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Attendance
90 individuals attended and 79 completed evaluations
- 63 people identified themselves as faculty, 10 individuals identified as administrators, 2 as a staff member, 1 as an instructor, 1 as a post-doc, and 1 as a doctoral student.

Suggestions for Improvement/Action Items
- FORWARD could explore providing leadership in revising the SROIs to address issues of gender bias.
- Encourage speakers to provide concrete suggestions that are applicable to NDSU – don’t just identify a problem but explain possible solutions.
- Consider holding a workshop for students about gender bias and evaluations of teaching.
- Add the speakers’ references lists to the FORWARD website as another resource for faculty.
- Work on informing the campus community that the presentations are available on the FORWARD website.
- Consider ways to facilitate more discussion in units/colleges about the issue of gender bias.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my work at NDSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel I have acquired new skills, information, or understanding about gender and climate at NDSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I will be able to implement new strategies and knowledge as a result of my participation in this lecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel that my knowledge of how to promote a positive climate at NDSU has increased because of today’s workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would recommend this lecture series to others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate the overall quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form

1. What questions do you still have after attending this workshop? Please list any areas that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification.
   • I think the contents in the workshop are not new to me, but what to do is important. Or, I guess as there is nothing I can do.
   • How can we fix the problems that were highlighted?
   • How do we as instructors overcome the gender issues presented?
   • I wish I had an example of a “good” evaluation form so I could copy and use.
   • Will NDSU do anything to improve SROIs? Based on the research identifying problems with current questions.
   • Will administrators respond to the data provided?
   • Will NDSU actually start to change SROI?
   • How to fairly evaluate faculty.
   • I hope we’ll start a discussion and a revision of SROI here very soon.
   • How do we actually go about changing our SROIs? We now know the problems but none of that matters if we don’t change how our teaching is evaluated.
   • How can we change to improve NDSU’s SROI’s and how can we be successful in getting improvements passed in University Senate.
   • None. Except how can we convince our college to use additional measures for evaluating teaching?
   • Some actual examples of teaching evaluation questions that are of good quality.
   • She brought up the fact that a SROI of 3 isn’t really a 3 but didn’t provide insight of getting a 3 to be a 3.
   • Great ideas- now how do we get to use this info in our campus evaluations?
   • How do you fight gender bias? Or do you conform just to evaluations?
   • Is it best for females to conform to the norm to get higher marks on SROI’s? What is the best way to approach this?
• Does NDSU’s administration take today’s conclusions into account when looking at faculty SROI scores?
• Sample SROI from different institutions to compare to NDSU.
• So how will administrators look at this talk, and change how they evaluate us.
• Gives us specific ideas? Instead of asking us to discover them ourselves.
• Students “spread the word” about professors; this leads to pre-expectations they have-i.e. he/she is short-fused; caring, etc.
• Are tenure and promotion rates different between genders?
• Changing the culture.
• It would be nice to see FORWARD make papers/references of speakers available on their web-site/other…
• Clearly there are issues with NDSU’s SROI form but how do we change it? What’s the process?
• Why do we still have student evaluations?
• How do you get this message to those who can make the change?
• How to fix the problem of gender bias?
• How can we carry forward this work?
• More specifics on how to change our SROI sheets.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the workshop you attended today?
• Let the administrator know.
• Simply quantified what I already know.
• Good level of detail, engaging speaker.
• Knowledge that the issue exists.
• This present information that helps me understand better why I’m exhausted after teaching as a female faculty.
• Everything was helpful, but strategies for reducing bias (when using the current SROIs) were particularly helpful.
• How to teach our students to evaluate us.
• Data to support concepts-citations to go find.
• Things to do to decrease gender influence!
• Ideas for teachers to improve evaluations. Most important: Changes to SROIs-we need this to happen.
• Understanding gender differences.
• Ways to mitigate and limit gender influences from impacting evaluations.
• Research that supports gendered adj in evaluations.
• Ways we can be proactive to “protect ourselves” from bias.
• The conversations stimulated at the tables.
• New ideas for how to phrase questions to get feedback from students.
• The direct analysis of NDSU’s teaching evaluation.
• Facts provided by speaker.
• Evaluating NDSU rating of instruction.
• Teach students how to evaluate faculty. How to communicate credibility.
• What can be done with evaluations?
• Was great to see the data.
• Possible changes to SROI questions.
• Examples and comparisons.
• How to lead students to be less gender biased.
• Reinforced what I experience and see in the classroom.
• Suggestions at end “what teachers can do?”
• What can teachers do to evaluate their own learning?
• Practical suggestions were very helpful.
• Male vs. female frames.
• The SROI’s suck.
• Encouraging thoughtful questions, two hours with lunch in middle is good set up.
• Reminder of specific issues we face.
• Eye opening about gender stereotypes.
• Teaching evaluations.
• Cognitive psychological approach to gender research and understanding.
• Nice overview of recent research in gendered aspects of evaluations.
• Discussion of gender not only as it applies to women but men.
• Learned something about myself and problems I had in the past.
• Examples and study data.
• Occurrences of the problem.
• Good presentation-interesting, new information.
• Specific examples.
• Knowledge is power - just knowing that student ratings are affected by these things will help me prepare.

3. How could this workshop be improved to be more beneficial to you? What recommendations do you have for future workshops?
   • Add gender & race into one graph and show the difference for the same course. Students grade for men and women teachers.
   • Keep the focus on what individual faculty can use rather than what the regents or administrators need to do to fix a problem.
   • About different class assessment methods.
   • Are links available to presenter’s slides, is session videotaped?
   • Can’t think of anything to be improved. It was awesome.
   • More discussion on more reasonable questions; the workshop portion was pretty weak.
   • Follow-up. Change student rating of instructors so it is reliable and valid. Remove opportunity for gender bias.
   • More breakout time in groups.
   • Have a workshop or lecture for students! Include them in these discussions.
   • Required for all PTE.
   • Very good. Maybe have break-out sessions with departments.
   • Too much on gender, bring out point by evaluating other aspects also.
   • More time to compare to what we do and how to improve.
   • In future, it could be about grading students’ work.
   • The 2 hours workshop is better than trying to squeeze in information into 1 hour.
   • This was very informative. Speaker is intelligent, funny AND fun 😊
   • Give specific ideas. Instead of asking us to discover them ourselves.
   • It would be nice to see FORWARD make papers/references of speakers available on their website/other…
   • Could not hear questions asked to speaker. Find a way for people to not talk to each other during the presentation.
   • Are there any specific questions we could add to be survey that are a bit more gender neutral?
   • It was ok.
   • Color contrast on PowerPoint was very hard to read.
   • It was great!

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today’s workshop and/or the FORWARD program in general.
   • I liked her a lot - funny and fun.
   • Great speaker.
   • These workshops are useful.
   • This is probably one of the best and most interactive ones to date.
   • Thank you!
   • We need to continue a campus conversation about SROIs.
   • Was great!
   • Students should be included in these discussions.
   • Thanks!
   • More workshops on gender bias.
   • Great workshop!
   • FORWARD is doing an excellent job of recruiting top-notch speakers. Great job!
   • It was good workshop.
   • Thanks!