Student Feedback Survey Working Group
Final Report

Executive Summary

The Student Feedback Working Group (SFWG) was formed in 2015 to address suggestions made by the SETE Evaluation Committee. A set of 10 questions to be used on the University-wide Student Feedback Survey (SFS) (student evaluations) were developed by gathering input from faculty, administrators and students. The questions are ready to be pilot tested University-wide in the spring of 2017. Questions were designed to meet ABOR guidelines as one measure of teaching effectiveness.

The SFSWG was charged by the Provost with eight tasks: 1) Gather and use background information and data from previous committees working on end-of-term student opinion survey. 2) Provide comprehensive communication to all the stakeholders on the work of the committee. 3) Draft guidance to appropriate faculty committees (e.g., promotion and tenure committee) and administrators regarding how end-of-term student opinion survey data are to be used. 4) Develop university guidelines for incentives offered to students to improve response rates. 5) Work with the Faculty Senate Council on Learning, and the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee to avoid duplication of efforts. 6) Identify a questionnaire that will be used for the end-of-term student opinion survey for all classes being evaluated. 7) Make transparent to faculty and administration the process by which the instrument was identified, and tested and will be used, and 8) Draft a warning to be included in the survey reports on how the results should be used.

The SFSWG reaffirms previous recommendations that the **Student Feedback Survey report scores and comments should be only one of multiple measures of teaching effectiveness**. The SFSWG made the following recommendations:

1) Implement ten questions for the campus-wide pilot electronic SFS in the Spring of 2017 (See Appendix A for questions).
2) Conduct a formative assessment on the questions and responses after reports are completed.
3) Included on the SFS report the statement drafted as guidance for the use of the responses.
4) Provide instructions on the use of the SFS reports to College Faculty Status Committee (FSC) and the Chairs Council in the fall of 2017.
5) Continue to increase response rates by; the use of small incentives determined at the unit level, instructors communicating the value of the SFS to students, and offering University-wide incentive through the Provost's Office.

The appended report explicates the process, outcomes and recommendations of the SFSWG in more detail.

Background

In 2012, then Provost Liz Grobsmith charged a Task Force on Evaluation of Teaching to explore current NAU practices in the evaluation of teaching and best practices in other institutions and to make recommendations for Northern Arizona University. The Task Force determined that at its core, the evaluation of teaching is conducted to ensure a *positive and productive learning experience for our students*, while helping to *develop the effectiveness of those who teach*. To establish a teaching evaluation system that preserves this perspective, the Task Force recommends a framework that invites units to explore reasonable means of gathering relevant data from multiple sources for effective evaluations. To this end, the Task Force recommended the use of a brief questionnaire and the adoption of the Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness SETE questionnaire and the SmarterSurvey electronic delivery system. See the Task Force Recommendations for further details.

The SETE system was pilot tested with five departments in the spring of 2013 and University-wide trial was conducted in the fall of 2013 and spring of 2014. At the conclusion of the trial, then Provost Laura Huenneke convened a committee to evaluate the SETE instrument and the SmarterSurvey delivery system in alignment with the 2012 Task Force recommendations. The committee determined that system should be managed by the Provost's Office. However, there was a strong dislike for the SETE questions and a lack of confidence in the reliability and validity of the instrument. A committee should be formed to address the problems with the SETE questionnaire. See the SETE Evaluation Report.

In response, the Student Feedback Survey Working Group (SFSWG) was formed in the spring of 2015 with the primary focus to improve the University-wide student feedback survey questions. The SFSWG met on a weekly basis during the summer and fall of 2015 and monthly during the spring of 2016 to address recommendations made by the SETE Committee. The SFSWG members include:

Shadow Armfield, (2015)
Wanda Costen
Denise Helm, Chair
Steve Palmer
Susan Smiley
Galen Collins
Bruce Fox
Robert Horn
Michael Rulon (2015-2016)
Lawrence Katon, student

Process, Outcomes and Recommendations
This report describes the work that resulted from the Student Feedback Survey Working Group (SFSWG) and includes recommendations and best practices for the use of the Student Feedback Survey (SFS) report scores and comments. The below narrative is organized with the 2015 committee recommendations that became the charge or tasks of the SFSWG (*in italics*), with the SFSWG process, outcomes and recommendations related to each recommendation made by the SETE Evaluation Committee below. The process and outcomes, which are not typically a part of a report of this type, are included because the Evaluation Committee recommended transparency of the process. Included is Appendix A, SFSWG Process, Outcomes and Recommendations Summary and Appendix B, Best Practices for Student Feedback Surveys at NAU that can be used by faculty, chairs, FSC and annual review committees.

