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I. Executive Summary

"Evaluation of teaching cannot be totally objective, but such evaluation must include a conscientious effort to obtain and consider information bearing upon the work of the classroom and the activities which make effective classroom performance possible."

- From the Institute Policies and Procedures Manual

Current State

The RIT optical scanning service associated with student ratings is 38 years old and built upon outdated, non-supported technology. This paper-based system does not provide the information that faculty, students and administrators need to improve teaching and learning. There is no common set of core questions shared by all eight colleges.

In January 2010, a task force was charged by the Provost with recommending a consistent university-wide process for student evaluation of courses and teaching based on best practice in the field related to instrument design, administration, data collection, report format and use of results.

Conceptual Design and Content

An online course evaluation system is recommended with a plan to identify and communicate best practices in order to achieve satisfactory response rates (target: 65%).

Content

The online evaluation includes seven core questions common across the Institute, aimed at evaluating the faculty member’s effectiveness as a teacher, a student evaluation question, an open-ended question to garner comments, as well as a bank of questions which may be used and adapted by the college, department or faculty member. A tiered level of access to the analysis and reporting features of the new system meets the needs of different members of the RIT community.

Product

Online evaluation systems were considered that met institute requirements, while accommodating college and department needs. Each product was evaluated for fit against the functional and technical requirements. Products that met the majority of requirements were demonstrated. Three products passed the initial evaluation with OnlineCourseEvaluations from GAP Technologies selected by the committee. It was the only product of the three finalists that provides access to students to view the evaluations (university standard questions) for a course and for a professor.
II. Charge

Task Force on Student Evaluation of Courses and Instructors

Task Force Charge:

Recommend a consistent university-wide process for student evaluation of courses and teaching. Please consider the following points in arriving at a recommendation:

1. The process should be consistent across campus and based on best practice in the field related to instrument design, administration, data collection, report format and use of results.

2. There should be a set of 5-7 core questions that adequately reflect the essentials of teaching excellence at RIT. In addition, there should be a bank of additional formative questions.

3. The process should reflect appropriate use of technology. The current RIT optical scanning service associated with student ratings is 38 years old and is built on outdated, non-supported technology. According to ITS, it is highly probable that services could not be restored should an extreme outage occur. Given this, the university will need to replace the technology and the configuration of the technology based on needs or buy a new system and the associated processing from the marketplace.

4. In arriving at a recommendation the task force should explore products within RIT (e.g., On-line Evaluation System) as well as student rating products and services including IDEA Center products (http://www.theideacenter.org/node/5), the University of Washington Instructional Assessment System (IAS) and other commercially produced and supported systems.

Timeframe: Recommendations to Provost by June 30, 2010.

Task Force Members:

CIAS: Alan Reddig/Nancy Ciolek
CAST: Changfeng Ge
COS: G. Thomas Frederick
SCOB: Robert Barbato
GCCIS: Ed Holden
KGCOE: Beth DeBartolo
Student Government: Teraisa Chloros; Cory Gregory
Assessment: Anne Wahl, Consultant to Committee

Resources:

- Current Student Rating Forms Used at RIT: Dr. Anne Wahl has them on file
- Article from IDEA Center: Student Ratings of Teaching: Recommendations for Use
III. Conceptual Framework – Teaching Effectiveness at RIT

Four elements of the course evaluation system comprise the conceptual framework: method of delivery, content, analysis and reporting, and administration.

Method of Delivery

An online course evaluation system is recommended and endorsed by the Provost. A plan to identify and communicate best practices in achieving satisfactory response rates (target: 65%) is an important component to ensuring success. Some additional requirements related to delivery of evaluations are:

- Evaluations open 80% through the term
- Evaluations close before final grades may be viewed by students
- Students have a minimum of 3 days to complete the evaluations
- Faculty are not present when evaluations are completed
- Responses are available to faculty once final grades have posted
- Faculty are unable to connect a student to an evaluation response

