GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
AGENDA FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
APRIL 3, 2019
Robinson Hall B113, 3:00 – 4:15 p.m.

I.   Call to Order

II.   Approval of the Minutes of March 6, 2019

III. Announcements
President Cabrera
Provost Wu

IV.   Committee Reports
   A. Senate Standing Committees
     Executive Committee
     Academic Policies
     Budget and Resources
     Faculty Matters
     Nominations
     Organization and Operations

   B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives
     Effective Teaching Committee – Lorraine Valdez Pierce, Chair
       Policy Recommendations for Faculty Evaluation Procedures   Attachment A
       Accompanying Motions   Attachment B
       Student Evaluation of Teaching Form Draft Revision   Attachment C

V.   Unfinished Business
     Additional Gift Committee Motion #2 (postponed)   Attachment D

VI.   New Business

VII. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty

VIII. Adjournment

Policy Recommendations to the Faculty Senate of
George Mason University
for Revising Faculty Evaluation Procedures
March 21, 2019

INTRODUCTION

The Effective Teaching Committee, a university standing committee, is charged with developing and helping implement procedures that encourage and reward effective teaching, enabling faculty to improve their teaching effectiveness independent of any evaluation procedures, and implementing procedures for evaluation of effective teaching.

The Committee is charged with recommending policy to the Faculty Senate and monitoring the use of such policy for the evaluation of teachers and courses, including the following:

A. Review, improve, and provide guidance to the Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness (OIRE) on the course evaluation form and related procedures at least once every three years;

B. Review existing policies relating to the faculty evaluation process, identify alternatives to these policies and recommend changes to the Faculty Senate;

C. Work closely with the Stearns Center for Teaching & Learning to support the use of formative and self-assessment techniques and materials for promoting faculty professional growth and teaching effectiveness, including strategies for robust student feedback.

During 2018–19, based on input gathered over the past few years from all stakeholder groups - students, faculty, and administrators - we drafted recommendations for changing faculty evaluation policies, including using the Course Evaluation Form as only one of multiple measures for making high-stakes decisions about course instructors. We based these recommendations on stakeholder feedback, as well as on a review of best practice in the research literature and of actions taken at universities across the nation, as well as internationally. Our review revealed university actions that include modifying the course evaluation form, converting from paper to online forms and examining response rates, and in a growing number of cases, eliminating the course evaluation form altogether and replacing it with alternatives for faculty evaluation.

Our recommendations are aimed at three levels of impact and decision-making: (1) the University as institution, (2) programs and colleges, and (3) individual course instructors. At each level, we make recommendations for faculty evaluation and using the Course Evaluation Form as part of that evaluation. In addition, these recommendations support specific goals listed in Mason's Strategic Plan, as indicated at the end of this document.

Part I. Institutional/University Level Recommendations

I. Implementation from paper to online forms

The Committee has been made aware by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE) that online evaluation of faculty is being seriously considered due to its cost-effectiveness. While this Committee does not take a position on whether or not an online Course Evaluation Form should be made mandatory for all instructors, we do have some concerns based on our reading of the research on this topic, the experiences of other universities, and stakeholder feedback. Our primary concern regards low response rates, which have been repeatedly documented when course evaluation forms go online. Another concern is the assumptions that are made when asking students for their input on the effectiveness of their instructors' teaching. Stakeholder feedback suggests that students are unaware of how responses are being used, e.g., to make career decisions about instructors. The following recommendations are intended to address these concerns.

Recommendation 1: The Committee recommends that Course Evaluation Forms be administered in class to retain or enhance response rates.

- For the purpose of completing online forms in class, the University will need to ensure reliable Internet access in every classroom to enable students to access evaluation forms via laptop and mobile devices.
- The University will need to change instructions for administration of the Course Evaluation Form to include reserving 15 to 20 minutes of class time for completing the form. The time required is consistent with the time required in the current administration of paper-based forms.

-

Recommendation 2: The Committee recommends the University establish strategies to increase response rates for any Course Evaluation Forms that are administered online.

- For this purpose, the University can issue multiple automatic reminders (automatic and personalized by instructor).
- Any online Course Evaluation Form should allow students to save and resume their responses.
- Incentives should be determined at the university/college level and may need to be rolled out over multiple years. To prevent corruption of the evaluation process, the Committee strongly advises against the use of incentives by the instructor (e.g., extra credit). The Committee recommends monitoring the effectiveness of implemented incentives for increasing response rates.