Task #1: Gather, understand and use background information and data from formal committees such as the 2008 Faculty Evaluation Task Force and the 2014 SETE Evaluation Committee as well as informal groups like the University College and the Faculty Fellows.

Student Feedback Survey Working Group

- **Process:** The following process was used to avoid duplication of efforts of the Task Force and the SETE Evaluation Committee. Prior to the initial meeting the SFSWG read the Task Force and Evaluation Committee reports along with the Provost's Response and initial literature on end-of-term course evaluations. The first working group session consisted of a presentation by Associate Provost Dan Kain about the purpose of the SFSWG and previous efforts, as well as discussion and clarification of the previous work. During subsequent discussions the SFSWG chair reminded members of the previous work when discussion would become redundant. Also in an attempt to avoid duplication of efforts, representatives from UC and Faculty Fellows were interviewed to better understand their role in the studying teaching effectiveness at NAU. A Faculty Senate Council on Learning member served on the SFSWG.
- **Outcomes:** The SFSWG found that UC and Faculty Fellows work was not overlapping with the charge of the SFSWG but instead they were exploring additional measures of teaching effectiveness that could be used as a part of faculty members' teaching evaluation. The SFSWG continued working on their charge.
- **Recommendations:** No recommendation needed

Task #2: Provide comprehensive communication regarding the activities of the committee to all the stakeholders to ensure a transparent process. We will ask that a communication plan be drafted as the first order of business.

Student Feedback Survey Working Group

- **Process:** To facilitate communication and to ensure a transparent process, members of the SFSWG members were intentionally selected from each of the stakeholder groups (Deans, faculty, students…) to facilitate communication. Members were encouraged to engage their peers and students in conversations

about the Student Feedback Survey. Additionally, a strategic communication plan was developed, a communication toolkit, after examining the literature on best practices in strategic communication.

- **Outcomes:** The strategic communication plan included the identification of the stakeholders who were engaged in communication**.** The stakeholders and method of communication were as follows: the **Provost** by including Associate Provost Dan Kain in email communication and meeting agendas and minutes; the **Deans** through presentations at PALC and email message when updates were needed; **Students** through presentation to ASNAU and GSG; the **Chairs** through presentation to ACC and email message to the ACC chair; **Associate Deans** through presentation at ACADA and emails to the members; and **Faculty** through presentations to the Executive Committee and the full Senate, and email messages. Email messages were sent to the stakeholders at the start of each semester regarding the progress of the SFSWG. SFSWG's communications sent on an as needed basis (e.g., on the question categories and the questions). Members also gathered input from the respective stakeholders through *hallway conversations* to determine the desire for more/less information from the SFSWG. Stakeholder groups were sent surveys on the categories and questions for the Student Feedback Survey (SFS).
- **Recommendations:** The SFSWG recommends that a strategic communications plan should be used by future working groups

Task #3: Draft explicit guidance to appropriate faculty committees (e.g. promotion and tenure committee) and administrators regarding how data are to be used.

Student Feedback Survey Working Group

- **Process:** To develop guidance for faculty committees and administrators regarding the use of the data collected through the SFS the SFSWG reviewed the literature on best practices. The members discussed the role that the SFS plays in the evaluation of faculty.
- **Outcomes:** The SFSWG drafted a statement to be included on the SFS reports as guidance for committees and administrators. The SFSWG Drafted a Best Practices document for the use by committees. See Appendix C.
- **Recommendations:**
  1. The SFSWG recommends the following statement be included on all Student Feedback Survey reports as guidance for the faculty committees and administrators. "This survey is based on students' opinion of the instructors' performance. Results are not intended to be used as a single measure of teaching effectiveness but should be used in conjunction with other proven indicators of teaching effectiveness."
  2. The SFSWG or a Provost representative should meet with the College FSC and Chair Council in the fall of 2017 to provide instructions on the use of the SFS scores.
     - A composite score is not a valid measure (mean of the mean) and should not be used to evaluate an instructor
     - That course design is not the same as instruction; in some cases, the instructor has no control over course or syllabus design so scores from

these questions should not be used to evaluate instructors who do not design the materials.
- The Tool Box will include use of the evaluation scores.