While acknowledging concerns about decreased response rates and possible differences in overall ratings in using an online evaluation system, the benefits far outweigh potential problems. In particular, the cost benefit of moving to an online system is presented in Section VII. NTID adopted an online evaluation system, and GCCIS, COS, and CIAS are administering the majority of their course evaluations online. More than 35% of all RIT courses use The Wallace Center’s Online Course Evaluation Instrument and this number has increased each year. The literature indicates that the ratings on online evaluations do not differ significantly from the ratings on paper-based evaluations (Cates, 2002; Heath, et al., 2007; Carini, et al., 2003)

Content

1. Description of the Two Primary Sections

The online evaluation has two primary sections. The first is a series of required questions, common across the Institute, aimed at evaluating the faculty member’s effectiveness as a teacher. This common core will consist of a series of multiple choice or Likert scale questions and a single open-ended question allowing students to make additional comments. More details on the question content are provided in Section IV of this report. The task force collected definitions of effective teaching from across the Institute, and found that these varied by college (see Summary Table in Appendix A). The only common baseline minimally met by each college is from the Policies and Procedures Manual section on Policy on Tenure (E5.0, 2d):

(5) An effective teacher, among other things, communicates special knowledge and expertise with sensitivity towards students’ needs
and abilities. This entails selection and use of appropriate instructional methods and materials and providing fair, useful and timely evaluation of the quality of the learner's work.

(6) Evaluation of teaching must include a conscientious effort to obtain and consider information that relates directly to teaching and learning and makes effective classroom performance possible. This includes the review of student and peer evaluations.

This basic summary of effective teaching and evaluations of teaching was used to inform the core question content.

The second section of the evaluation is customizable; questions can be added at the college, department, course, and faculty levels with the stipulation that the time to complete the evaluation does not exceed 10 minutes for a typical student. These additional questions can be newly created or selected from a question bank. In order to determine an acceptable number of questions on the evaluations, feedback should be gathered from students during the initial launch regarding the length of time it takes them to complete their evaluations.

2. Analysis, Reporting, and Use

The conceptual framework is designed with three purposes in mind. The first purpose is evaluation of faculty members across campus. Evaluation occurs on an annual basis as part of the faculty member’s yearly evaluation, and at other times such as consideration for tenure and/or promotion. The second purpose is continuous improvement. In addition to the core questions, the customizable portion of the survey will allow faculty members and administrators to gather information that they can use to help improve particular aspects of their courses and teaching. The third purpose is to make the evaluation system more transparent to the students. This includes informing them about how the results of evaluations will be used in an effort to encourage participation, as well as providing students with a means to access some evaluation information about a faculty member.

A tiered level of access to the analysis and reporting features of the new system meets the needs of different members of the RIT community.

Faculty see, for their own course(s):

- Summary statistics for each multiple choice item in the core and for all optional questions (mean and standard deviation, or similar; response rate)
- Raw data, in electronic format
- Their average scores compared to averages at the department, college and Institute levels
- Student Comments
A faculty member’s supervisor(s) see:
- The same information as the faculty member

All other members of the RIT community will be able to access:
- Summary statistics for a given faculty member for the multiple choice items in the core only, based on data going back no more than three years.

The following figure summarizes the recommendations for types of questions and who is able to view the responses.
3. Administration

The following administrative structure is recommended:

**Institute-Wide Coordinator:**
- Responsible for system-wide maintenance and technical issues
- Creates and edits Institute-wide questions
- Provides support to College-Level Coordinators who need assistance

**College-Level Coordinators:**
- Create and edit questions added at the college and department levels
- Provide support to faculty who need assistance customizing their course or faculty-level questions
IV. Recommendation for Content of Student Evaluation

*Required: One Student Self-Evaluative Question*

I had a strong commitment to this course

*Required: Seven Core Questions (Institute-wide)*

Scale
5  Strongly Agree
4  Agree
3  Neutral
2  Disagree
1  Strongly Disagree
NA= Not Applicable

1. The instructor motivated me to learn.
2. The instructor was organized and prepared.
3. The instructor communicated clearly.
4. The instructor effectively demonstrated knowledge related to this course.
5. The instructor cared about my learning.
6. The instructor evaluated my work in a fair and useful manner.
7. The instructor was very effective. (design a different scale for final question)

*Required: One Open-Ended Question*

Allows students to make additional comments and asks students about positive attributes and areas for improvement.

