Faculty Teaching and Learning Center Advisory Committee
2011-12 Report to ECS/UAS
April 20, 2012

FTLCA 2011-12 Roster

Elected Members
David Bair, COE (2012), Chair
Peter Riemersma, CLAS (Geology) (2014) Vice-Chair
Joy Washburn, KCON (2013), Chair-Elect

Lindsey Ellis, BCIS (2012)
Vijay Gondhalekar, SCOB (2012)
Scott Grissom/*Alternate* Hugh McGuire, PCEC (2014)
Deborah Herrington, CLAS (CHM) (2013)
Michael Scantlebury, CCPS (HTM) (2014)
Lynn Sheehan, University Libraries (2012)
Ellen Shupe, CLAS (PSY) (2012)
Laurie Stickler, CHP (2013)
Darren Walhof, CLAS (PLS) (2014)

Ex-Officio Members
Christine Rener, Pew FTLC Director
Kurt Ellenberger, Pew FTLC Associate Director of Grants
Kim Kenward, IT/Ed Tech
Patty Stow Bolea, Pew FTLC Faculty Fellow
Dana Munk, Pew FTLC Faculty Fellow

ECS/UAS Charge to FTLCAC

1. **Support Dr. Christine Rener, the FTLC Director, and meet with the FTLC staff to execute goals for the 2011-12 academic year.**
   a. Dr. Rener shared important upcoming events at every meeting.
   b. Members report to their colleges and encourage participations and utilization of the resources of FTLC.
   c. Some members provided support for the fall teaching conference.
   d. Dr. Ellenberger, Associate Director, chaired grants subcommittee, which reviewed three cycles of FTLC grants.
   e. There was an increase in grant applications from previously underrepresented colleges following the Associate Director's presentations to those colleges.
   f. Faculty Fellow Patricia Stow Bolea chaired the Teaching Awards Subcommittee.
   g. The Teaching Awards Subcommittee offered some recommendations for changes in procedures, which the full committee discussed:
      i. Recommend no longer requiring student letters of support.

    ii.   Recommend that a clearer distinction be made between the *Outstanding Teaching Award* and the *Pew Teaching Excellence Award*; indicate that the *Outstanding Teaching Award* should be given to a faculty member who has demonstrated sustained excellence over time.

    iii.   Recommend that applicants provide summary tables and summary descriptions of their course evaluation results.

    iv.   Recommend that application portfolios be divided among subcommittee members such that each nominee is reviewed by three members.

    v.   Recommend an increase in the stipend provided with the *Outstanding Teaching Award* to several thousand dollars, to be more commensurate with the value and importance of this award.

2. Support ECS/UAS and FPPC in considering policy revisions concerning the use of student evaluations of teaching at GVSU.

    a. Create and develop more consistent evaluation tools and/or more consistent use of these evaluations across the whole University

        i.   This was the focus of most of our work this year.

        ii.   Reviewed numerous student evaluation tools (SETs) that could be used campus-wide. See Appendices 1 and 2 for committee comments and comparison table. After thorough discussion, several seem worth considering (or remain under consideration while getting additional information).

            1.   IDEA: currently being used by the GVSU College of Health Professions; questions focus on student learning; results are not easy to interpret and require some training; has been in use for 35 years; allows various comparison groups and over time; used at 340 colleges/universities; questions are not alterable, but questions can be added; both open-ended and close-ended questions; a short and long form; IDEA processes results; takes about 10 days to get results.

            2.   SIR II: administered by ETS; questions can be added and results can be compared to other institutions; some concern about the cost of implementation.

            3.   Digital Measures: flexible; large question bank from which to draw (perhaps too many choices); data is stored at Digital Measures offices; we approximated costs to be $24,000 per year. We want to meet with representative (they canceled presentation earlier this year); can they create evaluations for clinical practices?

            4.   Class Climate (Scantron): Numerous survey options (alumni, etc.), including clinical/practical settings; scans written comments (concern for anonymity?); data managed onsite by our personnel; unsure about the related costs; integrates easily with Blackboard. We want to meet with representative: want to see sample questions.

        iii.   To discuss "consistent use" of SETs at GVSU, we gathered current SETs being used from various colleges across campus. These were posted on the FTLC Blackboard site and provided the background for our discussions of commercial SETs.