Possible incentives may include:
- Providing early access to grades.
- Providing students with upload certification on Blackboard.
- Providing students early access to future course registration.
- Providing transcript credits for graduates or other credits such as Mason money for copies or bookstore purchases.
- Providing a lottery/raffle with small prizes.
- Recognizing academic programs for meeting target responses rates.

Recommendation 3: The Committee recommends that the University engage in education of the faculty on how to communicate the uses of the Course Evaluation Form results to students.

For this purpose, the University can develop training materials and/or information sessions regarding the role and use of the Course Evaluation Form and the purposes behind latest revisions being made to the form. The University can convey the Committee's recommendations for instructor level practices (see below), such as developing and providing program/college level discussions regarding transparency on the use of Course Evaluation Forms in faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure decisions.

Recommendation 4: The Committee recommends that the University engage in the education of students on how the results from Course Evaluation Forms are used in the faculty evaluation process.

To this end, the University should consider the following approaches:

- Involving student organizations and associations in developing and promoting training materials about the importance of evaluations.
- Encouraging use of midterm formative evaluations as an opportunity to educate students about the importance of student evaluations. These midterm evaluations can also show students that their opinion is taken into account by instructors.
- Including training materials in orientation and transfer packets.
- Involving advisors.
- Offering a university-wide competition for students to prepare education materials (e.g. video).

Recommendation 5: The Committee recommends that in the transition from paper to online Course Evaluation Forms, the University provide increased accessibility to data sets and reports to individual course instructors.

The University should continue to provide access to raw data resulting from Course Evaluation Forms to programs/colleges/departments and faculty to enable academic units to conduct their own statistical analysis in order to aid decision making.

- The University should continue to provide measures of central tendency (mode, median, mean), variability, and percentages in the standard report to faculty based on the results of the Course Evaluation Form used in each course.
- Departments and/or units should be provided with reports analyzing the relationship between class characteristics (student information items) and item responses.

Recommendation 6: The Committee recommends that the University ensure that all buildings allow for Internet access during the period designated for students to complete the Course Evaluation Forms.

This will require infrastructure upgrades, as not all classrooms on campus have the Wi-Fi capability to allow large numbers of students online at the same time.

II. Evaluation and Monitoring of Changes to the Course Evaluation Process

The Course Evaluation Form should be periodically reviewed and revised based on careful monitoring of its use in evaluating course instructors. As noted in its charge, the Committee recommends required periodic review of the Course Evaluation Form and of the faculty evaluation process.

Recommendation 7: The Committee recommends that OIRE collaborate with faculty to conduct research on how the results of Course Evaluation Forms are used to evaluate faculty and to improve teaching.

- For this purpose, the University should require colleges/programs to use results of the Course Evaluation Form responsibly in determining hiring, promotion and contract renewal decisions.
- The University should also require programs to determine minimum response rates by class size and/or related factors to ensure fair and appropriate use of Course Evaluation Forms.
- The University should support and encourage the use of multiple measures beyond Course Evaluation Forms in evaluating faculty including: peer observations, self-assessment, and portfolios.

Part II: Program & College Level Recommendations

Programs and colleges have flexibility in determining how to evaluate instructional faculty, so some variation is evident between one academic unit and another. On the other hand, many units share common practices when it comes to the faculty evaluation process and using the Course Evaluation Form to evaluate instructional faculty. In particular, Course Evaluation Forms are typically used for only summative evaluation at the end of a course, when improvement of teaching in the current course is no longer a possibility. Second, of all the items provided on the Course Evaluation Form, academic units tend to use only one or two overall numbers to make determinations of teaching quality. Third, programs and academic units often do not require student feedback for formative purposes, i.e., improving teaching effectiveness at any time during the course of instruction. To address these concerns, the following recommendations are offered.

Recommendation 8: The Committee recommends that the primary purpose of faculty evaluation, and of the Course Evaluation Form as part of that evaluation, should be for formative purposes, i.e., the improvement of teaching effectiveness.

With that goal in mind, academic units need to educate both faculty and students on the processes of formative assessment. This could include:

- Ensuring that course instructors are informed of the potential individualization of items on the Course Evaluation Form. The new Course Evaluation Form can be individualized to

provide information to improve their teaching. Instructors need to be educated on how to add items to the form.

