

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

10-19-2009

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, October 19, 2009

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, October 19, 2009" (2009). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 406.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/406

This Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.





FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

October 19, 2009
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Champ Hall Conference Room

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Ed Heath
Approval of Minutes September 21, 2009
- 3:05 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
Raymond Coward, Provost
- 3:20 Announcements**.....Ed Heath
Next Brown Bag Lunch w/ President, Thursday November 12th at noon Champ Hall
- 3:25 Information Items**
- Athletic Council Report.....Ken White
 - Faculty Evaluation Committee Report.....Greg Podgorski
- 3:45 New Business**
EPC Items.....Larry Smith
- 3:50 Adjournment as Executive Committee and reconvene as Faculty Forum Committee**



FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 21, 2009 3:00 P.M.

Champ Hall Conference Room

Present: Ed Heath (Chair), Mike Parent (Past President), Vincent Wickwar (President Elect), Byron Burnham, Steve Burr, Renee Galliher, Kelly Kopp, Glen McEvoy, Flora Shrode, Darwin Sorensen, Nathan Straight (excused), Provost Ray Coward (Ex-Officio), Joan Kleinke (Exec. Sec.), Marilyn Bloxham (Assistant) **Guests:** Christie Fox, Lisa Leishman, Ronald Ryel, Larry Smith, Jill Thorngren,

Ed Heath called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Byron Burnham motioned to approve the minutes of August 24, 2009. Motion was seconded by Mike Parent and the motion passed unanimously.

University Business – Provost Coward

Provost Coward introduced and welcomed Dr. Jill Thorngren. Dr. Thorngren is an American Council on Education Fellow and will be working with the President for the upcoming year. She is the Associate Dean for the College of Education, Health and Human Development at Montana State University.

Enrollment numbers show that overall headcount is up about 7% for all campuses. We will have the highest total enrollment in the history of the university with 25,065 students. The undergraduate enrollment on the Logan campus was up 3.1%, regional campuses up 17.2%. Total FTE are up 4.5%, this is about 700 extra FTE's resulting in approximately \$2.5 million in unexpected tuition. This is the fourth year in a row the Logan campus will have an enrollment increase. Regional campus enrollment has increased from 5000 in 2004 to 10,000 in 2009. High school graduate numbers have been flat and declining. Growth is attributed to efforts made by the Admissions program for actively recruiting students who would have gone elsewhere for their education.

Negotiations on the merger with CEU continue. Progress is being made on basic but important issues such as: students will be receiving USU degrees, faculty will be USU faculty, employees will be USU employees, and students will be USU students. From this comes a number of other decisions that have been in dispute, for example, once they are USU degrees then it is appropriate that curricular issues come through the USU Faculty Senate. Committees are moving towards a Memorandum of Understanding that would be adopted by the Regents and then become the basis for legislative action. Several name changes have been suggested. USU has agreed to retain the traditional name of the College, but believes the future exists with Utah State, and has proposed the name be Utah State University - College of Eastern Utah. Faculty Senate reapportionment will also be an issue as the merger progresses.

Announcements – Ed Heath

- The next Brown Bag Lunch with the President and Provost will be October 19th at noon in Champ Hall.
- Faculty Forum Planning Meeting will be held directly after FSEC October 19th
- FEC will report to the FSEC on October 19th

Information Items

EPC Annual Report – Larry Smith. Noteworthy items from the last year include the restructuring of the John M. Huntsman School of Business, several name changes to departments and programs, and a major revision of the student code particularly section 6 which deals with student academic

integrity. As a result there will be a new online form called the Academic Integrity Violation Form (AIVF). This should streamline the reporting process for faculty who are concerned about students that may be violating academic standards. Vince Wickwar asked that the TOFEL scores be clarified; the scores in the report are undergraduate scores. There is a standalone minor for Climate Change & Energy, in the Plants, Soils, and Climate Department. It needs to be made clear that this minor is available to people in any department. Mike Parent moved to accept the report and place it on the consent agenda, Byron Burnham seconded and the motion carried.

Honors Program Report – Christie Fox. The Honors Program has been restructured creating a new Honors Research Fund. Faculty are no longer paid for the mentorship of students in contracts. Some of the money that used to go to faculty is now being funneled directly to students. Students may apply for Research Funds, up to \$400. The Honors Program has implemented a new application process; students may now apply while still in high school. The Honors Program reports a freshman class of 150, which met their enrollment goal. Scholarship awards related to the Honors Program include a Rhodes Finalist, two Goldwater Scholars, one Honorable Mention, and a White House intern. Renee Galliher moved to accept the report and place it on the consent agenda, Vince Wickwar seconded, motion carried.

Libraries Advisory Council Report – Ronald RyeI. An institutional repository is being developed to house all institutional academic works that would be accessible not only to the University but would be accessible worldwide. The repository will be an easy place to reference because it will be a permanent source for the information. The libraries have also focused on standardization and communication of copyright issues relating to publications. This is a complicated issue because publishers have different rules. Improving access to remote campuses and standardizing this access is also a priority. A question was raised about journal subscriptions and if the committee has any oversight regarding them. Ronald said that half of the committee's time is spent on this issue. A key component is that you not only have to have current access to online journals but historical access as well. It is a constant challenge to fund the most important journals and identify which ones should not be renewed. Mike Parent moved to accept the report and place it on the consent agenda, Glenn McEvoy seconded, motion carried.

Parking Committee Report – Lisa Leishman. Resolutions that were approved by the committee included a resolution to change the designation of the lot at the LDS Church on 7th North and 12th East from free, no permit required, to a student blue lot. This helps to offset the loss of blue stalls due to the new tennis courts. Resolution 9.2 increased the cost of a motorcycle permit from \$20 to \$40 for students; faculty and staff who have a green permit can still get a motorcycle permit for \$20 and will receive a sticker that allows them to park the motorcycle in their regular faculty/staff lot. A resolution that was not approved would have defined legal parking areas for bicycles and included the ability to cite bicycles. It would be difficult to identify the owners of the bicycles and enforcement such a policy. Bicycle registration is not required on campus. Comments were made that there needs to be additional parking stalls for bicycles. The hours of enforcement in the gold lot on the west side of the business building were changed. The gates are now open at 5:00 pm but there are stalls reserved for faculty and staff. The resolution to extend the hours of the Big Blue Terrace was not approved. The Parking Committee is advisory to the administration, and all resolutions and actions must be approved by the administration. Vince Wickwar asked what is being done to improve traffic flow near the performance hall during performances. Lisa indicated that they are working with the College of HASS to try to develop a better solution for parking for their patrons. The Employee of the Month parking program for the College of HASS is a benefit for HASS employees. The College pays an annual fee of \$500 for this privilege. The selected employee can park in that designated space, regardless of their own parking pass restrictions. Steve Burr asked how the number of disability parking stalls is determined. Federal law mandates that there is one disabled stall for every 25 regular stalls up to 1000, after which it is determined by formula. It is determined per parking lot, not campus wide. Mike Parent moved to accept and place the report on the consent agenda, Steve Burr seconded, motion carried.

New Business

EPC – Larry Smith. Neither the General Education Subcommittee or the Academic Standards Subcommittee has met yet. The Curriculum subcommittee has had 44 requests for minor changes in course actions. Last year the committee handled 650 such requests. A major action that occurred was the approval of a proposal to offer an Associate of Pre-Engineering degree. Renee Galliher moved to accept the report and place it on the consent agenda, Vince Wickwar seconded, motion carried.

Committee on Committees – Ed Heath. There are still a few senators that need to be appointed to committees by the colleges. Ed visited with some of the colleges in person to encourage the appointments. PRPC has not met yet and the AFT committee is still lacking a member, but progress is being made. It is expected to have the vacancies filled by the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Minutes Submitted by: Joan Kleinke, Faculty Senate Executive Secretary, 797-1776

Utah State University

Athletic Council Report

For Period of
July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009

Submitted to the
Utah State University
Faculty Senate

By USU Athletic Council

Kenneth L. White Chair, (2008-2009), Faculty Athletics Representative
Hilda Fronske, Vice Chair (2008-2009)

Executive Summary

The Athletic Council advises the President with respect to the athletics program. The duties of the council are to: (a) help maintain an athletic program compatible with the best academic interests of the university; (b) assure compliance with the rules of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and the university athletic code; (c) review and recommend to the President all intercollegiate athletic budgets; and (d) recommend policies and procedures for all aspects of the intercollegiate programs. Major issues of importance to Athletics at Utah State University (USU) during the 2008-09 academic year were: Athletics student funding referendum, coaching staff changes, and addressing challenges associated with the national economic downturn. The Utah State University Athletics department was honored as the 2009 National Champions for Excellence in Management, which is recognition for running the most efficient program in the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS). The latest (2008) Utah State University student athlete federal graduation rate is 65% (2001-02 cohort rate; compared to 44% for the general USU student Body), with a four-year average of 58% (46% for all students). A total of 181 student athletes received All – Academic conference (WAC – lead the conference). There were 150 recipients of the Joe E. Whitesides Scholar-Athlete awards (3.2 or better GPA). The Athletics department continued their efforts at enhancing funding through increased ticket sales, Big Blue contributions, sponsorship opportunities, media contracts, outside donations and increased student funding. Overall, the Athletics programs at Utah State University are working toward the growth that is necessary to keep the program competitive as a member of the WAC.

Faculty Senate Report Athletics Council

Introduction:

Committee Members: Kenneth White, Chair; Hilda Fronske, Vice-Chair, Stan Albrecht, Raymond Coward, Gray Chambers, Fred Hunsaker, Ross Peterson, Scott Barnes, Jana Doggett, Dennis Dolny, Wallace Odd, Lance Brown, Grady Brimley, Brandon Broadhead, Melissa Osterloh, Nnamdi Gwacham, Jeanine Hernandez, Pat Evans, Brett Shelton, David Olsen, Allison Cook, Dallas Holmes. *Ex Officio Members:* Brian Evans, Jeff Crosbie, Dave Cowley, Whitney Pugh.

Mission: The Athletic Council advises the President with respect to the athletics program. The duties of the council are to: (a) help maintain an athletic program compatible with the best academic interests of the university; (b) assure compliance with the rules of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and the university athletic code; (c) review and recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees all intercollegiate athletic budgets; and (d) recommend policies and procedures for all aspects of the intercollegiate programs. The annual report from the Athletics Council to Faculty Senate includes both future and current issues facing the Athletics Department. Each issue is reviewed by the athletics council to insure the Department of Athletics is operating within the guidelines of the NCAA and Utah State University.

Meeting Schedule: The Athletics Council meets monthly from September –April of each academic year, unless conflicts or a lack of agenda items dictates meeting cancelation. During 2008-09 academic terms the Council held six of the scheduled eight meetings. Meetings during the months of October and December were canceled and the business items carried over to the next regularly scheduled meeting. The December meeting was canceled due to the final exam period conflicts and a lack of time-sensitive pending agenda items and the October meeting was canceled due to a lack of agenda items. All agendas and minutes of 2008-09 Athletic Council meetings are available in the Appendix of this report.

I. *Significant Athletic Council Issues/Actions during 2008-09 academic year (highlights briefly described below):*

1. Athletic Program Compatible with Academic Interests of University.

- Academic Improvement plans reviewed for Football and Men's Basketball.
 - APR and GSR rates reviewed for each team (refer to Academic Performance data listed below).
- Mid-semester academic progress report procedures revised to achieve higher response rates.

2. Assure NCAA Rules Compliance.

- USU successfully sponsored new legislation to treat students on missions similar to all other student-athletes who desire to transfer institutions.

- Gender equity continues to be monitored – maximum limits for men’s and minimum limits for women’s programs have been established to help maintain equity.
- Additional women’s sports opportunities will need to be evaluated for possible addition at some future period.

3. **Review and Recommendation of Athletics Budgets.**

- The Council reviewed and accepted 2007-08 final budget numbers and proposed budget for 2008-09.
- The Council had extensive discussion during several meetings throughout the year regarding the need for increased student athletic fees to help address budgetary needs.
- Discussed and approved proposed student athletics fee referendum.

4. **Recommend Policies and Procedures for Athletics Programs.**

- Implemented new comprehensive student athlete exit interview spring of 2009.
- Online venue for all student athletes.
- Face-to-face exit interviews with student athletes exhausting eligibility (Athletic Director, Senior Associate Athletic Director, and Faculty Athletic Representative).

II. ***Miscellaneous Athletics-Related Events/Changes during 2007-08:***

1. Changes in Athletics Department Personnel:

- Coaching Changes:
 - Gary Andersen was named Utah State head football coach on December 4. Gary Andersen becomes the 26th head coach in 115 years of Aggie football. Gary Andersen comes to Utah State after five seasons as the assistant head coach, defensive coordinator and defensive line coach at Utah.
 - Other football coaching changes - Dave Baldwin was appointed Utah State's new offensive coordinator; Bill Busch was appointed as Utah State's defensive coordinator; Alex Gerke was appointed Utah State's offensive line coach; Corey Raymond was appointed Utah State's cornerbacks coach; Steve Mathis was appointed as director of football operations; Ilaisa Tuiaki was appointed Utah State's running backs coach; Chad Kauha 'aha 'a was appointed as Utah State's defensive line coach; Kevin Clune was appointed as linebackers coach; Kevin McGiven appointed the quarterbacks coach; TJ Woods was appointed as Utah State's tight ends coach.
 - Carissa Kalaba was appointed Utah State's new softball coach replacing Candi Letts. Kyla Sullivan was hired to join Kelly Park as the two softball assistant coaches.
- Other Personnel Changes:
 - Kent Stanley was appointed the Utah State Athletics Department as senior associate athletics director for development on August 4.

Stanley will be responsible for the overall administration, management and supervision of athletic development and fundraising efforts, and associated personnel for the athletics department. He will also focus on planning and executing capital and annual fund initiatives for athletics in conjunction with the University foundation.

- Evan Simon has joined the Utah State Athletics Department as its new strength and conditioning coach.
- Jason Thomas has joined the Utah State Athletics Department as an academic advisor/tutor coordinator for student-athlete services.

2. Athletic Facilities Updates:

- Hall of Honor opening in the Jim and Carol Laub Athletics-Academics Complex.
- Construction of off court facilities for men's and women's basketball started, to be completed October 2009.

3. Academic Performance of Student Athletes 2007-08:

- Graduation rates
 - The 02-03 cohort rate is 73%, with a four year average of 60%;
 - The 01-02 cohort rate is 65%, with a four year average of 58%;
 - The 00-01 cohort rate is 41%, with a four year average of 55%;
 - The 99-00 cohort rate is 61%, with a four year average of 64%;
 - The 98-99 cohort rate is 64%, with a 4-year average of 62%;
 - The '97-'98 cohort rate was 53%, with a 4-year average of 62%;

The NCAA released the first Graduation Success Rate (GSR) for all teams of all NCAA Division I Member Institutions in December, 2005. This rate, a 4-year Average that can be directly compared to the Federal Rates' 4-year average mentioned above, is a more accurate snapshot of how scholarship student-athletes graduate. Students who transfer to USU that fall into one of the cohorts are counted in this rate (they are *not* counted in the federal rate) when they graduate; students who transfer from USU and are academically eligible at the time of transfer do *not* count against USU graduation rates (as they do with the federal rate). The overall USU GSR for the 4-year cohorts encompassing 1999-2002 is **85% (compared to last year's 82%)**.

4. Academics/Awards

- Composite 3.04 Student-Athlete GPA
- 181 Academic All-Conference Selections (***Most in the Western Athletic Conference***) 2008-09.
- 85% NCAA Graduation Success Rate (***leads the Western Athletic Conference***)
- 150 Whiteside Scholar-Athletes (***3.2 or better GPA***)
- Utah State's men's and women's cross country teams received the

U.S. Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association (USTFCCCA) Academic Award. The men had the second-highest GPA of the schools honored with a **3.755** average. The Aggie women were the 10th-highest in GPA average with **3.640**

- USU's women's soccer team received the NSCAA/Adidas College Women Team Academic Award for the sixth straight year. USU also had four players honored by the NSCAA as seniors Alyssa Lowry and Ali Griffin, and junior Lindsey Smart were named to the second-team, while junior Sydne Porter was named to the honorable mention team. Smart was also named all-region by Soccer Buzz.
- Volleyball players Rebecca Anderson and Katie Astle, and track and field athletes Tyler Ellis, Ashley Johnson and Steve Strickland all earned CoSIDA academic second-team all-district VIII honors, as did football player Derek Hoke.

5. Athletics Accomplishments of Department (2008-09):

- Utah State University was recognized as the **2009 National Champions in the Excellence in Management Cup**. This is awarded to the most economically efficient athletic department in the Football Bowl Subdivision (formerly Division IA).
- Utah State won its second straight Western Athletic Conference regular season title, including its first outright. USU also won its first-ever WAC Tournament championship.
- Stew Morrill was named the WAC Coach of the Year for the third time at Utah State (2000, 2002, 2009) and for the fourth time overall as he was named the Big Sky Conference Coach of the Year in 1991 at Montana.
- Senior forward Gary Wilkinson was named the WAC's Player of the Year in 2009, while junior guard Jared Quayle was named to the league's second-team along with being named to the all-newcomer squad. Wilkinson was also named an honorable mention All-American by the Associated Press.
- Gary Wilkinson was also named the Most Valuable Player of the 2009 WAC Tournament, while Jared Quayle and Tai Wesley were both named to the all-tournament team.
- Utah State was ranked in the top 25 for four weeks during the 2008-09 season, including three straight weeks in February when it climbed as high as No. 17 in the ESPN/USA Today Coaches poll and No. 21 in the AP poll.
- Utah State set a school record by winning 30 games this year, breaking the old mark of 28 wins set during the 1999-2000 and 2000-01 seasons.
- Utah State recorded its 10th straight 23-win season, extending its current school record. Overall, it is the 25th time in school history that Utah State has won 20 or more games.

- Utah State played in its 10th straight postseason, which is a school record, as it has appeared in the NCAA Tournament six times (2000, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2009) and the NIT four times (2002, 2004, 2007, 2008).
-

III. **Budget:**

Revenues	Actual FY07-08	Actual FY08-09
E&G	\$2,739,845	\$3,320,878
Inst. Support	\$3,506,788	\$2,937,702
Student Fees	\$1,566,834	\$1,772,698
Football Home Gate	\$440,332	\$884,324
Football Guarantees	\$700,000	\$335,000
Men's Basketball	\$809,633	\$806,155
BBSF Donations	\$856,907	\$1,039,515
BBSF Events	\$218,167	\$105,349
TV Rights	\$0	\$50,000
ASP - Sponsorship	\$708,570	\$791,399
Athletic Fund	\$586,565	\$525,867
NCAA/WAC	\$1,247,973	\$1,533,642
Endowment Earnings	\$115,279	\$2,346
Sport Specific		\$1,311,783
TOTAL	\$13,496,893	\$15,416,658

Expense (FY08-09)	Sports	Non-Program Specific	TOTAL	
Athletics student aid	\$3,549,081	\$535,811	\$4,084,892	
Guarantees	\$390,950		\$390,950	
Coaching salaries, benefits, etc.	\$3,405,119		\$3,405,119	
Coaching other compensation	\$45,000		\$45,000	
Support staff salaries, benefits, etc.	\$71,587	\$2,136,786	\$2,208,373	
Severance Payments	\$163,998		\$163,998	
Recruiting	\$246,961		\$246,961	
Team travel	\$1,775,494		\$1,775,494	
Equipment, uniforms and supplies	\$565,717	\$226,578	\$792,295	
Game expenses	\$313,420		\$313,420	
Fund raising, marketing, promotions	\$14,936	\$174,780	\$189,716	
Direct facilities, maintenance and rental	\$457,307	\$415,126	\$872,433	
Spirit Groups	\$2,674		\$2,674	
Medical expenses and insurance	\$3,005	\$315,440	\$318,445	
Memberships and dues	\$7,131	\$407,257	\$414,388	
Other operating expenses	\$408,858	\$631,814	\$1,040,672	***
TOTAL	\$11,421,238	\$4,843,592	\$16,264,830	

REVENUE	\$15,416,658
EXPENSE	\$16,264,830
Surplus/(Deficit)	(\$848,172)

***** Top Four Categories**

Professional/Technical Fees
Contract Services
General Travel
Visit/Receptions

Appendix:

**Athletic Council Meeting
Champ Hall Conference Room
September 17, 2008
Agenda Items**

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. | Athletic Director Report | Scott Barnes |
| 2. | NCAA Dashboard | Scott Barnes |
| 3. | ASUSU Live Bull for Mascot | Grady Brimley |
| 4. | Schedule for Athletic Council | Ken White |
| 5. | Other Business | Ken White |

**Athletic Council Meeting
Champ Hall Conference Room
November 19, 2008
Agenda Items**

- | | | |
|----|--|--------------|
| 1. | Athletic Director Report | Scott Barnes |
| 2. | NCAA graduation rate | Brian Evans |
| 3. | Mid-term Progress of Student-Athletes | Brian Evans |
| 4. | Academic Performance of our Student-Athletes | Brian Evans |
| 5. | Additional items | Ken White |

**Athletic Council Meeting
Champ Hall Conference Room
December 17, 2008
Agenda Items**

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. | Athletic Director Report | Scott Barnes |
| 2. | Gender & Minority Issues subcommittee | Gary Chambers |

**Athletic Council Meeting
Champ Hall Conference Room
January 21, 2009
Agenda Items**

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------------------|
| 1. | Gender & Minority Issues Subcommittee | Gary Chambers |
| 2. | Athletic Director Report | Scott Barnes/Jeff Crosbie |
| | A. 2008-2009 Athletics Budget | |
| | B. Intercollegiate Athletics Financial Plan | |
| 3. | Academic Breakdown Fall 2008 | Brian Evans |
| 4. | Other Business | Ken White |

**Athletic Council Meeting
Champ Hall Conference Room
February 18, 2009
Agenda Items**

1. Athletic Director Report
 - A. Sports Update
 - B. Athletic Student Fee Referendum
 - C. 2008-2009 Budget

**Athletic Council Meeting
Champ Hall Conference Room
March 18, 2009
Agenda Items**

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--------------|
| 1. | Athletic Director Report | Scott Barnes |
| 2. | Academic Update | Brian Evans |
| 3. | Compliance Program Overview | Jake Garlock |

Athletics Council Minutes

September 17, 2008

Athletics Council meeting was held on September 17, 2008 in the Champ Hall Conference Room. Those in attendance were Gary Chambers, Raymond Coward, Dave Cowley, Jeff Crosbie, Lance Brown, Brian Evans, Grady Brimley, Brandon Broadhead, Wally Odd, Whitney Pugh, Melissa Osterloh, Brett Shelton, Scott Barnes, Ken White, Ross Peterson, and David Olsen.

