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Things to keep in mind

- PLEASE read first progress report (February 11, 2010)
- Putting SET online is a separate issue
What we told you last time

- SET Purpose: To improve teaching
- Specific items:
  - Identified concerns with existing SET forms
  - Proposed moving in a *formative* direction
  - Planned to seek input from stakeholders
  - Highlighted our plans to develop items
What we have learned

- From students:
  - Want confidentiality ensured
  - Like the idea of formative feedback
  - Don’t know why we do student evaluations of teaching

- From staff: find doing SET on paper is a major workload

- From faculty:
  - Worry about uneven use of scores in current system
  - Appreciate customization of proposed feedback

- From administrators: express a need for summative information
What we have accomplished

- Identified major categories (Arreola, 2007)
  - Instructional design
  - Instructional delivery (tentative)
  - Instructional assessment (tentative)
  - Course management (tentative)
  - Self-reported course impact on the student (tentative)

- Generated items under *Instructional Design* category and the following three subcategories
  - Objectives
  - Exams and assignments
  - Materials and resources

Play movie now
Where we go from here

- Meet with CollegeNet on February 9 – online implementation
- Obtain copyright permission
- Get input from students and faculty on items generated to date (Instructional Design)
- Proceed generating items for other categories
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Instructional Design: Objectives

1. The instructor makes me aware of the current problems in this field
2. The course adapts according to student needs
3. I have been informed of the direction the course is taking
4. The instructor does NOT provide a sufficient variety of topics
5. Too much material is covered in this course
6. The instructor does NOT combine theory and practical applications
7. Relationships between course concepts are made clear
8. Course concepts are communicated in a logical manner
9. Course objectives are clear
10. The instructor defined realistic objectives for the student
11. Objectives have been stated for each unit in the course
12. The objectives of this course should be modified
13. The instructor’s expectations have NOT been clearly defined
Instructional Design: Assignments and Exams

1. The ________ assignment should be modified.
2. The assignments are too challenging
3. The assignments expose me to diverse approaches to solving problems
4. The assignments provide an opportunity to show what I have learned
5. The exams provide an opportunity to show what I have learned
6. The assignments are appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course
7. The exams are appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course
8. There are too many assignments
9. There are too many exams
10. There is too much material covered on exams
11. The exams occur at appropriate intervals
12. I have enough time to complete assignments
13. I have enough time to complete exams
14. I learn from doing the assignments
15. Directions for the assignments are clear
Instructional Design: Resources and Materials

1. I have the academic preparation to understand the course material
2. The course materials are understandable
3. The course materials expose me to diverse approaches to solving problems
4. The course content is up-to-date
5. The course materials are appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course
6. I am able to keep up with the amount of course material
7. I find the assigned readings too difficult
8. The course resources made available help me meet the aims and objectives of the course
9. The course materials are easy to understand
10. The course materials stimulate critical thinking
11. The _____________ [course materials] provide useful background for the lectures
Response Rates - Physics

Current SET form response rates

- Average prior to spring 2010 (paper forms)
- Spring 2010 (online forms)

SET return rate comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of course</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>On-line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bac core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>