- Preparing faculty to use student feedback, and the results of the Course Evaluation Form in particular, to improve teaching.

Instructors need to be guided in obtaining student feedback multiple times for more frequent feedback throughout each semester or course. Formative assessment is only useful while a course and the teaching are in process rather than at the end of the experience. Programs and colleges can use items from the Course Evaluation Form to devise alternative formats and sample forms for obtaining student feedback and examples of how that feedback can be used to improve teaching.

Recommendation 9: The Committee recommends that programs and colleges educate students on the uses of the Course Evaluation Form.

Programs and colleges should ensure that students know their unique role in the faculty evaluation process. In addition, programs and colleges should provide clear acknowledgment in writing that their feedback is confidential and will not be used to affect the grading process, as instructors are required to submit grades before receiving the results of Course Evaluation Forms. Academic units should consider adding a statement to each course syllabus regarding the purpose and use of the Course Evaluation Form in making high-stakes decisions for faculty accountability and assuring confidentiality of student responses.

Programs and colleges should plan on phased implementation of outreach and education efforts for both faculty and students. For example, in the initial year of implementation, programs and colleges can volunteer for faculty training, with rolling implementation of other colleges in subsequent years. In the second year, programs and colleges can proceed with student training by individual college, again with rolling implementation across subsequent years.

Recommendation 10: The Committee recommends that faculty evaluation should have as its secondary purpose accountability, and programs and academic units should make use of multiple measures for this process, including peer review.

Peer Review
Faculty should be evaluated for accountability purposes in making decisions regarding merit, hiring, tenure, and promotion. Peer review should be part of this evaluation process. While peer review is commonly used for decisions of promotion and tenure, it is less frequently used for the purpose of annual faculty evaluation. To prepare faculty for peer evaluation, programs and colleges should provide instructor training in the process of peer observation and the use of scoring protocols. This training should include approaches for limiting bias and increasing the validity of inferences and rater training for scoring protocols to ensure reliability of outcomes.

Peer evaluation should include review of syllabi, course materials, assessments, and grading practices. The process should also be based on classroom observation of instruction and the development and field-testing/validation of observation protocols. In addition, measures of learning outcomes and student perceptions of learning, such as the

Student Assessment of Learning Gains (SALG) should be included in the evaluation process. Course instructors should be provided with formats for self-assessment and documentation of their teaching, such as teaching portfolios and reflection statements based on student feedback.

Programs and colleges should plan on phased implementation of new annual evaluation procedures so that faculty are gradually introduced to and enabled to engage in self-assessment and peer review. For example, in the first year of implementation, instructors could be provided with information and guidance on preparing a teaching portfolio or statement. In the same year, some faculty could engage in peer review training, including the use of criteria for syllabus review. In subsequent years, faculty could be trained on how to conduct peer reviews based on class observations. Since peer review for annual faculty evaluation is probably not feasible for all faculty, programs and colleges could decide how often to conduct peer reviews, such as in alternating years, and how to determine eligibility of faculty for peer review.

Multiple Measures

Programs and academic units should use multiple measures to ensure the validity and reliability of the outcomes used in the faculty evaluation process. Given the high-stakes nature of faculty evaluation for career decision-making, programs and colleges should ensure the accuracy and fairness of the evaluation process for both full-time and part-time faculty.

To ensure metric reliability and validity, programs and colleges need to use multiple measures and take steps to ensure that no single or overall score is used to determine the teaching effectiveness of any course instructor. Instead of a single overall number or mean on Course Evaluation Forms, programs and colleges can use total mode, median, or mean scores in combination with other indicators of teaching effectiveness.
Vague descriptors on the Course Evaluation Form or in scoring protocols need to be removed in order to improve the reliability of outcomes.

To increase the validity of inferences based on Course Evaluation Form results, programs and colleges should consider eliminating results of Course Evaluation Forms from faculty evaluation when response rates are low.

Programs and colleges should plan on phased implementation of revised faculty evaluation procedures, such as using the first year to determine the multiple measures to be used for faculty evaluation and developing those measures in a following year. In subsequent years, those measures can be pilot-tested and later implemented.

Differentiating the Use of Course Evaluation Results

Because in any given year some faculty teach more courses than others or teach required courses with large enrollments, or online courses, evaluations of teaching should be proportional to each instructor's teaching load and course characteristics.