The last football game was the most attended game by the students and we want to recognize Lance and Grady for the student turn out.

Director of Athletics Report: The first two weeks being on the job Scott's biggest surprise is the passion for the Aggies. Phase-in portions of the SWOT Analysis and identify where we stand relative to budget. The first 90 days Scott has been meeting with approximately 150 individuals including campus and community leaders, donors, alumni, former student-athletes, current student-athletes, media and sponsors. In addition we held several town meetings and other gatherings in Utah, California, and Nevada.

The rationale behind these meetings was to allow me to develop an understanding of the culture that exists here and to become current on issues, challenges and opportunities, which have an impact on the current and future success of intercollegiate athletics. Further, this activity has allowed me to begin cultivating new relationships.

Scott discussed the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the athletics department. He then reviewed the NCAA Dashboard information and the non-funded comparison of coaches and administration salaries. Scott then reviewed "what's next" for the athletics department.

Gary asked what drives a student-athlete to choose one school over another. Scott replied that the faculty, health of the program, team, and TV exposure is all factors. Specifically, it is all over the map.

Scott reviewed the priorities that we must achieve: overhaul Intercollegiate Athletics budget and analyze funding sources, reorganize ICA development operations, implement a football program enhancement plan, increase football season ticket sales, establish capital campaign focus areas, improve internal and external communication, and expand our donor reach.

Scott let the council know he appreciated them listening. Ken thanked Scott for his report.

Grady brought to the council an idea from ASUSU. They would like to have a live mascot. Grady has talked with Jeff and Ken took the idea to the cabinet. ASUSU will cover the cost of a calf and they are working with others to help with future costs. We will look for a donor that has ties to help us. Ken will make some contacts. A young animal will make it easier to work with. Ken summarized the discussion with the group and the general consensus is to support getting a live animal mascot. Ken and Grady will follow up with this project.

We will look again at everyone's calendar for a different meeting time. We want to try to accommodate everyone's schedule.

Ken asked if there was any other business. With no further business Ken thanked everyone for their time.

Athletic Council Minutes
November 19, 2008

Athletic Council Meeting was held on November 19, 2008 in Champ Hall Conference Room. Those in attendance were: Gary Chambers, Raymond Coward, Dave Cowley, Jeff Crosbie, Lance Brown, Jana Doggett, Brian Evans, Nnamdi Gwacham, Grady Brimley, Brandon Broadhead, Wally Odd, Whitney Pugh Brett Shelton, Scott Barnes, Ken White, Ross Peterson, Dennis Dolny, and David Olsen. Those excused from the council meeting were: Stan Albrecht Pat Evans, Hilda Fronske Dallas Holmes, Fred Hunsaker, Melissa Osterloh, Jeanine Hernandez, and Alison Cook.

Ken White conducted the council meeting. Ken asked the council if they had any changes to the October meeting minutes. The minutes were approved as they were.

Scott would like to address the football situation and then discuss the athletic budget for last year. Scott said the change in football and the decision with Brent has been difficult. There is a lack of sustainable momentum. We have made program but in terms of wins we are not quite there.

We are about two things; providing a quality education on the field, in the classroom and in life. We are also about championship programs. We have moved forward and will conduct a swift and thorough search for a new coach. It will take us about three weeks to get a new coach in place depending on the candidate and their availability. The President and Scott are conducting the search. They are working with several entities and have visited with several people across the country. We have started the process to find a new football coach. Scott then asked if anyone had any questions.

Ken asked if we have made a good message with the transition. This is a critical time academically and we do not want to drop any “balls.”

Scott indicated that we talked about academics specifically with the team. Brian and Scott are discussing where we are with academics. Scott asked Nnamdi to follow up with his teammates. Brian met with the team last night. They discussed getting their grades up and staying focused, especially after the New Mexico State game. Scott said we have to be in the trenches right now and double our efforts. It is our job to help them through.

Brian indicated that at the end of the meeting he picked out 15 to 16 guys that are not where they should be and discussed where they are and explained this could affect their eligibility.

Scott will release no one on the team at this time. Until you look at new leadership we will not release anyone. One informal decision cannot be made until the new staff was on board and every case is different. Scott will have the new leadership talk with that individual and then decide whether to release the individual.

Gary asked what we can do to be support decisions that were made. It is an emotionally charged decision. What can we do to help with the transition?

Scott has been sharing his three point plan for football. The big question is why today is different than four years ago. There are several reasons why. We are going to build and sustain success.

We are better off than when Brent took the position and he should be commended for moving the meter. It was not as much as we wanted but he did move the meter.

The Logan airport is one thing that is different. To be able to fly out of Logan and have opponents fly in to Logan is important.

There are three pieces to the plan:

1. Football Competitive Excellence Plan: We want continuity in the program. We have been successful at raising dollars. It is critical to attract quality individuals. We need dollars to use for salaries to have continuity in the program.
2. Scheduling: We can't build a program without a balanced schedule. BYU and UTAH rivalries are good but not every year. We will about one pay day game. We are only receiving \$600,000 for Texas A&M 600,000 and \$600,000 for Oklahoma. I can't buy us out of these games but we will move some things around.

We will play 1 AA game a year, play Utah or BYU at home, one pay day game and start a regional rival game before we play the WAC games. We have to create some momentum and we have to have the opportunity.

3. Facility Development: The new building is a wonderful too. We will see results with this recruiting class. The Hall of Fame on the 2nd floor will be football legends and the 3rd floor will be academics.

We have a plan in place. We will create team unity and energy with the athletes. The quality of candidates is outstanding.

The Provost asked what markers we are looking for in a candidate to prove they are committed to academics.

We are asking the right questions about their APR. There will be language in the contract that will reflect the APR and we will put a penalty clause in place if they fall below the APR.

Jeff handed out a budget worksheet for athletics. In the first column is the source of funds. This is the athletics approved budget versus the year to date budget. When we originally did our budget we had to take a 10% cut on the budget. We took some cuts in areas that we thought we could make cuts and found out we could not make those cuts. We are not traveling a full squad; athletes are sharing beds, etc.

In the beginning of the budget process we were thinking of a higher payout for the 2006-2007 BCS payouts. Our revenues were up and our expenses were up as well. Our

turnover rate for coaches increased our dollars more than we anticipated. Football had expenses they incurred with moving to the new building.

Provost asked if the over spending like this is poor estimation or irresponsible spending? Did we under-estimate the expenses for the year?

Jeff replied that when we sat down with coaches and created the budget and then took a 10% cut from the budget we had created put us over budget. One example is travel, we are asking them to make cuts where they just couldn't. We have coaching staff that stay with family and friends save hotel dollars or borrow someone else's vehicle to save those dollars.

Scott indicated that our budgets aren't realistic thus the deficit you see. This did not happen overnight. We have a minimum number of sports and we are not sending athletes to everything. We can always be better stewards of our revenues.

Scott understands normally we would have already presented this year's budget. We want to do it with a plan. Ken talked with Academic Senate. Scott has met with the student fee committee and shared with them the state of our budget. Not any one revenue source will fix our budget problem. The WAC is where we should be.

We have a three to one budget difference in the WAC and the WAC put forth a plan with emphasis on the bottom growing. We are growing to close the gaps. There are three resources to closing the gap: One piece is student fees. We are not asking the students to carry the whole load, we are asking the students to help like never before. Another piece is institutional support. The University comes to help us in different ways. We are asking they put that support in as a revenue item to help us grow. We will present the budget and a plan at the next council meeting. It is really a critical time and we have the same economic pressures. That is why we need to get this right. We want to make sure we have folk's blessings.

The Provost asked if the goal is not to do away from deficit but to move toward our peers. Scott indicated we do not have to be in top half of the WAC but to be put in a position to advance. What can we do to get there over time?

The Provost asked about presenting the athletics budget to the Faculty Senate Present. Ken said we need to resolve the issues from last year. We will go through the right groups and then we will go to the Athletic Council, Senate leadership and then the full Senate.

You can do the math in your head to forecast next year's deficit. We have a plan to address the deficit going forward and having a reasonable experience for our athletes.

We did not realize the realistic expense of being in the WAC. That is where we need to be but at the time we did not fully understand the cost. Way back when we were planning on being participant in WAC. Scott is not being negative or throwing stones, it is much easier to look back

Gary asked if this is really do-able. At USU in Cache Valley, can it really happen? Scott said yes, he wouldn't be here if he didn't think in terms of creating a financial plan and succeeding.

Gary indicated you get a great feel for what is there, the discouragement. Scott said the bad news is worse than we thought, but the good news is that we are better than we thought. We have one hundred volunteers ready to go. We have doubled our Big Blue over the last three years. This year we will double our football revenues. All three pieces will handle it. The biggest question is if the student fee is passes. There are still some questions yet to be answered.

The question was asked if there is an average percentage from student fees.

In the WAC we are in the top 25% for self-generated revenues. Currently in 2006-2007 we self generate 47% of our budget. How does that compare to other schools. We are in the 75% for budgets our size. We are carrying our weight. We have 53% of our funds allocated and we are somewhere in lower middle. In WAC comparisons we are high. When we look at the student fees they fall across the board and are all over the map. We have found fees from \$14 - \$15 million. The low end is less than one million in the lower third of the graph. LA Tech has a low student fee but is getting capital dollars from the state.

Brian reviewed the NCAA graduation rate and GSR comparison data. Brian handed out the new graduation success rate report. The handout shows sport-by-sport success rate. This is a four class average starting in 2001. This is a cohort freshman class graduating in 2007.

We also keep track of one list for scholarship student-athletes only. We still have a few that are continuing towards graduation. We have a 95% graduation rate for our women student-athletes.

The Provost asked how football looks versus other schools. We are 3rd in the WAC for football. The Provost then asked what the national average for football is. Brian guessed that the national average is 65%.

Brian has sent out a midterm progress reports. We sent 252 requests with 172 responses back and 80 that have received no response. We would like a better response to the request and we have tried to let the faculty know how important these requests are for the athletes. The Provost asked for a list of the 80 faculty not responding to Brian's request. Ken thought one mechanism is to bring department heads in the group.

The new facility is being used by the student-athletes. Any time of the day you can see students using the study area.

Ken thanked everyone for their' time.

Athletic Council Minutes January 21, 2009

Athletic Council Meeting was held on January 21, 2009 in Champ Hall Conference Room. Those in attendance were: Gary Chambers, Ray Coward, Dave Cowley, Jeff Crosbie, Lance Brown, Jana Doggett, Brian Evans, Pat Evans, Nnamdi Gwacham, Dallas Holmes, Grady Brimley Brandon Broadhead, Whitney Pugh, Brett Shelton, Scott Barnes, Ken White, Ross Peterson, Dennis Dolny, David Olsen and Alison Cook. Those excused from the meeting were: Hilda Fronske, Wally Odd, Fred Hunsaker, Melissa Osterloh and Jeanine Hernandez.

Gender and Minority Issues Subcommittee: Gary gave a Gender and Minority Subcommittee update to the council. The information in the handout reflects USU's participation comparisons that were reported for 2008 - and the numbers did climb for 2009.

Jana indicated the numbers are in sync. We have met with all the coaches to discuss squad size, maximum on the men's side and the minimum on women's side. USU must add another sport to the women's program. We are currently evaluating the club sports as potential options. We are not ready to add another sport yet, but we are looking into what adoptions we have for future consideration. It must be a sport that has local (campus) interest and that will allow us access to adequate numbers of women participants.

Gary asked if we are asking which program brings the most interest.

Dennis asked about adding a swimming team. We have a swimming pool and a diving well. We could get really qualified coaches that would be interested in starting a WAC program. Jana indicated that our swimming pool is a touch too small to qualify for competitions. We would have to travel a swimming team for all competitions.

Gary said that his committee is meeting regularly. We are documenting our information and making good strides.

Athletic Director Report: Scott presented information regarding the Athletics budget and student fees (presentation attached). We all believe the WAC is where we need to be, now at this point.

We are receiving \$52 now and are asking, through a special student referendum, for an additional \$65. We are comparing our student fees to the WAC and MAC schools because they are similar to us. If approved, this would constitute \$2 million in new revenues. Fresno State just passed a new student fee. Another important comparison is how much of our venues are reserved for students, for example, 40% of the USU basketball venue goes to students.

Financial Plan: We have a deficit of \$1,098,429 for the current year we are in (2008-09). In previous years, institutional support has become available to help offset expenditures as well as access to non-budgeted revenues (BCS Football funds). We originally were expecting \$1.6 million in student fees this year but there was a decrease

in fees and an increase in other areas such as tuition. We experienced a \$30,000 increase in football ticket sales and Men's basketball is close to reaching the projected revenue mark.

We are developing a plan looking out over several years and have a plan designed to fix this problem.

We have developed a football excellence fund. This fund is designed to fund higher salaries and increase expenses associated with the football program. We have commitments of over \$1 million for football and have \$600,000 to \$800,000 out in asks. This is not a grass roots program but a targeted gifts program from individuals that have specific interests in football and with the commitment to increase their giving and not reduce other planned giving.

Scott Barnes, Ken White and the Provost met with Mike Parent, Jon Krass, and Ed Heath, from the leadership of the Faculty Senate, this morning. Scott asked the Provost to talk a little about the meeting. The Provost said that the deficit is an internal loan that we have made to athletics. It is an issue that we must carry forward to be transparent but we shouldn't ever think that it is money that has not been paid. It is an accounting issue. Dave Cowley said that this is true; we have borrowed the money from ourselves. The Provost reiterated this is an internal accounting issue.

Gary said the vote on the referendum would be on March 23 and 24. This is a very interesting topic to see if students will pass or not.

Scott said that if the fees do not pass we would redo the financial plan and look elsewhere. This problem didn't happen overnight and therefore cannot be fixed overnight.

Ken said the council approved the report for last year's budget. The council needs to review and approve this year's (2008-09) budget. He asked Scott to have the budget ready to go before the council at the next meeting.

Gary said that in the history of the fee board no one has come back every year for an increase. Historically we haven't increased fees every year.

Academic Breakdown Fall 2008: Brian presented the academic breakdown for fall 2008. We are at a 3.06 and that is up .02 from the previous spring. All but three sports are over 3.0. Men's basketball is up and doing a good job. The women's team is at 3.314 and the men's team is at 2.856. We have about 52% above 3.0 and 90% above 2.0.

Football is at a 2.269 and a cumulative GPA of 2.571. This is down from a 2.71 cumulative GPA. The numbers for fall are always down especially for freshman. They are learning all new schedules. In meeting with the new staff there is a different atmosphere and philosophy. Brian gave a report of information to the new coaches and is optimistic that GPA numbers will increase drastically.

The Provost asked if this eliminates their eligibility. Brian answered not at this time. We have a few that have submitted appeals to the NCAA and some of our freshmen are on warning at this time.

The Provost asked that the council look at further breakdown of the 38 athletes below a 2.0. He wants descriptive information why are we up from 26 athletes. What happened to get us to this point? We need to diagnose the problem and develop a better strategy to address the issue.

Brian indicated that the reality with football, as far as academics are concerned, there is a direct association with the level of oversight from the coaching staff. If the coaches focus on academics and establish expectations, then the kids will meet those expectations.

The Provost indicated this is an advisory committee to the President. The Provost said this is unacceptable academic performance from our football players. It is unacceptable as a University.

Nnamdi said that the number would see a tremendous decrease. Coach Andersen has his list and those athletes are being watched. Coach makes sure that an assistant coach is at study hall every night.

Dennis Dolny indicated that the coaches have the stick and can put an end to this problem overnight. This is the way to motivate the athletes.

Ken asked Brian to generate the information requested for the Provost and the Academic Subcommittee, and concluded the meeting.

Athletic Council Minutes

February 18, 2009

Athletic Council Meeting was held on February 18, 2009 in Champ Hall Conference Room. Those in attendance were: Ken White, Dennis Dolny, Tyler Labrum, Grady Brimley, Nnamdi Gwacham, Alison Cook, Gary Chambers, Cecile Germer, Ross Peterson, Brian Evans, Whitney Pugh, Jeff Crosbie, Jana Doggett and Scott Barnes. Those excused from the meeting were: Hilda Fronske, Wally Odd, Fred Hunsaker, Melissa Osterloh, Stan Albrecht, Raymond Coward, Lance Brown, Pat Evans, Dallas Holmes, and Jeanine Hernandez.

Ken welcomed everyone to the council meeting.

The NCAA membership approved our USU sponsored legislation. If another school wants to communicate with an athlete while they are on a church mission that school must receive prior-permission from the institution the athlete departed from to serve the mission. If the athlete returns from their church mission and decides they want to go play somewhere other than the original institution they departed from to attend the mission they will now have to sit out a year prior to being eligible for competition.

Sports Update:

Scott asked Nnamdi to update the council on the “Dancing with the Stars” Charity Event. This is the first year for this charity event. We had a mix of athletes from every sport. They practiced for about a month and then put on a show. Tariq Polley and his partner won the competition dancing to a Cha’ Cha’. Scott gave kudos to Grady for stepping out of his comfort zone.

Men’s basketball is in the top 25. Their home winning streak is an all time record. Women’s Basketball is 11-12, and 5-12 in WAC play. Golf finished 11 out of 14. Gymnastics won their meet again Utah. Softball won their game against Santa Barbara. We are hosting the WAC Track Championship in March.

Athletic Student Fee Referendum:

Scott made a presentation that he is showing to groups of students regarding the student fee referendum that will be voted on in March. The Student Fee Committee approved, 13 to 1, the request to move this process forward. The students seem to want to use Facebook versus a town hall meeting format to exchange questions and answers.

This has been more positive than we anticipated. There are 15 students that serve on an ad-hock committee. The Athletics administration is attempting to meet with this committee every week or two to get information out to students. The goal is to ensure that the people who are talking about the referendum have the correct information.

Gary Chambers indicated that traditionally the fee schedule is the same for both on campus and regional campus students. Students at the regional campuses will pay the same fee as those on campus. We are going to impose a \$65 fee on regional campus but not allow them to vote. Gary asked if this particular fee increase will not be imposed on the regional campus.

Scott indicated that currently Athletics does not receive any of the fees collected from regional campuses. Gary suggested this may deserve some additional discussion on fees and the regional campuses. Whitney Pugh indicated the overall philosophy is; One University, many locations. One way we try to be consistent is tuition and fees.

Ken White asked if there is a point where you say the fee actually needs to go to the proposed purpose. Is this a specific referendum to campus? Whitney indicated there may not currently be a mechanism where the fee is specific to campus.

Gary Chambers asked with all the groups met with so far, do we have any intent on making presentation to general student body. Scott said that the Facebook option is where the students have turned to for their general discussions. Thousands of people are already members of Facebook.

Dennis Dolny suggested calculating how many dollars we pay yearly to student workers as “value-added”. In this way Athletics is reinvesting student fee dollars back into student’s pockets. This amount of money would be startling for the students understand how much income is generated that actually returns to the students through a sporting venue.

Scott said the question was asked why the University does not remove Athletics to save \$2.5 M in E & G Funds. His response was the Athletics Department spends \$3M a year on campus.

Budget- 2008-09:

Athletics has a ten-year plan to reduce the deficit and balance the budget. We have considerable Title IX concerns we will have to deal with.

Jeff Crosby indicated there has been reduction in institutional support for this current budget cycle. We were originally expecting \$1.8M in student fees and only have received \$1.7M.

Football sales are up this year (08-09). The guarantees for games are not as high as previous years. Big Blue is \$150,000 ahead of a year ago, the current year fund drive will start-up in April. NCAA projected money payments will come in April and May. Right now we are okay but have work to do.

Ken White asked if there were any questions on the first page and if there were any preferences regarding the more “summarized” version of the budget or the far more detail versions Jeff has provided today? It was recommended the Council continue to use the more detailed page.

The athletics programs are still looking at ways to cut costs. We are setting down with each coach and looking at ways to save.

The majority of difference in revenue is in institutional support and BCS money; between these two categories there is almost \$1M in lost revenues. We have controlled those things that are in our control.

Gary Chambers asked what the Big Blue Scholarship expenses were used for. Jeff indicated that those expenditures include golf tournaments, the auction, printing and copying, etc.

Ross Peterson moved the motion to accept the budget as proposed, Dennis seconded the motion. The record will show the vote was unanimous to accept the 2008-2009 budgets.