*Required: Bank of Additional Formative Questions*

Customizable questions may be added and adapted by the college, department and/or faculty member, with the stipulation that the time to complete the evaluation does not exceed 10 minutes for a typical student.

These additional questions may be newly created or selected from a question bank. A database of questions is available online to assist instructors with question choice.

Minimum of one question related to assessing learning/outcomes (samples below)

- The instructor supported my progress towards achieving the course outcomes.
- This instructor enhanced my learning with effective approaches to instruction.
- This instructor provided a variety of appropriate instructional approaches to enhance learning.
V. Recommendation for Course Evaluation System

Scope

Online evaluation systems which met institute requirements while accommodating college and department needs were considered.

Out-of-scope

This project will not replace the Student Government professor evaluation web site.

The Provost has decided that Test scoring of bubble sheet tests will be discontinued. The Provost’s office will communicate this to the academic departments.

Approach

1. Create Functional and Technical Requirements
2. Review/edit requirements with full team
3. Create list of potential vendors/solutions
4. Evaluate vendors for potential fit
5. Tech team demo reviews
6. Develop a short list of vendors
7. Best fit vendor demonstration for full committee
8. ISO Review
9. Recommendation

Products Considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Demo Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CourseEval</td>
<td>Academic Management Systems</td>
<td>3/26/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CourseResponse</td>
<td>Digital Measures</td>
<td>4/14/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OnlineCourseEvaluations</td>
<td>GAP Technologies</td>
<td>3/23/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravic Web Survey</td>
<td>Gravic</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Climate</td>
<td>Scantron</td>
<td>4/6/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Course Evaluation</td>
<td>The Wallace Center</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SurveyDig</td>
<td>Runner Technologies</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Idea Center</td>
<td>IdeaCenter.org</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not demonstrated due to poor fit to requirements
Requirements

Functional Requirements

- Administration
  - Web-based survey/template creation
  - Intuitive User Interface
  - Granular security options at survey/evaluation level
  - Customizable Permission Levels (Institute, Dean, Chair, Faculty, Assistant)
  - Question Formats
    - Drop down
    - Checkbox
    - Radio button
    - Likert Scale
    - Text
    - Date Entry
    - File upload support
    - Large Text support
  - Tracked or anonymous survey
  - Branching questions
  - Ability to add questions at different levels (institute, department, course, instructor)
  - Ability to support ad-hoc evaluations/surveys
  - Keep history of all survey templates for future use
  - Shared question banks
  - Ability to organize questions by type
  - Ability to reorder/edit survey questions
  - Ability to survey different subsets of students (deaf/hh/esl, dropped/withdrawals)

- Reporting
  - Real-time, web-based reporting
  - Min, Max, Mean, Average, calculations
  - Graphical reports
  - Longitudinal capabilities (compare against college, department, institute, courses)
  - Export to Excel, SPSS, Data warehouse
  - Filter by student demographics (hearing status, gpa, graduate, non-major)

- User Interface
  - User-friendly interface
  - Full functionality cross-platform (Windows, Mac, Linux, Mobile devices)
  - Major Browser support (IE, Firefox, Safari) - current versions
  - Authentication of student/course
  - Limit responses to once per student per course
  - Support multiple instructors
  - Conditional questions based on user or responses
  - Ability to save evaluation, continue at later time (during evaluation period)
Technical Requirements

- ITS Supported Servers (OS / Web / Database)
- Single Sign-on
- Open APIs
- Flexible Import/Export option
- Meets ISO security standards for the platform, connection, and storage
- Integration with SIS/Email/Directory
  - Ability to import enrolled, dropped, and withdrawn students
- Scalable (Support up to 20,000 students/faculty/staff)