Programs and colleges should develop guidelines for instructor evaluation based on course characteristics such as course or student level, required vs. optional course, class size, delivery

platform, and Course Evaluation Form response rate. Some suggested weights might include 50% for peer review, 30% for self-assessment, and 20% of the total evaluation score based on the results of the Course Evaluation form, as each program determines these to be appropriate. Programs and colleges can apply weights to Course Evaluation Form results as determined by course load and course characteristics.

Programs and colleges should plan on phased implementation of differentiation of Course Evaluation Form results, such as using the first year to determine category weights for effective teaching by faculty role and the second year for determining policies for using results of the Course Evaluation Form.

Recommendation 11: The Committee recommends that course instructors be informed of and educated on the migration from paper to online Course Evaluation Forms.

The process of informing faculty about the move from paper to online forms could include the following:

- Explaining the timeline for the transition.
- Discussing how evaluations will be used in faculty evaluation.
- Considering how shifting response rates may impact faculty evaluation process.
- Ensuring that instructors know that they need to be proactive to ensure strong response rates, e.g., including statements in syllabi addressing course evaluations.

Part III. Instructor Level Recommendations

I. Phased implementation from paper to online forms

With Mason likely to be moving from paper to online Course Evaluation Forms, plans must be made to prepare both course instructors and students on the implications and ramifications of this migration. The recommendations below suggest actions that could to be taken to prepare instructors and students for the migration.

Recommendation 12: The Committee recommends that course instructors educate students on the importance, purposes, and uses of the Course Evaluation Form.

Students need to be provided with information on the following:

- The purposes of the form, both formative and summative assessment
- Responses on the Course Evaluation Form are anonymous even though students must log in with student credentials to access the form
- Final grades are submitted before instructors receive results of the Course Evaluation Forms and, as such, are not affected by their responses on the form
- Assure students that the Course Evaluation Form has been developed and pilot-tested with feedback from all stakeholders, including both graduate and undergraduate students.

Instructors should describe the role of the Course Evaluation Form in the instructor evaluation process, e.g., for determining high-stakes decisions such as annual evaluation, promotion, contract renewal, and salary setting.

In addition, instructors can let students know that they plan to use their feedback on the form as formative assessment to improve the course.

II. Increasing online response rates

Research suggests that instructors can take steps to increase online response rates for Course Evaluation Forms. The Committee does not support the use of instructor-based incentives (e.g., extra credit for completing Course Evaluation Forms, snacks), as this will likely result in respondent bias.

Recommendation 13: The Committee recommends that course instructors of face-to-face courses use class time to allow students to complete the Course Evaluation Form.

In a process similar to paper forms, online Course Evaluation Forms can also be administered by setting aside 15 – 20 minutes of class time. During this time, students can logon and go online to access the form.

Instructors need to check their assigned classroom to determine that it can support all students on Wi-Fi at the same time so that the Course Evaluation Form can be completed during class time.

For online courses, instructors should monitor response rates and provide frequent written and oral reminders to students regarding completion of the form.

Recommendation 14: The Committee recommends that course instructors conduct multiple informal, mid-semester, anonymous, course evaluations.

Instructors can use online polling tools (e.g., Survey Monkey) to determine student perceptions of their teaching effectiveness and of student efficacy, such as approaches that encourage learning or challenges posed by the course. Instructors can summarize this feedback to the class with an indication of how it will be used to improve the course, such as which student suggestions will be implemented and which are not possible to implement. When the Course Evaluation Form is distributed at the end of the semester, instructors can remind students of the mid-semester evaluation to highlight that student feedback is valued, anonymous, meaningful, and implemented, while also explaining the end-of-semester form has much higher stakes.

An extensive list of references can be found on the web site of the Faculty Senate.

Alignment of Policy Recommendations to Mason's Strategic Plan (2017)

This Committee's work supports the following Strategic Goals:

Strategic Goal 8: DIVERSE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

Create an inclusive and diverse academic community that reflects the diversity of the National Capital Region.

Metric #1: Increase the proportion of instructional and research faculty, staff, administrators, and graduate students who come from historically underrepresented groups to better reflect the diversity of our undergraduate student body.

