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The Basics

What
Over the next few years, MIT will be moving its central subject evaluation system online and away from paper-based forms. Students registered for credit and instructors in the following subjects will be pilot-testing the new online subject evaluation system in May 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physics (Course 8)</th>
<th>Chemical Engineering (Course 10)</th>
<th>Literature (Course 21L)</th>
<th>Philosophy (Course 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>21L.004</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.022</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>21L.011</td>
<td>24.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.901</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>21L.017</td>
<td>24.213/CMS.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>10.491</td>
<td>21L.421</td>
<td>24.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.322</td>
<td>10.494</td>
<td>21L.701</td>
<td>24.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When
May 5, 2008, 9:00am: Evaluation window opens for students.
May 16, 2008, 9:00am: Evaluation window closes for students.
June, 2008: Custom reports for department administrators and instructors available (if grades are turned in).
mid-July, 2008: Summary results available to MIT community.

Where
To take evaluations and view results, go to web.mit.edu/subjectevaluation.

Who
The move from paper-based to online subject evaluation is a multi-year joint project of the Office of the Dean for Undergraduate Education and Information Services and Technology. For more details, visit the project web page, web.mit.edu/se-project. The online evaluation instrument is run by Digital Measures, www.digitalmeasures.com. As part of the vendor selection process, the MIT Technology Review Board reviewed and approved the vendor's data security.

If you have problems logging in, viewing evaluations or results, or need any other technical assistance, contact se-help@mit.edu.

Why
Evaluation reports are used by instructors, departments, and students. Instructors use the feedback to identify where they can improve the curriculum and their teaching. Most departments consider evaluation results when reviewing instructors for reappointment, raises, promotion, and tenure. Students use evaluations to help them choose subjects and instructors.
For Students

**Evaluation Period**
Subject evaluations are kept open for the two weeks prior to the end of class. You may evaluate your subjects at any time during the evaluation period.

**Where to Start**
Go to web.mit.edu/subjectevaluation, click on Take Evaluation, read the instructions, and proceed to the evaluations. This will take you off the MIT site to Digital Measures, our subject evaluation vendor. They use your Kerberos ID to match you with subjects to evaluate, but you will remain anonymous to your instructors. You will need MIT certificates installed on your browser to proceed to the evaluations; you can get them at web.mit.edu/certificates. If you don’t have a Kerberos ID, first go to web.mit.edu/register (you’ll need your 9-digit MIT ID number) and then you can get your certificate.

**Welcome Screen**
When you click Take Evaluation, your MIT certificate authenticates you and brings you to a welcome screen where you can see all subjects flagged for evaluation in which you are currently registered for credit. **If you don't see a particular subject listed, it is because the department is not evaluating it online this term.**

**Evaluating a Subject**
To evaluate a subject, click on any subject with a status of Incomplete. (Once you have completed a subject evaluation, you cannot redo it.) All questions are voluntary; it’s OK to skip some.

The questions under Quality of Teaching are about instructors. The questions below the Section/Instructor area are about the subject. First, choose a section and then an instructor to evaluate. Questions for that instructor will appear.

If you want to evaluate another instructor, click the Add Another Instructor Evaluation button. You may keep evaluating as many instructors as you would like, providing they show up as choices. **If you do not see a particular instructor listed, it is because that instructor is not being evaluated for this subject.**

You don’t have to complete more than one subject evaluation in one sitting. However, at this time, once you start a single evaluation, you need to finish it — you can’t save it and come back to it later. If you exit it without clicking Submit, you will lose your answers. Also, clicking Submit is final — you can’t redo the evaluation.

**Viewing Results**
Public evaluation results will be posted on the current (paper) subject evaluation results site, web.mit.edu/acadinfo/sse, in midsummer. Instructors will not receive their results until after grades are turned in.
For Instructors

Getting evaluated
In Spring 2008, only instructors in pilot subjects will be evaluated. In the future, if you want your subject and/or you to be evaluated via MIT’s central online evaluation system, you will need to let your department administrator know. Your department administrator will contact all instructors asking if they want to be evaluated in a given term.