1. We also concluded that there were several issues to consider when deciding on a SET.
   a. The use (and importance) of class time for students to do evaluations. Low response rates for online indicate students are less willing to complete evaluations on their own time.
   b. Ways to increase online response rates by using incentives, extra credit, or holding grades back.
   c. Can or should we send reminder emails to students who did not do evaluations?
   d. How can we make course evaluations more a part of a course? Students are more likely to complete course evaluations if they see value in them. Perhaps have (or require) midterm evaluations and allow students access to the course evaluations.
   e. How much money does GVSU spend on student evaluations currently?
   f. What do our students think about the course evaluation process?
   g. Perhaps we could require fewer evaluations; more frequent course evaluations for newer faculty, fewer for tenured and more senior faculty.
   h. How do we use the information if the response rate is low? We also need a policy on what to do if response rate is consistently low.
   i. Paper and online course evaluations seems to generate data which is not always comparable.
   j. How the evaluations are used varies greatly across campus. Will a single evaluation tool change this?

b. **Work with the Graduate Council to create and develop consistent "student evaluation" tools for graduate level courses.**
   i. Mark Luttenton, Chair of Graduate Council, did not receive this as part of his charge, but was willing to collaborate and discuss this later, as needed.

c. **Provide guidance to ECS/UAS on the value of standardizing the tools for and uses of student evaluations across all units.**
   i. See 2. iii above
   ii. Additionally, we discussed a number of issues to consider if we move to standardized too for student evaluations.
      1. Formative versus summative evaluation; how do we want to use these evaluations?
      2. Validation of questions; some extensive tools were non-validated; is that important?
      3. Paper versus online evaluations; can these be reasonably compared?
      4. Reports that can be generated; can we compare with groups both within and beyond our university?

5. Cost to the university; do we know or can we assess the costs of our current disparate course evaluation systems across campus, in order to compare with the cost of a single commercial evaluation tool?

3. **Collaborate with the Academic Standards and Policies Committee on the creation, development and recommendations of implementation for Academic Integrity policies as they apply to teaching.**
   a. Dan Vaughn, Chair of the ASPC, offered to come and talk with the FTLCAC at a later date, to discuss their work on academic integrity.

Respectfully Submitted on April 20, 2012
David E. Bair, College of Education,
Chair, FTLCAC

Criteria

	IDEA	SPTE	SIR II	IAS	TCE	SEEQ
Used /originated where	KSU 340 others C. of Health Prof. @ GVSU	Wichita S U Social Science Research Lab	ETS	U Washington Used by 61 colleges	U Arizona Can't tell if it is used outside Arizona	U of Saskatchewan Used at some other US colleges
Length of use	1975			1972		Well-established
Current? Updated?		Not since 1996				
Ease of use	Can remind non-respondents			Extremely lengthy		
Adaptable [the questions]	Can add questions Hard to gain info from individual questions	No; cannot add own questions	Can add optional questions	Customizable forms (but questions cannot be modified) Many types of forms (13) Specific forms for clinical	Forms can be modified; some common questions, unit can add other questions	Many forms of the evaluation; can be adapted.
Flexible [use in various settings]			Six categories of questions	Various formats, for labs, large lectures, etc.	Yes, can handle different types of courses (labs, clinics, etc.)	Yes, could be used in supervising clinical settings.
Sort results	Can compare groups over time	Cannot be compared with other institutions	Can be compared to peer institutions		Yes, by faculty, course, history of individual, department…	
Reports		We would have to generate our own institutional	Many reports and support materials	Various reports can be generated, comparing across		We would have to do the scoring and analysis; and

		reports		courses and instructors		generate any reports
Data interpretation (8)	Requires training to interpret	Easier to interpret than IDEA				
Paper/online	Both	Paper	Both	Both	Both	
Response rate			Online: 40%			
Nature of questions	Focus on student learning	Questions are well-validated		Majority of questions related to instructor, not learning (not overly impressed with quality of questions)		Wording of some questions unclear
Who processes/ time	IDEA; ten days	SSRL proctors and processes results		They process; 15 days plus shipping time		We would do the processing
Cost	.20-.30 /form; plus $4-7$ per class to process		.80-.90/form, plus processing fees (seemed relatively expensive)	Seemed reasonable; .10/form; .16 to process; plus report fees		Seems to be free, but apparently unsupported
Other comments	They control the process, through training and data analysis	Not sure if it can be used elsewhere Inability to add questions puts this lower on the list of choices to consider			2nd set of questions can be used for mid-term eval (through Blackboard)	

Appendix 2
Summaries of Student Evaluation Tools

IDEA
Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment
Student Ratings of Instruction System
Nonprofit since 1975, originated at Kansas State University
340 colleges & universities use form annually

Currently used by the College of Health Professions at GVSU
Features of IDEA Online
- Four delivery options for student surveys:
    - Blackboard Building Block™
    - E-mail delivery system with unique URL for each student
    - Unique course URL posted on the course web page
    - A combination of the above
- Student surveys are restricted to one submission
- Survey forms are submitted confidentially
- Only students enrolled in the course have access to the survey
- Automatic reminders can be scheduled for non-respondents
- E-mail delivery of Faculty Information Forms (FIF)
- IDEA Online allows faculty to access their FIF multiple times during the FIF administration period
- Additional questions can be added to the student survey form
- The institution can define a default survey administration period for a set of courses or unique administration period for a single course
- System provides a summary report of student open-ended comments for each course
- IDEA Online allows administrators to monitor real-time response rates