Task #4: Develop university guidelines for incentives offered to students to improve response rates. Concurrently, disseminate information on best practices for faculty actions that enhance response rates.

Student Feedback Survey Working Group

- **Process:** To establish guidelines on incentives offered to students to improve response rates the SFSWG reviewed the literature on the role of incentives in increasing response rates on end-of-term course evaluations.
- **Outcomes:** The SFSWG determined that even small incentives could increase response rates. Additionally, the length of the questionnaire, regular reminders to complete the survey and faculty members' explanation of the purpose of the evaluation had a strong influence on response rates. There was disagreement between members about offering grade incentives. The SFSWG preferred strategies such as group incentives; for example, if 90% of the class completes the SFS the instructor brings doughnuts to class. Information on improving response rates was shared with faculty at presentation.
- **Recommendations:** The SFSWG made three recommendations related to the use of incentives to increase response rates.
  1) Guidelines for small incentives should be determined at the unit level. No more than 1% of the total course points should be offered as an extra credit incentive.
  2) Instructors are encouraged to communicate the value of the SFS, explain and provide examples of how students' feedback has been used in the recent past to improve the course.
  3) A University-wide incentive should continue to be offered through the Provost's Office.
  4) Instructors are not to hold grades hostage for non-response.

Task #5: Work closely with the Faculty Senate Council on Learning, and the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities to communicate progress and share resources making sure to avoid duplication.

Student Feedback Survey Working Group

- **Process:** To share resources and to avoid duplication of efforts between the Faculty Senate Council on Learning and the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee the SFSWG identified the relationship between the groups. The Council on Learning Chair was a member of SFSWG to facilitate communications and avoid redundancies. The Faculty Senate President also served on the SFSWG.
- **Outcomes:** After interviewing the chair of Rights and Responsibilities, it was determined that the work of the SFSWG would not overlap with their efforts.
- **Recommendations:** No recommendation needed.

Task #6: Identify a questionnaire that will be used for the end-of-term student opinion survey for all classes being evaluated. a) if a ***commercial product*** *is selected, the committee is responsible for gathering the validity and reliability of the instrument as well as psychometric information. The committee will also determine how the instrument will be incorporated with the current delivery system and assess and address conflicts in copyright or proprietary use. b) if* ***the committee determines it is best to develop an instrument****, the committee is responsible for testing validity and reliability and documenting the psychometric information. The committee will also determine how the instrument will integrate with the current delivery system and explore opportunities for copyright.*

Student Feedback Survey Working Group Process: To identify the questions that were valid and reliable, the SFSWG engaged in a multi-step process. The SFSWG was guided by various references on questionnaire creation and validation, e.g., *Tips for developing and testing questionnaires/instruments,* from the Journal of Extension (www.joe.org) and *Survey Fundamentals: A guide to designing and implementing surveys,* from the Office of Quality Improvement at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (www.quality.wisc.edu). As recommended, the SFSWG identified the purpose of the student evaluation (as noted above, teaching effectiveness) and the target audience (NAU students). The second step was the conceptualization of the questionnaire, where the SFSWG members reviewed the literature on end-of-term student opinion surveys as well as examined the literature on best practices teaching to identify potential of teaching effectiveness. The SFSWG determined that due to NAU's unique context a commercial product did not offer the flexibility that would gather the best information from a SFS. The members committed to drafting a SFS that took into consideration such things as multiple modes of class delivery and the vast array of class length. As a starting point in developing a homegrown survey, the SFSWG explored what teaching effectiveness meant. Drawing from Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education, (Chickering & Gamson, 1987) SFSWG identified potential categories for the SFS as one of the initial steps in establishing validity (through expert input and field-testing). Good practice in teaching is reflected when an instructor: Encourages contact between students and faculty (student engagement), Develops reciprocity and cooperation among students (engagement); Encourages active learning (student engagement); Gives prompt feedback (instructor effectiveness and test, assignments and grading criteria); Emphasizes time on task (student engagement and test assignments and grading criteria); Communicates high expectations (learning outcomes); and Respects diverse talents and ways of learning (instructor effectiveness). These principles were used as indicators of teaching effectiveness and became potential categories for the SFS.