Once you have indicated that you’d like to be evaluated, you will receive an email with a link to the evaluation system. You’ll need certificates to connect; if you don’t have them, go to [web.mit.edu/certificates](http://web.mit.edu/certificates). If you don’t have a Kerberos ID, first go to [web.mit.edu/register](http://web.mit.edu/register) (you’ll need your 9-digit MIT ID number) and then you can get your certificate.

Managing questions
For the Spring 2008 pilot, departments will continue to use the questions from the HASS and Science/Engineering paper evaluation forms. In addition to these standard questions, some pilot instructors have submitted subject-specific questions. Our vendor, Digital Measures, manually set those up so they will appear in the pilot evaluations.

In the future, there will be a question management system in which instructors may have the authority to create subject- and instructor-specific questions on their own. The creator of a question may review, edit and delete that question. You’ll be able to ask many different types of questions: rating scale, multiple choice, multiple selection, text, ranking, and binary (e.g. yes or no). In addition to asking instructor- and subject-specific questions, you’ll be able to ask questions for all sections of a specific type (e.g., lectures); all instructors with a specific role (e.g., recitation instructors); even questions that appear based on the student’s response to another question.

Viewing the evaluation from the student’s perspective
See the [Sample Evaluation](http://Sample Evaluation). In the future, you will have the ability to preview your questions as they would appear to the student taking the evaluation.

Evaluation period
Subject evaluations are kept open for the two weeks prior to the end of class. Students may evaluate subjects at any time during the evaluation period.

Response rates
Evaluation reminders will be sent via e-mail to students who haven’t completed evaluations and will contain an HTTP link to the survey engine.

Response rates for evaluations will be sent to departments and instructors during the evaluation window.

You can help boost response rates by emphasizing the importance of subject evaluation to your students.
If a student answered questions on an evaluation but did not submit it before the end of the evaluation window, the student’s responses will not be included in evaluation results, but will be included in response rates and identified as incomplete.

**Viewing results**

You will not be able to view results until the evaluation window is complete and your grades are turned in.

After you submit your grades, you will be able to view your results. Go to web.mit.edu/subjectevaluation and click View Results. Read the section on Custom Reports for Department Administrators and Instructors, read the instructions, and click on “view and download custom reports”. This will take you off the MIT site to Digital Measures, our subject evaluation vendor. They use your Kerberos ID to match you with evaluated subjects that you taught. You will need MIT certificates installed on your browser to proceed to the reports; if you don’t have them, go to web.mit.edu/certificates.

From the Digital Measures welcome screen, click on Custom Reports at upper left to download summary data with quantitative results and open-ended comments, as well as anonymous individual student responses for your section(s).

For instructor-specific questions within a subject (the Quality of Teaching quantitative questions plus the Comments on Teaching open-ended question on the current forms), each instructor will just be able to view his or her responses. Only people with department-administrator-level access will be able to view the responses for all instructors within a subject.

The public HTML subject reports will be posted on web.mit.edu/acadinfo/sse in mid-July. They will be similar to what is currently available on that site; no open-ended comments will be posted.

Subjects that are part of a cluster subject (Joint, Meets With, School-Wide Elective) will have results for all cluster subjects combined.

Subjects that have sections which function as standalone subjects (different instructors, different curriculum content) will be reported separately from the main subject.

**Getting Help**

If you have problems logging in, viewing results, or need any other technical assistance, contact se-help@mit.edu.
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For Departments

Workflow

Who’s Teaching What (WTW) is more powerful and more connected to online subject evaluation than it was with the paper forms. To prepare for subject evaluation, the sequence of work for a department administrator is as follows:

Who’s Teaching What
Enter teaching data.
Optionally, assign students to sections.
Submit data. This sends evaluated subjects to Digital Measures, our online evaluation provider.

Online Survey Engine
Optionally, collect subject-specific questions from instructors and send to se-help@mit.edu.
Monitor response rates.
Download custom departmental reports.