Hosting Requirements:
- Pass SAS70 Audit
- Comply with FERPA/RIT Privacy regulations
- Disaster Recovery
- Migration options
- 24x7 availability

Product Recommendation

Each product was evaluated for fit against the functional and technical requirements. Products that met a good portion of the requirements were demonstrated for the Tech Team. Based on the demos and requirements, three products passed the initial evaluation:

- CourseEval
- CourseResponse
- OnlineCourseEvaluations

At a committee meeting in June, a requirement was added to provide access to students to view the evaluations (university standard questions) for a course and for a professor. The only product that provides this functionality is OnlineCourseEvaluations from GAP Technologies. Based on these criteria a product demonstration for the full committee was held on June 18, 2010 and those in attendance agreed that the product was a good fit with which to move forward.

Key Unique Features

- Ability to survey students that drop or withdraw from a class
- Ability to identify faculty who excel in an area and could mentor other faculty
- Access for students to view university standard questions by course, faculty member
- Uses RIT authentication to access evaluation system

The recommendation is to license the OnlineCourseEvaluations system (OCE) from GAP Technologies.
VI. Implementation/Timeline

This section provides a timeline, launch approach and task list for successfully implementing the system.

Timeline

Implementation timeline is approximately 1-3 months, depending on resource availability and testing approach.

Launch Approach

Options:
1. Phased roll-out. Start with one or two colleges to gain experience with the product and participation incentives.
2. Big-bang. Roll out to entire campus at the same time.

Implementation Task List
The detailed implementation task list is found in Appendix B.
VII. Budget and Resources

Current Cost of Paper/Online System at RIT

- The current system is a combination of custom FORTRAN code and an Opscan paper scanning device
- ITS currently pays an $3,399 annual maintenance fee for the Opscan scanner
- FORTRAN resources are contracted for support, if needed, at $85/hour
- The current system is no longer supportable and it would cost a minimum of $12,000 to recover from a breakdown
- The Wallace Center supports and hosts an internally developed Online Course Evaluation system used by 35% of all RIT courses for a cost of approximately $15,000 annually.

Estimated Cost of New System

Multi-Year Pricing Option

In the Multi-year scenario, Rochester Institute of Technology commits to a 4-year agreement term. In exchange for that commitment, OCE will set our year-1 payment at $30,144 subject to the same 3.5% annual increase. This multi-year agreement affords us a savings of 47% in the first year, and 15% over four years.

There is a $32,500 early termination fee if we terminate the agreement prior to the fourth year.

The multi-year plan includes all setup activities and features of the OnlineCourseEvaluations.com application as described below. The two plans are compared below:

"Traditional" Year-1 Pricing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-time Setup Charge</th>
<th>$ 27,711</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recurring Annual Charge</td>
<td>$ 28,889 (Subject to 3.5% annual price increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-1 Total</td>
<td>$ 56,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four-Year Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Pricing</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>4-Year Contract Pricing</th>
<th>$$ Savings From Traditional</th>
<th>% Savings from Traditional</th>
<th>Early Termination Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 56,600</td>
<td>Year-1</td>
<td>$ 30,144</td>
<td>$26,456</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 29,900</td>
<td>Year-2</td>
<td>$ 31,199</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 30,947</td>
<td>Year-3</td>
<td>$ 32,291</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 32,030</td>
<td>Year-4</td>
<td>$ 33,421</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 149,476</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 127,055</td>
<td>$22,421</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staffing Requirements

1. Academic Affairs level (see sample job description Appendix C)
   a. Primary Evaluation Administrator – workload is cyclical based on evaluation periods. After initial training and setup, estimated workload is two days per evaluation period.

2. College-level support
   a. College/Department Evaluation Administrator – workload is cyclical based on evaluation periods. After initial training and setup, estimated workload is two days per evaluation period.

