

University of Puget Sound  
Faculty Meeting Minutes  
April 6, 2009

**1. Call to Order**

Dean Kris Bartanen called the meeting to order at 4 p.m. in Thompson 193. 57 people were in attendance at 4:45.

**2. Approval of minutes**

The minutes for the meeting of February 17, 2009 were approved as posted, with a small typographical correction (“fora” replacing “for a”).

**3. Announcements from the floor**

Bartanen reported that President Thomas is in Olympia advocating on our behalf.

**4. Report of the Academic Vice-President**

Bartanen noted that faculty members have received Fulbright Awards and a Goldwater.

George Mills reports a successful Campus Visit Day; four students made their deposits while here. Suzanne Holland gave a great keynote address. The sciences had an open house, with nice presentations by students and faculty. The second and third Campus Visit Days are April 17 and 20. Thank you to all who are participating, sending e-mails, and trying to improve our yield. 20-50 students are visiting per day.

**5. Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate**

Professor Doug Cannon reports that election season is here, and there are a large number of nominations. The primary season will begin with electronic balloting on April 15. Some nominees have been contacted to see if they consent to being candidates; the rest will be contacted soon.

**6. Changes to Bylaws on Diversity (continuing business)**

Professor Judith Kay expressed gratitude to those who have served on the Diversity Committee and worked on the proposed revisions. She encouraged faculty to keep in mind the problems that have led to the proposed revisions:

- a) the Committee’s structure has not changed since becoming a Faculty Senate Committee,
- b) it is not accountable to faculty for its efforts or outcomes,
- c) faculty concerns are not central to its focus,
- d) it is outdated now that there is a Chief Diversity Officer and Diversity Strategic Plan,
- e) the old Bylaws do not allow for flexibility as our understanding of diversity changes.

Kay explained that the revisions in Version B are on the table for a vote (**attached**). It includes a major change to the structure of the Committee, making it

comparable to that of other standing committees. There will be three Diversity Committees: one for faculty, one for staff, and one through ASUPS (if students wish it). The other major task of the revision was to reorient tasks around faculty concerns. Articles b1-5 address traditional areas of faculty concern.

Kay noted that the revised Article b1 ends with a definition of diversity that refers to the Diversity Strategic Plan. She cited the following reasons for this contentious decision:

- a) definitions of diversity are fraught with difficulty, and locating the definition outside of the committee enables the committee to be a place of dissent
- b) the forward-looking nature of the university's definition allows for continuing evolution of our understanding of diversity
- c) while debate about the definition is fruitful, insisting on a consensus before the committee can do anything could be paralyzing.

Article 6 refers to a group that already exists on campus, BERT, which would have an educational response to instances of alleged bigotry or prejudice in the campus community. In response to faculty concerns, this has been rewritten to include the promotion of academic freedom and freedom of expression. The Committee felt this should also be included in Article 5, as a duty of the Committee itself.

BERT receives reports of incidents from those targeted, refers individuals to appropriate on-campus resources, and organizes educational forums in response to incidents. Although originally created by the Diversity Committee, it is now under the authority of the Dean of Faculty and Dean of Students. Article 6 would enable faculty to maintain oversight of the group.

No one seems to like BERT's name, and that this may be one of the first things changed if the revision to the bylaws is approved.

The revised Article 6 does not create an enforcement role for the Diversity Committee or BERT. Both are committed to being responsive in an educational way to members of the community who feel alienated, degraded, or excluded. BERT is in its infancy and has floundered somewhat; having it under the purview of the Diversity Committee would help.

Open discussion commenced. Cannon, having made the original motion, accepted Version B of the revision; Professor Hans Ostrom seconded.

Professor Carolyn Weisz raised questions about the "promotion of academic freedom and freedom of expression": what would these promotional activities include? Kay suggested that these would not be separate activities, but rather components of other events meant to educate students about diversity.