Rationale: Research has shown that using an overall measure of student satisfaction (such as Items 15 & 16 on the current Course Evaluation Form) results in negative bias toward minorities and females. By removing the bias inherent in using a single number for high-stakes evaluation, Mason can improve the accuracy and fairness of faculty evaluations and improve retention of minority and female faculty.

Strategic Goal 9: SUPPORT TEACHING AND FACULTY EXCELLENCE

Mason will provide an environment and resources to support faculty and encourage academic innovation and excellence.

Metric #1: Instructional/research faculty will report increasing levels of job satisfaction.

Metric #4: Annual increase in faculty's satisfaction with renewal, promotion, and tenure policies, expectations, and reasonableness

Rationale: The Committee's research regarding faculty satisfaction with the Course Evaluation Form indicated overwhelming dissatisfaction with the form itself, as well as how the form is used in renewal, promotion, tenure, and salary decisions. As such, much of this Committee's work has focused on making those changes to the form that would increase usefulness to faculty, while also providing a fair and reasonable tool in employment decision-making.

Strategic Goal 10: ELEVATE RESEARCH

Strengthen Mason's research and scholarship portfolio to solidify the institution's position as a public research university of the highest caliber.

Metric #3: Recruit and retain 300 tenure-track and tenured faculty, with emphasis on amplifying Mason's existing disciplinary strengths while also promoting multidisciplinary activities in research, scholarship, and creative activities.

Rationale: To retain research faculty who are also instructional faculty, the University must use fair and accurate evaluation methods. Fair and accurate evaluations can contribute to high-quality scholarly output, as well as demonstrating to research faculty that they are also valued for the quality of their teaching.

Strategic Goal #12: GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT

Expand opportunities for global learning by creating partnerships and programs to support student and faculty mobility and collaboration.

Metric #2: Increase total number of faculty engaged in international teaching or research projects.

Rationale: Training and development planned to enable faculty to succeed in a diverse campus environment must also provide access to fair and accurate evaluation of effective teaching. In particular, minority faculty must be supported and retained through the use of accurate evaluation systems. All faculty must be supported in effectively teaching international students and students from cultures different from their own.

Motions to the Faculty Senate - April 3, 2019

1. The Faculty Senate recommend advancing the revised course evaluation form to the Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness and to the Provost for pilot testing on a large-scale, university-wide basis with both face-to-face and online courses during AY 2019-20.

2. The Faculty Senate endorse institutional/university level faculty evaluation policy recommendations #s 1 – 7.

3. The Faculty Senate endorse program and college level faculty evaluation policy recommendations #s 8 - 11.

4. The Faculty Senate endorse instructor level faculty evaluation policy recommendations #s 12 - 14.

Attachment C

Revisions to the Course Evaluation Form

Recommendations by the Effective Teaching Committee – Feb. 21, 2019

As part of its charge as a university standing committee, the Effective Teaching Committee has prepared a revised Course Evaluation form for consideration by the Faculty Senate. The current Course Evaluation Form has not undergone any sort of significant revision since 2006. The revised form is the result of work conducted between 2014 and 2019 by eighteen faculty representing thirteen schools and programs from seven of the university's ten schools or colleges. The Committee's work has been informed by research into elements of effective teaching, as well as the purposes for which the form has been used. The Committee has revised the form to make it research-based, more useful to faculty for improving teaching, and more fair when used for the purposes of faculty evaluation (in support of Mason's Strategic Goal #9, Metric #4).

We followed a rigorous development process, including (1) identifying elements of effective teaching; (2) revising course items; (3) obtaining feedback on the items from both faculty and students; (4) pilot testing the items; and (5) analyzing the results. We chose to undertake this development process for two reasons: (1) to ensure that the inferences made about teaching and the subsequent decisions based on those inferences are valid and can be supported by an instrument that adheres to measurement development principles, and (2) to protect all parties involved in a high-stakes evaluation process.

We developed new items based on a review of the literature on the uses of university student evaluations of teaching (SETs) for faculty evaluation with specific goals of increasing the validity and reliability of results. We also obtained faculty, administrator, and student input on indicators of effective teaching that matter to each group. We obtained feedback from all interested stakeholders by (1) conducting online surveys of students, program chairs, and instructional faculty; (2) holding focus groups with students and faculty from across the university; and (3) meeting with Program Chairs, Associate Provosts, the Provost, a college Dean, the Office of Digital Learning, the Faculty Senate Chair, the Faculty Senate, representatives of the Stearns Center for Teaching & Learning, and with the Director and staff of the Office for Institutional Research & Effectiveness (OIRE).