Managing questions

For the Spring 2008 pilot, departments will continue to use the questions from the HASS and Science/Engineering paper forms. In addition to these standard questions, some pilot instructors have submitted subject-specific questions. Our vendor, Digital Measures, will manually set those up so they appear in the pilot evaluations. We will give department administrators access so they can see how the evaluation (with subject-specific questions) would look to students.

In the future, there will be a question management system in which administrators may have the authority to create or edit survey questions at a specified level of permission. The creator of a question may review, edit and delete that question.

• You’ll be able to ask many different types of questions: rating scale, multiple choice, multiple selection, text, ranking, and binary (e.g. yes or no).

• In addition to asking subject-specific questions, you’ll be able to ask questions about specific instructors; for all sections of a specific type (e.g., lectures); all instructors with a specific role (e.g., recitation instructors); even questions that appear based on the student’s response to another question.

• If a subject in your department has a Joint or Meets With relationship with a subject in another department, you’ll be able to view all questions, including those added by the other department.

• You’ll be able to preview the survey and approve it (or not). You’ll even be able to modify WTW once the survey is underway, although there will be restrictions — if students have already answered questions about a particular teacher, for example, it will be too late to change that teacher’s name.
How Who’s Teaching What affects the evaluation

Generally speaking, for the FY08 pilot, once you have entered teaching data in WTW, there is nothing else you have to do on the online subject evaluation side except get reports on your department’s subjects once grades have been turned in. However, it is helpful to understand the relationship between the two applications.

Correcting WTW data

You can correct WTW data up to and even during the evaluation period, although there are restrictions once the evaluation is underway (specifically, you can’t remove a teacher from a section if there are already survey responses about that teacher).

Changing the evaluation availability window in WTW

Evaluation dates are defined in WTW by entering an end date for the evaluation window for each section of the subject. The start date of the window is automatically defined as two weeks before the end date. The default end date for the window is the last day of classes for the current term, so in most cases, users never have to change this.

However, some sections of a subject might end earlier in the term, in which case WTW users need to change the end date for that section, and the availability window for the subject is then calculated as (end date of earliest section minus 2 weeks) until (end date of latest section). Although you can change the end date of the survey availability window, you’ll need to pick a date that is at least 3 days later than the day you’re making the modification. This allows time for the Who’s Teaching What data to get transferred to the online subject evaluation engine.

How section assignments in WTW affects what students see in the evaluation

See the sample evaluation. When a student takes an evaluation, s/he will be presented a list of subjects in which s/he is enrolled, along with the evaluation availability window of each. An evaluation is available for selection when its availability window includes the current date, and the student has not completed it.

When the student selects a subject, the evaluation will display the questions for that subject.

Following the subject questions will be drop-down lists of sections from which to choose. If you’ve assigned students to sections in WTW, only the sections in which they’re enrolled will display to the student. When a student is not assigned to a section, the drop-down list will contain all sections for the subject.

How section format type in WTW is used

The evaluation will display the sections based on section format type, e.g. lecture, recitation. Each section format type drop-down list will contain the sections with that format type. Section information will display section number, name, format type, and the days/times the section meets, e.g. “8.01T Phys LEC01 MWF”. When multiple section format types are available for evaluation, and have multiple associated sections, multiple drop-down lists will be displayed.
How teacher roles and sort order in WTW are used
Following the section questions, OSE will display a drop-down list of teachers assigned to that section. Their teaching roles will show up next to their names.
WTW will provide the sort order in which the teachers’ names appear in the drop-down list.

Response rates
Evaluation reminders will be sent via e-mail to students who haven’t completed evaluations and will contain an HTTP link to the survey engine.
Response rates for evaluations will be sent to departments and instructors during the evaluation window.
You can help boost response rates by emphasizing the importance of subject evaluation to students in your departments.
If a student answered questions on an evaluation but did not submit it before the end of the evaluation window, the student’s responses will not be included in evaluation results, but will be included in response rates and identified as incomplete.