A questionnaire was developed and sent to students and faculty to test categories to be included on the SFS. The initial questionnaire, which was designed as a pilot test for a University-wide questionnaire, received 64 responses from faculty and students (40 students, 24 faculty). Analysis of the response data indicated that a University-wide survey was not necessary. For example, 83% of the participants agreed or strongly

agreed that responses to questions about instructor effectiveness would provide meaningful feedback for faculty. See Table 1 in the section for the responses for each category. Once the categories were identified by students and faculty, the SFSWG gathered and reviewed instruments from numerous institutions, for example, Stanford, BYU, Ohio State University, University of Utah, University of Michigan as well as commercial products available for purchase such as IDEA, or Scantron.

Faculty and Student Survey Results on Category Survey

The following **category** would provide meaning feedback for instructors.

Category	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Learning outcomes	20%	49%	27%	4%
Organization	34%	46%	18%	2%
Instructor Effectiveness	44%	39%	14%	3%
Test, Assignments and Grading Criteria	36%	42%	20%	2%
Student Engagement	30%	50%	14%	3%

Table 1 *n* = 64 (faculty = 24, students = 40)

Next, a questionnaire was developed, pilot tested and sent to all faculty and students to identify questions that were guided by the literature and other existing student surveys for each category to be included in the SFS. Response rates to this questionnaire were faculty 25% (*n* = 229) and 0% students. See Table 2 for results. The SFSWG decided not to send another survey to students because the 16 week SFS was open and there was concern that survey fatigue could have a negative impact on response rates of the SFS. See Appendix A for the questions that were selected to be included of the 2015 pilot test.

Responses from this survey were used to develop ten questions to be pilot tested during the summer of 2016. Questions that were redundant or in the wrong category were moved or deleted. A survey was sent to the summer instructors to determine if they thought the students' responses to the ten questions provided meaningful feedback. Of those who responded, 70% or more either agreed or strongly agreed that each of the questions provided meaningful feedback. One respondent marked strongly disagreed on all questions because he/she did not think we should have a SFS. This served as the initial establishment of the instruments reliability, with subsequent review of item response feedback to be completed after the spring 2017 pilot testing for comparison of meaningful feedback. See Table 3 below for actual scores.

- **Recommendations**:
  1) After reviewing faculty and student input, the SFSWG recommends the following SFS categories: a) Learning outcomes, b) Organization, c) Instructor

Effectiveness d) Test, Assignments and Grading criteria, and e) Student engagement.

2) The SFSWG agreed to implement the ten questions in the spring of 2017, after the pilot test and reviewing the instructors' survey responses.
3) A formative assessment should be conducted on the questions after reports are completed in the spring of 2017. Of special attention should be responses to the question on respect. This question should be analyzed in relationship to the instructors, race/ethnicity and gender. Additional sampling of instructor (and student) feedback is recommended to further establish the reliability of the student feedback survey.
4) The SFSWG understands that developing a valid and reliable instrument is an iterative process and the questions may need minor adjustments. Future work on the SFS instrument should be the responsibility of the Faculty Senate Council on Learning.

Questions with the Highest Faculty Response

The **question** will provide the instructor with useful feedback.

Category and Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES				
Course requirements were stated clearly in the syllabus.	59% (134)	33% (76)	6% (14)	2% (5)
Course assignments contributed to the student learning outcomes.	41% (95)	43% (99)	10% (24)	4.8% (11)
ORGANZATION				
The course was organized in a way that helped me learn.	41% (91)	45% (100)	8.6% (19)	5% (11)
The course was well-organized.	37% (81)	43% (94)	15% (34)	5% (12)
INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS				
The instructor provides constructive feedback on assignments.	54% (120)	39% (87)	5% (10)	2% (4)
The instructor communicates the subject matter clearly.	52% (114)	38% (84)	8% (17)	3% (6)
The instructor answers questions and concerns in a timely manner.	51% (113)	42% (93)	4% (8)	3% (7)
The instructor shows respect for students	40% (89)	43% (94)	9% (20)	8% (18)
TEST, ASSSIGNMENTS AND GRADING CRITERIA				
The assignments helped me understand the subject more clearly.	51% (111)	41% (89)	6% (14)	2% (5)
The grading criteria for each assignment were clear.	38% (83)	50% (110)	9% (19)	3% (7)
STUDENT ENGAGEMENT				
The assignment that most contributed to my learning was...	49% (107)	40% (87)	9% (20)	1% (3)
What did you like best about this course...	48% (104)	9% (86)	9% (20)	4% (8)
What suggestions to do you have to improve this course...	41% (90)	45% (98)	8% (18)	5% (11)

Table 2 *n = 229 *Not all respondents answered all questions.