Ken White asked Scott Barnes to bring information to the April Council Meeting regarding what sports are being evaluated in the context of compliance with Title IX. Also to provide educational information regarding potential or existing deficiencies, any University liabilities, etc associated with Title IX compliance. This does not have to be a decision-making matrix but he would like a presentation in April to inform and educate Council members regarding the issues associated with Title IX. We will plan on twenty minutes for this discussion.

Scott Barnes indicated with the state of our current sports the last thing we need to do is add another sport. We are working on roster management: capping men's and maximizing women's rosters.

Alumni Event at WAC Basketball Tournament:

Cecile distributed information on the Alumni event during the WAC Basketball Tournament. The event is on Friday, March 14 from 3:30-5:30 p.m. at the Silver legacy Resort and the cost is \$15 per person.

We had 200 people attend the Boise Alumni Event.

Scott Barnes let the council know we are sold out of our 250 ticket allotment and are directing all others to the Nevada Ticket office.

With no other business, Ken adjourned the meeting.

Athletic Council Minutes

March 18, 2009

Director of Athletics Report

We had a little altercation at the WAC Tournament and had to suspend our mascot. We have two mascots and the apprentice is the one that made the mistake. We felt it would be the wrong move to allow any mascot to perform. We are asking the commission to look at the usher the issues the bet and to Pistol Pete. He ran the length of the court and blindsided our mascot. Our mascot could have been seriously injured by being tackled. We are dealing with those issues right now. Big Blue donated the \$100 wager towards charity.

Men's basketball was in the top 25 this year and Stew Morrill was the WAC Coach of the Year. We received a lot of national media exposure and we are proud of them.

Women's basketball had a great year. This was their first WAC win in tournament play.

Gymnastics had a tough season overall but a great win against BYU.

Softball will play their first twenty two games with sixteen games on the road. Their first home game is on Friday.

Football started spring practice yesterday. There is a winning expectation. The coaching staff is doing a great job turning the program. Gary's philosophy is if they meet expectations in the classroom it transfers to the field.

Track and Field had two All-Americans. Men's took second and the women's finished 4th. We will be hosting the WAC Track and Field Championship in May.

Golf is hosting the WAC Golf Championship in Las Vegas this year.

Men's tennis is 7 -4 and the women's tennis team is 3-9.

Academic Update

Brian- not a composite 3.04 GPA

43 student-athletes

Academic all conference title

82%GSR

Submitting next cohort on June 1.

150 Whitesides Scholar Athletes

Right on mark as in past

Cumulative GPA 3.2 or better

Ken introduced Jake to the group. Jake is the Assistant Athletic Director for Compliance.

Compliance Program Overview

Institutional Control is the theme that overrides all compliance:

1. Education
2. Monitoring
3. Policing

Education:

Monthly meetings with coaching staff

Annual Meetings on campus within the departments- Teach enough to ask questions to prevent violations.

Student-Athletes-Weekly emails- Questions and Answers are the buildings

- Alumni
 - Monitoring- auditing and displaying- documenting that we are watching
- Recruiting
 - Front and Brian
 - Back and reconciliations
- Camps and Clinics
 - Approval on from of advertising
 - Improve monitoring of camp
- Phone Calls
- Recruiting Visits
- Scholarships
- Eligibility
- Awards and Benefits
- Meals
- Documents Seasons

We are constantly trying to improve things and head off before we have any violations. We reported ten to fifteen secondary violations last year.

Ken would be concerned if we did not have any violations. If we have more than Ken would ask if we are not educating our personnel.

Ken enjoys working with Jake. He has a knack for compliance. It is far better to ask the right question so we can all fix the mistakes. Everyone makes mistakes but ask the questions.

Ken asked if there was any other business or any new business.

The Provost asked for meeting to go over NCAA certification issues. We need to look back and look ahead.

Agenda items for next month's meeting will be Ross's sub-committee and Title IX issues.

Gary indicated that no documentation in the past was kept on the sub-committee reports. Gary has those minutes and suggested that we need to have one place for those documents.

Ken asked that all sub-committee documentation be sent to him and Ronda. We will collect and storehouse all documents. We will verify all documentation is together.

The meeting was adjourned.

Athletic Council Minutes

April 15, 2009

Athletic Director Report

We started our annual fund drive last Thursday. We have eight volunteers leading the charge. This is a significant leg to the stool. The difference in the fund drive this year is that we are having them sign the commitment now and then they can pay upon receiving their tickets. We are striving for a \$200,000 increase this year.

We will have our spring blue and white scrimmage and barbeque this weekend for football. We will have our alumni in for the game. Last summer we formed an Athletic Director Advisory Board and they will have a meeting this Saturday in conjunction with the game. This board will help us open doors in the business community. This board will look and provide advice from different perspective.

We will host the WAC Track and Field Championships from May 13 -16.

Men's basketball banquet is tonight at 6:30 p.m. at the Copper Mill.

The Whitesides' luncheon is on Wednesday, April 22 at 11:30 a.m. TSC Ballroom. Utah State's men's and women's outdoor track and field teams will host the Mark Faldmo Invitational on Saturday, April 18.

Softball will play Louisiana Tech with a doubleheader beginning at 2 p.m. on Friday, followed by a single game on Saturday at Noon.

Women's Tennis will play three Western Athletic Conference matches this weekend against Louisiana Tech, San Jose State and Nevada. USU will play its first match on Friday at 9 a.m., against Louisiana Tech and then face San Jose State Friday afternoon at 5 p.m. The Aggies will then conclude the weekend on Saturday against Nevada at 1 p.m. All matches will be played at the Sports Academy & Racquet Club.

We will host the Oakridge Golf Tournament on May 11. Registration materials are in the mail.

Title IX

Before we move forward we have a lot of work to do to stabilize our budget. The next step is to better manage our rosters before adding another sport. The key areas are in competition for 2007-2008 show we are heading in the right direction. The three areas to look at are the participation numbers, the scholarship numbers and the budget numbers.

Jana provided a report with women's sports we could look at adding.

The Provost asked if this report emulates undergrad students. Jana said that in 2008 52% were males and 48% were females and those are the numbers we are striving for.

This is a preliminary look that we have done. We are looking at budgets and start up costs. We still have a lot we need to do with our current women's sports. We have been making forward progress.

Gary asked about the minimum participation numbers now? Are there not enough scholarships or not enough interest? Jana said you could impose numbers. The difference is that males just want to be part of the team and females want playing time.

Volleyball is carrying fifteen players and most teams usually only have twelve. They are engaged because of the possibilities to play.

Scott also said that the quality diminished for the player the higher numbers you get. Women's sports numbers have been increased.

The NCAA just adjusted the numbers in two sports. There are additional scholarship opportunities in track and soccer. There is also discussion among track coaches to add unlimited numbers.

Gary asked if the percent is based on scholarship or participation. Jana informed the group that they look at scholarships, opportunities and budgets for women's sports.

Brett asked about possibly adding a women's ice hockey team. We will add it to the list of possibilities.

Dave Cowley brought up that BYU has a very successful diving team and that they have the same pool as us. Jana indicated they cannot host many home events and they are currently building a new swimming pool.

Lance brought up the referendum for recreation center. It is still on his radar. This may be the time to bring up the referendum again for the new recreation center here on campus. This would be a possible area to expand.

Ken pointed out that nobody is moving ball forward as far as adding. We will keep our eye out and provide opportunities for women.

Athletic Relation Sub-Committee Report

We had our Athletic Relations Sub-Committee Report on April 9. We discussed the athletics events plans and how to execute. Alumni gave a report. We reviewed the upcoming football schedule and where we will have events. September 24 is Homecoming and Ag Day. We will also have reunions that week. We will have an event at BYU.

The use of the President's suite for next football season will be shared with the colleges, used for Homecoming and the Old Main Society. The President's office will do the invitation list.

There was a vigorous and constructive discussion on student groups and some problems we had last year. The chair will meet with the music department to form a more cooperative effort.

Academic Improvement Plan for Football Team

In the fall we raised the question on academic performance with the football program. Scott, Briand and Jana meet to discuss opportunities. The Provost met with Scott, Gary, and Brian to review football academics. He wanted to update the council on what is happening and the changes the new coaching staff has implemented.

Brian likened the coaching staff to a range of hammers. What we had was not working with football but it is working now.

Some of the highlights are that we restructured the mentoring program and implemented a skills part of our mentoring program.

The football coaches are active in checking classes. We have identified students that are at risk. Out of 1,000 classes checked there were only 31 instances of not attending class. We are hopeful that the grades will be markedly different and that we see a dramatic turn around.

Brian saved three from suspension and every grade check has seen C's, B's or even some A's.

The Provost just wanted to report back to the council with academics.

Nnamdi said that it is a hundred times different. Coach Andersen puts a lot of stock in academic integrity. He carries a sledge hammer and it not afraid to use it.

Provost said we had an inkling there was a problem. With the new coaching staff the students have responded to the changes. There is a new you out there. We are involved, engaged and we are overseeing it.

Brian meets with Scott and Gary every Wednesday to discuss academics. Jason and Brian meet with all staff on Thursday to review the football player's academics.

Provost said the challenge will be to finish semester and finish strong. We will monitor freshmen and transfers coming in the fall for all sports and how to help them adjust. Brian will identify at risk athletes prior to them getting on campus. The Provost will continue to monitor the grades.

Annual Activity Reports from Subcommittees

The chair of each subcommittee will sit down and provide an activity report. They will provide summary documents through the year. By June1 each chair will send a summary report to Ken and Ronda.

From the Budget Subcommittee will we want a cover memo showing the close-out of the year, the proposed budget and a mid-year update on the budget. This will include salary adjustments, the referendum and the budget cuts.

Athletics Relations Subcommittee

Ken asked if we could accomplish same tasks without the Athletic Relations Subcommittee. Ross indicated that the coordination of key events is very helpful. Jana

said the group could keep communicating whether there was a meeting or not. Gary said from the historical perspective it is critical to keep this group. It provides a tremendous check and balance. This committee help ensure the student voices does not get lost. Gary also feels that the

Gary said the students made a huge financial commitment. He feels that they are a critical committee support from voices that would not be heard. It is a tremendous check and balance. This is the only group that involves students and Gary recommends keeping this group.

Ken asked for the next time around target the first of each semester for the Athletic Relations Subcommittee to meet.

Gary feels the students will want accountability because of the fees. Gary also thinks there are futuristic things that this committee can do. Wally also feels there is a lot to be there. The goal of this subcommittee is to look at the committee, rejuvenate it and see where it needs to go.

We will email all the notes to the council for review before the first meeting in the fall.

Ken asked the council if they had any other issues to bring before the council. The council was dismissed.

Faculty Evaluations Committee Annual Report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

2008 – 2009 Activities

Committee Members:

2008 – 2009

Greg Podgorski, Chair, Science
Tamara Vitale, Agriculture
Yong Seog Kim, Business
Jamison Fargo, Education and Human Services
Doran Baker, Engineering
Michael Lyons, HASS
Nancy Messner, Natural Resources
Ronda Olsen, Extension
Pamela Martin, Libraries
Jeremy Jennings, ASUSU Academic Senator
Lance Pflieger, ASUSU Executive Council
Adam Fowles, GSS Officer

2009 - 2010

Greg Podgorski Chair, Science
Paul Jakus, Agriculture
Konrad Lee, Business
Yanghee Kim, Education and Human Services
Doran Baker, Engineering
Michael Lyons, HASS
Nancy Messner, Natural Resources
Robert Mueller, Extension
Pamela Martin, Libraries
Ben Croshaw, ASUSU Academic Senator
Tyler Haws, ASUSU Student Advocate Vice President
Rick Kelly, ASUSU Graduate Student Senate Vice President

Committee Tasks: Assess current methods of student ratings of teaching and propose improved methods if necessary; Evaluate and make recommendations for USU Teacher of the Year and Faculty Advisor of the Year.

Outline of Meeting Facts and Discussions:

(Note: this report focuses only on an assessment and recommendations for the current system of student rating of faculty teaching)

On September 24, 2008, Dr. Raoul Arreola, a faculty evaluations system expert from the University of Tennessee, met with the Faculty Evaluations Committee. He spoke about dimensions of teaching that most institutions believe should be assessed (instructional design, instructional delivery, instructional assessment, and course management), what constituted a good evaluation system, and pros and cons of developing a system versus using a commercially available one. Many committee members attended the public presentation on developing faculty evaluation systems given by Dr. Arreola later that day.

At the **October 20, 2008** meeting, the Committee discussed research findings on faculty evaluation systems and how well our existing form met rigorous psychometric standards. Dr. Greg Podgorski was elected Chair of the Committee, replacing Dr. Michael Lyons, who continued to serve the Committee as a member.

At the **November 24, 2008** meeting, the Committee discussed the relative merits of modifying our existing evaluations form (this form is included in Supporting Materials) or using a commercially available instrument. Dr. Joan Kleinke, ex-officio committee member, presented her findings on the costs of commercial faculty evaluations. Dr. Kleinke's report is included in Supporting Material. In outline, there are significant cost differences among the three major companies providing faculty evaluation

services, ranging from a low of ~ \$31,000/year for the IDEA Center instrument to a high of ~ \$114,000/year for the CIEQ instrument.

Also at the November meeting, Dr. Craig Peterson, ex-officio Committee Member, agreed to research what faculty rating systems are used by our peer institutions and sister institutions within Utah.

The Committee moved to evaluate our existing faculty evaluation instrument. Dr. Jamison Fargo, committee member from the College of Education and Human Resources and a statistics and psychometrics expert, agreed to analyze all faculty evaluation data from fall 2008.

At the **January 12, 2009** Committee meeting, Dr. Peterson reported his findings on ratings systems used by peer institutions and sister institutions. This report is provided in the Supporting Materials. In overview, among this group of institutions there is no consensus on the types of rating forms, whether they are standardized across the institution or vary between colleges or departments, and whether they are given as traditional pencil-and-paper forms in-class or outside of class online. The only consistent finding was that none of our peer and sister institutions currently use commercially available evaluation instruments.

At the **February 2, 2009** Committee meeting, Dr. Fargo presented the results of his analysis of the USU's current faculty evaluation instrument.

Key results include:

- There is high internal reliability (consistency in responses to questions) throughout the instrument
- There is a high correlation in responses within subset II (Information About the Course) and subset III (Information About the Instruction) questions and between the two subsets
- Some questions within subsets II and III could be eliminated without reducing the information gained
- The summary questions of section I (Overall impression of course; Instructor's effectiveness) are good predictors of the responses for questions in subsections II and III
- The response distributions are heavily right-skewed (a strong Lake Wobegon effect in which every child is above average)

The Committee discussed these findings and whether they indicated the current evaluation form was valid in addition to being internally reliable (in this context, validity indicates that the questions actually measure what they intend to measure). The conclusion was that no questions of the current form have been tested for validity. Based on the literature describing faculty rating systems, we concluded that the existing form could be tested for validity and examined for the dimensions of teaching that it assesses, but this would be a long and difficult process that would almost certainly result in substantial modifications to the form. If cost were not an impediment, the Committee's preference was to use a validated, commercial instrument.

On **February 17, 2009**, Dr. Podgorski presented a summary of the Faculty Evaluation Committee's work to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. At this meeting, Provost Raymond Coward and Dr. Byron Burnham, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, had questions for the Committee and were invited to attend the next Faculty Evaluations Committee meeting.

At the **February 28, 2009** Committee meeting, Provost Coward and Dean Burnham attended the first portion of the meeting. Provost Coward stated that he was strongly in favor of using commercially available, validated, and nationally-normed rating instruments and reiterated his commitment made in the Executive Committee meeting to provide financial support to implement such a rating system. Dean Burnham spoke of the importance of using the ratings to promote faculty development and stressed the importance of viewing the output of these instruments as faculty ratings, not evaluations.

The Committee moved to test one of the commercial instruments in fall 2009 and went on to discuss the three major commercial evaluation forms: CIEQ, IDEA, and SIR II. An overview of each of these instruments is provided in Dr. Arreola's book, *Designing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System* (3rd ed) and is presented in Supporting Materials.

The Committee agreed that an ideal faculty ratings instrument should: 1) have validated questions (i.e., the questions are proven to actually measure what's intended by the question); 2) examine important aspects of teaching; 3) be flexible enough to provide valuable information across the entire spectrum of courses (for example, be able to rate an advanced music performance class and a general education biology class); 4) allow open-ended responses; 5) offer national norms to compare instruction at USU to that occurring at other institutions; 6) provide the maximum amount of information to instructors for improvement of their teaching; and 6) provide clear and accurate information to administrators for evaluative purposes.

Based these criteria, the CIEQ instrument was viewed as a poor fit for our purposes as well as being the most expensive of the instruments. A decision was made to not consider it further. The Committee was charged to look more closely at the IDEA and SIR II instruments, to explore online versus in-class paper-and-pencil submissions, and to investigate whether there were any other validated, nationally-normed ratings instruments available.

At the **April 7, 2009** Committee meeting, Drs. Kleinke, Peterson and Podgorski reported that their research revealed no additional validated ratings instruments.

In comparing online versus in-class paper-and-pencil submissions, we learned that online submissions suffer from low response rates unless coupled with punitive measures (for example, not releasing grades or releasing grades late if surveys are not completed). For these reasons, the Committee voted to use in-class administered surveys for at least the short-term.

In comparing the IDEA and SIRII instruments, the Committee felt that the IDEA instrument better met the criteria of an ideal faculty ratings instrument.

In brief, the potential advantages of the IDEA survey instrument are that it examines recognized important dimensions of instruction, its questions have been carefully validated in more than 30 years of use across many institutions, it allows comparisons between institutions across the nation (a list of institutions using the IDEA instrument in December, 2008 is included in Supporting Materials), and it offers great flexibility to instructors who choose which aspect or aspects of teaching are most important to them. These instructor-specified dimensions of teaching (for example, stressing communication skills development or developing quantitative skills) are used to weight in the ratings of teaching.

A motion was approved to pilot test the IDEA instrument in a set of representative classes in fall 2009.

Although outside the 2008 – 2009 academic year, the ***September 15, 2009*** meeting of the Faculty Evaluations Committee is being reported because of its importance to ongoing Committee activities. The Committee welcomed seven new members, four returning members, including the chair, and two returning ex-officio members. At this meeting, the Committee discussed in broad outline the points to consider in evaluating the IDEA instrument. The Committee identified three stakeholders: faculty, students, and administrators. In the case of faculty, the IDEA survey would be considered superior to the existing form if it provided more useful diagnostics to improve teaching. For students, the IDEA survey would be considered superior if they believe it provides information to instructors that will help them become better teachers. For administrators, the IDEA survey would be considered valuable if it provides information to improve teaching and provides insights into the strengths and weaknesses of instruction for individual instructors and units across campus. In future meetings we will begin to develop questions and methods to assess if these goals are achieved by the IDEA ratings instrument.

A motion was made that:

- The committee ask the USU administration to assist with the implementation of a pilot study in fall, 2009 of course ratings using the full version of the IDEA ratings form,.
- The committee recommends that only courses taught by tenured faculty be included in the pilot study, and that the ratings produced by the pilot study be excluded from consideration in promotion and salary decisions, unless a faculty member opts to have these pilot study ratings considered.
- The committee will identify a representative sample of USU courses whose instructors will be asked to participate in the pilot study.

Each Committee member was asked to identify courses in the following categories with their college:

- Large enrollment general education course
- Large enrollment freshman class for majors
- Upper division (3000 – 5000) undergraduate course of moderate size (30 – 100)
- Upper division (3000 – 5000) undergraduate course of small size (10 – 30)
- Two graduate courses (6000 – 7000)

The next Committee meeting is scheduled for October 20, 2009.

