

SCF COMMITTEE MEETING

Marriott Library, Room 1705

Thursday, April 27, 2017

1:00pm to 2:00pm

ATTENDEES: Joanne Yaffe, Pat Tripeny, Adam Halstrom, Mohd Iqmal Abd Halim, Jeff Bates, Debra Mascaro, Julia Franklin, Lorelei Rutledge

ABSENT/EXCUSED: Ann Darling, Audrey Thompson, Ananya Roy, Khem Narayan Poudel, Kevin Yang

INTRODUCTIONS

MINUTES (AVAILABLE ON CANVAS)

February 27, 2017 Student Sub-committee Meeting Minutes
(Julia moves, Iqmal seconds) Unanimous approved

February 9, 2017 Faculty Sub-committee Meeting Minutes
(Jeff moves, Lorelei seconds) Unanimous approved

December 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes
(Lorelei moves, Julia seconds) Unanimous approved

October 19, 2016 Meeting Minutes
(Julia moves, Jeff seconds) Unanimous approved

REPORT TO ACADEMIC SENATE

Academic Senate Executive Committee, 3/20/17

- There was not a lot of push back from the Executive Committee.
- JoAnn reviewed the report for the committee.
- RPT guidelines should require/suggest peer review in addition to SCF.
 - There is more push back on this than expected.
 - CTLE may be able to play a role in helping departments understand how to do this without making it punitive.
- We should be pushing that SCF is just generic information. If faculty or departments want to get supplemental data, then they should use other instruments. CTLE can help develop ways to gather student feedback for instructor development. A different resource should help departments measure learning outcomes.
 - Some faculty are pushing back against a separate instrument to measure learning outcomes.

Academic Senate, 4/3/17
Jo presented the committee's report.

AGREEMENT ON INSTRUCTIONS TO CTLE FOR REVISIONS

Response Rate

Jeff Bates motions to charge CTLE to see what it takes to conduct evaluations in-class.
Julia Franklin seconds.

Discussion:

Set up the surveys so they are available for faculty to allow students to complete the survey in-class during the final week of classes.

There may need to be some training for faculty.

There may be a concern that faculty will opt out.

CTLE is charged with developing an implementation plan and then take that to the Academic Senate.

Should we roll-out with a few departments, or go campus-wide?

Questions

We have discussed having a small number of institutional questions.

Different questions for different kinds of classes.

Should we have a series of recommendations for different kinds of questions or a set of guidelines?

Start by grouping existing questions into themes?

Other systems that might be helpful for other forms of assessment: SkyFactor, Qualtrix, Canvas, Student Voice.

It would be helpful to have a clear statement about the goal of the instrument to help determine which questions are appropriate.

“Capture the student experience in the class.”

The wording of the questions should be validated somehow.

Dissemination Issues

CTLE is charged to come up with a couple of pages to describe different kinds of data and interpretive data to give to SAC.

Add a “check box” to confirm they've read guidelines before seeing quantitative data.

OTHER ACTIONS?

Pat updated the committee on an update to the PeopleSoft “View Grades” app that hides grades until a student completes the survey. As of early April, a PeopleSoft update wiped out this functionality. Student Systems was able to restore functionality and the feature has been confirmed in production as of April 26, 2017. Strategic IT Committee deals with IT related concerns for academic needs.

COMMITTEE CHAIR FOR 2017-2018

Any interest?

Jo is will to serve on committee, but will not be chair.

The Senate presidency will appoint a new chair.

FUTURE MEETINGS

ATTACHMENTS:

Minutes

Senate Report

Student Town Hall Responses

SCF COMMITTEE MEETING

Marriott Library, Room 1726
Wednesday, October 19, 2016
3:00pm to 4:00pm

ATTENDEES: Joanne Yaffe, Ann Darling, Pat Tripeny, Adam Halstrom, Audrey Thompson, Lorelei Rutledge, Jeff Bates, Mohd Iqmal Abd Halim, Gail Benuzillo, Xan Johnson (visiting)

ABSENT/EXCUSED: Debra Mascaro, Julia Franklin, Kem Narayan Poudel, Ananya Roy

INTRODUCTION

The committee members introduced themselves. Joanne Yaffe acknowledged that a vice-chair will need to be selected among the faculty representatives who will be continuing on the committee next year.