Task #7: Make transparent to faculty and administration the process by which the instrument was identified, and tested and will be used.

Student Feedback Survey Working Group

- **Process:** The SFSWG's goal is to remain transparent in the creation of a student feedback survey.
- **Outcomes:** The SFSWG made presentations in the fall of 2016 to the student government groups, PALC, Chairs Council, the Associated Deans and Faculty Senate after the pilot and focus groups are conducted. In the fall of 2016, the SFSWG members met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Faculty Senate, PALC, ACADA, and ACC, to describe the process by which the questions were identified.
- **Recommendations:** The SFSWG should meet with the College FSC in the fall of 2017 to describe best practices in the use of the SFS scores for evaluating faculty.

Instructors Feedback on 10 Pilot Questions Summer 2016

Responses to the following question provided me, as instructor, meaningful feedback?

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Course requirements were stated clearly in the syllabus.	33% (29)	52% (45)	10% (9)	5% (4)
The course was organized in a way that helped me learn.	29% (25)	45% (39)	22% (19)	5% (4)
The instructor provides constructive feedback on assignments.	36% (31)	50% (43)	13% (11)	2% (2)
The assignments helped me understand the subject more clearly.	31% (27)	54% (47)	14% (12)	1% (1)
The assignment that most contributed to my learning was...	41% (36)	45% (39	10% (9)	3% (3)
The grading criteria for each assignment were clear.	31% (27)	55% (48)	13% (11)	1% (1)
The instructor answers questions and concerns in a timely manner.	41% (36)	45% (39)	13% (11)	1% (1)
The instructor shows respect for students.	38% (33)	40% (45)	17% (15)	5% (4)
What suggestions do you have to improve this course..."	32% (28)	47% (13)	16% (14)	5% (4)
What did you like best about this course..."	35% (30)	47% (41)	15% (13)	4% (3)

Table 3 *n=87 complete

Task #8: Draft a warning to be included in the survey reports on how the results should be used.

Student Feedback Survey Working Group

- **Process:** The SFSWG discussed the role that the SFS should play in the faculty evaluation process.

- **Outcomes:** The SFSWG drafted the below recommendation.
- **Recommendation:** In support of the 2012 Task Force Recommendation that the SFS report scores and comments should be only one of multiple measures of teaching, the SFSWG recommends that caution should be used when automatically reporting student opinion survey scores. Reports of student opinion survey scores should contain warnings regarding proper and improper use.

As our work comes to an end, the SFSWG would like to thank the Provost for the opportunity we had to provide input into the Student Feedback Survey instrument and its use. We recognize that this is important work that has potential to have a great impact on teaching and learning at NAU. We are grateful for the support and guidance that Associate Provost Dan Kain provided through this process.

Appendix A: The Ten Questions Recommended for Campus-wide Implementation

1. Course requirements were stated clearly in the syllabus.
2. The course was organized in a way that helped me learn.
3. The instructor provides constructive feedback on assignments.
4. The assignments helped me understand the subject more clearly.
5. The grading criteria for each assignment were clear.
6. The instructor answers questions and concerns in a timely manner.
7. The instructor shows respect for students.
8. The assignment that most contributed to my learning was... (open ended with textbox for comments)
9. What suggestions do you have to improve this course...” (open ended with textbox for comments)
10. What did you like best about this course..." (open ended with textbox for comments)

Appendix B: Student Feedback Survey Working Group Process, Outcomes and Recommendations: Summary