Supporting Materials:

- Course Evaluations in Use at Peer and Utah Sister Institutions
- Performance Analysis of USU's Existing Faculty Ratings Form
- Costs of Commercial Instruments
- Overview of Commercial Instruments
- USU's Current Evaluation Form
- Institutions Using the IDEA Rating Instrument

STUDENT COURSE EVALUATIONS AT OTHER UTAH UNIVERSITIES

University of Utah

Online since Fall 2003
Incentive is viewing grades early—e.g., Dec 13 vs. Dec. 30
Response rate 70%
Instrument developed at University of Utah
Course specific questions can be added
Contact: Jill Stephensen

Brigham Young University

Online since Fall 2002
No incentives or penalties
Response rate 60-70%
Instrument developed at BYU. Revised when switched to online.
Course specific questions can be added
Contact: Bryan Bradley

Weber State University

Paper and pencil, except online for online courses
Each college has its own instrument, except for two questions that are used
university-wide
Contact: Steve Kerr

Utah Valley University

Online since Fall 2003
No incentives or penalties, just frequent online reminders
Response rate less than 20%
Instrument developed at UVU
Considering KSU IDEA instrument---approximately \$70,000/year
Contact: Bruce Parker

Salt Lake Community College

Currently, paper and pencil using commercial instrument
Will pilot online Fall, 2009, using an instrument developed at SLCC
Instrument will have 9-12 questions, plus 200 optional questions that
faculty can choose from.
Contact: Ray Emmett

STUDENT COURSE EVALUATIONS AT PEER INSTITUTIONS

Colorado State University

Paper and pencil

Developed at CSU

22 university-wide questions and 10 “empty” questions that can be customized by the instructor

No plans to move to online because of response rate problem

Iowa State University

Paper and Pencil

Decentralized

Departments develop their own instrument

Departments do their own data analysis

Washington State University

Decentralized --colleges, departments, and even faculty can use their own instrument

Four of nine colleges have been using online surveys since about 2004

Each college uses a different instrument

Overall response rate is 50%

Some colleges allow extra credit incentives and others do not

Other five colleges are paper and pencil

UC Davis

Paper and Pencil

Decentralized

Two standardized questions, departments and instructor add others

Processed by IR Office

New Mexico State University

Paper and Pencil

Decentralized:

Departments develop their own instrument

Some data is processed by IR and some is processed by departments

Analysis of Fall 2008 USU Teacher/Course Evaluations (N = 50,962)



Jamison D. Fargo, PhD, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Utah State University

February 2009

I. General Evaluation (2 items)

	M	SD	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%	n	NA
Q1_1	5.04	1.00	1	4	5	6	6	50877	85
Q1_2	5.08	1.06	1	4	5	6	6	50473	489

Histograms for q1_1 and q1_2:




Correlation between q1 and q2: 0.85

Cronbach alpha (**Internal Consistency Reliability**) for q1 and q2: 0.92

II. Subscale I: Information about the Course (8 items)

	M	SD	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%	n	NA
Q2_1	5.03	1.04	1	4	5	6	6	50810	152
Q2_2	5.18	0.96	1	5	5	6	6	49872	1090
Q2_3	5.18	0.98	1	5	5	6	6	50608	354
Q2_4	5.09	1.05	1	5	5	6	6	50551	411
Q2_5	5.13	1.03	1	5	5	6	6	45912	5050
Q2_6	5.13	1.07	1	5	5	6	6	50330	632
Q2_7	5.11	1.03	1	5	5	6	6	50707	255
Q2_8	4.96	1.12	1	4	5	6	6	48461	2501

Histograms for q2_1 thru q2_8:



Correlation matrix for q2_1 through q2_8:


	Q2_1	Q2_2	Q2_3	Q2_4	Q2_5	Q2_6	Q2_7
Q2_2	0.73						
Q2_3	0.75	0.78					
Q2_4	0.66	0.70	0.70				
Q2_5	0.69	0.70	0.73	0.72			
Q2_6	0.66	0.66	0.67	0.68	0.73		
Q2_7	0.78	0.71	0.73	0.69	0.72	0.74	
Q2_8	0.66	0.67	0.69	0.64	0.66	0.63	0.71

Cronbach alpha (**Internal Consistency Reliability**) for q2_1 thru q2_8:
0.95


III. Subscale II: Information about the Instruction (10 items)

	M	SD	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%	n	NA
Q3_1	4.99	1.10	1	4	5	6	6	50707	255
Q3_2	5.15	1.09	1	5	6	6	6	50724	238
Q3_3	5.25	1.00	1	5	6	6	6	50679	283
Q3_4	5.15	1.07	1	5	5	6	6	50688	274
Q3_5	5.46	0.88	1	5	6	6	6	50778	184
Q3_6	5.20	1.04	1	5	6	6	6	50724	238
Q3_7	5.39	0.89	1	5	6	6	6	50755	207
Q3_8	5.34	0.93	1	5	6	6	6	50762	200
Q3_9	5.32	0.97	1	5	6	6	6	50644	318
Q3_10	5.13	1.07	1	5	5	6	6	49659	1303


Histograms for q3_1 thru q3_10:




Course Org Helped Learning




Helpfulness of Explanations




Use of Examples




Use of Class Time




Enthusiasm




Helpfulness of Resolving Questions




Prepared for Class



Opportunity to Ask Questions



Opportunity to Comment/Express Opinion



Availability of Extra Help

Correlation matrix for q3_1 thru q3_10:

	Q3_1	Q3_2	Q3_3	Q3_4	Q3_5	Q3_6	Q3_7	Q3_8	Q3_9
Q3_2	0.78								
Q3_3	0.75	0.84							
Q3_4	0.76	0.78	0.80						
Q3_5	0.62	0.67	0.70	0.68					
Q3_6	0.72	0.84	0.79	0.76	0.71				
Q3_7	0.69	0.70	0.72	0.73	0.71	0.73			
Q3_8	0.62	0.69	0.67	0.66	0.64	0.73	0.67		
Q3_9	0.61	0.67	0.66	0.63	0.62	0.71	0.64	0.86	
Q3_10	0.63	0.67	0.64	0.64	0.60	0.71	0.62	0.70	0.69

Cronbach alpha (**Internal Consistency Reliability**) for q3_1 thru q3_10:
0.96

IV. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (Construct Validity)

A. Existing Instrument

CFI/TLI

CFI	0.923
TLI	0.912

RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error Of Approximation)

Estimate	0.069	
90 Percent C.I.	0.069	0.070
Probability RMSEA <= .05	0.000	

SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Square Residual)

Value	0.033
-------	-------

STANDARDIZED MODEL RESULTS

				Two-Tailed
	Estimate	S.E.	Est./S.E.	P-Value
COURSE				
BY				
Q2_7	0.862	0.002	481.581	0.000
Q2_1	0.849	0.002	472.153	0.000
Q2_2	0.843	0.002	420.085	0.000
Q2_3	0.871	0.002	523.114	0.000
Q2_4	0.798	0.002	327.814	0.000
Q2_5	0.836	0.002	372.133	0.000
Q2_6	0.798	0.003	316.128	0.000
Q2_8	0.789	0.003	311.884	0.000
INSTRCT				
BY				
Q3_2	0.899	0.001	680.818	0.000
Q3_1	0.843	0.002	443.102	0.000
Q3_3	0.887	0.002	566.902	0.000
Q3_4	0.867	0.002	502.118	0.000
Q3_5	0.776	0.003	273.545	0.000
Q3_6	0.893	0.001	633.962	0.000
Q3_7	0.817	0.002	346.197	0.000
Q3_8	0.799	0.003	295.295	0.000
Q3_9	0.779	0.003	266.241	0.000
Q3_10	0.770	0.003	282.212	0.000
INSTRCT W/ COURSE	0.901	0.002	590.036	0.000

R-SQUARE

Observed Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Est./S.E.	Two-Tailed P-Value
Q2_1	0.722	0.003	236.076	0.000
Q2_2	0.710	0.003	210.042	0.000
Q2_3	0.759	0.003	261.557	0.000
Q2_4	0.637	0.004	163.907	0.000
Q2_5	0.698	0.004	186.067	0.000
Q2_6	0.637	0.004	158.064	0.000
Q2_7	0.743	0.003	240.790	0.000
Q2_8	0.622	0.004	155.942	0.000
Q3_1	0.710	0.003	221.551	0.000
Q3_2	0.808	0.002	340.409	0.000
Q3_3	0.787	0.003	283.451	0.000
Q3_4	0.751	0.003	251.059	0.000
Q3_5	0.601	0.004	136.773	0.000
Q3_6	0.798	0.003	316.981	0.000
Q3_7	0.667	0.004	173.098	0.000
Q3_8	0.639	0.004	147.648	0.000
Q3_9	0.607	0.005	133.120	0.000
Q3_10	0.594	0.004	141.106	0.000

FACTOR RELIABILITY

COURSE: 0.978
INSTRUCT: 0.982

B. Revised Instrument (Items 3, 6, and 9 removed from Subscale II)

MODEL FIT

CFI 0.956
TLI 0.949

RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error Of Approximation)

Estimate 0.056
90 Percent C.I. 0.055 0.057
Probability RMSEA <= .05 0.000

SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Square Residual)

Value 0.025

STANDARDIZED MODEL RESULTS

		Two-Tailed			
		Estimate	S.E.	Est./S.E.	P-Value
COURSE	BY				
Q2_7		0.862	0.002	483.527	0.000
Q2_1		0.850	0.002	476.721	0.000
Q2_2		0.842	0.002	419.088	0.000
Q2_3		0.872	0.002	529.467	0.000
Q2_4		0.798	0.002	327.339	0.000
Q2_5		0.835	0.002	371.341	0.000
Q2_6		0.797	0.003	314.859	0.000
Q2_8		0.790	0.003	313.045	0.000
INSTRCT	BY				
Q3_2		0.879	0.002	563.608	0.000
Q3_1		0.864	0.002	497.459	0.000
Q3_4		0.872	0.002	521.876	0.000
Q3_5		0.768	0.003	263.858	0.000
Q3_7		0.820	0.002	353.006	0.000
Q3_8		0.774	0.003	267.849	0.000
Q3_10		0.765	0.003	273.410	0.000
INSTRCT W/	COURSE	0.919	0.001	646.287	0.000

R-SQUARE

Observed Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Est./S.E.	Two-Tailed P-Value
Q2_1	0.723	0.003	238.360	0.000
Q2_2	0.709	0.003	209.544	0.000
Q2_3	0.761	0.003	264.734	0.000
Q2_4	0.636	0.004	163.670	0.000
Q2_5	0.697	0.004	185.671	0.000
Q2_6	0.635	0.004	157.430	0.000
Q2_7	0.743	0.003	241.763	0.000
Q2_8	0.623	0.004	156.523	0.000
Q3_1	0.746	0.003	248.729	0.000
Q3_2	0.773	0.003	281.804	0.000
Q3_4	0.760	0.003	260.938	0.000
Q3_5	0.590	0.004	131.929	0.000
Q3_7	0.673	0.004	176.503	0.000
Q3_8	0.599	0.004	133.925	0.000
Q3_10	0.585	0.004	136.705	0.000

FACTOR RELIABILITY

COURSE: 0.978

INSTRUCT: 0.976

Joan, please forward this to the committee. (2/11/09; from Craig Peteson)

I asked Jamison if he would compute the correlations between the overall questions and specific questions. Below are his results. They are a little lower than I would have guessed.

Q1_1 Overall Quality of the Course

Q2_1	0.7438910	Course objectives clear
Q2_2	0.6958287	Relevance of assignments to course content
Q2_3	0.7538188	Relevance of material presented to course goals
Q2_4	0.6518347	Appropriateness of workload to course goals
Q2_5	0.6869177	Relevance of exams to course goals
Q2_6	0.6537371	Fairness of grading procedures
Q2_7	0.6958160	Extent to which course responsibilities were clarified
Q2_8	0.6726052	Helpfulness of assigned text/readings to achieving course goals

Q1_2 Instructor Effectiveness

Q3_1	0.7722657	Course organization
Q3_2	0.7950851	Helpfulness of explanations by instructor
Q3_3	0.7734726	Instructor's use of examples
Q3_4	0.7693011	Instructor's use of class time
Q3_5	0.6610140	Instructor's enthusiasm for the subject
Q3_6	0.7563081	Instructor's helpfulness in resolving student's questions
Q3_7	0.6891190	Extent to which the instructor was prepared
Q3_8	0.6260081	Opportunity to ask questions
Q3_9	0.6148232	Opportunity for students to make comments and express opinions
Q3_10	0.6256982	Availability of extra help

V. A Few Recommendations for Retooling Existing Instrument:

- 1) Modifications to Subscale II:
 - a. Several items are highly intercorrelated, suggesting redundancy: Items 2 and 3 are correlated @ .84; items 2 and 6 are correlated @ .84; 3 and 4 are correlated @ .80; 8 and 9 are correlated @ .86.
 - i. Combine items 2, 3, and 6 into 1 item (or drop items 3 and 6).
 - ii. Combine items 8 and 9 into 1 item.
 1. Cronbach alpha for subscale II without items 3, 6, and 9 is: 0.94
 - iii. Construct validity improves when items 3, 6, and 9 are removed: Model fit increases .91 to .95, reaching acceptable levels.
- 2) Either switch to a 5-point scale: "Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, Very Poor" or keep 6-point scale, but change labels so distribution is more balanced. Use of an even-numbered scale is traditionally intended to eliminate a neutral or "middle of the road" option: "Excellent, Good, Above Average, Below Average, Poor, Very Poor".
- 3) Due to skewness and ordinality of distribution, present Medians in addition to or in place of Means.
- 4) Elimination of several items per subscale would create flexibility for individuals colleges/units to add customized items of their own.

STUDENT RATING OF INSTRUCTION FORMS COSTS FROM NATIONAL VENDORS

Quotes are based on the number of course evaluations that we do now: 110,000 responses a year with approximately 5,000 courses each year.

SIR II

Online	\$99,000.00
--------	-------------

Paper and Pencil	\$78,830.00
(Shipping costs are an additional \$738.12 from them to us)	

Turn around time: If they have it on Monday it will be returned the following Friday.

IDEA

Online Diagnostic Form	\$30,786.00
------------------------	-------------

Online Short Form	\$27,036.00
-------------------	-------------

Paper and Pencil Diagnostic Form	\$30,786.00
----------------------------------	-------------

Paper and Pencil Short Form	\$27,786.00
(Prices include shipping)	

Turn around time: Ten days from receipt of paper pencil surveys or for online surveys ten days from notification that the file is closed.

IDEA has a pilot program so that an institution can determine if the rating forms are a good fit for them. If we did a one semester pilot study on 100 classes with an estimate of 20 students per class the cost would be \$273.75.

CIEQ

Paper and Pencil with all processing provided by CODES (Shipping costs are added when the forms are sent and also when forms are output and returned.)	\$114,400.00
---	--------------

Email version	\$ 94,640.00
---------------	--------------

Paper and Pencil all scanning done by USU	\$ 50,600.00
---	--------------

Turn around time: Ten days.

Commercially Available Student Rating Forms

Student rating forms constitute a critical element of virtually every faculty evaluation system. Because the data generated by student rating forms can play a major role in the evaluation of faculty performance, it is important that the forms used be reliable and valid and provide meaningful information that can be used for improvement purposes as well as personnel decision-making purposes. As has been noted earlier, the development of a valid and reliable student rating form is a process that requires the application of a host of professional measurement and statistical skills.

Because numerous student rating forms have been developed locally and may not possess the necessary psychometric qualities of reliability and validity, it is generally a good idea to consider adopting or adapting a professionally developed form rather than developing one from scratch. This chapter provides guidelines for selecting from among a number of available student rating forms. Included here is a checklist for selecting forms and technical reviews of well-known and commercially available forms, including the Aleamoni Course/Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire (CIEQ) system, Kansas State University's IDEA forms, and the Educational Testing Service's Student Instructor Rating (SIR II) form.

■ CHECKLIST FOR IDENTIFYING AND SELECTING PUBLISHED FORMS

In examining the field of published student rating forms for possible adoption or adaptation by your institution, it is best to follow a specific set of steps that give you the best possibility of identifying the better forms to consider. The

following checklist is suggested as a guide for finding and testing such forms.

- Use the Mental Measurement Yearbook (MMY; Buros Institute of Mental Measurements) and Tests in Print (Buros Institute of Mental Measurements) to learn what forms are available. The MMY and the Tests in Print should be available in your library and provide critical reviews by experts concerning each form.
- Write to the publishers, universities, or private corporations identified in the MMY as producing or reviewing such forms. Request any manuals and announcements for references to forms, services, and technical data from the publishers.
- Review the literature on student ratings of instruction. Professional publications such as the American Educational Research Association's Instructional Evaluation and Faculty Development or the National Council on Measurement in Education's quarterly newsletter or its Journal of Educational Measurement often contain announcements and/or reviews of new forms as well as general articles on the use and analysis of student rating forms. The bibliography at the end of this handbook provides an excellent starting point for reviewing the literature.
- Send for a specimen set of the form or forms selected for consideration. Publishers will often provide such sets to institutions wishing to consider their purchase or use. Examine the specimen set to analyze in depth the questions used and material covered.

- Try out the form. It is a good idea to simply try out the questionnaire or rating form in its original form. Check with the form's publisher to determine policies concerning trial administrations.
- After trying out a number of possible forms, have the individuals responsible for the courses or course sections in which the forms might be used critically review their appropriateness.
- As part of the process in selecting a form for possible adoption or adaptation, determine whether the form publisher provides any of the following services and how much these services cost:
 - Form scanning and processing.
 - Rapid turnaround in providing computer analyses of form results.
 - Comparative norms for appropriate groupings of faculty and courses.
 - Willing to sell the system to your institution including debugged computer software and the rights to print modified forms.

In many instances, it may be more cost effective to buy the entire processing system. Buying a complete service or adapting an existing operating student rating system saves time and effort in the overall development of your faculty evaluation system.

■ REVIEW OF SELECTED PUBLISHED OR COMMERCIALY AVAILABLE STUDENT RATING FORMS

The following are reviews of the three major commercially available student-rating-of-instruction-and-instructor forms for use in higher education. Although the systems included for review here are considered among the best in the field, they are not the only commercially available student rating forms and systems. Care must be taken in selecting any commercial student rating form system. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a starting point for faculty and administrators who may be interested in adopting a commercially available student rating system. The information contained in the reviews may also be helpful to those designing local systems to meet unique needs. However, you are urged to familiarize yourself with the relevant original reports and descriptions of a system and to obtain the most recent technical descriptions of

products and services from the contact source listed with each review.

It is generally not recommended that an institution develop its own student rating form unless it is willing to conduct the appropriate psychometric studies required to do so correctly. If none of the commercially available forms meet the needs of your institution and you wish to design and develop your own student rating form, Chapter 13 outlines the recommended procedure and Chapter 14 provides a catalog of student rating items.

Each review of a student rating form system includes a technical critique, a description of the service, a sample of the basic student rating form, and an example of the report provided to the faculty member. More detailed information on the specifications of the forms, the services provided, costs, and other related issues are available at each agency's web site as indicated in the contact information section of each review.

■ ALEAMONI COURSE/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CIEQ)

Contact Information

Lawrence M. Aleamoni, Director
 Comprehensive Data Evaluation Services, Inc.
 6730 N. Camino Padre Isidoro
 Tucson, AZ 85718
 Phone: 520-621-7832
 FAX: 520-297-9427
 Web site: www.cieq.com

Format

The CIEQ rating form is available on a computer scorable answer sheet only. No online version of the CIEQ is currently available.

The CIEQ answer sheet is divided into five sections. The first section elicits student background information including student level, whether the student is taking the course pass/fail, whether the course is an elective, student gender, expected grade, whether the student is taking the course as a part of a major, and the semester in which the evaluation takes place. The second section consists of three general items that elicit student responses to the course content, the instructor, and the course in general. Ratings in this section are made on a 6-point scale ranging from Excellent to Very Poor. Section three includes 21 statements which represent 5 subscales or factors labeled General Course, Attitude, Method of Instruction, Course Content, Interest and Attention, and Instructor. A sixth

scale, Total, provides scores for all items combined. Items are rated on a 4-point scale ranging from Agree Strongly to Disagree Strongly. The fourth section provides space for 42 optional items if the instructor wishes to include any additional items. These items may either be selected from an item catalog, which is part of the CIEQ system, or written by the instructor. The final section allows for open-ended responses to questions on course content, the instructor, course objectives, papers and homework, examinations, suggested improvements, and an evaluation of the course based upon student satisfaction with the course and student perceptions of its value as an educational experience.

Results

The results of the CIEQ are presented on computer output in four parts. The first part presents course and instructor identification. The second part presents student background information and results for the three general items. Given are the proportion and number responding to each item alternative and the proportion *not* responding. The mean and the standard deviation are also presented for each of the general items.

The third part lists the responses to the five subscales. Included are the:

- Percentage responding
- Mean response
- Standard deviation
- Reliability coefficient (based upon an internal consistency calculation)

Also provided are a variety of normative comparisons, including:

- The rank norm (a comparison of the course with all courses given by instructors at the same rank)
- The level norm (a comparison of the course with all courses at the same course level)
- The institution norm (a comparison of the course with all courses at the university)
- The college norm (a comparison of the course with all other courses in the appropriate college within the university)
- The nationwide norm (a comparison of the course to all the courses throughout the U.S. which have used the CIEQ)

- The department norm (a comparison of the course with all other courses in a particular department)

The final part lists each of 21 standard items and provides:

- The proportion and number responding to each alternative
- The most favorable response
- The mean response
- The standard deviation
- The college-wide norm decile (a comparison of the mean response with those obtained throughout the college or university) for each item
- An optional item listing (if any optional items are used)

Special Features

The optional item catalog (Aleamoni & Carynnk, 1977) contains 350 items divided into 20 categories. The results interpretation manual (Aleamoni & Laham, 1992) provides information on scale development and validation, recommended uses and administrative procedures, description and interpretation of results, and decile norm cutoff scores for seven various subscale databases.

Institutions wishing to use the CIEQ may select one of two options:

- *Option 1.* CIEQ forms may be purchased individually from Comprehensive Data Evaluation Services, Inc. (CODES) and returned for processing.
- *Option 2.* An institution may choose to purchase the computer analysis program and rights to print and use the CIEQ under a royalty arrangement. Institutions purchasing the program receive annual updates of the normative database derived from the hundreds of institutions that have used and/or are currently using the CIEQ. The computer program is written for Apple Macintosh computers and is designed to be used as a simple desktop system.

Development and Validation

The CIEQ was developed in 1975 through an analysis of the earlier versions of the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ). The original CEQ was based on an initial pool of more than 1,000 items collected in the early 1960s, reduced and refined by a variety of techniques, including factor analysis, to a form containing 50 items (Aleamoni & Spencer, 1973). The current version (Form

76) uses normative data from approximately 10,000 course sections at the University of Arizona and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and 150,000 course sections from other U.S. institutions gathered from 1972 through 1999. Internal consistency reliability coefficients for the five subscales range from .88 to .98 (Aleamoni & Laham, 1992). Test-retest reliability ranges from .92 to .98 for the subscales and the total and from .81 to .94 for individual items (Gillmore, 1973). Aleamoni (1978) reviews several studies of the CEQ that he claims are generalizable to the CIEQ. He reports that the CIEQ is not affected by gender, term; curriculum, class size, instructor rank, required/elective, major/minor, student status, pass/fail, expected grade, and final grade. In addition, the ratings of colleagues and trained judges appear to correlate with CIEQ student ratings (Aleamoni, 1978).