3. ITS Support (see sample job description Appendix D)
   a. Integration and file uploads
   b. Authentication Support
VIII. References


## Summary of College Tenure and Promotion Policies

### Criteria Related to Effective Teaching

**Rochester Institute of Technology**

**Spring 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Effective Teaching Definition</th>
<th>Criteria for Tenure and Promotion</th>
<th>Evaluation and Use of Student Ratings to Measure Effective Teaching</th>
<th>Potential Questions to Support Assessment of Effective Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGCOE</td>
<td>Effective teaching includes clearly and enthusiastically communicating special knowledge and expertise based on an understanding of curricular objectives and learner’s needs and abilities.</td>
<td>To be eligible for tenure, it is expected that the faculty member will develop excellent skills as an educator, and will develop relationships with students and colleagues outside of, as well as inside the classroom. The faculty member should place emphasis on the quality of the educational offerings provided to the students and on the extent to which students achieve the learning outcomes of the courses taught.</td>
<td>Student ratings using global questions of teaching performance have been shown to be reliable and valid measures of teaching effectiveness and are widely accepted as such at most universities and colleges. End-of-course feedback assessing student satisfaction will be measured using a survey used by the College.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Teaching Effectiveness listed as criteria – no definition included.</td>
<td>It should be clear that an RIT faculty member’s primary professional responsibility is to maintain a high-level of effectiveness in the classroom and a constant effort to improve his/her teaching competence through additional study and the use of appropriate instructional methods and materials. For</td>
<td>Review six quarters of college-administered student evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Effective Teaching Definition</td>
<td>Criteria for Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>Evaluation and Use of Student Ratings to Measure Effective Teaching</td>
<td>Potential Questions to Support Assessment of Effective Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| COS     | Educational: Instruction  
• Demonstrated ability to organize course material  
• Effective presentation style  
• Development and conduct of meaningful laboratory experience  
• Development of meaningful web material  
• Receptiveness and responsiveness to student questions and concerns  
• Utilization of clear and effective testing procedures  
• Availability and helpfulness to students outside of class  
• Demonstration of ability to intellectually stimulate and engage the student in the learning process  
• Presentation of course content that is up to date and in keeping with advances in the discipline | purposes of tenure review, it becomes essential that we find some means for judging this elusive quality, effective teaching. | RIT has long subscribed to the great importance of the teaching function; the College of Science has upheld this position and considers teaching to be the foremost activity of its faculty and of paramount importance in the granting of tenure (draft language). | Teaching Evaluations  
Candidate should supply numerical evaluations for the pre-tenure probationary period, arranged chronologically with the most recent first. |
| GCCIS   | Effective teaching | Varies by program – samples below  
Effective teaching involves abilities to organize and effectively | Use slightly varies by program – samples below  
A candidate must have demonstrated teaching |  |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Effective Teaching Definition</th>
<th>Criteria for Tenure and Promotion</th>
<th>Evaluation and Use of Student Ratings to Measure Effective Teaching</th>
<th>Potential Questions to Support Assessment of Effective Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTID</td>
<td>Effective teaching, among other things, consists of clearly and enthusiastically communicating special knowledge and expertise based on an understanding of curricular objectives and the learner’s instructional development demonstrating initiative beyond a maintenance level in such areas as curriculum, teaching methodology, instructional materials, and laboratory facilities. In addition,</td>