Professor Rich Anderson-Connolly raised the question of whether it was desirable to keep the definition of social diversity outside of the Bylaws, so that it could be changed without a faculty vote, through a change to the Diversity Strategic Plan. Cannon noted that parallel passages in the Bylaws about the Curriculum Committee and Faculty Advancement Committees also refer to outside documents; Professor Randy Bentson pointed out that the outside documents are ones over which the faculty has control. Professor Harry Velez-Quinones commented that he was troubled by the apparent anxiety

over the definition of “diversity.” Concerns were raised about whether tying the definition to the DSP would prevent the Diversity Committee from dealing with diversity issues not included in the DSP. Professor Jac Royce commented that when she was on the Committee, it struggled to get disabled people included in the Committee’s charge because of the campus’s limited definition of diversity. She said it is important that the faculty have control over broadening the definition and not be limited to the Trustees’ definition; others concurred.

Professor Bill Haltom **moved to amend B1**, striking “as defined in the university’s Diversity Strategic Plan.” Professor Bill Barry seconded. **The motion carried.**

Weisz asked if calling for the “promotion” of academic freedom and freedom of expression is necessary, given that we all presumably value these things already. Velez-Quinones suggested that it is important to include this in the Bylaws as a reminder that we value these things even while trying to educate students about the harms of discrimination. Anderson-Connolly said that the goal of promoting free expression may be at odds with the goal of dealing with prejudice and bigotry. Professor Keith Ward noted that only the University Enrichment Committee also has “promote” in its Bylaws. Professor David Lupher suggested that “promotion” might be replaced by “protection” or “preservation.”

Professor Peter Wimberger raised the question of whether it is desirable to have more committees on diversity—one for faculty, one for staff, one for students. Would it be better to have fewer committees, in order to promote communication across the campus community? Chief Diversity Officer Kim Bobby noted that the Diversity Advisory Council has wide membership, and the maintenance of separate committees for faculty, staff, and students would enable them to focus their attention specifically on these constituent groups’ concerns. Wimberger inquired whether there were issues on the current Diversity Committee where the staff didn’t want to talk about faculty concerns or vice versa, and Kay said yes. Professor Nancy Bristow said that the old Bylaws give the Committee the charge to deal with things over which they have no actual power; the tripartite division (separate faculty/staff/student committees) would enable groups to work on issues over which they do have power, and the new layer of diversity work alleviates the need for a single committee to connect the constituencies. Dean Bartanen said that the Diversity Advisory Council is comparable to the Sustainability Advisory Committee, in that it deals with institution-wide considerations.

Professor Suzanne Holland moved to call the question; motion carried. The vote was conducted by paper ballot. The final tally: 42 yes, 13 no, and 3 abstentions. **The revision to the Bylaws passed with 76.2% of the vote in favor (abstentions are not counted).**

## **7. First reading of proposed revisions to Faculty Code concerning Early Tenure and Promotion**

Cannon made a procedural motion to move items 7d (proposed revisions to Faculty Code concerning Early Tenure and Promotion) and 7e (proposed revisions to Faculty Bylaws concerning Student Life Committee) forward on the agenda for first readings without discussion. The motion carried.

Cannon said **a motion to amend the Faculty Code (attached)** was being made on behalf of the Faculty Senate, which in March voted to endorse these amendments. The effect of the amendments is to change the Faculty Code so that no higher standard is required for tenure or promotion earlier than specified in the Code. This would avoid complications by establishing a uniform standard. Of the five clauses affected by the amendments, three are to be changed and two are to be struck. Anyone interested should compare the existing clauses with the substitute language in the motion, and also become familiar with passages of the Code referred to in the proposed language, in preparation for the second reading. Included in Clause 1: “If tenure is not granted after any evaluation for tenure, the next year’s contract shall be terminal.” This “up-or-out” policy clarifies that one only comes up for tenure once, even if they choose to come up for tenure early.

