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Charge

- Identify *issues and concerns* in 2010 feedback
- Establish *principles* for survey development
- Establish *guidelines* for survey administration, based on best practices in the literature
- Draw up a revised set of *core questions* based on best practices
Faculty concerns about student input

- **Relevance**
  - Students have a limited view of the value of a faculty member
  - Student surveys are merely opinion polls
  - Our goal is beyond the student – look to the learning process

- **Ramifications**
  - Given undue weight, using variable practices
  - For intimidating faculty (especially if shared with others)
  - Excludes faculty in interpretation process

- **Survey tool** (core items)
  - Poorly worded
  - Wrong focus
Defining teaching effectiveness

E5.0 Policy on Tenure

- An effective teacher ...
  - Communicates special knowledge & expertise
    - With sensitivity
    - Mindful of students’ needs and abilities
- Effective teaching entails ...
  - Appropriate instructional methods & materials
  - Fair, useful, timely evaluation of learner’s work
- Distinct from:
  - Faculty *evaluation*
  - *Course* evaluation
ONE of many!

Faculty Evaluation

Scholarship
- Academic Qualifications
- Prof'l Qualifications
- Prof'l Activities

Teaching
- Personal Assessment
- Peer Ratings
- Student Ratings
- Syllabi Course Docs
- Student Work
- Teaching Portfolios
- Alumni Ratings

Service
- Internal Contributions
- External Contributions
- Leadership
Principles

- Purpose will be summative and formative

- As a **summative** tool:
  - One of many sources of evidence
  - Focused only on areas students can judge
  - Adjusts for variables affected by student characteristics
  - Will guarantee student anonymity
  - Will preserve confidential nature of the faculty appraisal process

- As a **formative** tool:
  - Will be diagnostic, geared toward improvement
  - Will be flexible to accommodate varieties of courses and methods
Guidelines

- Survey will incorporate the necessary analyses to account for known effects.
- Students will be educated about the purposes and uses of survey results.
- Results will be interpreted in light of multiple sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness.
- Results will be used to foster ongoing professional development and improvement (per E7.0).
Selecting a Survey Tool

- Selection process
  - Guided by:
    - Faculty feedback
    - *Extensive* literature review
    - Our principles & guidelines
    - Specific evaluation criteria
  - Conducted Internet searches and telephone interviews with reps
  - Weighed relative strengths & weaknesses

- Narrowed to two candidates:
  - IDEA Center: **IDEA Tool**
  - GAP Technologies: **SmartEvals**
IDEA Online

- Comprehensive Individual Development and Educational Assessment
  - National resource on student ratings
  - National database: 3 million forms annually
  - Aggregated data for creating local norms
- Based on a Student Learning Model
  - Recognizes “divergent methods and objectives, and shifting circumstances”
  - Scores adjusted for student motivation, work habits, effort, course difficulty, class size
- Diagnostic Form: 47 items
  - Customizable with up to 20 additional items
- Guides improvement via a Diagnostic Report
- Multiple delivery options to students
- Response rates monitored real-time
- Automatic reminders to non-responders
SmartEvals

- A “Do-It-Yourself” System
  - Ability to create and organize surveys
  - Customizable for each unit
    - Create your own items, or
    - Use bank of items from 270 customers, allowing a comparison base

- Various electronic delivery options
- Automatic reminders to non-responders
- Response rates monitored real-time
- Analytic reports available (data warehousing at extra cost)
  - Can “drill down” on individual items
A pilot run: WHY?

- Can we bear the cost of Best Practice?
  - Faculty effort vs needs? Usability...?
  - Administrative resources...?
- Give the community a taste of both
- Examine faculty/student experiences before making a large-scale commitment
- Determine which meets our needs better
  - “Best Practice” or
  - “Most Flexible”

Coordinated by AAC faculty team + selected campus experts
Timeline

- Fall quarter, 2012-1: **PILOT**
  - Recruit volunteer faculty
  - Pilot both systems (no cost)
  - Collect faculty, student, administrator opinion on ease of use and prospective value

- Winter quarter, 2012-2: **EVALUATE & RECOMMEND**
  - Analyze feedback
  - Formulate and present recommendation to AS

- Spring quarter, 2012-3: **PREPARE**
  - Select & train campus coordinator
  - Educate the community
  - Initiate professional development component

- Fall semester 2013: **FIRST FULL IMPLEMENTATION**
We 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.