

To: All Faculty Senators

From: ASG/Faculty Senate Committee on Evaluations

Attached is a draft of our letter requesting funding for our evaluation project. Please read before Thursday's Senate meeting so we may have your thoughts and comments. We will submit a motion requesting Senate approval for this preliminary proposal.

(Typing errors will be corrected before the letter is sent.)

Some Items for Discussion

1. Should such an evaluation be mandatory or voluntary for each faculty member?
2. Who should administer such an evaluation?
 - a. the ASG
 - b. the FS
 - c. ASG and FS together
 - d. the administration (Dept. Heads for example)
 - e. someone else
3. What should the evaluation form be like?
 - a. only multiple choice questions
 - b. written comments only
 - c. both M.C. and written comments
 - d. same form for everyone
 - e. part of the form the same for everyone, and part put together by the individual or department members
 - f. other
4. What should happen to the results?
 - a. given to faculty member only
 - b. given to faculty member and his/her Department Head
 - c. given to ASG for distribution to faculty members and/or others
 - d. results should be made available to all students to aid their choice of instructors
 - e. other

Since the Faculty Senate may be able to come to some conclusions at the November 9th meeting that might not be in line with the 'purpose' of a faculty evaluation as outlined in the rough draft of the letter given you at the last FS meeting, do you have thoughts on any changes we might make in the Purpose Statement?

The purposes currently are:

- A. To improve the quality of Western's academic program where ever improvement is necessary, and
- B. To provide teacher/course information useful to both student and instructor

How do you feel about fac evaluation by students

October 3, 1978

Dear

The purpose of this letter is to request University funding for a Student Faculty/Course Evaluation Program. For Clarity, we have divided our letter of request into the following sections:

- I. Description of the Associated Student Government/Faculty Senate Committee making the request.
- II. Purpose of the proposed evaluation.
- III. The Evaluation
 - A. Form of Evaluation
 1. Re-Translation
 2. Departmental Section
 - B. Administration of the Evaluation
 - C. Computing of Results
- IV. Cost
- V. Future Plans

The Committee feels that the nature of its proposed project--the first Faculty Evaluation sponsored by the ASG and Faculty Senate--requires a detailed rationale.

- I. Description of the committee making the request.

The Associated Student Government/Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Evaluation was established to:

- A. Study the feasibility of regular faculty evaluation by students, and
- B. Determine the means and instruments such an evaluation should adopt if the evaluation is deemed feasible.

At the request of the ASG, the Committee came into being during the spring semester of the 1977-1978 academic year and immediately began regular deliberations. The representatives from the ASG are Victor Jackson (senior and chair of the committee), Shawn Ratliff Bryant (senior), and David Vance (sophomore). Those appointed by the chair of the Faculty Senate are Phillip G. Duff (Psychology), Charles H. Henrickson (Chemistry), and Mary Ellen Miller (English).

II. Purpose of the proposed evaluation. We propose a Student Evaluation of Faculty/Course that would serve to:

- A. Improve the quality of Western's academic program wherever improvement is necessary.
- B. Provide teacher/course information useful to both student and instructor.

In addition, we hope that the results of the evaluation would be used to better publicize the strengths of programs already superior to similar offerings at other state institutions; to foster good student/instructor relationships; and to contribute to the student's sense of pride in being a Western graduate.

III. The Evaluation

A. Form of Evaluation. The evaluation form we propose would have two sections. The common section would be designed by a process called re-translation. In this procedure, a group of students develop quality dimensions which they feel are important in determining effectiveness of a course/instructor. Behavior samples are generated for all these dimensions by other groups of students. Finally a group of students attempt to match behavior samples to the quality dimensions. Those which all students agree are relevant and which students agree are descriptive, are retained.

The second section would be designed by individual departments. We feel that this two-part form is the ideal way to include questions that would apply to all classes and questions that would be suitable for special kinds of courses. A similar procedure has been funded at Eastern Kentucky University, and we propose a research trip to consult with the designers (combined ASG and Faculty Senate Committee) of the Eastern evaluation. We believe that such a field trip would enable us to profit from the experiences of the Eastern committee and help us to avoid certain pitfalls in designing our evaluation form.

B. Administration of the Evaluation. Following is a brief outline of the procedures to be used.

1. Pre-Class Administration

- A. Student workers will obtain from departments a list of all classes and enrollments in that department.
- B. Workers will assemble packets for qualifying classes. Packets shall include appropriate numbers of instruments (with attached departmental questions), instructions for monitor, and mailing labels for classes.
- C. Assembled packets will be sent to appropriate departments by student workers.

2. Administration in class

- A. Evaluation will be administered in class by members of departments faculty. It will be the responsibility of each instructor to arrange for a colleague to administer his evaluations.
- B. A time span of two (2) weeks will be given for the instrument administration.
- C. Completed evaluations will be returned to departmental office, who will be responsible to their security until end of evaluation period, whereupon an ASG Representative will pick them up.