We reviewed a variety of sources on teaching effectiveness and identified eighteen potential categories that we ultimately collapsed into five. We identified categories of effective teaching by reviewing the criteria for teaching excellence set forth by the Center for Teaching and Faculty Excellence, criteria for genuine excellence in teaching set by the Provost's Office, and item databases used by other universities. The categories that were ultimately included in

the revised Course Evaluation Form are: (1) student information, (2) student participation (3) learning outcomes, (4) course environment and experiences, and (5) instructor preparation and course organization. Some items may fall into overlapping categories, which suggests a need for further piloting. With additional trials and analysis, items should more clearly fall into distinct categories. We also added several open-ended responses as requested by faculty, as well as sample optional questions on the use of technology by the course instructor. We encourage faculty to customize the form by adding items of their own choosing.

We included student information items on class level (e.g., freshman vs. doctoral student), whether or not the course is required, the delivery format, self-reported information on absences from class, hours the student spent preparing for class, and expected final grade in the course. We included these self-reported items because the research shows that student ratings of faculty, as well as online response rates, can be highly correlated with some or all of these student and course characteristics

We removed two items from the current form, Items 15 & 16, which ask for overall ratings of the teaching and of the course, respectively. These items, which in many schools and colleges across the university have become the only items out of the current twenty-three that are considered in decisions regarding teaching effectiveness for the purposes of annual evaluation, contract renewal, tenure, and promotion, were removed for several reasons. First, research on using these types of items suggests that they do not result in objective measures of teaching effectiveness and may lend themselves to gender and racial bias, as well as to bias based on grade expectations. Students may assign lower ratings to females and instructors of color and when they anticipate getting a final grade with which they do not agree. Grading leniency often leads to favorable ratings but may not lead to successful student performance in follow-on courses. Part-time instructors are particularly vulnerable to grade inflation due to the high-stakes nature of the evaluation forms. In addition, these items tend to be influenced by student satisfaction with an instructor without regard to any particular aspect of instruction, making the items susceptible to a variety of biases. Finally, these items offer no useful information to instructors for improving their teaching. By removing the bias inherent in using an overall rating for high-stakes evaluation, Mason can improve the accuracy and fairness of faculty evaluations and improve retention of minority and female faculty (in support of Mason's Strategic Goal #8, Metric #1).

In May 2018, we pilot-tested a revised Course Evaluation Form in twenty-five online courses with almost 400 students in eight colleges or schools. Face-to-face courses were not included in the pilot-testing per direction of the Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness (OIRE). Based on the results of the pilot test, we removed items determined to be redundant or unclear and reduced the number of items on the form to twenty Likert scale items (three less than the current form). An exploratory factor analysis on the items indicated a single factor (except for Items 7 & 8 on student participation), which we take as evidence of the construct validity of the revised form.

In preparing to use the new form, course instructors should be informed that a new Course Evaluation Form has been designed with its primary focus being to measure aspects of teaching effectiveness. The proposed form has been revised over four years of research and development, with a specific focus on stakeholder relevance (e.g., Mason faculty, deans/directors, and students). Following this Committee's recommendations regarding how the form should be used, the University will ensure that the form serves primarily as a tool for improving teaching, with a secondary goal being accountability as one of multiple measures used for evaluation.

Since the new Course Evaluation Form is a departure from the current form, we suggest a university-wide discussion on the purposes for using the form, in light of research on its limitations and lack of reliability for summative purposes. Under no condition should the results of the Course Evaluation Form be used as a single indicator of teaching effectiveness. In every case where teaching is being evaluated, multiple measures should be used. This Committee has prepared a robust set of policy recommendations for faculty evaluation, including the use of this or any course evaluation form, which will be released as a separate document.

The Committee's main recommendation is for the University to move forward with additional pilot testing of the revised form in a variety of course formats – online, face-to-face, and hybrid courses – with a stratified random sample of students representing each school or college in the University. Each pilot test would result in analysis and further revisions to the form to increase its usefulness and accuracy.

We submit this new Course Evaluation Form (see next page) to the Faculty Senate for discussion and consideration with the hopes that you will recommend it to the Provost's Office for further pilot testing, and that the Provost moves to accept it as a faculty-generated tool for improving teaching effectiveness.

