


Academic Affairs Student Ratings Report



**University-wide System
of Student Ratings on Teaching
Effectiveness**

March 21, 2013

Student Ratings Pilot Subcommittee

Roxanne Canosa, GCCIS

Carol De Filippo, NTID

David Hostetter, ITS

Michael Laver, COLA

Tracy Worrell, COLA

Christine Licata, Senior Associate Provost

Karel Shapiro, Senior Staff Specialist



Prologue

- Where we have been
- Where we are
- Where we are going



Charge

- *We (Academic Affairs Committee) move that Academic Senate endorse the recommendation of the Academic Affairs 2012 Task Force, as outlined in Part IV of their report, to conduct a pilot investigation of two systems of student input on teaching effectiveness in order to determine a final recommendation of a system for university-wide launch in fall semester, 2013.*



Pilot Study Methods

- Contact select faculty (final N=58)
- Set up courses for each vendor (128 total)
- Open from 10/22 – 11/11
- Post surveys for students and faculty regarding systems

	SmartEvals	IDEA Center
Student Population	1421	1524
Ratings Survey Response Rate	59%	51%
Post-Survey N	238	337

Notable Pilot Results - Students

	SmartEvals	IDEA Center
Survey too long	$M = 2.27$	$M = 2.87$
Survey easy to fill out	$M = 4.26$	$M = 4.11$
Overall	$M = 4.05$	$M = 3.91$

SmartEvals	IDEA Center
None (16), easy to use, quick, thorough, usability, more items needed, prefer old system, anonymity.	None (44), quick, easy, efficient, some items unnecessary, confusing, too generic, too long, old system is fine.



Notable Pilot Results - Faculty

	SmartEvals	IDEA Center
Understood how to interpret report	$M = 3.94$	$M = 3.26$
Overall*	$M = 3.52$	$M = 3.19$
*Not significant		

SmartEvals	IDEA Center
Simple, fewer items, easy to add items and see online feedback, user-friendly, clear, easy, online report, appears to provide better information, better response rate, better than current system, fast feedback, good communication with users, IDEA has too many items and too complex of a report.	Intuitive, easy to grasp, robust instrument, effective for reflecting upon goals, easy to interpret results and set up, teaching rated according to goals, more comprehensive, items helpful, relevant details given, new information and way to look at the data, SmartEvals is less helpful in terms of improving the course in future years.

Notable Pilot Results – Heads/Deans

- **Unit Heads/Chairs(20)**
 - Both systems fit needs
 - IDEA too long
 - Preferred the customizability of SmartEvals
 - Liked the comparability, prof. development focus, and reliability/validity of IDEA
 - Majority spoke in favor of SmartEvals over IDEA Center
- **Deans (Representatives from all Colleges)**
 - IDEA too long
 - Only need a small set of items to show how an instructor is doing
 - Deans would like a reliable system with potential to compare to other universities
 - Response rates are of large concern



Recommendations

1. Use the SmartEvals system to gather student ratings of teaching effectiveness.
2. Use the same set of established core items across the university.
3. Online results for individual instructor (except for instructor added items) available only to the instructor, instructor's immediate supervisor and dean, the provost, and tenure and promotion committees per college guidelines.
4. Re-evaluate the above after three years of data collection with SmartEvals.



Why SmartEvals over IDEA Center?

	SmartEvals	IDEA Center
Familiarity	Information more like faculty and admin. are used to	Report looks complicated and takes time to interpret
Simplicity	Limited set of core items with no action from faculty needed	Benefits from diagnostic report depend on faculty form
Speed	Short survey for students	Long item-set (47) expected to burden students, rater fatigue
Flexibility	Brief, so items added need not be onerous	No flexibility to core item set, limit to added items
Completion	Fewer items favors completion of entire survey	Concern of drop out rate due to length of survey
Response Rates	Brevity and email tips should favor higher responses	Concern of rate decrease across years due to length
Program Needs	Core items don't address objectives, avoids possible conflicts	Concern of specifying objectives at instructor level and possible confusion
Reporting	Timely, web-based reporting allowing for customization	Longer distribution of reports via .pdf
Cost	Low cost	Higher cost for fully loaded system that may not be utilized

Why SmartEvals (cont'd)

- Enables uniformity
 - Core items administered can be adopted across the university.
- Provides "drill-down" capability
 - The web-based SmartEvals report enables views of results for selected subsets of the data.
- Offers suggestions of formative items
 - Maintains a bank of items used by its customers, available as suggestions for our faculty.
- Allows creation of faculty action plan
 - The report provides some guidance to the faculty about how to build an action plan to enhance instructional effectiveness.



Core Item Set (SD→SA)

1. The instructor enhanced my interest in this subject.
2. The instructor presented the course material in an organized manner.
3. The instructor communicated the course material clearly.
4. The instructor established a positive learning environment.
5. The instructor provided helpful feedback about my work in this course.
6. The instructor supported my progress towards achieving the course objectives.
7. Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.



Core Item Set

- I attended this class regularly. Yes No
- Open-Ended Questions
 - What did this instructor do well?
 - How can this instructor improve?



Benefits for Students

- Access a personal web page with courses
- Assured of anonymity of their responses
- Paperless system
- Notification via e-mail when rating periods open and close
- Receive reminders about completing rating form
- Ability to complete ratings on a Smartphone



Benefits for Faculty

- Can add additional items to the core item set
- Receive summary statistics for each of the core items and for all items that are added (mean, standard deviation; response rate)
- See their average scores compared to averages at the department, college and university levels
- Receive student responses to open ended questions
- Can access their historical rating data from past terms
- Export reports in a variety of formats (i.e. Excel, .pdf)



Benefits for Unit Heads & Deans

- **Unit Heads**

- Able to customize a set of items to be added for all faculty at the department level or course level
- View same core information as the faculty member
- Able to set up different types of analysis
- View aggregated data from department

- **Deans**

- Able to customize a set of items to be added for all faculty in the college
- View same core information as the faculty member
- View aggregated data from departments
- Analysis across College



Support

- Campus coordinator
- College level support
- ITS & Registrar Support—Integration and file uploads and authentication support
- Teaching/Learning Services
- Faculty Engagement



Topics to Supplement our Report

- Pre-Launch Communications
- Encourage Survey Participation
- Data Analysis
- Data Reports
- Uses of Student Ratings
- Professional Development
- Research Plan



Formal Motion

- **The Academic Senate endorses the report of the Academic Affairs Committee concerning online student ratings of teaching effectiveness, including the four recommendations:**



Recommendations

1. Use the SmartEvals system to gather student ratings of teaching effectiveness.
2. Use the same set of established core items across the university.
3. Online results for individual instructor (except for instructor added items) available only to the instructor, instructor's immediate supervisor and dean, the provost, and tenure and promotion committees per college guidelines.
4. Re-evaluate the above after three years of data collection with SmartEvals.



THANK YOU!

QUESTIONS?

