evaluation of teaching contributions,
and

Whereas questionnaires completed by students regarding the quality of an instructor's teaching are often influenced by factors extraneous to the quality of teaching (see attachment 1),
and

Whereas the proper administration and interpretation of the results of student questionnaires is widely recognized by specialists to be of crucial importance in rendering impartial evaluations of teaching performance by Departmental Tenure Committees (DTCs, soon to be called Tenure and Promotion Committees),
and

Whereas student ratings of instructors comprise only one of several components in the effort to achieve an impartial and accurate evaluation of teaching ability,
and

Whereas studies of the value of student questionnaires demonstrate only moderate correlations between the student-generated evaluations and independently conducted assessments of teaching quality, e.g., correlations between student ratings of the teaching of their professor and their achievement in the course is typically .4-.5 out of a possible 1.0).
and

Whereas a joint committee of administration and SFUFA has proposed a new policy for promotion, tenure, and renewal that includes an expanded set of criteria for the evaluation of teaching (Proposed Policy A11.05, Section 5; see attachment 2).

Therefore, the SFUFA urges its executive and SFU administrators to press Senate to strike a subcommittee or taskforce to develop and recommend for implementation appropriate methods of evaluating faculty contributions to teaching.

Specifically:

The adoption of student questionnaire forms by each department that have been designed by specialists and have been demonstrated to have a viable degree of reliability and validity across a broad spectrum of teaching styles and fields (see attachment 3), and that provides opportunity for local adaptation and/or additions of items,
and

The adoption of clear and consistent procedures to be used by DTCs when evaluating and interpreting the results of student questionnaires. These procedures should require DTCs to make a concerted effort to factor out extraneous influences and incorporate the faculty member's own narrative,
and

The adoption of the 'teaching dossier/portfolio', which provides a balanced and holistic evaluation of each instructor's teaching, as the primary document to be submitted by faculty and used by DTCs (see attachment 4),
and

The education of DTCs in methods of evaluating teaching dossiers/portfolios, as well as Chairs and Directors of each academic department and school, to enable them to properly facilitate each DTC's evaluation of teaching/portfolios. Criteria are specified in Policy A11.05, Section 5 (see attachment 2).

*Drafted by Adhoc Working Group of SFUFA: Bob Hadley,
Sheila Delaney, Neil Abramson, David Kaufman (advisor)*

6.

ATTACHMENT 1

Greenwald, A. Validity Concerns and Usefulness of Student Ratings of Instruction. *American Psychologist*. Nov., 1997.

ATTACHMENT 2

SFU ~~Proposed~~ Policy A11.05, Section 5

ATTACHMENT 3

See next two pages

ATTACHMENT 4

See the excellent Teaching Dossier Kit on the University of Victoria website
<http://web.uvic.ca/terc/resources/publications/teaching.htm>

A 11.05 Criteria for Appointment, Contract Renewal, Tenure, Promotion and Salary Review

5. DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

5.1 Each department, school and non-departmentalized faculty or area within a non-departmentalized Faculty will draw up, and have adopted by the tenure-track faculty, sets of criteria, standards and methods of assessment for tenure and for promotion to Professor that will be reviewed and either reaffirmed or revised no less than every three years. These departmental criteria must be approved by the Dean, copied to the Vice President, Academic and must be consistent with the general university requirements for tenure and promotion contained in this policy.

5.2 When a faculty member is hired into a tenure-track position, he/she must be given a copy of the most recently approved departmental criteria for tenure. These will be the applicable standards when that faculty member is considered for tenure unless he/she opts to be evaluated against the department's most recently approved criteria for tenure.

5.3 When a faculty member is being considered for promotion to Professor, his/her performance will be measured against the most recently approved criteria for promotion to Professor in existence at the time of consideration.

March 1, 2003

ATTACHMENT 3

STUDENT RATINGS OF INSTRUCTION

Standardized Instruments

IDEA – Individual Development Educational Assessment

The IDEA Center, Inc.