Dean Bartanen noted that there is a Faculty Medical and Family Leave Policy that has bearing on the tenure and promotion clock. She suggested that those working on this might consider mentioning the FMFLP in the following clause, so as not to put documents in conflict and so as to be family- and human-friendly: “In no case shall the time for consideration of tenure exceed the time set in Chapter IV, Section 1 e.”

### **8. First reading of proposed revisions to Faculty Bylaws (concerning Student Life Committee)**

Professor Nick Kontogeorgopoulos brought forward a first reading of proposed changes to the Faculty Bylaws concerning the duties of the Student Life Committee (**attached**). The Senate gave the SLC this charge this year. As background, we had no charges from the Senate three years ago. It took the committee a long time to figure out what it was supposed to do. They came up with open-ended charges, which helped, but realized that these should be listed as duties for the committee. The purpose of the changes is to clarify for future members of the committee what their duties are and to facilitate their work.

### **9. Core Curriculum review**

Professor Lynda Livingston reported that questions were distributed to faculty, and six written responses were received. Three meetings were held, dealing with different types of core courses: first-year seminars, Approaches, and Connections. Faculty said they were happy with the core. They did not think an assessment mechanism would be practical. There was discussion about the distinction between Writing & Rhetoric and SCIS courses: do we need to make sure students understand the distinction? Are WR courses overburdened by themes? How do themes work for SCIS? Should SCIS be a sophomore-level class? Should the Fine Arts description involve a broader emphasis on aesthetics so there would be more FA courses for students to choose among? Faculty were in agreement that the upper division core experience is essential, though it doesn’t have to be in the senior year. Connections is serving this purpose, but is it necessary to have both that and the upper division requirement—is Connections redundant? Should it be reorganized to get away from a specific mandate of interdisciplinarity and instead be more thematic?

Livingston expressed her appreciation for those who participated in the meetings. Faculty are encouraged to continue sharing comments with the Curriculum Committee this spring. Chapter 2 of the reaccreditation self-study has more information for those

wanting to read more about the core reassessment, available at <http://www2.ups.edu/dean/reaccreditation/>

Dean Bartanen said the reaccreditation visitors are coming April 22-24. We are in the process of scheduling their visit; some faculty may meet with them. An open session has been tentatively scheduled for April 22 at 3 p.m.

### **10. Report and Recommendation of Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation**

Professor Suzanne Holland reported that the Committee surveyed the faculty using Survey Monkey, and had a high response rate. Based on analysis of data, the Committee brainstormed three different revised versions of evaluation forms (**attached**). The rationale came from concerns raised in the survey: to streamline the form to decrease the workload for all those who participate in the evaluation process, and still allow for good feedback from students. Option A is closest to the current version, while B and C venture further afield. Holland reported having used Option A last semester in her classes, which helped with the design of B and C. B emphasizes quantifiable answers, with evaluative comments allowed on the back; A and C are less number-crunchy. These revised forms attempt to correct a problem with the current forms in use, which is that they mix feedback and evaluation; the revisions also begin to differentiate between course and instructor evaluation.

Faculty discussed the various versions: how will the numbers be crunched? Which version is likely to help students fully understand and reflect on the questions, provoking the most thoughtful responses? Does B ask for too many numerical answers in a row, leading to mechanical number-circling? Is C not specific enough to help students give useful answers? Do questions on C combine too many different issues in one question (e.g., 2E)? Would it be possible to create a Version D, incorporating A's reminders to think critically about pedagogy, but with more examples and fewer numbers? Are students really able to think critically about pedagogy? Would it be possible for a professor to design his/her own quantitative questions specific to the course?

A faculty member inquired about the purpose of asking students what grade they anticipate receiving and what grade they feel they deserve. Holland and Associate Dean Sarah Moore replied that the answers to these questions may help contextualize a student's comments about a class: if a student expects not to receive the good grade he/she feels entitled to, this may color their evaluation of the course. Professor Steve Rodgers suggested changing "deserve" to "earned" to avoid implying that a grade is a moral issue.

This discussion will be continued at the May 5 faculty meeting.