<td>communicate information, in courses at all levels, and show concern for students. This is still the most important criterion for promotion at RIT. A candidate must demonstrate promise for becoming an effective teacher. A candidate should demonstrate an ability to organize and effectively communicate information, and show concern for students. A candidate should also show potential to effectively teach courses at various levels. A candidate must have demonstrated effectiveness as a teacher. This criterion is the most important one considered for promotion. Quality teaching is essential in order for RIT to continue providing outstanding undergraduate and graduate education.</td>
<td>effectiveness by good peer and student evaluations. Realizing that student evaluations are not always a reliable measure of teaching, other factors, such as ratings by peers who have attended classes taught by a candidate, will be considered.</td>
<td>The evaluation of teaching cannot be totally objective, but such evaluation must include a conscientious effort to obtain and consider information bearing upon the work of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Effective Teaching Definition</td>
<td>Criteria for Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>Evaluation and Use of Student Ratings to Measure Effective Teaching</td>
<td>Potential Questions to Support Assessment of Effective Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>needs and abilities. Further, it entails selecting and using appropriate instructional methods and materials which lead to learning and providing fair and useful evaluations of the quality of the learner's work. Effective teaching requires a sensitivity to and rapport with the learner.</td>
<td>the faculty member should demonstrate ability in developing effective approaches to instruction and the learning process as well as effective educational activities that transcend traditional classroom instruction.</td>
<td>the classroom and the activities which make effective classroom performance possible. Instructional performance as measured by annual performance appraisals; systematically administered written student evaluations; and, testimony of colleagues having relevant recognized expertise and firsthand knowledge of the individual’s performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>Adopted RIT policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAS</td>
<td>CIAS currently uses the Institute Teaching Effectiveness statement. Other than Individual agreements with the Dean, there is no other CIAS general Teaching Effectiveness statement. Note: The CIAS Tenure committee is in the process of developing better guidelines and structure which will address some teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effective Teaching Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Effective Teaching Definition</th>
<th>Criteria for Tenure and Promotion</th>
<th>Evaluation and Use of Student Ratings to Measure Effective Teaching</th>
<th>Potential Questions to Support Assessment of Effective Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCB</td>
<td>Lists Learning Environment and Effective Teaching as criteria</td>
<td>Provide an effective learning environment, with teaching as its main component, will be measured by at least the following forms of input: peer reviews, student feedback, portfolio of teaching and learning environment accomplishments, and evidence of effective interaction with students.</td>
<td>Student Feedback and Evidence of Interaction with Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Policies &amp; Procedures Manual</td>
<td>An effective teacher: Communications special knowledge and expertise (For example: The instructor communicated special knowledge and expertise related to this course. Agree/Disagree) Does this with sensitivity toward students' needs and abilities (For example: The instructor was sensitive to students' needs and abilities in this course. Agree/Disagree) Selects and uses appropriate instructional methods and materials (For example: The instructor selected and used appropriate instructional methods and materials. Agree/Disagree) Provides fair, useful, and timely evaluation of student work (For example: The instructor provided fair, useful, and timely evaluation of student work. Agree/Disagree) Evaluation of teaching must include information that relates to [<em>teaching (above 4 bullets) and] learning</em> (For example: I believe that I learned a lot in this course. Agree/Disagree) Open-ended &quot;good&quot; (For example: What did you like most about the teaching of this course?) Open-ended &quot;bad&quot; (For example: If you could change one thing about the teaching of this course, what would it be?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
- There is no common definition of effective teaching among the 8 colleges
- Colleges use multiple measures to assess effective teaching and do not solely rely on student ratings
Appendix B: Implementation Tasks