211 South Seth Child Road, Manhattan, KS 66502-3089

1.800.255.2757 or 1.785.532.5970 ---- FAX 1.785.532.5725

<http://www.idea.ksu.edu/products/Sturatings.html>

Another website which includes advantages and disadvantages of using IDEA

http://www.sju.edu/facultysenate/facomm/FacultySenate/Ad%20Hoc%20Committee%20on%20Teaching%20Evaluation_report_021002.htm (See section labelled "Alternative 5b)

SEEQ - Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality

<http://cea.curtin.edu.au/seeq/about.html>

"...SEEQ provides an empirical basis to research teaching and when administered at the end of the semester, generates a summative profile of teaching performance..."

Another website... <http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/files/tcheval.html>

Multidimensional

According to Marsh (1984, 1993), there are several reasons why evaluations of teaching should be considered as multifaceted. First, if effective teaching is multifaceted (e.g., Cruckshank, 1985; Gage and Berliner, 1992; Huitt, 1995), then instruments for student evaluations should reflect this multi-dimensionality. Second, there is no single criterion of effective teaching (e.g., McKeachie, 1990). Therefore, a construct approach to validate student ratings is necessary whereby the student evaluation ratings are shown to be related to additional indicators of effective teaching. Finally, different factors of student evaluations will correlate more highly with different indicators of effective teaching (e.g., McKeachie, 1973). Therefore, student ratings should not be summarized by one response to a single item or an unweighted average response to many items.

Throughout the 1980's and 1990's, Marsh (1983, 1984, 1993) studied the multi-dimensionality of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness by the administration of one million questionnaires representing 50,000 courses. Marsh's questionnaire, the Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality (SEEQ), contains thirty-three evaluation items, divided into nine subgroups...

ETS – Educational Testing System (Major Field Tests)

Testing Service Educational

Rosedale Road

Princeton, NJ 08541 USA

(609) 921-9000

FAX: 609-734-5410

<http://www.ets.org/hea/mft/index.html>

SUSSAI – State University System Student Assessment of Instruction

The State University System Student Assessment of Instruction (SUSSAI) was created by the Board of Regents in 1995. It has been administered every semester in virtually every course in all eleven Florida state universities. This section provides information regarding the administration of the SUSSAI and uses of its results.

<http://www.fgcu.edu/planning/Assessment/SUSSAI/documents/Validation.html>

SIR-II – Student Instructional Report II

College instruction has many dimensions, necessitating evaluation that is multifaceted. The Student Instruction Report II takes into account that the best way to evaluate an instructor's effectiveness is to do so over time and in a variety of ways. In the SIR II -- which takes 15 minutes or less to complete -- students respond anonymously to 45 questions, plus up to 10 optional questions added by the instructor.

<http://www.ets.org/hea/sirII/>

Sample Report <http://www.spsu.edu/arts/documents/sir2.doc>

AZTEQ – Arizona Teacher – Course Evaluation Questionnaire

... The AZTEQ was built around four dimensions: instructor's presentation and delivery, instructor's interaction and feedback, course components and integration, and workload and difficulty. Clearly the SIR-II, the IDEA, and the AZTEQ cover most of the major components of the construct of teaching effectiveness....

<http://sccaix1.sunysuffolk.edu/Web/Central/IT/InstResearch/strate.htm>

Purdue Instructor and Course Evaluation Service - PICES (replaces Purdue Cafeteria System)

<http://www.dis.purdue.edu/instructionaldata/pdf/service.pdf>

Little else could be found about either Cafeteria or PICES. Please see:

http://provost.utsa.edu/documents/Course_Evaluation_Instrument_Report-20010405.pdf

Another website: (See "Evaluating Teaching" <http://online.sfsu.edu/~perttula/ratings/Fink.htm>)

CIEQ - Aleamoni Course/Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire

<http://www.cednet.com/info.html>

http://provost.utsa.edu/documents/Course_Evaluation_Instrument_Report-20010405.pdf

IAS – University of Washington Instructional Assessment System

<http://www.washington.edu/oea/describe.htm>

Another website: http://provost.utsa.edu/documents/Course_Evaluation_Instrument_Report-20010405.pdf