### **11. Discussion of the Pass/Fail Option**

Professor Seth Weinberger reported that at the last Academic Standards Committee meeting in the fall, a committee decided to abolish the P/F option to provoke discussion on campus. The Senate asked that the broader faculty provide input on what the P/F policy should look like. Three issues that the ASC considered in their recommendation:

- 1) One third of students who take courses P/F do so within their major department, creating a GPA muddle in that these courses do not then

- contribute to the major.
- 2) It creates a problem when freshmen take P/F courses that then turn out to be required for their majors
  - 3) There is anecdotal evidence that some kinds of classes attract lots of P/F students (such as creative writing, art, business), and faculty are concerned that these students have a negative impact on the ethic of the class.

Weinberger did a nonscientific survey of peer institutions and discovered that our P/F is extremely liberal by comparison. Puget Sound does not require faculty consent for students to take courses P/F, nor do they know who is taking the course P/F. Most schools don't let first- or second-year students take P/F courses, nor to let students take P/F courses within their major departments, and most require the instructor to give permission.

This discussion will continue at the May 5 faculty meeting: what policies would we like to see with regard to the P/F option? Note that this discussion pertains to academic classes, not activities.

## **12. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gwynne Brown  
Secretary of the Faculty

**Version A: Includes Friendly Amendments approved at First Reading on 2-06-09** Faculty Bylaws, Article Five, Section Six:

H. The Committee on Diversity

- a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio); the Chief Diversity Officer (ex-officio); no fewer than seven appointed faculty members, and one student.
- b. The duties of the Committee shall be
  1. To serve the university's goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus as defined in the university's Diversity Strategic Plan.
  2. To participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from historically under-represented populations and to support better the retention and success of such faculty.
  3. To work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer concerning diversity initiatives that can benefit from faculty presence and leadership, as needed.
  4. To establish liaisons with key university units including staff and student diversity groups to assess strategic needs and work collaboratively in diversity-related initiatives, as needed.
  5. To work with colleagues to maintain an inclusive classroom environment.
  6. To activate a group that will address educationally, as needed, manifestations of prejudice or bigotry within the campus community; to collaborate with this group and provide oversight; to promote academic freedom and freedom of expression, as needed; and to report annually to the Faculty Senate.
  7. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

**Version B: Diversity Committee's Proposed Amendments to Version A** Faculty Bylaws, Article Five, Section Six:

H. The Committee on Diversity

- a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio); the Chief Diversity Officer (ex-officio); no fewer than seven appointed faculty members, and one student.
- b. The duties of the Committee shall be
  1. To serve the university's goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus as defined in the university's Diversity Strategic Plan.
  2. To participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from historically under-represented populations and to support better the retention and success of such faculty.
  3. To work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer concerning diversity initiatives that can benefit from faculty presence and leadership, as needed.
  4. To establish liaisons with key university units including staff and student diversity groups to assess strategic needs and work collaboratively in diversity-related initiatives, as needed.
  5. To work with colleagues to maintain an inclusive classroom environment; to promote **academic freedom and freedom of expression, as needed.**
  6. **To activate, collaborate with, and oversee a group, focused on education, that will address, as needed, manifestations of prejudice or bigotry within the campus community through activities that include the promotion of academic freedom and freedom of expression; to include the activities of this group specifically in the annual report to the Faculty Senate.**
  7. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.



**On behalf of the Faculty Senate, in order to permit early consideration for both tenure and promotion under the standard normally required, but including an “up-or-out” provision permitting only one consideration for tenure,**

**I move to amend the Faculty Code as specified in these five clauses:**

(1) to strike the current language of Chapter IV, § 1, e and e (1) of the Faculty Code [p. 26 lines 31-36 online], and to substitute the following,

If a decision is made to grant tenure, it must be made not later than during a tenure-line faculty member’s sixth year of tenure-line service at the University of Puget Sound. If tenure is not granted after any evaluation for tenure, the next year’s contract shall be terminal. **[Note how revised wording clearly mandates an “up-or-out” policy]**

(1) Upon application of a faculty member and agreement of both the dean and the head officer of the faculty member’s program department, or school, faculty may be considered for tenure before the sixth year of tenure-line service at the University of Puget Sound. Upon such application and agreement, faculty may be considered for tenure before a time specified in the faculty member’s initial contract. No matter when a faculty member is considered for tenure, the decision shall be governed by Chapter IV, Section 1, b and d.

