



OAKLAND UNIVERSITY SENATE

Oakland University Senate

1976 - 1977
First Meeting
Thursday, September 16, 1976
5:00 p.m.
128-130 Oakland Center

AGENDA

Submitted by George T. Matthews, for the Steering Committee

I. Approval of minutes of the meeting of April 22, 1976: attached to this agenda is a copy of a request from Mr. Joel Russell, for correction of the minutes of April 22 as distributed. The Steering Committee suggests the Senate approve the minutes as corrected by Mr. Russell.

II. Annual reports from Standing Committees, (attached)

III. Report of Steering Committee activities, (attached)

IV. New Business:

1. Steering Committee election (Ms. DeMont): Mr. Nigel Hampton, member of the Steering Committee from the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences is on leave fall, 1976. Replacement for the one semester only is needed.

2. Nomination to membership on and to the Chair of the Academic and Career Advising Committee: Ms. Dolores Burdick has resigned from the Chair of and from membership on, the Academic and Career Advising Committee. With thanks to Ms. Burdick for her fine leadership of this important committee last year, the Steering Committee nominates Mr. William Bezdek for membership on and to the Chair of this committee for the 1976-78 term and so moves (Mr. Tower).

Procedural motion, eligible for final vote.

3. Motion from the Teaching and Learning Committee (Mr. Burke)

MOVED, THAT THE SENATE ADOPT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMENDS THAT ALL DEPARTMENTAL
QUESTIONNAIRES ON STUDENT PERCEPTION OF TEACHING

EFFECTIVENESS INCLUDE THE SET OF QUESTIONS LISTED BELOW FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS. THAT THE RESULTS OF THIS SET BE AVAILABLE TO A DULY CONSTITUTED *AD HOC* COMMITTEE STRICTLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT THIS SET CAN BE USED FOR MAKING RELIABLE ASSESSMENTS OF STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS ON A UNIVERSITY-WIDE BASIS.

1. (THE SCALE FOR THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IS RARELY - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - ALMOST ALWAYS)

THE PROFESSOR TEACHING THIS CLASS:

1. IS AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS OUTSIDE THE REGULARLY SCHEDULED CLASSROOM HOURS.

2. SEEMS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THE SUBJECT MATTER.

3. MAKES CHANGES TO MEET NEW SITUATIONS.

4. GIVES FEEDBACK SO THE STUDENTS KNOW HOW THEY ARE DOING IN THE COURSE.

5. MAKES CLEAR WHY THE IDEAS IN THIS COURSE ARE IMPORTANT.

6. ATTEMPTS TO ADAPT TEACHING METHODS TO THE BACKGROUND OF THE STUDENTS IN THE COURSE.

7. GIVES CLEAR EXPLANATIONS OF THE COURSE MATERIAL.

8. COMPARED TO THE OTHER INSTRUCTORS AT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY, I PERCEIVE THIS INSTRUCTOR TO BE
(ONE OF THE WORST - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - ONE OF THE BEST).

9. COMPARED TO ALL THE COURSES I HAVE TAKEN AT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY, I WOULD RATE THIS COURSE AS
(ONE OF THE WORST - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - ONE OF THE BEST).

10. THE AMOUNT OF WORK DONE FOR THE GRADE EXPECTED WAS
(EXTREMELY LIGHT - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - EXTREMELY HEAVY).

11. I HAD A STRONG DESIRE TO TAKE THIS COURSE.
(STRONGLY AGREE - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - STRONGLY DISAGREE).

III.

12. MY STUDENT STATUS IS:

- a. FRESHMAN
- b. SOPHOMORE
- c. JUNIOR
- d. SENIOR
- e. GRADUATE

13. MY GPA PRIOR TO THIS SEMESTER IS _____.

Comment; Our current system of assessing student perception of teaching effectiveness across departments is similar to equating apples to oranges. No common baseline exists for comparing the teaching effectiveness of individuals from different departments. This motion will establish procedures for testing the validity of such a comparison by analyzing student responses to the proposed set of questions for two years.

This set of questions is the culmination of a long and intense investigation of all departmental questionnaires, many external questionnaires, all the research literature, of student opinions, and a consensus of local experts working in this research area. The research literature has shown that all other types of questions correlate highly with this set and that this set explains more than 50% of the traits which have been isolated as being important for effective teaching. In addition, the majority of questions in this set are also those which Oakland students rate as being important.

This resolution represents the first step of a rational approach toward achieving a sense of fairness and uniformity in dealing with the highly complex process of the evaluation of effective teaching.

First Reading: Debatable and amendable, but not eligible for final vote.

4. Motion from the Teaching and Learning Committee (Mr. Burke)

MOVED, THAT THE SENATE ADOPT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMENDS THAT EACH DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION OF A FACULTY MEMBER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND/OR PROMOTION SHOULD INCLUDE AN EVALUATION OF HIS TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS BY A COMMITTEE OF HIS COLLEAGUES, BASED ON CRITERIA ADOPTED PUBLICLY BY THE DEPARTMENT, AND CONTAINING AT LEAST THESE THREE COMPONENTS;

1. A THOROUGH DISCUSSION WITH THE FACULTY MEMBER OF HIS GOALS AND METHODS IN TEACHING;
2. A CAREFULLY ADMINISTERED STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE FROM EACH OF HIS COURSES;
3. REPORTS OF VISITS TO HIS CLASSES BY AT LEAST TWO COLLEAGUES ON AT LEAST TWO SEPARATE OCCASIONS EACH.

Comment: Oakland University is committed to good teaching as one of perhaps the most important of its three main criteria for reappointment and promotion of faculty members. However, our present methods of evaluating teaching vary so much from one department to another, and are so indirect in some cases, that the evidence may not be given the weight it deserves in overall decisions. This proposal aims to give some uniformity to the process, while

leaving departments plenty of autonomy in defining their criteria and precise procedures appropriate to various teaching situations. The above recommendations incorporate four general principles in the evaluation of teaching:

- a. There are two groups from whom primary data on teaching effectiveness should be sought? students and colleagues- each of whom can contribute important data not available to the others. These can either confirm or qualify each other, and data from both groups is therefore essential.
- b. Whatever data is used should be as complete as possible (hence questionnaires rather than random interviews with students).
- c. Whatever data is used should be as direct as possible (hence class visits by colleagues rather than hearsay).
- d. All evaluations should be in terms of the stated goals and criteria of the department and of the individual faculty member (hence both of these should be explicit).

First Reading: Debatable and amendable, but not eligible for final vote.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE SENATE

1. As a result of the deliberations of a Joint Congress-Senate Conference Committee which met May 14, 1976, at the request of the University Congress the Senate wording of Main Motion 2. (Old Business) on the Agenda of April 15, 1976, adopted April 15, 1976, as amended was approved as follows:

THAT OAKLAND UNIVERSITY'S GRADING SYSTEM BE CHANGED IN THE FOLLOWING WAY EFFECTIVE THE FALL TERM, 1976: THAT ALL UNDERGRADUATE GRADES OTHER THAN WS AND WN APPEAR ON A STUDENT'S TRANSCRIPT.

2. The Steering Committee, acting in the name of the University Senate has approved and forwarded to the President the following diploma, graduation and University honors lists:

Diplomas: April 23, 1976

Graduates: April 23 and June 22, 1976

University

Honors: April 23 and June 22, 1976

3. Schedule of fall, 1976 Senate meetings: The Steering Committee has scheduled the Senate to meet on the following dates, 128-130 O.C., Thursdays at 3:00 p.m.:

October 21, 1976

November 18, 1976

December 9, 1976

Back to

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

S E N A T E

Home Page