See fee schedule on BB site
Notes from the Committee
This survey tool is currently being used by the GVSU College of Health Professions. Questions focus on student learning and not specifically on the professor. The results are not easy to interpret and require some training. While you can add some questions, it is not easy to pull out information from individual questions. This offers multiple ways to get at teaching effectiveness. Has a lot of info and has been around for 35 + years. Allow classes to be compared across groups over time. It has been in use since 1975 and originated at Kansas State University. About 340 colleges and universities use the form annually and long and short versions of paper and online forms are available.
More info at *http://www.theideacenter.org/node/5*

SPTE
Student Perceptions of Teaching Effectiveness
Wichita State University Social Science Research Lab
Paper form - SSRL proctors classes and processes results

Notes from the Committee
Last updated in 1996. Not sure if it can be licensed outside of Wichita State. Uses a series of 40 well-validated questions in paper form. Not customizable or flexible; cannot add questions. Not being able to include your own questions is an issue. Questions are well done (could be adapted for our own system). Easier to interpret than the report from IDEA. A central location (department) would need to process the norm/comparison data for institutional analysis. Administered by the Wichita State University Social Science Research Lab. Need to hire proctors to implement survey evaluation. Results not compared to other institutions and we discussed who will handle norming and collection of in house data. Inability to add questions convinced us to give this a lower priority.
More info at http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=9112SSRL&p=/spte/SPTE_home/

SIR II
Student Instructional Report
Educational Testing Service
Online, paper, online class version

Notes from the Committee
Six categories of questions. Unable to see the actual questions. Can add optional questions (per instructor or department). Results can be sorted. Numbers can also be compared with peer institutions. Online, paper versions available. Online response 40%. Lots of publications and reports. Repeated email reminders. Very expensive. .80/.90 cents per student.   Additional processing & handling fees.

Online and paper versions administered by the Educational Testing Service. Questions can be added and results can be compared to other institutions. We expressed some concern about the cost of implementation.
More info at http://www.ets.org/sir_ii/about/content/.

IAS
Instructional Assessment System
University of Washington
61 colleges & universities use form annually
Online and paper
Customizable with stock formats for labs, large lectures, etc

Notes from the Committee
Lots of different kinds of forms that can be adapted. Especially helpful for faculty that are supervising in clinical settings. Charge associated with the product. Not capable of modifications. Extremely lengthy (not overly impressed with the quality of the questions). Only two questions associated with learning. Majority of questions are associated with the instructor.

Customizable survey with stock formats for labs, small and large classes etc. Cannot modify form itself but can add questions to a separate questionnaire. Some concern with survey length and focus. It may be too long with too many questions that focus more on the instructor than whether on learning in the course. Survey tool merits future discussion.
More info at http://www.washington.edu/oea/services/course_eval/about.html

SEEQ
Students' Evaluation of Educational Quality
University of Saskatchewan, but also administered at other (U.S) universities
Not a commercial product

Notes from the Committee
Lot of different kinds of forms that can be adapted. Especially helpful for faculty that are supervising clinical settings.   Used at 61 colleges/universities. Charge associated with the product. Allows for online and paper. Not capable of modifications. Extremely lengthy (not overly impressed with the quality of the questions). Only 2 questions associated with learning. Majority of questions are associated with the instructor.

An established survey tool with detailed manuals available that is free but seemingly unsupported. We would have to do the scoring and analysis (comparison to norms?) as it is not a commercial product. We had some comments on the wording of some of the questions. From the University of Saskatchewan, but also administered at other (U.S) universities.
More info at http://www.usask.ca/ip/assessment/seeq/what_is_seeq.php

TCE
Teacher-Course Evaluations
University of Arizona
Notes from the Committee
Short form (Summative Purposes) performance appraisals and Informative Purposes (development/improvement) and are currently developing a system so that faculty can add some specific questions and some custom forms and are used by some of the units.

Research supported.

Paper or online options.

Questionnaire is adaptable - some questions are common and some questions can be unit specific and units can add them. Flexibility for handling different type of courses (labs/clinics)

Not sure if it is used outside of University of Arizona.

The results can be sorted by faculty, courses, history of individual faculty over time, department. Not sure on who administers the survey and analyzes results for non U of Arizona schools.

2nd set of questions from Long form could be used as a mid-semester evaluation (even done in Blackboard).

At Arizona students can access results.

More info at http://aer.arizona.edu/aer/teaching/Guide/TCEGuide.asp