(2) and furthermore, to strike the current language of Chapter IV, §1, f of the Faculty Code [p. 26 lines 42-47 online], and to substitute the following,

Faculty members who have had full-time faculty service in other institutions before employment by the University of Puget Sound shall be evaluated for tenure by a time to be specified in the faculty member’s initial contract. If tenure is not granted by the time specified in the initial contract, the next year’s contract shall be terminal. In no case shall the time for consideration of tenure exceed the time set in Chapter IV, Section 1 e.

(3) and finally, to confirm our understanding and agreement that the references to tenure in the Faculty Code interpretation of 9 February 1987 are hereby nullified and will be deleted from future editions of the Code.

(4) to strike the current language of Chapter IV, § 2, b (4) of the Faculty Code [p. 27 lines 32-34 online], and to substitute the following,

A faculty member who wishes early promotion and believes grounds exist for it may request it in writing to the head officer and the dean. The dean may then initiate the evaluation proceedings. No matter when a faculty member is considered for promotion, the grounds shall be as set out in Chapter IV, Section. 2 c.

(5) and furthermore, to confirm our understanding and agreement that the Faculty Code interpretation of 9 February 1987 is hereby nullified and will be deleted from future editions of the Code.

Proposed revisions to Article V, Section 6f(b) of the Faculty Bylaws (added language in italics)

The duties of the Committee shall be

1. To act as a liaison on student life issues among students, staff, faculty, and the administration. *This includes providing input on various Student Affairs projects and initiatives as brought to the Committee by the Dean of Students, as well as establishing ongoing communication with and providing input to ASUPS on various projects at the request of that body's executives.*
2. *To review information sources available that could help identify issues relevant to student life. Such information sources include individual faculty, students, and staff, as well as the Office of Institutional Research and the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee.*
3. To conduct reviews and make recommendations ~~as necessary~~ about those policies and procedures that affect students' lives outside the classroom.
4. To conduct reviews and make recommendations ~~as necessary~~ about co-curricular programs and services.
5. *To serve as a pool of faculty from which to draw for participation on Student Affairs ad hoc committees.*
6. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

**Instructor and Course Evaluation Form  
Option A**

**To the Student:** The evaluation you are about to write is an important document for your instructor. The information provided will be used by the university in the evaluation of your instructor's teaching. It will also be used by the instructor for improving course structure and teaching. Your evaluation does count. You are encouraged to respond thoughtfully, to take this evaluation seriously, and to provide written remarks; we have allowed time for you to reflect and provide an honest appraisal.

Your instructor will not see these evaluation forms until after he or she has turned in final grades. If you do not want the instructor to see your hand-written form, check this box  and your responses will be typed before it is given to the instructor.

Course# \_\_\_\_\_ Semester \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor's Name \_\_\_\_\_

**1. Student Background Information**

A. Major \_\_\_\_\_ Minor (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

B. Status:     First year     Sophomore     Junior     Senior     Graduate Student

**2. Instructor's Promotion of Students' Learning**

	Disagree			Agree	
a. The instructor was intellectually challenging	1	2	3	4	5
b. The instructor was skilled in helping students master relevant concepts and skills	1	2	3	4	5
c. The instructor encouraged students to take learning seriously and to think critically	1	2	3	4	5
d. The instructor encouraged students' intellectual self-reliance and self-motivation	1	2	3	4	5
e. Class assignments (e.g., homework, lab reports, papers, readings) were useful learning tools.	1	2	3	4	5
f. The instructor presented material in a clear manner.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