APPROVE MINUTES

Motion was made by Ann Darling to approve the March 9, 2016 Meeting Minutes. Motion was seconded by Lorelei Rutledge. Motion passed unanimously.

SUSTAIN OFFICERS

Lorelei Rutledge volunteers as vice-chair for 2016-2017. *Lorelei Rutledge was confirmed as co-chair with a unanimous.*

Gail Benuzillo is rotating off due to graduation. Adam Halstrom will work with ASUU to find a replacement. We can also consider replacing Gail with one of CTLE's graduate student fellows.

NEW CHARTER/POLICY

Links to Policy 6-100-II-N and 6-002 are on the committee's Canvas page. Documents showing policy changes are also on Canvas.

We are now an Academic Senate Committee. We should report to the Senate on our activities approx. two times a year.

Joanne Yaffe reported to the committee on the passionate discussion at Academic Senate meeting last spring, when the policy changes were approved. It was emphasized that SCF should be used to gather feedback regarding the student experience, not learning outcomes. It was also emphasized that SCF should not be used in isolation for personnel decisions. Several reflections on the nature of SCF were discussed: we know that women and faculty of color are evaluated differently; and difficulty of content affects student ratings.

Joanne described some of the issues that we're facing: we know some departments are disproportionately weighting quantitative data in evaluation of faculty performance. Some SAC groups went to RateMyProfessor for their SAC reports.

Questions that we need to think about as a committee:

What should be included on the course evaluation?

How should it be administered?
Should the same tool be used for every course?

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE SUMMARY REPORT

Based on the report of Jim Tabery, member of this committee during the 2015-2016 year, the School of Medicine uses SCF to monitor student engagement and participation and attendance. JoAnn summarized Jim Tabery's report on SoM process which can be found on the committee's Canvas page. Pat Tripeny clarifies that the structure of SoM evaluation stems from their last accreditation visit. They have two committees governing evaluation: one to evaluate courses, the other to set curriculum. It was important to keep these separate.

Questions for the committee:

Do we get someone from SoM represented on this committee?

Ask the person in charge of CEC to participate on the committee? Or present to us?

GOALS FOR THIS YEAR

The committee agreed that a primary goal is to determine what should be included in SCF. Are we in the business of evaluating student competencies? The number of survey questions is also an issue.

Students may think this system serves institutional needs—not their own needs. This committee should attempt to understand what students want to get out of SCF.

- We are also concerned about some evidence that students are going to RateMyProfessor.com and even using these in SAC RPT reviews.
 - We may need to talk to Pat Hanna about issues with this for UPTAC.
- Students on the committee would like to know if we can we make comments available.
 - We know that there is software available to help filter inappropriate comments.
 - If comments were made public, it may be prudent to have a waiting period during which an instructor can ask for a comment to be reviewed and suppressed. Some group would need to be able to review these comments and determine whether or not to make them public.

We have seen a decrease in response rates over the last few years.

- We acknowledged that even with the decline, many of our peers would still envy our response rates.
- We have questions about whether this decline has something to do with timing? Grades?
- Adam will collect response rate data to present to the committee for review.

There is interest in seeing a break-down of ratings for courses with a heavy online component compared to courses without an online component.

Direction on how to interpret SCF data is needed across campus, especially for units who heavily use quantitative SCF data to make hiring and retention decisions.

