

Final Report for Student Ratings Review Team
Submitted to VPAA Planning Council 9/14/16 by Elizabeth Yost Hammer
Edited and Approved by VPAA Planning Council November 9, 2016

Committee and Charge

In Spring 2015, in collaboration with the VPAA's Office, a committee was formed to review our current course evaluations. The committee included the following representatives.

- James Bartkus (Division of Business)
- Renee Akbar (Division of Education and Counseling)
- Andrea Edwards (Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences)
- Harris McFerrin (Division of Biology and Public Health)
- Jeremy Tuman (Division of Fine Arts and Humanities)
- Suki Prammar (College of Pharmacy/VPAA Planning Council)
- KiTani' Parker Lemieux (College of Pharmacy)
- Michael Homan (Faculty Association)
- Steve Salm (Rank and Tenure)
- Elizabeth Yost Hammer (Convener, CAT+FD, Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences)
- Karen Nichols (CAT+FD, Distance Education)

In consultation with the VPAA's Office, Institutional Research, and the Dean's Office, we were charged with the following tasks:

- Review the content/questions on the evaluation themselves;
- Review the way evaluations are administered (e.g., paper versus online);
- Explore evaluations for online/hybrid courses;
- Prepare a report for the VPAA Planning Council.

Process

In Spring 2015 we began by doing a literature review and summarizing the research on student evaluations. We noted that student reviews (commonly referred to as course evaluations) are just one component assessing teaching effectiveness, and they need to be interpreted (whereas course evaluations imply a summative form of assessment). We also brought in models from other schools. We opened a website where we posted all minutes and relevant documents (see <http://cat.xula.edu/scholarship/srrt/>). Through this website (which we promoted at faculty assemblies as well as via emails), we solicited faculty comments throughout the process.

Over Summer 2015, we conducted an informal survey, asking faculty to identify the following from our current ratings form.

- What are the 3 most important questions?
- What are the 3 least important questions?
- Describe 3 specific ways you use student ratings to inform your teaching.

- Identify 3 new questions that would improve our student ratings form.

In Fall 2015, with this data, we identified which characteristics were the most important to evaluate and generated a table of current and potential questions to assess each.

Based on this process, we drafted a new student rating form, posted it to the website, emailed it to faculty, and held two open forums where faculty could give input directly to the committee.

In Spring 2016, we reviewed all feedback we had gotten on the draft (via emails, website, and forums) and revised the student ratings form. **See Appendix A for our final proposed form.**

Once we completed this task, we began to address issues of implementation and policies related to student ratings. **See Appendix B for our proposed policies.**

Simultaneously, Dr. Karen Nichols took the final form to the Online Advisory Board and they drafted a student ratings form for online/hybrid course. They kept to the original as much as possible to maintain their comparative value for self-assessment and review by others. **See Appendix C for our final proposed form.**

In Fall 2016, Dr. Hammer introduced the proposal from the Student Ratings Review Team last meeting to the VPAA Planning Council. VPAA Planning Council committee members solicited comments from their divisions. This committee discussed and made the following changes (see also updates Appendices):

- For Instructor Question 1 we changed it from “The instructor was available for consultation” to “The instructor was available for consultation as outlined in the syllabus.” This change makes it parallel with Online/Hybrid form.
- We added the policy, “Classes worth 0 credit hours will not be randomly selected for evaluation.”
- At our last meeting, we decided to add Student Question 1 (“What is your reason for taking this class?”) to the online course.
- At our last meeting, we decided to make the options consistent between the Online/Hybrid and Face-to-Face form for Student Question 2 (referring to hours spent on course).
- A typo was pointed out after the meeting via email and the word “notifying” was removed from Point 5 in Appendix B.

The committee approved the proposal with these changes. Dr. Giguette will let Dr. Hammer know where the proposal should go next in order to move it forward.

Original APPENDIX A

Student Rating Review Team Content Recommendations

INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONS

On a scale of (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree

1. The instructor was available for consultation.
2. The instructor provided useful feedback on tests, reports, projects, etc. to help me learn.
3. The instructor made clear what was expected of students in this course.
4. The instructor explained the subject matter clearly and concisely.
5. The instructor respected students as individuals.
6. The instructor motivated me to learn.
7. The instructor made me realize the relevance and applicability of course content.
8. Considering each of the above characteristics, the instructor of the course is an effective teacher.
9. Describe the instructor's major strengths as a teacher. (open-ended)
10. Suggest how this instructor could improve his/her teaching. (open-ended)

COURSE QUESTIONS

On a scale of (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree

1. The course/learning objectives were clear.
2. The course materials (readings, videos, lecture slides, etc.) enhanced my learning.
3. The assigned course work (papers, projects, etc.) enhanced my learning.
4. This course has helped me develop knowledge of the fundamental principles of this subject.
5. Describe the major strengths of this course. (open-ended)
6. Suggest how this course could be improved. (open-ended)