**3. Instructor's Organization and Ability to Establish Clear Expectations**

	Disagree			Agree	
a. Overall, the course was well organized.	1	2	3	4	5
b. The instructor was well prepared for each class session.	1	2	3	4	5
c. The instructor established clear expectations of students' responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

4. **Instructor's Interaction With Students**

	Disagree			Agree	
a. showed concern for the students' understanding of the material.	1	2	3	4	5
b. was respectful of a variety of viewpoints.	1	2	3	4	5
c. was available during office hours and/or by appointment.	1	2	3	4	5
d. led students to engage the course material.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

5. **Instructor's Evaluation of Students' Learning**

	Disagree			Agree	
a. Tests, quizzes, papers, homework, etc., were consistent with the course's contents and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
b. The instructor provided reasonable preparation for tests and quizzes.	1	2	3	4	5
c. The instructor did a thorough job of evaluating my work.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

6. **Overall Rating of Course and Instructor**

- a. After carefully considering the items above, provide an overall rating of this course. Poor                      Excellent  
1   2   3   4   5
- b. What grade do you anticipate receiving in this course? \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Considering the effort and quality of your work, what grade do you believe you deserve in this course? \_\_\_\_\_
- d. With reference to the subject in this course, please explain how and why your interest and/or curiosity have increased or decreased over the duration of the semester.

- e. After carefully considering the items above, provide an overall rating of your instructor. Poor                      Excellent  
1   2   3   4   5
- f. Please describe what you think your instructor does best and what you think should be improved.

**Instructor and Course Evaluation Form  
Option B**

**To the Student:** The evaluation you are about to write is an important document for your instructor. The information provided will be used by the university in the evaluation of your instructor's teaching. It will also be used by the instructor for improving course structure and teaching. Your evaluation does count. You are encouraged to respond thoughtfully, to take this evaluation seriously, and to provide written remarks; we have allowed time for you to reflect and provide an honest appraisal.

Your instructor will not see these evaluation forms until after he or she has turned in final grades. If you do not want the instructor to see your hand-written form, check this box  and your responses will be typed before it is given to the instructor.

Course# \_\_\_\_\_ Semester \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor's Name \_\_\_\_\_

**1. Background Information**

A. Major \_\_\_\_\_ Minor (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

B. Status:      First year      Sophomore      Junior      Senior      Graduate Student

**2. Rating of Instructor** Please consider and rate each of the following:

	Disagree				Agree
a. The instructor was intellectually challenging	1	2	3	4	5
b. The instructor was skilled in helping students master relevant concepts and skills	1	2	3	4	5
c. The instructor encouraged students to take learning seriously and to think critically	1	2	3	4	5
d. The instructor encouraged students' intellectual self-reliance and self-motivation	1	2	3	4	5
e. Class assignments (e.g., homework, lab reports, papers, readings) were useful learning tools.	1	2	3	4	5
f. The instructor presented material in a clear manner.	1	2	3	4	5
g. The instructor was well prepared for each class session.	1	2	3	4	5
h. The instructor established clear expectations of students' responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
i. The instructor showed concern for the students' understanding of the material.	1	2	3	4	5
j. The instructor was respectful of a variety of viewpoints.	1	2	3	4	5
k. The instructor was available during office hours and/or by appointment.	1	2	3	4	5
l. The instructor led students to engage the course material.	1	2	3	4	5
m. Tests, quizzes, papers, homework, etc., were consistent with the course's contents and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
n. The instructor provided reasonable preparation for papers, tests, and quizzes.	1	2	3	4	5
o. The instructor did a thorough job of evaluating my work.	1	2	3	4	5

3. **Overall Instructor Evaluation:**

- |   | Poor |   |   | Excellent |   |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|---|
|   | 1    | 2 | 3 | 4         | 5 |
| a. After carefully considering the items above, provide an overall rating of your <u>instructor</u> .     |      |   |   |           |   |
| b. Please describe what you think your <u>instructor</u> does best and what you think should be improved. |      |   |   |           |   |