Research on the CIEQ has shown it to be a valid, reliable measure of student reactions to the course and instructor. The CIEQ provides meaningful information that may be successfully used in a program of instructional improvement or as part of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system designed to provide data for faculty personnel decisions.

Sample Form and Report

Figure 15.1 shows a copy of the CIEQ form (double-sided), the reverse side of which contains the free response section. Figure 15.2 presents an example of the report (analysis printout) for the CIEQ. Figure 15.3 shows a copy of the brief interpretation guide provided to faculty using the form.

Figure 15.1 CIEQ Form (front)

ALEAMONI COURSE/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CIEQ) (FORM 76)										
COMPREHENSIVE DATA EVALUATION SERVICES, INC. © LAWRENCE M. ALEAMONI, 1975										
MARKING INSTRUCTIONS		STUDENT INFORMATION		COURSE INFORMATION		CODING INFORMATION				
MARK: AS IF YOU AGREE STRONGLY WITH THE ITEM A IF YOU AGREE MODERATELY WITH THE ITEM O IF YOU DISAGREE MODERATELY WITH THE ITEM OS IF YOU DISAGREE STRONGLY WITH THE ITEM MARK ONLY ONE RESPONSE PER ITEM USING PENCIL ONLY ERASE CHANGED ANSWERS CLEANLY AND COMPLETELY. SAMPLE MARK AS A O OS		ARE YOU A ARE YOU TAKING THIS COURSE FOR PASS/FAIL ARE YOU TAKING THIS COURSE AS A ARE YOU A YOUR EXPECTED GRADE IN THIS COURSE IS THIS COURSE IS WITHIN YOUR SEMESTER		RATE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING COURSE CONTENT MAJOR INSTRUCTOR COURSE IN GENERAL		COURSE CODE SPECIAL CODE				
STANDARD ITEM SECTION						OPTIONAL ITEMS				
						SECTION I		SECTION II		
1	It was a very worthwhile course.	AS	A	O	OS	22	AS	A	O	OS
2	I would take another course that was taught this way.	AS	A	O	OS	23	AS	A	O	OS
3	The instructor seemed to be interested in students as individuals.	AS	A	O	OS	24	AS	A	O	OS
4	The course material was too difficult.	AS	A	O	OS	25	AS	A	O	OS
5	It was easy to remain attentive.	AS	A	O	OS	26	AS	A	O	OS
6	NOT much was gained by taking this course.	AS	A	O	OS	27	AS	A	O	OS
7	I would have preferred another method of teaching in this course.	AS	A	O	OS	28	AS	A	O	OS
8	The course material seemed worthwhile.	AS	A	O	OS	29	AS	A	O	OS
9	The instructor did NOT synthesize, integrate or summarize effectively.	AS	A	O	OS	30	AS	A	O	OS
10	The course was quite interesting.	AS	A	O	OS	31	AS	A	O	OS
11	The instructor encouraged development of new viewpoints and appreciations.	AS	A	O	OS	32	AS	A	O	OS
12	I learn more when other teaching methods are used.	AS	A	O	OS	33	AS	A	O	OS
13	Some things were NOT explained very well.	AS	A	O	OS	34	AS	A	O	OS
14	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter.	AS	A	O	OS	35	AS	A	O	OS
15	This was one of my poorest courses.	AS	A	O	OS	36	AS	A	O	OS
16	The course content was excellent.	AS	A	O	OS	37	AS	A	O	OS
17	Some days I was NOT very interested in this course.	AS	A	O	OS	38	AS	A	O	OS
18	I think that the course was taught quite well.	AS	A	O	OS	39	AS	A	O	OS
19	The course was quite boring.	AS	A	O	OS	40	AS	A	O	OS
20	The instructor seemed to consider teaching as a chore or routine activity.	AS	A	O	OS	41	AS	A	O	OS
21	Overall, the course was good.	AS	A	O	OS	42	AS	A	O	OS
22						43	AS	A	O	OS
23						44	AS	A	O	OS
24						45	AS	A	O	OS
25						46	AS	A	O	OS
26						47	AS	A	O	OS
27						48	AS	A	O	OS
28						49	AS	A	O	OS
29						50	AS	A	O	OS
30						51	AS	A	O	OS
31						52	AS	A	O	OS
32						53	AS	A	O	OS
33						54	AS	A	O	OS
34						55	AS	A	O	OS
35						56	AS	A	O	OS
36						57	AS	A	O	OS
37						58	AS	A	O	OS
38						59	AS	A	O	OS
39						60	AS	A	O	OS
40						61	AS	A	O	OS
41						62	AS	A	O	OS
42						63	AS	A	O	OS

Figure 15.2 Example of CIEQ Analysis Printout

CIEQ Analysis — U of Arizona — Spring 2001

ALEAMONI COURSE/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructor: ALEAMONI

Class: EDP 640 1

Sample size: 23

Process Date: 6/19/01

College Code: 20020

Class Description Results

Class Information

	<i>Fr</i>	<i>So</i>	<i>Jr</i>	<i>Sr</i>	<i>Grad</i>	<i>Oth</i>	<i>OMIT</i>
%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.65	0.00	0.35
#	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	8.00

Gender

Course Option

	<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>OMIT</i>		<i>Req</i>	<i>Elec</i>	<i>OMIT</i>
%	0.26	0.39	0.35	%	0.43	0.22	0.35
#	6.00	9.00	8.00	#	10.00	5.00	8.00

Pass-Fail Option

Major-Minor

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>OMIT</i>		<i>Maj</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Oth</i>	<i>OMIT</i>
%	0.00	0.61	0.39	%	0.61	0.04	0.35	
#	0.00	14.00	9.00	#	14.00	1.00	8.00	

Expected Grade

	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>OMIT</i>
%	0.22	0.35	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.35
#	5.00	8.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	8.00

Content Rating

	<i>V.P.</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>V.G.</i>	<i>Ex</i>	<i>OMIT</i>			
%	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.20	0.20	0.50	0.00	Mean	=	5.00
#	0	1	0	2	2	5	0	S.D.	=	1.33

Instructor Rating

	<i>V.P.</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>V.G.</i>	<i>Ex</i>	<i>OMIT</i>			
%	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.20	0.50	0.00	Mean	=	4.90
#	0	1	1	1	2	5	0	S.D.	=	1.29

Course Rating

	<i>V.P.</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>V.G.</i>	<i>Ex</i>	<i>OMIT</i>			
%	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.20	0.50	0.00	Mean	=	4.80
#	0	1	1	1	2	5	0	S.D.	=	1.69

Subscale Results

Subscale	Items	% Res	Mean	S.D.	Rel.	IR	CL	D	C	UA	N
Attitude	4	1.00	3.28	1.06	0.98	4	5	3	4	5	6
Method	4	1.00	3.13	1.09	0.94	6	7	6	6	6	7
Content	4	1.00	3.30	0.91	0.68	8	8	8	8	8	9
Interest	4	1.00	3.08	1.07	0.88	7	7	5	6	7	7
Instructor	5	0.98	3.27	0.93	0.91	4	5	2	4	5	5
Total	21	1.00	3.21	1.01	0.98	6	7	5	6	6	7

IR=Instructor Rank; CL=Class Level; D=Department; C=College; UA=University of Arizona; N=Nationalwide. NA in a normative decile category indicates that normative data is not available for this category or that this category is not applicable to the current data.

Figure 15.1 (continued) CIEQ Form (back)

C I E Q

PLEASE USE THIS SIDE OF THE FORM FOR YOUR PERSONAL COMMENTS ON TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS AND GENERAL COURSE VALUE. YOUR INSTRUCTOR WILL NOT SEE YOUR COMPLETED EVALUATION UNTIL AFTER FINAL GRADES ARE IN FOR YOUR COURSE.

COURSE CONTENT

PLEASE GIVE YOUR COMMENTS ON THE COURSE CONTENT, SUBJECT MATTER AND ANY PARTICULAR RELEVANCE THIS COURSE HAS HAD TO YOUR AREA OF STUDY.

INSTRUCTORS

WRITE THE NAME OF YOUR PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTOR _____ T.A. _____
WHAT ARE YOUR GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE INSTRUCTOR(S) IN THIS COURSE?

COURSE/INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

WERE THE OBJECTIVES CLEARLY STATED FOR THIS COURSE? YES _____ NO _____ COMMENT:

PAPERS AND HOMEWORK

COMMENT ON THE VALUE OF BOOKS, HOMEWORK AND PAPERS (IF ANY) IN THIS COURSE.

EXAMINATIONS

COMMENT ON THE EXAMINATIONS AS TO DIFFICULTY, FAIRNESS, ETC.

GENERAL

1. WHAT IMPROVEMENTS WOULD YOU SUGGEST FOR THIS COURSE?

2. WHAT IS YOUR EVALUATION OF THIS COURSE BASED UPON (A) YOUR SATISFACTION WITH WHAT YOU GOT OUT OF THIS COURSE AND (B) WHETHER IT WAS A VALUABLE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE OR A DISAPPOINTMENT? PLEASE COMMENT.

PLEASE FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE

Figure 15.2 (continued) Example of CIEQ Analysis Printout

Instructor: ALEAMONI
Process Date: 12/7/99

Class: EDP 646
College Code: 78933

Sample size: 10

Individual Item Results

1. It was a very worthwhile course.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.70	0.00	0.20	0.10	0.00	AS	3.30	1.16	5
#	7	0	2	1	0				

2. I would take another course that was taught this way.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.70	0.00	0.20	0.10	0.00	AS	3.00	1.16	7
#	7	0	2	1	0				

3. The instructor seemed to be interested in students as individuals.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.50	0.20	0.20	0.00	0.10	AS	3.33	0.87	4
#	5	2	2	0	1				

4. The course material was too difficult.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.70	0.00	DS	3.70	0.48	10
#	0	0	3	7	0				

5. It was easy to remain attentive.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.50	0.30	0.20	0.00	0.00	AS	3.30	0.82	8
#	5	3	2	0	0				

6. NOT much was gained by taking this course.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.70	0.00	DS	3.40	0.97	5
#	0	3	0	7	0				

7. I would have preferred another method of teaching this course.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.20	0.10	0.20	0.50	0.00	DS	3.00	1.25	6
#	2	1	2	5	0				

8. The course material seemed worthwhile.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.50	0.30	0.20	0.00	0.00	AS	3.30	0.82	6
#	5	3	2	0	0				

9. The instructor did NOT synthesize, integrate or summarize effectively.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.00	0.10	0.30	0.60	0.00	DS	3.50	0.71	8
#	0	1	3	6	0				

10. The course was quite interesting.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.50	0.20	0.20	0.10	0.00	AS	3.10	1.10	5
#	5	2	2	1	0				

Figure 15.2 (continued) Example of CIEQ Analysis Printout

11. The instructor encouraged development of new viewpoints and appreciations.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.50	0.10	0.30	0.10	0.00	AS	3.00	1.15	4
#	5	1	3	1	0				

12. I learn more when other teaching methods are used.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.00	0.20	0.40	0.40	0.00	DS	3.20	0.79	9
#	0	2	4	4	0				

13. Some things were not explained very well.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.10	0.00	0.60	0.30	0.00	DS	3.10	0.88	8
#	1	0	6	3	0				

14. The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.60	0.30	0.10	0.00	0.00	AS	3.50	0.71	4
#	6	3	1	0	0				

15. This was one of my poorest courses.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.10	0.20	0.10	0.60	0.00	DS	3.20	1.14	3
#	1	2	1	6	0				

16. The course content was excellent.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.60	0.10	0.10	0.20	0.00	AS	3.10	1.29	6
#	6	1	1	2	0				

17. Some days I was NOT very interested in this course.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.40	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.00	DS	2.40	1.35	5
#	4	1	2	3	0				

18. I think that the course was taught quite well.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.50	0.20	0.10	0.20	0.00	AS	3.00	1.25	4
#	5	2	1	2	0				

19. The course was quite boring.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.00	0.10	0.30	0.60	0.00	DS	3.50	0.71	8
#	0	1	3	6	0				

20. The instructor seemed to consider teaching as a chore or routine activity.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.20	0.00	0.40	0.40	0.00	DS	3.00	1.15	2
#	2	0	4	4	0				

21. Overall, the course was good.

	AS	A	D	DS	OMIT	BEST	MEAN	S.D.	DEC
%	0.60	0.10	0.20	0.10	0.00	AS	3.20	1.14	4
#	6	1	2	1	0				

Figure 15.3 CIEQ Interpretation Guide

A BRIEF CIEQ INTERPRETATION GUIDE

The following outline is provided as an aid to the rapid interpretation of CIEQ results. This guide can be used as a checklist when examining the computerized analysis output of the CIEQ. CIEQ interpretation is discussed in complete detail in the Manual.

Step 1. Adequacy of Results

- A. Refer to the top of the first page of the CIEQ output. Check the SAMPLE SIZE. If it or number of the students responding is less than one-half of the course enrollment, results may be biased and should be interpreted with caution.
- B. At the bottom of the first page is the section entitled SUBSCALE RESULTS that contains a column of figures labeled REL. This column contains the obtained reliabilities for the six subscales of the CIEQ. Any subscale with a REL below .65 should be interpreted with caution. Consult the Manual for further details.

Step 2. Comparative Information

- A. In all cases, comparative information is provided by decile rank (DEC). The decile rank describes the current course MEAN in relation to other courses that have administered the CIEQ. Decile ranks are always interpreted as follows:

1 - 3	Substantial improvement needed
4 - 7	Some improvement needed
8 - 10	No improvement needed

Differences between adjacent pairs of decile ranks within each interval (e.g., 1 vs. 2, or 4 vs. 5) are not considered to be significantly different.

- B. First refer to the SUBSCALE listing at the bottom of output on page 1. Each subscale represents a different aspect of the course as indicated by its title. Decile ranks for the current course/instructor are listed for each subscale in comparison to six normative groups:
 1. IR all instructors of the same faculty rank
 2. CL all courses at the same grade level (e.g., freshman, sophomore., etc.)
 3. D all courses within the same department
 4. C all courses within the same college
 5. UA all course at the University of Arizona
 6. N all courses that have used the CIEQ in the United States
- C. On the following two pages under INDIVIDUAL ITEM RESULTS are listed each of the 21 individual items of the CIEQ along with the proportion (%), frequency (#), mean, and standard deviation (SD) of responses to each individual item of the CIEQ. Also listed are the text of each item and the most favorable response or BEST answer for each item. All means have been scaled such that 4.00 is the most favorable response and 1.00 is the least favorable response, regardless of the initial wording of the item. To the far right of each individual item are listed decile ranks that compare each item mean to the item means obtained in all courses within the same college.

Figure 15.3 (continued) CIEQ Interpretation Guide

A BRIEF CIEQ INTERPRETATION GUIDE (continued)

D. In interpreting results, refer first to the decile ranks for subscales. Low deciles for a subscale identify potential problem areas. Individual items can then be examined for more specific information. The subscales are composed of the following individual items:

Attitude	items 1, 6, 15, 21
Method	items 2, 7, 12, 18
Content	items 4, 8, 13, 16
Interest	items 5, 10, 17, 19
Instructor	items 3, 9, 11, 14, 20
Total	items 1 - 21

Step 3. Descriptive Information

- A. Refer to the top of the first page of CIEQ output. Following the initial titles, information is listed on the composition of the responding sample under the heading Class Description Results. Both the proportion and frequency of responses are listed for each alternative of the following items: Class Information, Gender, Course Option, Pass-Fail Option, Major-Minor, and Expected Grade.
- B. The next portion of the output lists the proportion (%), frequency (#), mean, and standard deviation (SD) of responses to three global ratings: Course Content, Instructor Rating, and the Course Rating. A mean value of 6.00 is the most favorable rating. These three items have NOT been validated and should therefore be used only for the purpose of feedback to the instructor.

■ IDEA STUDENT RATINGS OF INSTRUCTION

Contact Information

The IDEA Center, Inc.
211 South Seth Child Road
Manhattan, KS 66502-3089
Phone: 800-255-2757
785-532-5970
FAX: 785-532-5725
Email: idea@ksu.edu
Web site: www.idea.ksu.edu

Format

The IDEA student rating forms are available as either paper answer sheets or as an online service. Complete description of the online service is available at the IDEA Center web site at www.idea.ksu.edu.

The IDEA system requires instructors to describe their course objectives prior to administering the rating form. The instructor is asked to rate the importance, on a 3-point scale (essential, important, or minor importance), of each of 12 IDEA objectives. The importance the instructor assigns to each objective is taken into account in tabulating results. The optically scanned rating form is divided into seven parts.

The first section consists of 20 items, which deal with 5 dimensions of instruction: Student-Faculty Contact, Involving Students, Establishing Expectations, Clarity of Communication, and Assessment/Feedback. Items are scored on a 5-point scale ranging from Hardly Ever to Almost Always. The second section deals with the students' evaluation of their progress on 12 course objectives, including gaining factual knowledge, acquiring team skills, developing creative capacities, and clarifying/developing personal values. Students are asked to compare the progress made on each objective with the progress made in other courses. Each item is scored on a 5-point scale ranging from Low (Lowest 10% of Courses Taken) to High (Highest 10% of Courses Taken). The third section deals with three course characteristics: amount of reading, amount of work in other assignments, and difficulty of subject matter. Ratings are compared to other courses on a 5-point scale ranging from Much Less Than Most Courses to Much More Than Most Courses. The next section includes a self-rating of student attitudes and behaviors in the course. Each item is scored on a 5-point scale from definitely false to definitely true. The fifth section consists of five "experimental questions" which the IDEA Center is studying for possible inclusion in future revisions of the form. The sixth section is for optional instruc-

tor-designed, multiple-choice questions. Finally, the form provides a space for students to make open-ended comments. A "short form" version, appropriate for "summative" but not "formative" evaluation, is also available. It employs only Sections 2, 4, and 6 of the standard form.

Results

The IDEA report consists of seven parts plus identifying information (faculty and course name, number of students enrolled, percent providing ratings). The first two parts summarize evaluation results for overall measures (Part I) and for specific objectives (Part II). "Unadjusted" and "adjusted" averages are compared with results in a very large national database. Adjusted results take into account factors which influence ratings but which are beyond the control of the instructor (e.g., class size, course-related student motivation, academic habits/effort, etc.) The overall evaluation measures, presented numerically and graphically, include progress on instructor-chosen objectives, improved student attitude, overall excellence of the teacher, and overall excellence of the course. Part II provides similar information for the specific objectives selected as "important" or "essential" by the instructor. Part III (Methods) summarizes responses to the 20 items dealing with teaching procedures found on Section 1 of the standard form (but not included on the short form). Averages are reported graphically for each item and for scales designed to measure five instructional dimensions. Items are labeled as Strengths, Weaknesses, or In-Between depending on how their averages differ from classes of similar size and student motivation level. A second section of Part III is intended to facilitate improvement efforts by identifying Strengths and Weaknesses that research by the IDEA Center has shown to be most relevant to specific teaching objectives. Part IV summarizes student descriptions of course characteristics and also reports a course description provided by the instructor, including principal instructional methods; intended audience; special circumstances; and the amount of emphasis given to such matters as writing, computer applications, and quantitative skills. Section V provides statistical detail—frequencies, averages, and standard deviations for all items, including optional instructor-designed items.

Special Features

The IDEA system is a commercial rating package. Charges for forms and processing vary depending upon the number of forms ordered and classes processed. Forms must be ordered from the center and returned to them for pro-

cessing. Institutions receive three copies of the IDEA computer report; interpretation aids are incorporated in the report. For an additional fee, participating institutions may receive Group Summary Reports, which combine results for all classes or for selected subgroups, and Faculty Summary Reports, which summarize all reports for a given faculty member over a specified period of time. The IDEA Center publishes *Exchange*, an occasional newsletter, and a series of technical and nontechnical publications on topics in faculty evaluation and development. National workshops on selected topics are offered annually, and consultative services can also be arranged.

Development and Validation


The development and initial validation of the IDEA system is described by Hoyt (1973) and Hoyt and Cashin (1977). Items on instructor objectives were originally formed from earlier taxonomic classifications, factor analytic work, and input from award-winning teachers, faculty-student committees, and users of IDEA. The 1998 revision employed the advice of users in eliminating three of these and adding five that reflect higher education's contemporary emphases on team skills, values, lifelong learning, and critical thinking. The 20 teaching method items (10 of which are new) were written to reflect Chickering and Gamson's (1987) seven principles and were selected on the basis of their unique contribution to the prediction of outcomes. Items on course management and student characteristics were included primarily to adjust outcome measures by taking into account factors that were

beyond the control of the instructor. The reliability of the five scales of teaching methods ranged from .76 to .91, averaging .86 for classes of 15–34 students. For individual items, reliabilities in similar classes ranged from .71 to .91, averaging .83. A principal indicator of validity was the finding that student ratings of progress on objectives were positively related to instructor ratings of importance of objectives. Also, relationships between teaching methods and progress on objectives were consistent with theoretical expectations. Multiple regression analyses showed that each of the 20 teaching methods made an independent contribution to the prediction of at least one progress rating, and that the relevance of specific instructor behaviors varied with class size. Factors that were used to adjust outcome measures included class size, student desire to take the course regardless of who taught it, the portion of "difficulty" ratings and of "effort" ratings that could not be attributed to the instructor, and a measure of "other student motivation." Later technical reports (e.g., Cashin & Perrin, 1978; Sixbury & Cashin, 1995a, 1995b; Hoyt, Chen, Pallett, & Gross, 1998) provide additional data on reliability and validity as well as a description of the computational procedures and comparative databases used in producing reports for the latest version of IDEA.