1. Send OnlineCourseEvaluations system (OCE) the RIT Implementation-Team contact information.

2. OCE sends “Welcome” email containing user-ids, passwords for the OCE/RIT website, as well as links to instructional videos sent to Primary Evaluation Administrator (PEA), Alternate-PEA, and IT contact.

3. OCE conducts an Introduction Call identifying/introducing RIT and OCE implementation support teams to one another and reviews this implementation process.

4. RIT sends OCE Customer Support the RIT question set(s). Customize as appropriate (with school colors, logo). Review/implement any changes to RIT’s evaluation question sets (e.g., include Follow-Up Question technology).

5. RIT Administrators review instructional videos and, as required, schedules operations meetings with OCE Customer Support (and/or, optionally, OCE IT) to cover:

   (a) The upload process; detailed review of the fields contained in upload records.
       - Review coding of course Departments/ Levels / Types.
       - Identify and set up cross-listed courses and team taught classes.
       - Determine report release dates (when are Administrators, Department Heads, Faculty, and/or Students allowed to view course evaluation results?)

   (b) Determine & implement the basic sign-on process and/or Single Sign-On, LDAP, Shibboleth options, as appropriate.
       - White listing
       - Other necessary/appropriate firewall settings

   (c) Decisions must be made with regard to assignments, which influence reporting roll-up and viewing permissions:
       - Assign departments to divisions, colleges
       - Assign question sets to class sections
       - Assure departments and department heads are correct

   (d) Develop RIT’s Communication Plan – tips and instructions on how to communicate RIT’s course evaluation process changes, targeted at Administration, Department Heads, Faculty, and Students.
       - Determine and set the evaluation periods
       - Review and optionally modify email templates for administration to send to students.
       - Review and optionally modify email templates for instructors to send to students.

6. Review instructor training options:
   (a) Instructor sign-on screen with “How-to” training links and videos.
   (b) Technical support emails to be broadcast and/or utilized individually for situation-specific support.
7. Other topics as needed

- Introduction/Getting Started
- Question Development/Selection
- Academic Affairs Coordinator Role and Responsibilities
- College-level Coordinator Role and Responsibilities
- Department Chair Role and Responsibilities
- ITS Role and Responsibilities
- Annual Institute Timeline
- Support and Resources
- Interpreting Reports
- Using the Data to Improve Teaching Effectiveness
- Professional Development Plans
- Accreditation and Program Assessment
- Response Rates
- Best Practices
We have found it to be incredibly beneficial to have one primary contact at each school, and one key person in the IT staff. This simplifies communication between the school and our company, and lets everyone at your school know who to contact with questions. The Online Course Evaluations team is always available to provide support and training for the Primary Evaluation Administrator and the IT contact person, to ensure that everyone at your school is completely thrilled with the new system. Different customers break up these responsibilities differently, so please feel free to call me if you want to discuss how this will apply at your school. Some clients operate with only one point person, and it works perfectly fine. If you have any questions at all, please do not hesitate to call our office.

The OnlineCourseEvaluations.com Team
(888) 309-6373, or (716) 801-1111

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY EVALUATION ADMINISTRATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Person should be able to access registration information at the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Person should be comfortable with computers and using the internet frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Act as the primary contact person at the school for the evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communicate as needed with the Online Course Evaluations (OCE) staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Be available to teachers, administrators, and students to handle evaluation questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coordinate activities to ensure a high response rate, based on OCE’s suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the first evaluation period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gather copies of any and all question sets (evaluation forms) that will be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Input administrators and department heads who need access to certain areas of the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communicate with appropriate individuals at the school to set login procedures, evaluation dates, information release date, and other settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Receive information from OCE that need to be distributed to faculty/administrators, and distribute them via email and/or campus mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Train with OCE staff on the administration pages of our system, to prepare for the evaluation period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Follow our step by step guide to generating outstanding response rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During each evaluation period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Be available to answer basic questions from users. Ex: “help, I forgot my password.” (This may be a responsibility of the IT Contact Person instead, or delegated to a general help desk.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compose reminder messages to students and teachers, and send them through the OCE system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Track response rates and communicate with professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor response rates and be in communication with the OCE team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improving Student Evaluations... One campus at a time
www.onlinecourseevaluations.com
## I.T. CONTACT PERSON

**Qualifications**
- Person should be able to access registration information at the school, and be comfortable writing queries / exporting data into a flat text file

**General responsibilities**
- Create the upload file each semester with correct registration information
- Communicate as needed with the Online Course Evaluations (OCE) staff

**Before the first evaluation period**
- Communicate as needed with the OCE staff, to learn our requirements for the upload
- Work with the registration system to prepare the first upload file
- Ensure that all users (students, teachers, and admins) have a login ID and password for the initial upload
- Upload the file to the OCE system
- Work with OCE staff members to set up single sign-on through the campus portal

**During each evaluation period**
- (This may be the IT person, OR the Primary Evaluation Administrator)
  - Be available to answer basic questions from users (Ex: "help, I forgot my password")

Again, our job is to work with you to delegate these responsibilities to the most appropriate individuals. We are happy to create different breakdowns to fit your school, but we have found these job responsibility assignments to be successful.