

QSSET for Instructors

Using QSSET

The purpose of this document is to assist instructors in interpreting QSSET results and presenting those interpretations to Heads, Deans, RTP committees or any others who will be making decisions about the instructor using QSSET results.

QSSET and the Evaluation of Teaching

Article 29.3.1 provides that a survey approved by QUFA and the University, now QSSET, will be used in the assessment and evaluation of teaching. However, it is important for instructors to recognize that this survey is not in itself an assessment and/or evaluation of teaching but one source of evidence which Heads, Deans, members of RTP committees and others will consider in the course of assessing and evaluating teaching.^{iv} The assessment of teaching as it is described in Article 29 requires the consideration of matters that extend well beyond the scope of QSSET, or any survey of students. Article 29.1.2 of the QUFA-Queen's Collective Agreement provides: "For assessment and evaluation purposes, teaching includes all presentation whether through lectures, seminar and tutorials, individual and group discussion or supervision of individual students work in degree-credit programs." 29.1.3 adds that "Assessment and evaluation of teaching shall be based on the effectiveness of the instructors, as indicated by command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, accessibility to students and influence on the intellectual and scholarly developments of students." However, as a one-on-one form of instruction supervision cannot be assessed through surveying. Moreover, students do not have the expertise to comment on matters such as command over subject matter and familiarity with recent developments in the field. QSSET has been

should be considered as well. However, instructors must be aware that Heads, Deans, RTP committees and any other evaluators may not be aware of the courses which the instructor has designed and/or prepared the materials for. They may also not be aware of the extent to which the instructor performed assessment in the course. Article 28.2.4 of the Collective Agreement provides that for the purpose of Annual and Biennial reports “it is the Member’s responsibility to provide...sufficient detail of activities and their outcomes to enable the Unit Head to assess the Member’s performance.” Moreover, for most personnel decisions the onus is on the Member to demonstrate that standards have been met. For these reasons, it is in the instructor’s interest both to ensure that assessors have adequate information to evaluate OSSET results appropriately, and to supplement OSSET with additional material as necessary.

Using OSSET

OSSET is designed to present correlations between student perceptions of instructor effectiveness and other factors that influence their experience of the course. Consider the questions under “Student,” which ask students to reflect on their own relation to the course. While the reflections these questions prompt may temper students’ responses on the “instructor” section, the students’ responses also provide information to the assessor about what the instructor was up against, or alternatively what advantages the instructor may have enjoyed. For instance, if students do not indicate strongly that the “course fits their interest,” and the course is a tough, required course—or alternatively that it is an elective but because of resource constraints there are few options for students—the instructor may wish to remind the assessor of that fact in explaining less than enthusiastic responses to the “instructor” questions. Alternatively, if in these circumstances students rate an instructor as high t an anhu10.62.3hf5.6).7 (1)20.7 6 (

instructors to provide valuable interpretation. Persistent bi-modal responses for a particular course may indicate that the instructor is teaching controversial material—off-putting to some students but exciting to others. Or it may indicate that the instructor's teaching is highly effective and stimulating for well-prepared students, but loses less well-prepared ones, a