STUDENT QUESTIONS

1. What was your reason for taking this class?
 - a. Required for major or minor
 - b. Required for core curriculum
 - c. Elective
2. How many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class time?
 - a. 0--3
 - b. 4--6
 - c. 7--9
 - d. 10+
3. What grade do you expect to earn for this course?
 - a. A
 - b. B
 - c. C
 - d. D
 - e. F
 - f. Other
 - g. Unsure

VPAA Planning Council Approved APPENDIX A Content Recommendations

INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONS

On a scale of (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree

1. The instructor was available for consultation as outlined in the syllabus.
2. The instructor provided useful feedback on tests, reports, projects, etc. to help me learn.
3. The instructor made clear what was expected of students in this course.
4. The instructor explained the subject matter clearly and concisely.
5. The instructor respected students as individuals.
6. The instructor motivated me to learn.
7. The instructor made me realize the relevance and applicability of course content.
8. Considering each of the above characteristics, the instructor of the course is an effective teacher.
9. Describe the instructor's major strengths as a teacher. (open-ended)
10. Suggest how this instructor could improve his/her teaching. (open-ended)

COURSE QUESTIONS

On a scale of (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree

7. The course/learning objectives were clear.
8. The course materials (readings, videos, lecture slides, etc.) enhanced my learning.
9. The assigned course work (papers, projects, etc.) enhanced my learning.
10. This course has helped me develop knowledge of the fundamental principles of this subject.
11. Describe the major strengths of this course. (open-ended)
12. Suggest how this course could be improved. (open-ended)

STUDENT QUESTIONS

1. What was your reason for taking this class?
 - a. Required for major or minor
 - b. Required for core curriculum
 - c. Elective
3. How many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class time?
 - a. 0--3
 - b. 4--6
 - c. 7--9
 - d. 10+
4. What grade do you expect to earn for this course?
 - h. A
 - i. B
 - j. C
 - k. D
 - l. F
 - m. Other
 - n. Unsure

Original APPENDIX B

Student Rating Review Team Policy Recommendations

The committee makes the following recommendations.

- We should retain the option to request paper or online student ratings for all faculty. However, due to low response rates, and in consideration of Rank and Tenure review, Heads should advise new faculty to use paper student ratings for the first 3 years of teaching.
- CAT+FD should explore ways to increase response rates (e.g., incentives, certificates, course grades released upon completion, raffles).
- We have no recommendations for coordinated courses. However, for team-taught, interdisciplinary courses, each faculty should administer a separate student ratings.
- Given that the teaching experiences for clinical pharmacy faculty are so different than A & S, we recommend that the College of Pharmacy form an internal committee to examine student ratings. We encourage them to stay as close to the proposed rating form as possible, but to change it in order to meet their needs (similar to what the Online Advisory Board did). Steve Salm and Elizabeth Hammer volunteer to be on the committee as a resource, to provide context.

Cycle of review (Current policy in Black, **suggested changes in red**)
Student Evaluation of Faculty Policy & Request Form

The following policy was recommended by the Planning Council for Academic Affairs and approved by the Vice President for Academic affairs, fall 1994 (**include new date when appropriate**).

- 1 All faculty in their first ~~two~~ **four** semesters of teaching at Xavier will be evaluated in all classes.
Rationale: Rank and Tenure would see 4 semesters at 3-year review.
- 2 **After the first 4 semesters**, all ~~other~~ non-tenured faculty will be evaluated in two courses each semester (courses to be randomly chosen with computer program).
- 3 All tenured faculty will be evaluated in one course each **semester** (course to be randomly chosen with computer program).
- 4 Any faculty member can request that any/all of his/her classes be evaluated in a given semester by submitting a request to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs*. ~~Forms will be provided through chairpersons to assure that sufficient~~

~~information is given.~~ **Department Heads should encourage pre-tenure faculty to request student ratings for all classes.**

***We recommend streamlining the submission process, to be discussed with the VPPA Office and Planning Council.**

- 5 Any **department head, division chair, dean, or provost may request student ratings of faculty members by notifying submitting such requests to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs*.**

***We recommend streamlining the submission process, to be discussed with the VPPA Office and Planning Council.**

Revised September 1994 **(change to appropriate date)**

VPAA Planning Council Approved **APPENDIX B**

Policy Recommendations

The committee makes the following recommendations.

- We should retain the option to request paper or online student ratings for all faculty. However, due to low response rates, and in consideration of Rank and Tenure review, Heads should advise new faculty to use paper student ratings for the first 3 years of teaching.
- CAT+FD should explore ways to increase response rates (e.g., incentives, certificates, course grades released upon completion, raffles).
- We have no recommendations for coordinated courses. However, for team-taught, interdisciplinary courses, each faculty should administer a separate student ratings.
- Given that the teaching experiences for clinical pharmacy faculty are so different than A & S, we recommend that the College of Pharmacy form an internal committee to examine student ratings. We encourage them to stay as close to the proposed rating form as possible, but to change it in order to meet their needs (similar to what the Online Advisory Board did). Steve Salm and Elizabeth Hammer volunteer to be on the committee as a resource, to provide context.