Sample Form and Report

The following pages contain a sample of the IDEA student rating form (front and back) as well as an example of a faculty report. The IDEA system also provides institutional summary reports.


Figure 15.4 IDEA Survey Form—Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses (front)




**IDEA
CENTER**

SURVEY FORM - STUDENT REACTIONS TO INSTRUCTION AND COURSES


IMPORTANT!



Proper Marks



Improper Marks



Your thoughtful answers to these questions will provide helpful information to your instructor.

Describe the frequency of your instructor's teaching procedures, using the following code:

1=Hardly Ever 2=Occasionally 3=Sometimes 4=Frequently 5=Almost Always

The Instructor:

1.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Displayed a personal interest in students and their learning
2.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Found ways to help students answer their own questions
3.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Scheduled course work (class activities, tests, projects) in ways which encouraged students to stay up-to-date in their work
4.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Demonstrated the importance and significance of the subject matter
5.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Formed "teams" or "discussion groups" to facilitate learning
6.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Made it clear how each topic fit into the course
7.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Explained the reasons for criticisms of students' academic performance
8.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses
9.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Encouraged students to use multiple resources (e.g. data banks, library holdings, outside experts) to improve understanding
10.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Explained course material clearly and concisely
11.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Related course material to real life situations
12.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Gave tests, projects, etc. that covered the most important points of the course
13.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject
14.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Involved students in "hands on" projects such as research, case studies, or "real life" activities
15.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Inspired students to set and achieve goals which really challenged them
16.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Asked students to share ideas and experiences with others whose backgrounds and viewpoints differ from their own
17.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Provided timely and frequent feedback on tests, reports, projects, etc. to help students improve
18.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Asked students to help each other understand ideas or concepts
19.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking
20.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, e-mail, etc.)

Twelve possible learning objectives are listed below. For each, rate your progress in this course compared with your progress in other courses you have taken at this college or university. (Of course, ratings on objectives which were not addressed by the course will usually be low.)

In this course, my progress was:

1-Low (lowest 10 percent of courses I have taken here)

2-Low Average (next 20 percent of courses I have taken here)

3-Average (middle 40 percent of courses I have taken here)

4-High Average (next 20 percent of courses I have taken here)

5-High (highest 10 percent of courses I have taken here)

Progress on:

21.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)
22.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories
23.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)
24.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course
25.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team
26.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Developing creative capacities (writing, inventing, designing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.)
27.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)
28.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing
29.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
30.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values
31.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view
32.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Acquiring an interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers

Copyright © IDEA Center, 1998

Printed in the U.S.A. (CJ-F3) CP68-1300

Continue on back page

Figure 15.4 (continued) IDEA Survey Form—Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses (back)

On the next three items, compare this course with others you have taken at this institution, using the following code:

1=Much Less than
Most Courses

2=Less than
Most Courses

3=About Average

4=More than
Most Courses

5=Much More
than Most Courses

The Course:

33. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Amount of reading
34. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Amount of work in other (non-reading) assignments
35. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Difficulty of subject matter

Describe your attitudes and behavior in this course, using the following code:

1=Definitely
False

2=More False
Than True

3=In Between

4=More True
Than False

5=Definitely
True

Self Rating:

36. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ I had a strong desire to take this course.
37. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ I worked harder on this course than on most courses I have taken.
38. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ I really wanted to take a course from this instructor.
39. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ I really wanted to take this course regardless of who taught it.
40. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ As a result of taking this course, I have more positive feelings toward this field of study.
41. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Overall, I rate this instructor an excellent teacher.
42. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Overall, I rate this course as excellent.

For the following items, blacken the space which best corresponds to your judgment:

1=Definitely
False

2=More False
Than True

3=In Between

4=More True
Than False

5=Definitely
True

43. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ As a rule, I put forth more effort than other students on academic work.
44. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ The instructor used a variety of methods—not only tests—to evaluate student progress on course objectives.
45. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ The instructor expected students to take their share of responsibility for learning.
46. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ The instructor had high achievement standards in this class.
47. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ The instructor used educational technology (e.g., Internet, e-mail, computer exercises, multi-media presentations, etc.) to promote learning.

EXTRA QUESTIONS

If your instructor has extra questions, answer them in the space designated below (questions 48-66):

48. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 58. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
49. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 59. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
50. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 60. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
51. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 61. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
52. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 62. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
53. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 63. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
54. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 64. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
55. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 65. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
56. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 66. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
57. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤

Your comments are invited on how the instructor might improve this course or teaching procedures. Use the space below for comments (unless otherwise directed).
Note: Your written comments may be returned to the instructor. You may want to PRINT to protect your anonymity.

Institution:

Instructor:

Course Number:

Time and Days Class Meets:

Comments:

Figure 15.5 Sample IDEA Report

The IDEA Report
Communications 0000 (MWF 11:30)
 IDEA Center
 www.idea.ksu.edu

SAMPLE



Faculty Name: SAMPLE, AX
 Institution: ALPHA UNIVERSITY

Number Enrolled: 18
 Number Responding: 15

Term: Fall 1998-1999
 % Responding: 83.3

Your results are considered fairly reliable; it is unlikely that re-rating by the same students would produce more than a moderate change in your report. The percentage of enrollees who provided ratings is high; results can be considered representative of the class as a whole.

Sections and Purposes of the Report

<u>Page</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
2	I. Overall Measures of Teaching Effectiveness	Primarily for administrative use in helping to make personnel recommendations. <i>Only this page and Page 6 are essential if this is the only use you plan to make of the report.</i>
3	II. Student Ratings of Progress on Specific Objectives	Primarily to identify the teaching objectives where improvement is most needed
4-5	III. Teaching Methods or Style Related to Student Ratings of Progress	Primarily to help develop a strategy for improving teaching methods
6	IV. Course Description/Context	Primarily to assist in interpreting the results by considering the context in which the course was taught
7-8	V. Statistical Detail	Primarily to provide details which may help you or your consultants to understand or interpret the report accurately
8	VI. Processing Error Messages	Identifies errors resulting from incomplete information provided on the Faculty Information Form

Definitions

Raw Score: Results obtained by using students' numerical ratings, all of which are based on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high).

Adjusted Score: Ratings which have been statistically adjusted to take into account factors which affect ratings but which are beyond the instructor's control (size of class; student desire to take course regardless of who taught it; course difficulty not attributable to instructor; student effort not attributable to instructor; and other student motivational influences)

T Score: A statistically derived score which makes it easy to compare various measures. Unlike raw scores which have different averages and standard deviations (variabilities), T Scores all have an average of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. This means that 40% of all T Scores will be in the range of 45-55, while less than 2% will be below 30 or above 70.

Similar Classes: On Page 4, ratings of specific teaching methods are compared with national averages for classes of "similar size and level of student motivation." Your ratings are compared with those from one of 20 groups defined by considering both class size (less than 15; 15-34; 35-99; or 100 or more) and average student response to "I had a strong desire to take this course" (under 3.0; 3.0-3.4; 3.5-3.9; 4.0-4.4; or 4.5 or above).

Understanding the Graphs

Most results are presented on graphs. Unadjusted T Scores are shown by the symbol \times ; adjusted T Scores are shown by the symbol \diamond . In most cases, we use a line on both sides of a symbol to indicate that ratings have a "margin of error"; the line represents \pm one standard error of measurement, a statistical indication of the reliability of the measure.

A Few Words of Caution

1. New items on the IDEA form are marked by an asterisk (*) because they have been tested on only 3,668 classes. Comparisons with the national database on these items will be less stable than for the items retained from the original IDEA form which are based on over 35,000 classes rated during the 1993-94 and 1994-95 academic years.
2. Student ratings can make a useful contribution to the appraisal of teaching effectiveness and to the development of improvement strategies. However, they have distinct limitations which need to be acknowledged before appropriate use can be made of them. Please read the enclosed *Overview of Student Ratings: Value and Limitations*.


Figure 15.5 (continued) Sample IDEA Report

Faculty Name: SAMPLE, AX
Course: Communications 0000

Term: Fall 1998-1999
Page 2

Section II Overall Measures of Teaching Effectiveness

This section compares your results with those for other instructors and courses in the national database on four OVERALL MEASURES OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS. The primary value of this information is to aid in making administrative recommendations; if this is the only use you will make of the report, you need to consult only these results and the context provided by Part IV, page 6. Please remember that most of the classes included in the database have been taught in a reasonably successful manner; therefore, a rating which is "below average" does not necessarily mean that the quality of instruction was unacceptable.



You may wish to assign these ratings to categories like those which have been used historically with the IDEA system. Simply assign T Scores to categories as follows: **Low** (lowest 10%)=T Score below 37; **Low Average** (next 20%)=T Score 37-44; **Average** (middle 40%)=T Score 45-55; **High Average** (next 20%)=T Score 56-63; and **High** (highest 10%)=T Score above 63.

1. Progress on Relevant (Essential and Important) Objectives. Because student learning is the central purpose of teaching, and because you chose the objectives considered by this measure, this is probably the most vital measure of effectiveness. A double weight is given to student ratings of progress on objectives you chose as *Essential*, and a single weight to those chosen as *Important*; objectives identified as being of *Minor or No Importance* were ignored in developing this measure.

2. Improved Student Attitude. The graph shows the average response of students to item 40, "As a result of taking this course, I have more positive feelings toward this field of study." This rating is most meaningful for courses which are taken by many non-majors. Most teachers hope that such students will develop a respect and appreciation for the discipline even if they choose to take no additional courses in it.

3. Overall Excellence of Teacher. This shows the average response to item 41, "Overall, I rate this instructor an excellent teacher." Overall impressions of a teacher affect student attitudes, effort, and learning.

4. Overall Excellence of Course. This shows the average response to item 42, "Overall, I rate this course as excellent." This evaluation is likely determined by a number of factors (e.g., teaching style, student satisfaction with course outcomes, and characteristics such as organization, selection of readings and/or other influences).

NA₁: Based on a combination of ratings where an average on a 5-point scale is not comparable.


Figure 15.5 (continued) Sample IDEA Report

Faculty Name: SAMPLE, AX
Course: Communications 0000

Term: Fall 1998-1999
Page 3

Section II. Student Ratings of Progress on Specific Objectives

This graph shows student progress ratings on the objectives you chose as *Essential* (Part A) and those you chose as *Important* (Part B). To the degree that students make progress on the objectives you stress, your teaching has been effective.



20 30 40 45 50 55 60 70 80

T Score—Comparison with all Classes in National Database where the Objective was Selected as "Essential" or "Important"

—X— Unadjusted T Score \pm one standard error of measurement

—◆— Adjusted T Score \pm one standard error of measurement (adjusted for class size; student desire to take course regardless of who taught it; course difficulty not attributable to instructor; student effort not attributable to instructor; and other student motivational influences)

Similar to Section I, you may wish to assign ratings to categories. Simply assign T Scores to categories as follows: **Low** (lowest 10%)=T Score below 37; **Low Average** (next 20%)=T Score 37-44; **Average** (middle 40%)=T Score 45-55; **High Average** (next 20%)=T Score 56-63; and **High** (highest 10%)=T Score above 63.

It is recommended that priority attention be given to *Essential* objectives with progress ratings which are *below average*. The second priority might be directed to *Important* objectives for which progress ratings are *below average*. A third priority might be *Essential* or *Important* objectives for which progress ratings are in the *average* range. If all progress ratings are *above the average* range, it is suggested that your present methods of teaching are effective and changes in your teaching style or approaches do not appear to be needed in order to ensure that your teaching promotes student learning. If improvement is needed, strategies can be formulated by examining "Strengths" and "Weaknesses" associated with progress ratings on the objectives chosen for priority attention. These are identified in Section III of this report.

Note: Students in your class also rated their progress on the objectives which you classified as being of *Minor or No Importance*. These ratings are considered irrelevant in judging your teaching effectiveness. However, a review of student ratings on these objectives, found in Section V (Statistical Detail), may provide you with insights about some "unintended" or "additional" effects of your instruction.

*New Item

Figure 15.5 (continued) Sample IDEA Report

Faculty Name: SAMPLE, AX
Course: Communications 0000

Term: Fall 1998-1999
Page 4

Section III. Teaching Methods or Style Related to Student Ratings of Progress

This section focuses on specific teaching methods. Results are given in two parts. **Part One** graphically compares ratings of your teaching methods with those of others who teach classes similar to this one in terms of size and level of student motivation. **Part Two** identifies the teaching methods most closely related to attaining your *Important* and *Essential* objectives, providing a basis for developing improvement strategies. **Part Three** highlights potential areas to emphasize for improvement efforts and teaching strengths that should be retained.

Part One: The graphs below classify methods as "strengths" if your rating was at least 0.3 above average for classes of similar size and level of student motivation and as "weaknesses" if your rating was at least 0.3 below the average for such classes. Although effectiveness generally improves when weaknesses are overcome while maintaining strengths, not all teaching methods promote progress on every teaching objective. The methods which are especially relevant to each of your *Essential* and *Important* objectives are identified in **Part Two** (page 5).




Figure 15.5 (continued) Sample IDEA Report

Faculty Name: SAMPLE, AX
Course: Communications 0000

Term: Fall 1998-1999
Page 5

Section III. Teaching Methods or Style Related to Student Ratings of Progress (continued)

Part Two: Column 1 below again lists those objectives you listed as *Essential* or *Important*. Column 2 lists those teaching methods which in combination are most closely related to progress ratings on your chosen objectives. Column 3 separates out those teaching methods rated as "strengths" and those rated as "weaknesses" in comparison to the national average. (The numbers in Columns 2 and 3 refer to the teaching methods numbered 1-20 on the graphical presentations in **Part One, page 4.**)

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	
<u>Chosen Objectives</u>	<u>Most Relevant Teaching Methods</u>	<u>Most Relevant Strengths/Weaknesses</u>	
		<u>Strengths</u>	<u>Weaknesses</u>
Essential Objectives			
24. Professional skills, viewpoints	3,4,6,7,8,11,12,14,18		4,6,11,12
28. Oral and written communication skills	1,3,5,7,8,9,10,19	1,5,9,19	10
Important Objectives			
26. Creative capacities	1,5,6,7,13,19,20	1,5,19	6
*31. Analysis and critical evaluation of ideas	3,5,8,13,18,19,20	5,19	

Part Three: This section summarizes teaching methods to consider for improvement strategies and methods which are effective and should be retained.

Potential Areas for Improvement Efforts

Generally, improvement efforts are most successful if they focus on no more than three teaching strategies at a time. These results suggest that your improvement strategies might best be chosen from the following teaching methods:

6. Made it clear how each topic fit into the course
4. Demonstrated the importance and significance of the subject matter
10. Explained course material clearly and concisely
11. Related course material to real life situations
12. Gave tests, projects, etc. that covered the most important points of the course

Strengths to Retain

In doing so, you should take care to retain the methods which are currently effective, including:

- *5. Formed "teams" or "discussion groups" to facilitate learning
19. Gave projects, tests or assignments that required original or creative thinking
- *1. Displayed a personal interest in students and their learning
- *9. Encouraged students to use multiple resources (e.g. data banks, library holdings, outside experts) to improve understanding

*New Item

Figure 15.5 (continued) Sample IDEA Report

Faculty Name: SAMPLE, AX
Course: Communications 0000

Term: Fall 1998-1999
Page 6

Section IV. Course Description/Context

This section describes several aspects of your course. Some of the description summarizes information you supplied when you administered the IDEA form, and some of the information comes from student responses. Information on this page provides the context in which the class was taught and in which interpretation of the ratings should be made. The IDEA Center will conduct additional research on these data to determine more precisely how they can improve interpretation of the report.

Course Description:

Primary Instructional Type: *Discussion/recitation* Team Taught: *Not reported*
Secondary Instructional Type: *Other/Not Indicated* Distance Learning: *Not reported*
Principal Type of Student: *Underclassmen, general*

Instructor's Ratings of Special Circumstances:

<u>Positive Impact on Learning</u>	<u>Neither Positive nor Negative Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact on Learning</u>
<i>Previous experience teaching course</i>	<i>Physical facilities and/or equipment</i>	<i>Adequacy of students' background/preparation</i>
<i>Desire to teach course</i>	<i>Changes in teaching approach</i>	
	<i>Control over course management decisions</i>	
	<i>Student enthusiasm</i>	
	<i>Student effort</i>	
	<i>Technical/instructional support</i>	

Instructor's Ratings of Course Requirements:

<u>Much Required</u>	<u>Some Required</u>	<u>None (or little) Required</u>
<i>Writing</i>		<i>Computer applications</i>
<i>Oral communication</i>		<i>Group work</i>
<i>Critical thinking</i>		<i>Mathematical/quantitative work</i>
<i>Creative/artistic/design endeavor</i>		

Student Ratings of the Course:

	Number of Students Saying:*					Average	T Score
	1	2	3	4	5		
33. Amount of reading	2	3	7	1	0	2.5	43
34. Amount of work in other (non-reading) assignments	0	1	3	7	2	3.8	57
35. Difficulty of subject matter	0	0	7	4	2	3.6	56

*1 = Much less than most courses 2 = Less than most courses 3 = About average 4 = More than most courses 5 = Much more than most courses

Similar to Sections I and II, you may wish to assign ratings to categories. Simply assign T Scores to categories as follows: **Low** (lowest 10%)=T Score below 37; **Low Average** (next 20%)=T Score 37-44; **Average** (middle 40%)=T Score 45-55; **High Average** (next 20%)=T Score 56-63; and **High** (highest 10%)=T Score above 63.

Figure 15.5 (continued) Sample IDEA Report

Faculty Name: SAMPLE, AX
Course: Communications 0000

Term: Fall 1998-1999
Page 7

Section V. Statistical Detail: Item Frequencies, Averages, and Standard Deviations

Items 1-20: Teaching Methods

Key: 1=Hardly Ever 2=Occasionally 3=Sometimes
4=Frequently 5=Almost Always

	1	2	3	4	5	Omit	Avg.	s.d.
1.	0	0	0	6	9	0	4.6	0.5
2.	0	1	5	4	5	0	3.9	1.0
3.	0	1	3	5	6	0	4.1	1.0
4.	0	1	2	4	8	0	4.3	1.0
5.	2	0	5	2	6	0	3.7	1.4
6.	0	1	4	3	7	0	4.1	1.0
7.	1	1	1	4	7	1	4.1	1.3
8.	0	2	5	3	5	0	3.7	1.1
9.	0	0	1	5	9	0	4.5	0.6
10.	0	1	5	3	6	0	3.9	1.0
11.	1	1	1	5	7	0	4.1	1.2
12.	0	2	2	5	6	0	4.0	1.1
13.	0	0	4	4	7	0	4.2	0.9
14.	0	2	4	0	9	0	4.1	1.2
15.	0	1	5	4	5	0	3.9	1.0
16.	0	0	3	2	10	0	4.5	0.8
17.	1	2	4	2	6	0	3.7	1.3
18.	0	3	1	3	8	0	4.1	1.2
19.	0	0	0	5	10	0	4.7	0.5
20.	0	0	4	2	9	0	4.3	0.9

Items 21-32: Progress on Objectives

Key: 1=Low 2=Low Average 3=Average
4=High Average 5=High

	1	2	3	4	5	Omit	Avg.	s.d.
21.	0	1	2	4	8	0	4.3	1.0
22.	1	2	1	5	6	0	3.9	1.3
23.	1	0	4	3	7	0	4.0	1.2
24.	0	2	2	4	7	0	4.1	1.1
25.	1	0	3	5	6	0	4.0	1.1
26.	0	1	1	2	11	0	4.5	0.9
27.	2	0	3	3	7	0	3.9	1.4
28.	0	0	2	3	10	0	4.5	0.7
29.	0	0	3	4	8	0	4.3	0.8
30.	2	1	3	4	5	0	3.6	1.4
31.	0	0	5	3	7	0	4.1	0.9
32.	0	1	5	2	7	0	4.0	1.1

Bold items were selected as *Essential* or *Important*.