George Mason University
Course Evaluation Form

Course Title (e.g., HIST 101 001)_____Instructor's
Name_____

Student Information

1) What is your class level?	○ Fresh.	○ Soph.	○ Junior	○ Senior	○ Mast.	○ Doct.	○ Other
2) For your plan of study, this course is:		○ a required course	○ elective course			○ Mason Core/ general education course	○ Other
3) What is the class format/delivery?	○ Face-to-face	○ Hybrid	○ Online				
4) How many times were you absent from class sessions?	○ 0-1	○ 2-3	○ 4-5	○ 6-7	○ 8 or more		○ N/A
5) On average, how many hours per week outside of class did you spend preparing for this class?	○ 1-3	○ 4-6	○ 7-9	○ 10 or more hours			
6) What grade do you expect in this course?	○ A	○ B	○ C	○ D	○ F	○ Pass	○ Fail	○ Other

Please thoughtfully consider the following statements and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A or Unknown
Student Participation						
7) I completed all assigned tasks before each class.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
8) I consistently contributed to class activities/discussions.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
Learning Outcomes						
9) I gained an understanding of the main concepts in this course.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
10) I learned through the variety of learning opportunities (e.g. assignments, projects, papers, discussions, group work, peer review, exams) provided.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
11) I found the instructor's feedback helpful for learning.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
12) I learned due to the instructor's teaching methods/style.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
Course Environment/Experiences						
13) The instructor created an environment that facilitated my engagement with course content.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
14) The instructor encouraged expression of diverse perspectives.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
15) The instructor offered opportunities for students to provide feedback on the course.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
16) The instructor offered opportunities to meet outside of class time, such as virtual or in-person office hours.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○

| 17) The instructor used technologies and/or resources/tools that increased my engagement with course content. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ○ |

Instructor Preparation and Course Organization

18) The course organization supported my learning.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
19) The instructor clearly communicated course requirements to students.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
20) The instructor clearly presented the course content.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○

Please respond to the following questions

1) Were there any significant obstacles to learning that were **beyond the control of the instructor** (e.g., scheduling or technology problems, university closings, limitations caused by other students or by group dynamics)? If so, please explain.

2) What 2 – 3 aspects of this course were <u>most valuable</u> to your learning experience?

-
-
-

3) What 2 – 3 aspects of this course were <u>least valuable</u> to your learning experience?

-
-
-

4) What modifications do you suggest for the next time the course is taught?

Thank you for your feedback!

SAMPLE ITEMS FACULTY MAY CHOOSE TO ADD

Technology Use

1) Navigation throughout the online components of the course was appropriate for the complexity of the course.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
2) The course directed students to technology resources to help them succeed in an online learning environment.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○

3) To what extent did the technology used in this course (e.g., Blackboard, synchronous learning, discussion board, Wikis) facilitate your learning?

Revised February 21, 2019

Motion #2

With regard to Article II Section C.6, the FS recommends that the full GAC will determine if a gift meets criteria for additional scrutiny. If the faculty representatives on the GAC are not in accord with the determination of the committee regarding the need for review, they shall raise their objections with the executive committee of the Faculty Senate for further review. If the Executive Committee concurs with the concerns of the faculty representatives on the GAC, the matter shall be brought before the full Faculty Senate for review and recommendation of gift acceptance. The vote of the faculty senate shall determine review processes under these circumstances.

The motion was amended to remove the last sentence: "The vote of the FS shall determine review processes under these circumstances." The amendment was approved. A second amendment, "with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to determine the best way to present the issue to the Faculty Senate" was added to the penultimate sentence. The amendment was approved.

The motion as amended reads:

With regard to Article II Section C.6, the FS recommends that the full GAC will determine if a gift meets criteria for additional scrutiny. If the faculty representatives on the GAC are not in accord with the determination of the committee regarding the need for review, they shall raise their objections with the executive committee of the Faculty Senate for further review. If the Executive Committee concurs with the concerns of the faculty representatives on the GAC, the matter shall be brought before the full Faculty Senate for review and recommendation of gift acceptance, with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to determine the best way to present the issue to the Faculty Senate.

The Senate voted to postpone further discussion on this motion to move to the elections of members to the Implementation Task Force, before the end of the meeting.