FUTURE MEETINGS

We will try to meet again mid-November. The focus of our November agenda will be the Student Town Hall results, with special attention to the questions students would like to see on the surveys, and the declining response rates.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

SCF COMMITTEE MEETING

Marriott Library, Room 1705

Friday, December 2, 2016

12:00pm to 1:00pm

ATTENDEES: Joanne Yaffe, Pat Tripeny, Jeff Bates, Mohd Iqmal, Debra Mascaro, Julia Franklin

ABSENT/EXCUSED: Ann Darling, Adam Halstrom, Gail Benuzillo, Abd Halim, Kem Narayan Poudel, Ananya Roy, Lorelei Rutledge, Audrey Thompson

APPROVE MINUTES

****There was no quorum so this was a very relaxed meeting.****

PRESENTATION

RESPONSE RATES

Pat explained the chart showing the University-wide response rates.

The point was made that increasing the response rate doesn't necessarily mean that better information will be collected.

Joanne suspects that higher response rates might indicate lower satisfaction scores.

Joanne would like to present information on historical response rates to the senate in February.

TOWN HALL RESULTS

Pat explained the various student groups that were approached to participate in the Student Town Halls including LGBT, ASUU, and Veteran Affairs.

The group reviewed the Faculty Town Hall results.

FUTURE MEETINGS

OTHER BUSINESS

Need new representative for Graduate Students because Gail Benuzillo is gone.

SCF COMMITTEE MEETING – FACULTY SUBCOMMITTEE

Marriott Library, Room 1705

Thursday February 9, 2016

11:00am to 12:00pm

ATTENDEES: Joanne Yaffe, Ann Darling, Pat Tripeny, Adam Halstrom, Debra Mascaro, Lorelei Rutledge, Jeff Bates (left early)

ABSENT/EXCUSED: Audrey Thompson, Julia Franklin

INTRODUCTION

We are meeting as a subcommittee to target separately the needs and ideas of faculty and students. We will hold a student subcommittee meeting on February 27, 2017.

DISCUSSION

Over the last year the committee has come to agreement that the course feedback instrument is about the student experience, not a measurement of student learning or the quality of teaching.

Ann added that SCF also does not assess whether or not instructors meet their own teaching goals. SCF is different than a peer assessment which can say “you had a good plan, you executed that plan, etc.” This kind of peer assessment subsists irrespective of the students’ experience in the class.

Joanne said that an idea she floated about training student reviewers to observe classes was categorically dismissed.

This committee is concerned with three areas of SCF:

- How should the **results be disseminated and used**, particularly in the RPT process?
 - Jeff noted that there is value in an instructors’ use of SCF to improve their own classes and teaching, and not simply as a measure of student satisfaction.
- What changes can be instituted in how the instrument is administered that might help address the falling **response/participation rate**?
- What **questions** should and should not be asked?

HOW SHOULD THE RESULTS BE DISSEMINATED AND USED, PARTICULARLY IN THE RPT PROCESS?

The inappropriate use of SCF by some departments and administrators has driven it to a place that has given it far more power than it should have.

The appropriate use of SCF in the RPT process is within the purview of this committee. The training of SACs may not be, but guidelines on the use of SCF by SACs might be recommended by the committee.

Perhaps we can make recommendations to the RPT standards committee to specify limits on the appropriateness of SCF for faculty reviews.

What is the role of SAC reports?

This committee has a limited role in this. We can make recommendations that SACs should not use SCF in isolation, or to discourage overreliance on SCF by SACs.

There is reason to believe that the process of checks and balances works this out already (through Deans, UPTAC, etc.)

Ann brought up the point that we are not allowing student votes to be executed when we fail to train students in best practices of methodology and investigation. It is too easy for faculty to dismiss the SAC vote on methodological grounds, and this is primarily a training problem. The students' voice is, in effect, being silenced because they aren't trained on how to make and present a valid and supported vote.

Part of the problem may be the reliance on institution-wide training.

Localized trainings at the level of Colleges or Departments would perhaps be more effective. Since each College, and in some cases Departments, writes their own RPT guidelines, it may be more reasonable to have someone inside these local units train students on how to prepare a SAC report that adheres to the Department's or College's guidelines and culture.

In most cases we see this role filled by Department Chairs or Associate Deans.

