

University Honors College Council

December 9, 2010

Minutes

Members Present: Dan Arp (ex-officio), Susie Brubaker-Cole, Ed Jensen (chair), Goran Jovanovic, Lani Roberts

Members Absent: Patti Duncan, Jessina McGregor

Guest: Toni Doolen (UHC)

Topic: New SET form for HC classes

Desired Outcome: Approval by UHCC prior to implementation for Winter 2011

Actual Outcomes: Returned to Doolen/Arp for additional changes

Background (more or less):

1. For several years (perhaps since its inception) HC has been using its own process for gathering student evaluation of teaching (not the official SET form used by OSU).
 - a. At some point in the past, mid-term group discussions were used.
 - b. More recently HC has used its own set of end-of-the-term questions, more qualitative and less comparative in nature than SET.
 - c. This form was created following consultation with other honors programs nationally and was endorsed by the UHCC.
2. Now, for a variety of reasons HC would like to modify the form, and include SET questions, in addition to its own set of questions.
 - a. The current HC questions are difficult to use in P&T dossiers.
 - b. HC needs to align better with rest of OSU, especially as OSU moves to an electronically administered SET.
3. Toni Doolen brought to the UHCC a proposed form, seeking feedback and, eventually, approval for adoption.
 - a. Multiple audiences and purposes (as with most evaluation data): course and curriculum improvement, course and instructor evaluation, better able to recognize HC teaching with P&T committees, etc.
 - b. Toni feels that UHCC needs to approve any changes to current form.

Discussion Points: (reflecting points raised by individuals—intended to capture the flavor of the discussion rather than each and every discussion point.)

1. Some instructors prefer narrative information (rather than quantitative information provided by SET).
2. Is it really necessary to conform to OSU norms?
3. HC teaching may not be fully recognized/appreciated by OSU because of absence of SET data.
4. Proposed form seems an expediency, emphasizing ease of summary and comparison over value of information to faculty member. Much value in narrative comments may be lost.
5. Some classes contain mixed HC and non-HC students. Can two different forms be administered? Will this confuse students?
6. Whatever is done, it's vital to communicate the importance of this process to students. This will increase student commitment to provide meaningful information.
7. Suggestion was made to consult with OSU SET committee before implementation.
8. Problems arise when we use the same document for a number of purposes. Aligning processes with the rest of the university is the inroad to having Honors College teaching play more prominently into P&T.

9. What's missing in the tabular presentation is that there has been a loss of opportunity for students to "think out of the box." Honors College could add 'comments' for each of the 1-23 tabular questions.

Summary: Many points were discussed and numerous suggestions for modifications were raised and discussed. Essentially, we ended up trying to retain some of the unique flavor and qualitative nature of the HC approach with the more standardized, quantitative nature of SET.

Next step: Arp and Doolen will work to incorporate many of the suggestions heard today, and re-submit to the UHCC at a future meeting within the next month or so.

Additional Item: There was not adequate time to discuss the proposed assessment plan. We will take it up at a future meeting.

Minutes recorded by Susie Brubaker-Cole and edited by Ed Jensen