Cycle of review (Current policy in Black, **suggested changes in red**)

Student Evaluation of Faculty Policy & Request Form

The following policy was recommended by the Planning Council for Academic Affairs and approved by the Vice President for Academic affairs, fall 1994 (**include new date when appropriate**).

- 1 All faculty in their first ~~two~~ **four** semesters of teaching at Xavier will be evaluated in all classes.
Rationale: Rank and Tenure would see 4 semesters at 3-year review.
- 2 **After the first 4 semesters**, all ~~other~~ non-tenured faculty will be evaluated in two courses each semester (courses to be randomly chosen with computer program).
- 3 All tenured faculty will be evaluated in one course each **semester** (course to be randomly chosen with computer program). **Classes worth 0 credit hours will not be randomly selected for evaluation.**
- 4 Any faculty member can request that any/all of his/her classes be evaluated in a given semester by submitting a request to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs*. ~~Forms will be provided through chairpersons to assure that sufficient~~

~~information is given.~~ **Department Heads should encourage pre-tenure faculty to request student ratings for all classes.**

***We recommend streamlining the submission process, to be discussed with the VPPA Office and Planning Council.**

- 5 Any **department head, division chair, dean, or provost may request student ratings of faculty members by submitting such requests to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs*.**

***We recommend streamlining the submission process, to be discussed with the VPPA Office and Planning Council.**

Revised September 1994 **(change to appropriate date)**

Original APPENDIX C

XULA Online Advisory Board Student Rating Content Recommendations*

*Highlights indicate where this form diverges from the face-to-face rating form.

INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONS

On a scale of (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree

1. The instructor was available for consultation **as outlined in the syllabus.**
2. The instructor provided useful feedback on tests, reports, projects, etc. to help me learn.
3. The instructor made clear what was expected of students in this course.
4. The instructor ~~explained~~ **presented** the subject matter clearly and concisely.
5. The instructor respected students as individuals.
6. The instructor motivated me to learn.
7. The instructor made me realize the relevance and applicability of course content.
8. Considering each of the above characteristics, the instructor of the course is an effective teacher.
9. Describe the instructor's major strengths as a teacher.
10. Suggest how this instructor could improve his/her teaching.

COURSE QUESTIONS

1. The course/learning objectives were clear.
2. The course materials (readings, videos, lecture slides, etc.) enhanced my learning.
3. The assigned course work (tests, papers, projects, presentations, etc.) enhanced my learning.
4. This course has helped me develop an appropriate depth and breadth of knowledge of this subject.
5. Describe the major strengths of this course.
6. Suggest how this course could be improved.

TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

1. **I understood how to find the online course materials (readings, assignments, quizzes, etc.)**
2. **I was given information on how to get help for technical problems.**
3. **Suggest how technical support could be improved.**

STUDENT QUESTIONS

1. What was your reason for taking this ~~class~~ **course online**?
 - a. I prefer online courses.
 - b. No face-to-face sections were available.
 - c. **Other**
2. How many hours per week did you spend on this course ~~outside of class time~~?
 - a. **0-5**
 - b. **6-10**
 - c. **11-15**
 - d. **16+**
3. What grade did you expect to earn for this course?
 - a. A
 - b. B
 - c. C
 - d. D
 - e. F
 - f. Other
 - g. Unsure

VPAA Planning Council Approved APPENDIX C

Content Recommendations

INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONS

On a scale of (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree

1. The instructor was available for consultation **as outlined in the syllabus.**
2. The instructor provided useful feedback on tests, reports, projects, etc. to help me learn.
3. The instructor made clear what was expected of students in this course.
4. The instructor ~~explained~~ **presented** the subject matter clearly and concisely.
5. The instructor respected students as individuals.
6. The instructor motivated me to learn.
7. The instructor made me realize the relevance and applicability of course content.
8. Considering each of the above characteristics, the instructor of the course is an effective teacher.
9. Describe the instructor's major strengths as a teacher.
10. Suggest how this instructor could improve his/her teaching.

COURSE QUESTIONS

1. The course/learning objectives were clear.
2. The course materials (readings, videos, lecture slides, etc.) enhanced my learning.
3. The assigned course work (tests, papers, projects, presentations, etc.) enhanced my learning.
4. This course has helped me develop an appropriate depth and breadth of knowledge of this subject.
5. Describe the major strengths of this course.
6. Suggest how this course could be improved.

TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

1. **I understood how to find the online course materials (readings, assignments, quizzes, etc.)**
2. **I was given information on how to get help for technical problems.**
3. **Suggest how technical support could be improved.**

STUDENT QUESTIONS

1. What was your reason for taking this class?
 - a. Required for major or minor
 - b. Required for core curriculum
 - c. Elective
2. What was your reason for taking this ~~class~~ **course online**?
 - a. I prefer online courses.
 - b. No face-to-face sections were available.
 - c. **Other**
3. How many hours per week did you spend on this course ~~outside of class time~~?

a.	0-3
b.	4-6
c.	7-9
d.	10+
4. What grade did you expect to earn for this course?
 - a. A
 - b. B
 - c. C
 - d. D
 - e. F

- f. Other
- g. Unsure