Items 33-35: The Course

Key: 1=Much Less than Most Courses 2=Less than Most Courses
3>About Average 4=More than Most Courses
5=Much More than Most Courses

	1	2	3	4	5	Omit	Avg.	s.d.
33.	2	3	7	1	0	2	2.5	0.9
34.	0	1	3	7	2	2	3.8	0.8
35.	0	0	7	4	2	2	3.6	0.8

Items 43-47: Experimental

Key: 1=Definitely False 2=More False Than True
3=In Between 4=More True Than False
5=Definitely True

	1	2	3	4	5	Omit	Avg.	s.d.
43.	1	4	1	5	3	1	3.4	1.3
44.	0	2	2	6	4	1	3.9	1.0
45.	0	0	1	9	4	1	4.2	0.6
46.	0	1	2	7	4	1	4.0	0.9
47.	1	1	6	5	1	1	3.3	1.0

Items 36-42: Self-Ratings

Key: 1=Definitely False 2=More False Than True
3=In Between 4=More True Than False
5=Definitely True

	1	2	3	4	5	Omit	Avg.	s.d.
36.	1	0	1	1	11	1	4.5	1.2
37.	0	2	4	6	2	1	3.6	0.9
38.	1	2	6	0	5	1	3.4	1.3
39.	1	0	3	4	6	1	4.0	1.2
40.	2	1	0	4	7	1	3.9	1.5
41.	0	1	2	4	7	1	4.2	1.0
42.	0	1	4	4	5	1	3.9	1.0

Figure 15.5 (continued) Sample IDEA Report

Faculty Name: SAMPLE, AX
Course: Communications 0000

Term: Fall 1998-1999
Page 8

Section V. Statistical Detail: Continued

Items 48-66: Extra Questions

	1	2	3	4	5	Omit	Avg.	s.d.
48.	0	0	4	18	6	0	4.1	0.6
49.	1	3	11	13	0	0	3.3	0.8
50.	3	7	14	4	0	0	2.7	0.9
51.	0	11	7	10	0	0	3.0	0.9
52.	23	0	2	0	3	0	1.6	1.3
53.	4	12	10	2	0	0	2.4	0.8
54.	5	4	9	6	4	0	3.0	1.3
55.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A
56.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A
57.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A

	1	2	3	4	5	Omit	Avg.	s.d.
58.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A
59.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A
60.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A
61.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A
62.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A
63.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A
64.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A
65.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A
66.	0	0	0	0	0	28	N/A	N/A

Section VI. Processing Error Messages

■ STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT II (SIR II)

Contact Information

Educational Testing Service (ETS)

Rosedale Road

Princeton, NJ 08541-0001

Phone: 609-921-9000

FAX: 609-734-5410

Web site: www.ets.org (For specific information about purchasing the SIR II visit the ETS web site, click on the "Products" tab, and scroll down to "SIR II".)

Format

The SIR II is available as a paper version and as an online service. The SIR II rating form consists of 45 core items that are divided into 10 sections with space for up to 10 instructor-prepared supplementary questions. The form is printed on both sides of a scannable answer sheet. The first five sections focus on instructor characteristics, including Course Organization and Planning, Communication, Faculty/Student Interaction, Assignments, Exams and Grading, and Supplementary Instructional Methods.

Each of these sections contains five or six questions. Items are scored on a 5-point scale, plus the option of Not Applicable. The 5-point scale is: 5=Very Effective, 4=Effective, 3=Moderately Effective, 2=Somewhat Ineffective, and 1=Ineffective. Questions in the first five sections include such teaching and learning factors as instructor's use of class time, ability to make clear presentations, responsiveness to students, comments on assignments and exams, and the use of practices and tools such as journals, portfolios, computers, case studies, and team learning.

The sixth and seventh sections of the SIR II provide the student with a different 5-point scale, asking them to rate the relationship between the course and their self-assessment of their contributions. The choices are: 5=Much More (than most courses), 4=More Than (most courses), 3=About the Same (as other courses), 2=Less (than most courses), and 1=Much Less (than most courses). In the Course Outcomes section, the questions are about a student's increase in interest in the subject, progress toward achieving course objectives, and involvement in learning. In the Student Effort and Involvement section, the questions ask for how much effort was put into the course, degree of preparation through homework, and how challenged the student felt.

The eighth section asks three questions about course difficulty, workload, and pace. The ninth section contains one question asking for an overall evaluation of the quality of instruction using the same 5-point scale as the first five sections. The final section of the SIR II questionnaire asks for student information such as class level, reason for taking the course, English language proficiency, gender, and expected grade. After space for up to 10 instructor-supplied questions, a final paragraph suggests that students make additional comments in writing on a separate sheet of paper.

Results

Three copies of a two-page report are provided for each class evaluated. For each of the questions, the percentages of the total number of completed questionnaires for each of the five ratings is displayed together with the mean score. An overall mean for each section is also printed, and for most of the sections, a comparative mean from either two-year or four-year institutions is also displayed. These means are based on a comparison of the instructor's average score on each item with means from a wide variety of two-year, technical, and four-year institutions that use the SIR II. Item means are flagged with a "+" if they are reliably at or above the 90th percentile of comparative data and with a "-" if they are reliably at or below the 10th percentile of comparative data. When class size is small and/or the percentage of students responding is low, responses may be flagged or not tabulated, reducing the probability of interpreting unreliable data. Separate comparative data guides for two-year and four-year institutions are provided with each set of reports. Each guide contains data analyzed for specific institution types, class size, class level, class type, and subject area. In addition to class reports, institutions may request a summary report and/or special combined reports.

Special Features

SIR II is a commercial rating system; the questionnaire must be purchased from Educational Testing Service. Sales of questionnaires are separate from processing charges, providing institutions the option of processing the questionnaires themselves. Costs vary with quantity ordered.

Development and Validation

The SIR II is a 1995 revision of the original 1972 SIR (Student Instructional Report). Two new forms were developed and pretested in spring 1994. These forms in-


cluded five of the scales from the original SIR with questions added or deleted. Three new scales or dimensions were added. These new scales reflected recent emphases on measuring learning outcomes and promoting students' time on task and effort in their learning. Each of the two pretested forms included a different response format to the same set of items and scales. By having random halves of students in 50 classes respond to the two forms, it was possible to determine which response format was better. Pretesting was carried out at 10 two- and four-year colleges. Traditional item and scale analyses of the two forms included computing means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, item-to-scale correlations, and factor analyses. A Rasch analysis also compared the response categories for the two forms to determine which provided better variation in student responses. Pilot-testing of the final form occurred at a variety of colleges from spring 1995 through spring 1996. Course means and standard deviations were computed for each item and scale. A sample of the data from the pilot-testing was used to determine the reliability and construct validity of SIR II. The three kinds of reliability computed established the internal consistency of the items within the scales (coefficient alpha), the number of students needed for consistency of course results (intra-class correlations), and the stability of responses over brief periods of time (test-retest). The factor analysis indicated that the resulting factors matched perfectly with the expected or a priori scales for SIR II.

Research Reports of the SIR also support the SIR II, given their similar research basis. John Centra, professor of education at Syracuse University, performed many studies of the SIR and was also instrumental in developing the SIR II (Centra, 1972a, 1972b, 1973, 1976, 1998; Centra & Gaubatz, 2000). He continues to write research reports from SIR II data. Six research reports based on SIR data covering such topics as comparisons with alumni data, research productivity and teaching effectiveness, relationships with the use of portfolio evaluation, and comparisons with self-ratings are available from Educational Testing Service.

Sample Form and Report

The following is a sample of the SIR II form as well as an example of the faculty report provided.

Figure 15.6 Student Instructional Report II (front)



STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT II (SIR II)

SIR II Report Number

--	--	--	--

This questionnaire gives you the chance to comment anonymously about this course and the way it was taught. Using the rating scale below, mark the one response for each statement that is closest to your view. Fill in the appropriate circle to the right of the statement.

(5) Very Effective
 (4) Effective
 (3) Moderately Effective
 (2) Somewhat Ineffective
 (1) Ineffective
 (0) Not applicable, not used in the course, or you don't know. In short, the statement does not apply to the course or instructor.

As you respond to each statement, think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.

A. Course Organization and Planning

1. The instructor's explanation of course requirements (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
2. The instructor's preparation for each class period (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
3. The instructor's command of the subject matter (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
4. The instructor's use of class time (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
5. The instructor's way of summarizing or emphasizing important points in class (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

B. Communication

6. The instructor's ability to make clear and understandable presentations (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
7. The instructor's command of spoken English (or the language used in the course) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
8. The instructor's use of examples or illustrations to clarify course material (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
9. The instructor's use of challenging questions or problems (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
10. The instructor's enthusiasm for the course material (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

C. Faculty/Student Interaction

11. The instructor's helpfulness and responsiveness to students (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
12. The instructor's respect for students (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
13. The instructor's concern for student progress (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
14. The availability of extra help for this class (taking into account the size of the class) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
15. The instructor's willingness to listen to student questions and opinions (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

D. Assignments, Exams, and Grading

16. The information given to students about how they would be graded (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
17. The clarity of exam questions (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
18. The exams' coverage of important aspects of the course (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
19. The instructor's comments on assignments and exams (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
20. The overall quality of the textbook(s) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
21. The helpfulness of assignments in understanding course material (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

E. Supplementary Instructional Methods

Many different teaching practices can be used during a course. In this section (E), rate only those practices that the instructor included as part of this course.

Rate the effectiveness of each practice used as it contributed to your learning.

22. Problems or questions presented by the instructor for small group discussions (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
23. Term paper(s) or project(s) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
24. Laboratory exercises for understanding important course concepts (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
25. Assigned projects in which students worked together (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
26. Case studies, simulations, or role playing (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
27. Course journals or logs required of students (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
28. Instructor's use of computers as aids in instruction (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

Very Effective
Effective
Moderately Effective
Somewhat Ineffective
Ineffective
Not used

Questionnaire continued on the other side. ➡

Copyright © 1995 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. No part of the Student Instructional Report II (SIR II) 57206 • 12402 • CV118M400X I.N.401651 may be adapted or reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher. Printed in the U.S.A. CHW85222 01057-0 4

Figure 15.6 (continued) Student Instructional Report II (back)

For the next two sections (F and G), use the rating scale below. Mark the one response for each statement that is closest to your view. Fill in the appropriate circle to the right of each statement.

- (5) **Much More** than most courses
 (4) **More Than** most courses
 (3) **About the Same** as others
 (2) **Less** than most courses
 (1) **Much Less** than most courses
 (0) **Not Applicable**, not used in the course, or you don't know. In short, the statement does not apply to the course or instructor.

Much More than most courses
 More Than most courses
 About the Same as others
 Less than most courses
 Much Less than most courses
 Not Applicable

F. Course Outcomes

29. My learning increased in this course
 30. I made progress toward achieving course objectives
 31. My interest in the subject area has increased
 32. This course helped me to think independently about the subject matter
 33. This course actively involved me in what I was learning

(5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
 (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
 (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
 (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
 (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

G. Student Effort and Involvement

34. I studied and put effort into the course
 35. I was prepared for each class [writing and reading assignments]
 36. I was challenged by this course

(5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
 (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
 (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

H. Course Difficulty, Work Load, and Pace

37. For my preparation and ability, the level of difficulty of this course was:
 (5) Very difficult (4) Somewhat difficult (3) About right (2) Somewhat elementary (1) Very elementary
 38. The work load for this course in relation to other courses of equal credit was:
 (5) Much heavier (4) Heavier (3) About the same (2) Lighter (1) Much lighter
 39. For me, the pace at which the instructor covered the material during the term was:
 (5) Very fast (4) Somewhat fast (3) Just about right (2) Somewhat slow (1) Very slow

I. Overall Evaluation

40. Rate the quality of instruction in this course as it contributed to your learning (try to set aside your feelings about the course content):
 (5) Very effective (4) Effective (3) Moderately effective (2) Somewhat ineffective (1) Ineffective

J. Student Information

41. Which one of the following best describes this course for you?
 (1) A major/minor requirement (2) A college requirement (3) An elective (4) Other
 42. What is your class level?
 (1) Freshman/1st year (2) Sophomore/2nd year (3) Junior/3rd year (4) Senior/4th year (5) Graduate (6) Other
 43. Do you communicate better in English or in another language?
 (1) Better in English (2) Better in another language (3) Equally well in English and another language
 44. Sex (1) Female (2) Male
 45. What grade do you expect to receive in this course?
 (1) A (2) A- (3) B+ (4) B (5) B- (6) C (7) Below C

K. Supplementary Questions

If the instructor provided supplementary questions and response options, mark your answers in this section. Mark only one response for each question.

46. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 48. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 50. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 52. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 54. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA)
 47. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 49. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 51. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 53. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA) 55. (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (NA)

L. Student Comments

If you would like to make additional comments about the course or instruction, use a separate sheet of paper. You might elaborate on the particular aspects you liked most as well as those you liked least. Also, how can the course or the way it was taught be improved? An additional form may be provided for your comments. **Please give these comments to the instructor.**

If you have any comments about this questionnaire, please send them to:
 Student Instructional Report II, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ 08541-0001.

Figure 15.7 SIR II Sample Class Report

STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT II

Enrollment	Admin. Date	Report No.	Batch No.
33	00/00	00000	0000

sir II

CLASS REPORT SAMPLE

Assessing Courses and Instruction

PERCENTAGES reported below are based on the total number responding, which is: 33

A. Course Organization and Planning <i>Think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.</i>		Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
1. The instructor's explanation of course requirements . . .				39	42	18			4.21
2. The instructor's preparation for each class period . . .				42	42	9	6		4.21
3. The instructor's command of the subject matter . . .				39	42	12	6		4.15
4. The instructor's use of class time . . .				42	30	18	6	3	4.03
5. The instructor's way of summarizing or emphasizing important points in class . . .				27	45	6	18	3	3.76
Overall mean for COURSE ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING is: 4.07 The comparative mean for X-year institutions is: x.x0.									

B. Communication <i>Think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.</i>		Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
6. The instructor's ability to make clear and understandable presentations . . .				30	36	27	6		3.91
7. The instructor's command of spoken English (or the language used in the course) . . .				61	36	3			4.58
8. The instructor's use of examples or illustrations to clarify course material . . .				33	33	30	3		3.97
9. The instructor's use of challenging questions or problems . . .				30	39	27	3		3.97
10. The instructor's enthusiasm for the course material . . .				21	45	30	3		3.85
Overall mean for COMMUNICATION is: 4.06 The comparative mean for X-year institutions is: x.x0.									

C. Faculty/Student Interaction <i>Think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.</i>		Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
11. The instructor's helpfulness and responsiveness to students . . .				39	33	15	12		4.00
12. The instructor's respect for students . . .				45	24	18	9	3	4.00
13. The instructor's concern for student progress . . .				36	33	15	15		3.91
14. The availability of extra help for this class (taking into account the size of the class) . . .				36	33	21	9		3.97
15. The instructor's willingness to listen to student questions and opinions . . .				39	36	12	6	6	3.97
Overall mean for FACULTY/STUDENT INTERACTION is: 3.97 The comparative mean for X-year institutions is: x.x0.									

+ This mean is higher than the comparative mean. See page 4.

- This mean is lower than the comparative mean. See page 4.

For explanation of flagging (*), see "Number of Students Responding," page 4

Figure 15.7 (continued) SIR II Sample Class Report

STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT II								
D. Assignments, Exams, and Grading Think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.								
	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
16. The information given to students about how they would be graded . . .			45	39	15			4.30
17. The clarity of exam questions . . .			36	33	21	9		3.97
18. The exams' coverage of important aspects of the course . . .			33	42	18	6		4.03
19. The instructor's comments on assignments and exams . . .			27	39	21	12		3.82
20. The overall quality of the textbook(s) . . .		6	12	45	15	15	6	3.45
21. The helpfulness of assignments in understanding course material . . .			27	48	21	3		4.00
Overall mean for ASSIGNMENTS, EXAMS, AND GRADING is: 3.93 The comparative mean for X-year institutions is: x.xx.								
E. Supplementary Instructional Methods Rate the effectiveness of each practice used as it contributed to your learning.								
	Omit	Not Used	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
22. Problems or questions presented by the instructor for small group discussions . . .	3	3	21	64	9			xxx
23. Term paper(s) or project(s) . . .			30	58	12			xxx
24. Laboratory exercises for understanding important course concepts . . .	12	52	18	9	9			xxx
25. Assigned projects in which students worked together . . .			33	48	12		6	xxx
26. Case studies, simulations, or role playing . . .			33	55	12			xxx
27. Course journals or logs required of students . . .	9	64	9	9	6	3		xxx
28. Instructor's use of computers as aids in instruction . . .	9	70	9	12				xxx
Means are not reported (xxx) for SUPPLEMENTARY INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS.								
F. Course Outcomes Mark the response that is closest to your view.								
	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Much More Than Most Courses	4 More Than Most Courses	3 About the Same as Others	2 Less Than Most Courses	1 Much Less Than Most Courses	Mean
29. My learning increased in this course . . .	3		15	33	33	12	3	3.47
30. I made progress toward achieving course objectives . . .	3		18	30	45	3		3.66
31. My interest in the subject area has increased . . .	3		15	24	33	15	9	3.22
32. This course helped me to think independently about the subject matter . . .	3		24	18	45	9		3.59
33. This course actively involved me in what I was learning . . .	3		27	33	30	6		3.84
Overall mean for COURSE OUTCOMES is: 3.56 The comparative mean for X-year institutions is: x.xx.								
G. Student Effort and Involvement Mark the response that is closest to your view.								
	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Much More Than Most Courses	4 More Than Most Courses	3 About the Same as Others	2 Less Than Most Courses	1 Much Less Than Most Courses	Mean
34. I studied and put effort into this course . . .	3		45	12	36	3		4.03
35. I was prepared for each class (writing and reading assignments) . . .	3		33	27	30	3	3	3.88
36. I was challenged by this course . . .	3		33	12	36	9	6	3.59
Overall mean for STUDENT EFFORT AND INVOLVEMENT is: 3.83 The comparative mean for X-year institutions is: x.xx.								
+ This mean is higher than the comparative mean. See page 4 - This mean is lower than the comparative mean. See page 4 For explanation of flagging (*), see "Number of Students Responding," page 4								

Figure 15.7 (continued) SIR II Sample Class Report

ASSESSING COURSES and INSTRUCTION							
H. Course Difficulty, Workload, and Pace <i>Mark the response that is closest to your view.</i>	Omit	Very Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	About Right	Somewhat Elementary	Very Elementary	
37. For my preparation and ability, the level of difficulty of this course was . . .	3	6	42	42	3	3	
	Omit	Much Heavier	Heavier	About the Same	Lighter	Much Lighter	
38. The work load for this course in relation to other courses of equal credit was . . .	3	55	24	15	3		
	Omit	Very Fast	Somewhat Fast	Just About Right	Somewhat Slow	Very Slow	
39. For me, the pace at which the instructor covered the material during the term was . . .	3	6	33	55	3		
Means are not appropriate for COURSE DIFFICULTY, WORKLOAD, and PACE. Review the distribution of students' responses.							
I. Overall Evaluation	Omit	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
40. Rate the quality of instruction in this course as it contributed to your learning. (Try to set aside your feelings about the course content.)	3	18	52	21	6		3.84
OVERALL EVALUATION mean is: 3.84							
J. Student Information	Omit	Requirement in Major		College Requirement		Elective	Other
41. Which one of the following best describes this course for you?	3	76		18		3	
42. What is your class level?	Omit	Freshman/ 1st Year	Sophomore/ 2nd Year	Junior/ 3rd Year	Senior/ 4th Year	Graduate	Other
	3			3	85	6	3
43. Do you communicate better in English or in another language?	Omit	Better in English		Better in Another Language		Equally well in English and Another Language	
	3	91		3		3	
44. Sex	Omit	Female			Male		
	3	52			45		
45. What grade do you expect to receive in this course?	Omit	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C
	100						
K. Supplementary Questions	Omit	NA	1	1	1	2	1
46.							
47.							
48.							
49.							
50.							
51.							
52.							
53.							
54.							
55.							
+ This mean is higher than the comparative mean. See page 4. - This mean is lower than the comparative mean. See page 4.							
For explanation of flagging (*), see "Number of Students Responding," page 4.							

Figure 15.7 (continued) SIR II Sample Class Report

INTERPRETING SIR II

The SIR II is designed to:

- Identify areas of strength and/or areas for improvement.
- Provide information on new teaching methods or techniques used in class.
- Provide feedback from students about their courses.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING

The number of students responding can affect the results when the class is very small (fewer than 10 students are enrolled), or when fewer than two-thirds of the students enrolled in the class actually respond. For this reason, a Class Report **will not be produced** when fewer than five students responded, that is, fewer than five completed answer sheets were received for a class.

The degree of accuracy for each item mean increases as the number of students responding increases. For example, the estimated reliability for the Overall Evaluation Item is .78 if 10 students respond; .88 if 20 students respond; and .90 if 25 students respond. (A full discussion of the reliability of student evaluation items can be found in *SIR Report No. 3*.) To call attention to possible reliability concerns, a report will be flagged (*) for one or more of the following.

- * The number responding **will be flagged** when: 10 or fewer students responded or less than 60 percent of the class responded (this calculation is based on information from the *Instructor's Cover Sheet*).
- * An item mean **will not be reported** when: 50 percent or more of the students did not respond, or marked an item "Not Applicable," or fewer than five students responded to an item.
- * An overall mean **is not reported** when one or more item means are not reported.

COMPARATIVE DATA (NOT AVAILABLE FOR SIR II PILOT)

The comparative means used throughout this report are based on user data from a sample of two and four year colleges and universities. An institution is identified by type — two-year or four-year — on the Processing Request Form that is returned with the questionnaires for scoring. Either two-year or four-year comparative data are used, based on that identification.

These data are **comparative** rather than **normative**. That is, they are prepared by combining class reports from institutions at which the questionnaire was administered. The data are updated periodically and are developed and published separately for two-year and for four-year institutions in the *Comparative Data Guides*.

The *Comparative Data Guides* for both two- and four-year colleges contain data analyzed for: size of class, level of class (freshman/sophomore and junior/senior), type of class (lecture, discussion, lab), and several different subject areas. A copy of the appropriate *Guide* is sent to Institutional Coordinators with the SIR II reports.

Local Comparative Data: Equally important and useful are an institution's own comparative data. Such local comparative data — e.g., an Institutional Summary, departmental summaries, program summaries — are available to any user institution. Forms for ordering these reports are included in the *Institutional Coordinator's Manual*.