There may be valid reasons to offer institutional "train-the-trainer" services and resources.

Part of this support would include information on how students should interpret ordinal data (what are the limits). How do we train them to interpret statistics? Perhaps we can provide departments with some basic information about statistics (maybe an information sheet) to share with their SACs during departmental training.

It is likely that including a standard deviation and confidence interval, and brief instruction on how to use these, will lead to more appropriate uses of the statistical information available to students.

The committee agrees that students can and should use SCF in their SAC reports. And students should receive training from their department.

There may also be a problem in the way faculty are using SCF to review their peers.

SCF should not be the sole standard for faculty reviews. Faculty should use other sources (e.g. peer observation and review).

Lorelei pointed out that it is unlikely that faculty across campus will be contented without some form of quantitative measure.

WHAT CAN AND SHOULD WE DO ABOUT THE FALLING RESPONSE/PARTICIPATION RATE?

We cannot continue to rely on students viewing their grade as an incentive to completing SCF (CANVAS has changed the possibility of this incentive).

The committee would like to investigate and possibly propose moving SCF back into the classroom to increase response rates and give a context for why we need this information and how it should be used.

CTLE can investigate what it would take to make this happen.

Communicating clearly with faculty or staff and providing some resource on how to conduct SCF in class will be needed.

Pat relayed information from another meeting that suggests around 97% of students carry a Smartphone with them to at least 3 classes per week.

Adam will send Joanne information on recent courses with extremely high response rates. There are groups of courses on campus that already conduct SCF in class. We want to see the response rates for these compared to similar courses within the same college. Adam will also contact instructors who received high responses rates in Fall 2016 to find out what they did, if anything.

WHAT QUESTIONS SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE ASKED?

Jo would like to recommend that colleges and departments cannot add questions to the standard instrument, but that we can add a number of questions from which they might select, in addition to required, campus-wide questions.

If Colleges or Departments want to collect responses to other questions (e.g., learning goals or competencies), they need a different instrument.

We may need several standard question sets to address the diverse learning environments and instructor types.

According to policy, CTLE can develop a set of questions to propose to the committee and Academic Senate for approval.

CONCLUSION

Joanne will present the faculty and student perspective to the Senate Executive Committee in March. Pat and Ann may be at the meeting to support Joanne's report.

SCF COMMITTEE MEETING – FACULTY SUBCOMMITTEE

Marriott Library, Room 1705

Monday February 27, 2016

3:30pm to 4:30pm

ATTENDEES: Joanne Yaffe, Pat Tripeny, Adam Halstrom, Mohd Iqmal Abd Halim

ABSENT/EXCUSED: Ananya Roy, Khem Narayan Poudel, Kevin Yang

INTRODUCTION

DISCUSSION

ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS YOU WANT TO HAVE ON THE SURVEY THAT WOULD HELP YOU CHOOSE YOUR CLASS?

Assignments and Exams question may not apply to all classes. Possibly opt out?

Workload relative to number of credit hours?

Fairness: grading standards are stated clearly, and instructor applied those standards fairly.

Were the materials you were required to purchase useful to the class?

The course objectives [and requirements] were clearly stated.

How useful was this elective course to your degree program?

ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS HERE THAT AREN'T PARTICULARLY USEFUL?

The question came up about students seeing comments.

RESPONSE RATES

Standard deviation

50th, 75th percentile

Pull 25% or lower to see if there is a pattern.

Histogram of response

50% complete survey vs. 100% complete

REVIEW OF FACULTY SUB-COMMITTEE NOTES

RPT: Jack described a new proposal to use College Councils in the current SAC function.

Response Rate: Move back into this classroom.

Questions should/shouldn't ask:

Get a bank for departments/colleges which is limited to a cap

Standard questions sets for different learning modes.

There seems to be a consensus to move away from using SCF to assess learning outcomes.

Students may want a layered survey with required questions (that are available to students and used in RPT) and then optional questions that departments/colleges.

Can Mark come to the next meeting to talk about his dissertations?