Viewing results
You will not be able to view results until the evaluation window is complete and instructors have turned in their grades.

Go to web.mit.edu/subjectevaluation, click View Results, then click “View custom reports for department administrators and instructors”. This will take you off the MIT site to Digital Measures, our subject evaluation vendor. They use your Kerberos ID to match you with evaluated subjects in your department. You will need MIT certificates installed on your browser to proceed to the reports; if you don’t have them, go to web.mit.edu/certificates.

From the Digital Measures welcome screen, click on Custom Reports at upper left to download summary data with quantitative results and open-ended comments, as well as anonymous individual student responses and raw data for student responses.

For instructor-specific questions within a subject (the Quality of Teaching quantitative questions plus the Comments on Teaching open-ended question on the current forms), each instructor will just be able to view his or her responses. Only people with department-administrator-level access will be able to view the responses for all instructors within a subject.

The public HTML subject reports will be posted on web.mit.edu/acadinfo/sse in mid-July. They will be similar to what is currently available on that site; no open-ended comments will be posted.
Sections which function as standalone subjects (e.g. two lectures with different instructors and different curriculum content) will be reported as separate subjects.

**Getting Help**
If you have problems logging in, viewing results, or need any other technical assistance, contact se-help@mit.edu.
Sample Evaluation

_In this example, we will see the evaluation from the perspective of a student, Jane Doe, who is enrolled in two hypothetical subjects: 27.02 and 28.00._

1) From the MIT subject evaluation launch page (web.mit.edu/subjectevaluation), Jane arrives at her welcome screen.

[Image 1: Welcome screen showing subject evaluations for 27.02 and 28.00]

2) She clicks on the first subject, 27.02. This subject uses the questions from the Science and Engineering form. The evaluation for 27.02 appears.

[Image 2: Sample evaluation form for 27.02 Web Development]
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The Quality of Teaching header contains instructor-level questions which will display once both a section and instructor have been chosen. The rest of the questions, beginning with Factors in Learning, are the standard subject-level questions for the Science and Engineering form. If the instructors submitted extra questions specifically about this subject, Jane would see those at the bottom of the page under the last header, Subject-Specific Questions.

3) Different instructors teach different sections. This class has one lecture with two instructors, and three recitation sections with one instructor each. Jane first picks the lecture, and then chooses the first lecturer to evaluate. The instructor-level questions appear.

Note: The term “section” refers to any regular meeting within a subject. A lecture that meets MW 3-4pm is a section. So is a recitation that meets TR 1-2pm and a lab that meets WF 4-5pm. All subjects have at least one section.

If the system knew that Jane was assigned to a particular recitation section (if department administrators managed student section enrollment using the Who’s Teaching What application), the recitation drop-down list would contain only the section in which she was enrolled. In this case, the department administrator opted not to manage student enrollment, so the drop-down list contains all possible sections.
4) At the bottom of the instructor-level questions is a button labeled Add Another Instructor Evaluation:

Jane clicks it, and another pair of Section/Instructor drop-down boxes appears:

There are a couple of different options Jane can take from here:

- **If Jane selects Lecture L01 again, she will only be able to select the second lecturer. The system knows that she already evaluated the first lecturer, David Lee, and therefore has removed David Lee from the picklist for the lecture. In other words, she can’t evaluate him multiple times for the same section.**

- **Jane might also choose to select one of the three recitations. Once she picks a recitation, she will pick the instructor listed for that recitation.**

- **If students in 27.02 were assigned to a particular recitation using Who’s Teaching What, Jane would only be able to pick the one recitation to which she**
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was assigned. She wouldn’t see the other two recitations in her Section select box. In other words, her evaluation experience would be further customized just for her, and there would be no possibility that she’d evaluate the wrong instructor by mistake.

5) Jane decides to pick Lecture L01 again and answers teaching questions about the second lecturer. Then she clicks the Add Another Instructor Evaluation button one more time, and repeats the process with her recitation instructor.

6) Jane then completes the subject-level questions and submits the evaluation.