Understanding Mean Ratings

Ratings can vary by class size and discipline. The *Comparative Data Guides* provide data by various categories to assist users in interpreting the SIR II reports. Please refer to the *Guide* and to the SIR II Guidelines for further information. Since student ratings typically tend to be favorable, it is important to have comparative data to interpret a report fully. For example, while a 3.6 is numerically above average on a 5-point scale, it may be average or even slightly below average in comparison to other means for items in SIR II.

What Makes a Score Difference Significant?

The mean scores on all of the items and scales in this report have been compared against the scores obtained by all of the classes in one of the appropriate comparative data groups (two-year or four-year institutions). Specifically, the scores have been compared against the score values corresponding to the 10th percentile and 90th percentile in the comparative group. If the results indicate a score is sufficiently reliable and is below the 10th percentile or above the 90th percentile, it will be flagged in the report as follows:

- + This class mean is reliably at or above the 90th percentile.
- This class mean is reliably at or below the 10th percentile.

Scores above the 90th percentile or below the 10th percentile are flagged when there is appropriate statistical confidence that the "true scores" (i.e., the scores that would be obtained if there were no measurement error) fall within these ranges. If a score is flagged with a +, there is less than one chance in 20 that the "true score" is below the 90th percentile; if a score is flagged with a —, there is less than one chance in 20 that the "true score" is above the 10th percentile. (One chance in 20 is the commonly accepted measurement standard for a 95% confidence level.)

Because measurement error varies from class to class, instructors with identical means on the SIR II items may not have the same items flagged. In particular, measurement error tends to be larger when the number of respondents is low and when disagreement among the respondents is high. For example, instructors in small classes are likely to have fewer items flagged than those in large classes because there is less confidence of the reliability of means in small classes.

Copyright © 1995 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

57206-12723-SIRP1-4ELX 7/24/95

REFERENCES

- Aleamoni, L. M. (1978). Development and factorial validation of the Arizona Course/Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 38(6), 1063-1067.
- Aleamoni, L. M., & Carynnk, D. B. (1977). *Optional item catalog (revised)*. (Information Memorandum No. 6). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona, Office of Instructional Research and Development.
- Aleamoni, L. M., & Laham, D. (1992). *Arizona course/instructor evaluation questionnaire: Results interpretation manual*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona, Office of Instructional Research and Development.
- Aleamoni, L. M., & Spencer, R. E. (1973). The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire: A description of its development and a report of some of its results. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 33, 669-684.
- Cashin, W. E., & Perrin, B. M. (1978). *Description of standard form data base* (IDEA Technical Report No. 4). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Centra, J. A. (1972a). *The Student Instructional Report: Its Development and Uses* (SIR Report No. 1). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Centra, J. A. (1972b). *The effectiveness of student feedback in modifying college instruction. Two studies on the utility of student ratings for instructional improvement* (SIR Report No. 2). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Centra, J. A. (1973). *Comparisons with alumni ratings, reliability of items, and factor structure* (SIR Report No. 3). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Centra, J. A. (1976). *Two studies on the validity of the Student Instructional Report: I. Student ratings of instruction and their relationship to student learning. II. The relationship between student, teacher, and course characteristics and student ratings of teacher effectiveness* (SIR Report No. 4). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Centra, J. A. (1998). *The development of the Student Instructional Report II*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Centra, J. A., & Gaubatz, N. B. (2000). Is there gender bias in student evaluations of teaching? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 70(1), 17-23.
- Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987, March). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 39(7), 3-7.
- Gillmore, G. M. (1973). *Estimates of reliability coefficients for items and subscales of the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire* (Research Report No. 341). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Office of Instructional Resources, Measurement, and Research Division.
- Hoyt, D. P. (1973). Measurement of instructional effectiveness. *Research in Higher Education*, 1, 367-378.
- Hoyt, D. P., & Cashin, W. E. (1977). *Development of the IDEA system* (IDEA Technical Report No. 1). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Hoyt, D. P., Chen, Y., Pallett, W. H., & Gross, A. B. (1998). *Revising the IDEA system for obtaining student ratings of instructors and courses* (IDEA Technical Report No. 11). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, the IDEA Center.
- Sixbury, G. R., & Cashin, W. E. (1995a). *Description of database for the IDEA diagnostic form*. (IDEA Technical Report No. 9). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Sixbury, G. R., & Cashin, W. E. (1995b). *Comparative data by academic field* (IDEA Technical Report No. 10). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.



TEACHER/COURSE EVALUATION

INSTRUCTOR: _____ COURSE: _____ SECTION: _____

Student evaluations are an important part of the assessment of teaching effectiveness. Please respond as honestly and candidly as possible. Disregard questions which do not seem to be applicable. The completed forms and the computer data will not be available to the instructor until after class grades are awarded.

Please use black or blue pen or no. 2 pencil only.

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR VERY POOR NOT APPLICABLE

I. GENERAL EVALUATION

- | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. The overall quality of this course was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

II. INFORMATION ABOUT THE COURSE

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. The extent to which course objectives were clear was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. Relevance of assignments to course content was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. Relevance of material presented in class to course goal(s) was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. Appropriateness of workload to course goal(s) was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. Relevance of exams to course goal(s) was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. Fairness of course grading procedures was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. The extent to which course responsibilities of students were clarified was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. Helpfulness of assigned text/readings to achieving course goal(s) was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

III. INFORMATION ABOUT THE INSTRUCTION

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. The extent to which course organization helped learning was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. The helpfulness of explanations by the instructor, if/when needed, was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. Instructor's use of examples, if/when appropriate, was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. Instructor's use of class time to help students learn the subject matter was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. Instructor's enthusiasm for subject of course was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. Instructor's helpfulness in resolving student's questions was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. The extent to which the instructor was prepared for class was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. Opportunity to ask questions was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9. Opportunity for students to make comments and express opinions was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10. Availability of extra help, if/when needed, was: | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

IV. INFORMATION ABOUT STUDENTS

1. At the beginning of the semester, my interest in the subject matter of the course was: ☐ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low
2. My current GPA at USU is in the range of: ☐ 4.0-3.5 ☐ 3.4-3.0 ☐ 2.9-2.5 ☐ 2.4-2.0 ☐ 1.9-1.0
3. This course is being used for: ☐ my major ☐ my minor ☐ a liberal Arts & Sciences major, minor or certificate
☐ general education ☐ an elective ☐ other
4. I am a: ☐ freshman ☐ sophomore ☐ junior ☐ senior ☐ graduate ☐ other
5. Grade I expect to receive is: ☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ F ☐ Pass

Please answer the two questions on the back.

1. What aspects of the teaching or content of this course do you feel were especially good?

2. What changes could be made to improve the teaching or the content of this course?

Institutions Using IDEA Student Ratings

December 2008

The institutions listed have varying levels of IDEA usage and implementation. We request that this list not be copied or distributed without prior permission from The IDEA Center. Please contact The IDEA Center for more information.

State Institution

AK UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA – ANCHORAGE

AL HUNTINGDON COLLEGE

AL JACKSONVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY

AL SAMFORD UNIVERSITY

AL SOUTH UNIVERSITY – MONTGOMERY CAMPUS

AL UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA – BIRMINGHAM

AL UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA – TUSCALOOSA - PILOT

AR JOHN BROWN UNIVERSITY

AR UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS-LITTLE ROCK

AZ ART INSTITUTE OF PHOENIX

AZ ART INSTITUTE OF TUCSON

AZ BROWN MACKIE COLLEGE - TUCSON

AZ COCONINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

CA ART INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA - HOLLYWOOD

CA ART INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA – INLAND EMPIRE

CA ART INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA – LOS ANGELES

CA ART INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA – ORANGE COUNTY

CA ART INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA – SACRAMENTO

CA ART INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA – SAN DIEGO

CA ART INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA - SAN FRANCISCO

CA ART INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA - SUNNYVALE

CA AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY

CA BIOLA UNIVERSITY

CA CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY-FRESNO

CA CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY-STANISLAUS

CA POINT LOMA NAZARENE UNIVERSITY

CA SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

CA SOKA UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

CA UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC

CA WESTMONT COLLEGE - PILOT

CO ART INSTITUTE OF COLORADO

CO COLORADO MOUNTAIN COLLEGE

CO ILIFF SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

CO WESTERN STATE COLLEGE

State Institution

CT RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE – HARTFORD
CT FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY - PILOT

DC HOWARD UNIVERSITY

DE WILMINGTON UNIVERSITY

FL ART INSTITUTE OF FORT LAUDERDALE
FL ART INSTITUTE OF JACKSONVILLE
FL ART INSTITUTE OF TAMPA
FL BROWN MACKIE - MIAMI
FL FLAGLER COLLEGE
FL GULF COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE—PILOT
FL MIAMI INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF ART & DESIGN
FL PALM BEACH ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY – PILOT
FL ROLLINS COLLEGE - PILOT
FL SOUTH UNIVERSITY – TAMPA
FL SOUTH UNIVERSITY – WEST PALM BEACH

GA ART INSTITUTE OF ATLANTA
GA BROWN MACKIE – ATLANTA
GA CLAYTON STATE UNIVERSITY - PILOT
GA OXFORD COLLEGE OF EMORY UNIVERSITY - PILOT
GA SOUTH UNIVERSITY
GA TOCCOA FALLS COLLEGE

IA DORDT COLLEGE
IA DRAKE UNIVERSITY
IA GRACELAND UNIVERSITY
IA GRAND VIEW COLLEGE
IA KIRKWOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
IA LORAS COLLEGE
IA LUTHER COLLEGE—PILOT
IA MORNINGSIDE COLLEGE
IA NORTHWESTERN COLLEGE
IA UNIVERSITY OF DUBUQUE

IL BENEDICTINE UNIVERSITY
IL BROWN MACKIE COLLEGE - MOLINE
IL ELMHURST COLLEGE
IL GREENVILLE COLLEGE—PILOT
IL ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF ART-CHICAGO
IL ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF ART-SCHAUMBURG
IL ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
IL NORTH PARK UNIVERSITY—PILOT
IL PRINCIPIA COLLEGE
IL REND LAKE COLLEGE
IL RUSH UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER - PILOT

State Institution

IN ART INSTITUTE OF INDIANAPOLIS
IN BROWN MACKIE – FORT WAYNE
IN BROWN MACKIE—INDIANAPOLIS
IN BROWN MACKIE COLLEGE – MERRILLVILLE
IN BROWN MACKIE – MICHIGAN CITY
IN BROWN MACKIE – SOUTH BEND
IN HUNTINGTON UNIVERSITY
IN INDIANA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
IN MARTIN UNIVERSITY—PILOT
IN UNIVERSITY OF EVANSVILLE
IN UNIVERSITY OF INDIANAPOLIS
IN UNIVERSITY OF SAINT FRANCIS

KS KANSAS ART INSTITUTE INTERNATIONAL—KANSAS CITY
KS BAKER UNIVERSITY
KS BENEDICTINE COLLEGE
KS BUTLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
KS BROWN MACKIE COLLEGE – LENEXA
KS BROWN MACKIE COLLEGE - SALINA
KS EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY
KS FRIENDS UNIVERSITY
KS HESSTON COLLEGE
KS KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
KS MANHATTAN AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE
KS OTTAWA UNIVERSITY
KS SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
KS STERLING COLLEGE
KS WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
KS WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

KY BLUEGRASS COMMUNITY & TECHNICAL COLLEGE
KY BROWN MACKIE - HOPKINSVILLE
KY BROWN MACKIE - LOUISVILLE
KY BROWN MACKIE – NORTH KENTUCKY
KY EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
KY MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY

LA LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY – ALEXANDRIA

MA CLARK UNIVERSITY - PILOT
MA EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE
MA NEW ENGLAND INSTITUTE OF ART AND COMMUNICATIONS
MA STONEHILL COLLEGE

MD HAGERSTOWN COMMUNITY COLLEGE—PILOT
MD HOWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MD JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
MD LOYOLA COLLEGE OF MARYLAND
MD UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND - COLLEGE PARK

State Institution

MI ART INSTITUTE OF MICHIGAN
MI CORNERSTONE UNIVERSITY
MI FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY
MI KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MI KUYPER COLLEGE
MI SCHOOLCRAFT COLLEGE

MN ART INSTITUTES INTERNATIONAL - MINNESOTA
MN BETHEL UNIVERSITY
MN CROWN COLLEGE
MN LUTHER SEMINARY
MN MACALESTER COLLEGE
MN MINNESOTA WEST COMMUNITY & TECHNICAL COLLEGE
MN NORTHWESTERN COLLEGE—PILOT
MN UNIVERSITY OF SAINT THOMAS—PILOT

MO CENTRAL CHRISTIAN COLLEGE—PILOT
MO CULVER-STOCKTON COLLEGE
MO DRURY UNIVERSITY
MO MISSOURI SOUTHERN STATE UNIVERSITY
MO ROCKHURST UNIVERSITY
MO SAINT LOUIS COLLEGE OF PHARMACY - PILOT
MO SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY
MO SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
MO TRUMAN STATE UNIVERSITY
MO UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL MISSOURI
MO UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY
MO WESTMINSTER COLLEGE
MO WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE

NC APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
NC ART INSTITUTE OF CHARLOTTE
NC ART INSTITUTE OF RALEIGH—DURHAM
NC BARTON COLLEGE

ND BISMARK STATE COLLEGE—PILOT

NE CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY
NE NEBRASKA METHODIST COLLEGE

NJ GLOUCESTER COUNTY COLLEGE
NJ GEORGIAN COURT UNIVERSITY
NJ NEW JERSEY CITY UNIVERSITY
NJ RARITAN VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NJ RICHARD STOCKTON COLLEGE

NM EASTERN NEW MEXICO UNIVERSITY
NM NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
NM UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

State Institution

NV ART INSTITUTE OF LAS VEGAS

NV GREAT BASIN COLLEGE

NY ART INSTITUTE OF NEW YORK CITY

NY CANISIUS COLLEGE - PILOT

NY ITHACA COLLEGE

NY JEFFERSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NY NAZARETH COLLEGE OF ROCHESTER

NY NIAGARA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NY RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

NY SUNY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AT UTICA/ROME

NY THE NEW SCHOOL - PILOT

OH ART INSTITUTE OF OHIO - CINCINNATI

OH BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE

OH BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

OH BROWN MACKIE COLLEGE - AKRON

OH BROWN MACKIE COLLEGE – CINCINNATI

OH BROWN MACKIE COLLEGE – FINDLAY

OH BROWN MACKIE COLLEGE – NORTH CANTON

OH CAPITAL UNIVERSITY

OH CEDARVILLE UNIVERSITY

OH CINCINNATI CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

OH FRANCISCAN UNIVERSITY OF STEUBENVILLE

OH MALONE UNIVERSITY—PILOT

OH MOUNT CARMEL COLLEGE OF NURSING—PILOT

OH NOTRE DAME COLLEGE—PILOT

OH OHIO DOMINICAN UNIVERSITY

OH OHIO UNIVERSITY - PILOT

OH UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

OH UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

OH WALSH UNIVERSITY

OH WITTENBERG UNIVERSITY

OK BROWN MACKIE COLLEGE—TULSA

OK CAMERON UNIVERSITY

OK OKLAHOMA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

OK OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY—PILOT

OK UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA - NORMAN

OR ART INSTITUTE OF PORTLAND

OR OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

State Institution

PA ART INSTITUTE OF PITTSBURGH
PA ART INSTITUTE STUDY ABROAD
PA ART INSTITUTE OF YORK
PA EDUCATION MANAGEMENT CORPORATION
PA ELIZABETHTOWN COLLEGE
PA GENEVA COLLEGE
PA LANCASTER BIBLE COLLEGE—PILOT
PA LEBANON VALLEY COLLEGE
PA MESSIAH COLLEGE
PA MOUNT ALOYSIUS COLLEGE – PILOT
PA NEUMANN COLLEGE - PILOT
PA NORTHAMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PA SAINT FRANCIS UNIVERSITY
PA SETON HILL UNIVERSITY
PA SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY
PA VALLEY FORGE MILITARY COLLEGE

RI PROVIDENCE COLLEGE
RI UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND - PILOT

SC ART INSTITUTE OF CHARLESTON
SC ANDERSON UNIVERSITY
SC LANDER UNIVERSITY
SC SOUTH UNIVERSITY – COLUMBIA CAMPUS

SD BLACK HILLS STATE UNIVERSITY
SD DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
SD NORTHERN STATE UNIVERSITY
SD SOUTH DAKOTA SCHOOL OF THE MINES AND TECHNOLOGY
SD SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
SD UNIVERSITY OF SIOUX FALLS
SD UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA

TN ART INSTITUTE OF TENNESSEE - NASHVILLE
TN BAPTIST COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCE
TN CHATTANOOGA STATE TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TN EMMANUEL SCHOOL OF RELIGION
TN KING COLLEGE
TN MILLIGAN COLLEGE
TN NASHVILLE STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TN NORTHEAST STATE TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TN RHODES COLLEGE
TN ROANE STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TN SOUTHWEST TENNESSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TN TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

State Institution

TX ANGELO STATE UNIVERSITY
TX ART INSTITUTE OF AUSTIN
TX ART INSTITUTE OF DALLAS
TX ART INSTITUTE OF HOUSTON
TX DEL MAR COLLEGE
TX HARDIN – SIMMONS UNIVERSITY
TX HOUSTON BAPTIST UNIVERSITY
TX SAINT MARY’S UNIVERSITY
TX SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
TX TEXAS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
TX TRINITY VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TX UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE
TX UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS – ARLINGTON
TX UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS – EL PASO - PILOT
TX UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS-SAN ANTONIO
TX WESTERN TEXAS COLLEGE

UT ART INSTITUTE OF SALT LAKE CITY
UT UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY - PILOT

VA ART INSTITUTE OF WASHINGTON
VA CHRISTOPHER NEWPORT UNIVERSITY
VA PIEDMONT VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

VT CHAMPLAIN COLLEGE

WA EVERETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WA ART INSTITUTE OF SEATTLE
WA EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WI CARROLL UNIVERSITY
WI MARIAN UNIVERSITY OF FOND DU LAC

WV APPALACHIAN BIBLE COLLEGE
WV EASTERN WEST VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE - PILOT
WV FAIRMONT STATE COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE
WV FAIRMONT STATE UNIVERSITY
WV SHEPHERD UNIVERSITY - PILOT
WV UNIVERSITY OF CHARLESTON
WV WHEELING JESUIT UNIVERSITY—PILOT

WY WARREN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY—PILOT

BC ART INSTITUTE OF VANCOUVER

ON ART INSTITUTE OF TORONTO

COLLEGE OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS - PILOT

Report from the Educational Policies Committee October 6, 2009

The Educational Policies Committee met on October 1, 2009. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page¹ and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties.

During the October 1st meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following discussions were held and key actions were taken.

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of October 1, 2009 which included the following notable actions:
 - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 112 requests for course actions
 - Approval of the request from the Health, Physical Education and Recreation Department to rename the Master of Science in Health, Physical Education and Recreation degree to Master of Science in Health and Human Movement
2. Approval of the report from the Academics Standards Subcommittee meeting of September 10, 2009. Of note:
 - For information only: Some departments/colleges are allowing advisors to give students upper division credit for lower division courses taken at other institutions or allowing an advisor to give student credits for work experience just before graduation to allow the student to complete degree requirements. With current Banner capabilities, those who make those exceptions will be noted by name and a report given to the appropriate Deans.
 - Changes to the E-mail Communication Policy were approved to now read:

All students enrolled at USU must specify a preferred e-mail address in the central system of record. A university-provided account or a commercial service provider e-mail account may be specified. A preferred e-mail addresses may be specified or changed at <http://id.usu.edu/>. University officials, including advisors, professors, administrators, and various office personnel, may use a student's preferred e-mail account as an official means of communication. It is the responsibility of all students to check their e-mail accounts on a regular basis. Students will be held accountable as being officially notified when any correspondence is sent by University representatives to their preferred@ e-mail accounts.

This change allows students to use an email account of their choice as their preferred account rather than that provided by the university.

- FERPA training policy: Current policy states that deans and department heads insure that faculty are trained in FERPA procedures and the Human Resources office tracks this training. A motion was passed that deans and department heads will be notified of faculty who need training and that the training will be effective for three years. After three years, if the faculty member is not retrained, they will lose access to confidential records. The training will be available on-line and provided by the Registrar's office. It was recommended that this policy go into effect in October 2010.
 - David Hole was elected chair of the Academic Standards for the 2009-2010 academic year.
3. Approval of the report of the General Education Subcommittee meeting of September 15, 2009. Of note:
- The following General Education courses were approved:
HONR 1300 (BAI)
APEC 5020 (CI)
SOIL 5750 (CI)
 - Three information items:
 - **Utah's Participation in AACU LEAP.** Utah State University, along with all other state institutions in Utah, will be participating in The Association of American Colleges and Universities' Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP). LEAP is an initiative that champions the value of a liberal education and focuses campus practice on fostering essential learning outcomes for all students, whatever their chosen field of study.
 - **CIL Review.** The panel assigned to create a questionnaire about the CIL exam reported on their progress. The questionnaire will be distributed to USU faculty and will be used to assess the relevancy of different parts of the CIL exam.
 - **Educated Person's Conference.** The Educated Person's Conference will be held October 30, 2009 at Utah Valley University. The topic is *Metarubrics and the USHE: Knowing What We Really Teach*. The Subcommittee was invited to attend and the Provost Office is willing to support participation.
1. <http://www.usu.edu/fsenate/epc/2009-2010/Minutes/Oct12009epcminutes.pdf>