

| Proposed main changes to the 2012 OCQ policy document | Reasons for proposed changes |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>1. Added: Item #1 admonishes against relying heavily on the OCQ to evaluate teaching, courses, and programs, or to assess student learning. Furthermore, item #1 requires departments and schools to create statements that explain how OCQ questions are being used within their unit.</p> | <p>Multiple methods should be used to evaluate teaching and courses. The same goes for evaluating programs and assessing student learning.</p> <p>The statements that units will be required to create are meant to promote critical thinking about, and shared understanding of, how that unit uses OCQ questions.</p> |
| <p>2. Deleted: The prohibition on using data from student-access questions for P&T and merit decisions has been removed.</p> | <p>The faculty of each unit should have control over which specific campus questions (i.e., which specific P&T, student-access, and open-ended questions) will be used at all, and used in what ways, in that unit's own evaluation systems.</p> <p>Individual faculty members who wish to do so should be allowed to include in their P&T dossiers the results for any or all student-access questions.</p> <p>According to the "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Reviews at IUB," results from student course evaluations are one of many items in the Dossier Checklist that may be included in P&T dossiers <u>"at the discretion of the candidate."</u></p> |
| <p>3. Added: Item #6 creates a mechanism for the BFC to change campus OCQ questions.</p> | <p>From time to time, there may be reasons to consider adding, removing, or modifying campus OCQ questions.</p> |
| <p>4. Added: Item #7 allows departments and schools to replace campus open-ended questions with open-ended questions of their own choosing.</p> | <p>The greater the number of open-ended questions that are on the OCQ, the lower may be the rate and quality of responses to some or all of them.</p> <p>There seems to be less reason to standardize written-response questions across campus than to do so for multiple-choice questions; it is only the latter type that easily lend themselves to quantitative comparisons.</p> |
| <p>5. Added: Item #11 specifies that the OVPUE will develop and implement outreach efforts to maximize OCQ response rates.</p> | <p>It should <i>not</i> be primarily the responsibility of <i>instructors</i> to maximize response rates (especially given that not all instructors are enthusiastic about using the OCQ in the first place).</p> |
| <p>6. Added: Item #12 states that information concerning the OCQ should be restricted to the IUB community.</p> | <p>Up until now, academic units have not been expected to make public any information about end-of-semester student surveys that they have been using, and switching to the OCQ need not change that situation.</p> |