3. Post-Class Administration

- A. ASG Academic Council caucus will be responsible for collection of packets delivery to Academic Computing Center, and distribution of results.
- B. Individual results will be given to individual instructors. Departments and Associated Student Government office will receive comprehensive results.

C. Computing of Results.

The computing of the results of the evaluation will be done by computer at the University of Kentucky. A standard statistical package will be used to process the data. However, many options exist on the method of getting the data into a machine decodable form. Among the alternatives are:

1. Printing the instrument on a machine readable form which then will be read by a scantron optical mark reader here at western. The reader will write card images onto a disk, which then can be relayed to U.A. by telephone (remote job entry). The drawback to this system is that this machine is hand fed and would require paying students to feed in the forms. Approximately 36 hours would be required to read in 50,000 forms.
2. Printing the instrument on a machine readable form which then will be read by a MCR optical mark reader at U.K. This will involve renting the machine from the University of Kentucky (\$500), and also paying to have an operator on duty. This machine is automatic and would require only 20 hours to read in the forms.
3. Printing the instrument on regular paper, then having keypunch operators key the responses into IBM 80 column cards. These cards then could be read in via a card reader, and card images would be created on disk. Savings on forms cost is offset by the cost of computer cards. This job could take from 1 to 2 weeks for two experienced

operators.

4. Printing the instrument on regular paper, but having students put responses on machine readable computer cards. These cards would then be read by the NCR machines at U.K. Cost of operator and time required to read forms would be substantially reduced. (Operator cost drops to \$10)

Final results will consist of the mean, medians, modes, and standard deviations for all questions. PCT. of response will also be computed. In addition to individualized results, will be made for each department and the University as a whole.

- IV. Cost. Following is an itemized list of the financial support we are requesting the University to provide.

ESTIMATED COST OF FACULTY EVALUATION
(BUDGETED ON 50,000 INSTRUMENTS)

A. Instrument Development

\$ 2400	Graduate Assistant (1 year)
300	60 paid (\$5) students for retranslation committees
60	Eastern Research Trip
50	Misc. Instrument Development Expenses
<hr/>	
\$ 2810	Total Instrument Development Expenses

B. Administration

\$ 360	160 Student worker hours at \$.25
165	Large manila envelopes (3500)
80	Plain white envelopes (3200)
35	Printing of instructions to monitors (3500 copies)
34	Office supplies (mailing labels, staples, paper clips)
30	Printing of letters to faculty members (4 letters, 750 copies)
2	Printing of letters to departments (3 letters, 45 copies)
50	Misc. Administrative expenses
<hr/>	
\$ 721	Total Administrative Expenses

C. Computer Compilation

\$ 900	Computer Cost (CPU and I/O Time; KEENET Funds can be used)
200	Printing forms (4 part forms, supplied by Univ. of Ky.)
800	Instrument Forms
650	Cost of transferring data from instruments to magnetic disk or magnetic tape. (Cash Outlay)
50	Misc. Computer related cost
<u>\$ 2600</u>	Total Computer Compilation Cost
\$ 6131	Grand Total of Evaluation Cost

(Also needed will be 1/2 load reduction for one faculty member in the Psy. department. This reduction is requested for 1 semester in order to provide professional assistance for the Graduate Student.)

V. Future Plans. It is our hope that the faculty/course evaluations will be an on-going procedure. If our initial request is funded, we will ask for continued financial support and we expect to apply (possibly for next fall) for a special office to conduct the evaluations. We are considering the possibility of requesting the ASG and Faculty Senate to make our committee a standing one to oversee the evaluation process and to deal with other issues of special interest to both groups.

Respectfully submitted by,
 Victor Jackson, Chair ASG/Faculty Senate Committee

Shawn Matliff Bryant
 David Vance
 Phillip G. Duff
 Charles H. Henderson
 Mary Ellen Miller

ASG approval _____
 Date

Faculty Senate Approval _____

Attachment for Resolution 78-16

Cost of Instruments (Based on actual prices and estimates of personnel of Office of Academic Computing)

I.	Purchase of Educational Testing Service Instrument	
	Copyright fee (every year)	<u>\$2500</u>
II.	Purchase of Purdue Instrument	
	Purchase of Purdue Instrument Program	800
	Questionnaire Preparation (every year)	300
		<u>\$1100</u>
III.	Development of Instrument using Retranslation	
	A. Graduate Student only	
	Graduate Student Assistantship	2400
	Paid students for retranslation	300
		<u>\$2700</u>
	B. Graduate Student/Facluty Advisor	
	Graduate Student Assistantship	2400
	1/4 faculty members time	????
	Paid students for retranslation	300
		<u>\$2700t</u>
	C. Outside Consultant	
	Professional Consultant (\$400 a day)	8000
	Paid students for retranslation	300
		<u>\$8300</u>

All cost, unless otherwise stated are one-time cost.