4. **Overall Course Evaluation:**

- |   | Poor |   |   | Excellent |   |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|---|
|   | 1    | 2 | 3 | 4         | 5 |
| a. Please provide an overall rating of this <u>course</u> .   |      |   |   |           |   |
| b. What grade do you anticipate <u>receiving</u> in this course? _____  |      |   |   |           |   |
| c. Considering the effort and quality of your work, what grade do you believe you <u>deserve</u> in this course? _____  |      |   |   |           |   |
| d. With reference to the subject in this course, please explain how and why your interest and/or curiosity have increased or decreased over the duration of the semester. |      |   |   |           |   |
| e. Please provide any feedback you have about the <u>course</u> that would be helpful for the instructor to know the next time s/he teaches it.                           |      |   |   |           |   |

**Instructor and Course Evaluation Form  
Option C**

**To the Student:** The evaluation you are about to write is an important document for your instructor. The information provided will be used by the university in the evaluation of your instructor's teaching. It will also be used by the instructor for improving course structure and teaching. Your evaluation does count. You are encouraged to respond thoughtfully, to take this evaluation seriously, and to provide written remarks; we have allowed time for you to reflect and provide an honest appraisal.

Your instructor will not see these evaluation forms until after he or she has turned in final grades. If you do not want the instructor to see your hand-written form, check this box  and your responses will be typed before it is given to the instructor.

Course# \_\_\_\_\_ Semester \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor's Name \_\_\_\_\_

**1. Background Information**

A. Major \_\_\_\_\_ Minor (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

B. Status:     First year     Sophomore     Junior     Senior     Graduate Student

**2. Please rate the following areas as related to your Instructor. Provide comments to clarify and provide context to your rating.**

a. **Instructor's Promotion of Student Learning:** (e.g., intellectual challenge, promotion of critical thinking, intellectual self-reliance)

Poor					Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	

Comment:

b. **Preparation of Instructor:** (e.g., use of class time, organization of course and class sessions)

Poor					Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	

Comment:

c. **Instructor's Communication:** (e.g., clarity of explanations and presentation of material, clarity of expectations of student work and role)

Poor					Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	

Comment:

- |  |  |      |   |   |   |           |
|--|--|------|---|---|---|-----------|
|  |  | Poor |   |   |   | Excellent |
| d. <b>Instructor Interaction with Students:</b> (e.g., rapport and availability of instructor, openness to other points of view, concern for student learning) |  | 1    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5         |

Comment:

- |  |  |      |   |   |   |           |
|--|--|------|---|---|---|-----------|
|  |  | Poor |   |   |   | Excellent |
| e. <b>Evaluation of Student Learning:</b> (e.g., methods of evaluation, helpfulness of feedback on work, timeliness of feedback on work) |  | 1    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5         |

Comment:

3. **Overall Instructor Evaluation:**

- |   |  |      |   |   |   |           |
|---|--|------|---|---|---|-----------|
|   |  | Poor |   |   |   | Excellent |
| a. After carefully considering the items above, provide an overall rating of your <u>instructor</u> . |  | 1    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5         |
- b. Please describe what you think your instructor does best and what you think could be improved.

4. **Overall Course Evaluation:**

- |   |  |      |   |   |   |           |
|---|--|------|---|---|---|-----------|
|   |  | Poor |   |   |   | Excellent |
| a. Please provide an overall rating of this <u>course</u> . |  | 1    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5         |
- b. What grade do you anticipate receiving in this course? \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Considering the effort and quality of your work, what grade do you believe you deserve in this course? \_\_\_\_\_
- d. With reference to the subject in this course, please explain how and why your interest and/or curiosity have increased or decreased over the duration of the semester.
- e. Please provide any feedback you have about the course that would be helpful for the instructor to know in preparing to teach this course again.