Task*	Process	Outcomes	Recommendations
Gather background information to avoid duplication of efforts	• Review documents from SETE Committee and Task Force • Added members from UC and Faculty Fellows interviewed • Added Faculty Senate Council on Learning member to SFSWG	No overlap found	None needed
Provide comprehensive communication of committee activities **Draft a communication plan as first order of business**	• Intentional selection of members from each of the stakeholder group • Members encouraged to engaged peers and students in discussions about SFS	• A strategic communication plan was developed using a communication toolkit • Regular presentations to the Provost, Deans, Students Chairs, Associate Deans Faculty • Consistent email messages to stakeholders • Gathered input from stakeholders through *hallway conversations* to determine the desire for more/less information from the SFSWG. • Stakeholder groups were sent surveys on categories and questions for Student Feedback Survey (SFS).	A strategic communication plan should be used by future working groups
Draft explicit guidance to appropriate faculty committees and administrators on to how data will be used	• Reviewed the literature on best practices • Discussed the role that the SFS plays in the evaluation of faculty	Drafted statement to be included on SFS reports as guidance for committees and administrators	This statement should be included on the SFS reports. "This survey is based on students' opinion of the instructors' performance. Results are not intended to be used as a single measure of but should be used in conjunction with other proven indicators of teaching effectiveness." The SFSWG should meet with the College FSCs and Chairs Council in the fall of 2017 to provide instructions on the use of the SFS scores including: • A composite score is not a valid

			measure (mean of the mean) and should not be used to evaluate an instructor • In some cases, the instructor has no control over course or syllabus design so scores from these questions should not be used to evaluate instructors who do not design the materials • The Council on Learning's Tool Box will includes how to use score
Develop university guidelines for incentives to students to improve response rates. **Disseminate best practices to faculty to enhance response rates.**	Reviewed the literature on the role of incentive in increasing response rates on end-of-term course evaluations.	The following impact response rates: • Small incentives. • length of the questionnaire, • regular reminders to complete the survey and faculty members' • explanation of the purpose of the evaluation • Information on response rates was shared with faculty at presentations • Strategies such as group incentives for completion of SFS were preferred	• Guidelines for small incentives should be determined at the unit level. No more than 1% for total course grade should be offered. • Instructors are encouraged to communicate the value of the SFS, explain and provide examples of how students feedback has been used in the recent past to improve the course. • A University-wide incentive should continue to be offered through the Provost's Office. • Instructors are not to use the evaluation as a part of students' grade or hold grades hostage for non-response
Work with the Faculty Senate Council on Learning, and the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities	• Identified the relationship between the groups • Council on Learning chair was a • Interviewed chair of Rights and Responsibilities • Faculty Senate President served on SFSWG	Determined that the work of the SFSWG would not overlap Rights and Responsibility	No recommendations needed

Create a questionnaire tested for validity and reliability and document testing, integrate with the current delivery system	• Identified and test 5 categories for questions • Identified 10 questions • Field tested 10 questions • Pilot tested 10 questions	5 categories and 10 questions were accepted for inclusion in the spring 2017 SFS	A formative assessment should be conducted spring of 2017 with attention to the question on respect The SFS instrument should become the responsibility of the Faculty Senate Council on Learning
Make identifying and testing instrument (questions) process transparent	Communication plan developed	Presentations to student government, PALC, Chairs Council, the Associated Deans and Faculty Senate at key point in the process	FSFWG should meet with the College FSC in the fall of 2017 to describe best practices in the use of the SFS scores for evaluating faculty
Provide a warning on report use	The SFSWG discussed the role of SFS in the evaluation process	Drafted best recommendations and best practices guides	• SFS report scores and comments only one of multiple measures of teaching • Caution should be used when automatically reporting student opinion survey scores. • Reports of student opinion survey scores should contain warnings regarding proper and improper use.

*Tasks are based on the Working Groups charge and the recommendation of the SETE Evaluations Committee

Appendix C: Best Practice in Student Feedback Survey for NAU

The appendix is designed to be a guide for Dean, Chairs, FSC and Annual Review Committee members in the use of the Student Feedback Survey (SFS) report scores and comments.

Use of Report Scores

- Caution should be used when automatically reporting student opinion survey scores.
- SFS report scores and comments should be used as **one** of multiple measures of effective instruction.
- A composite score is not a valid measure (mean of the mean) and should not be used to evaluate an instructor.
- Possibly consider the mode for items, as an item mean is easily skewed by even one extreme low or high score.
- In some cases, an instructor has no control over course or syllabus design so scores from these questions should not be used to evaluate instructors who do not design the materials. The Council on Learning's Tool Box will include recommendations how to use score. The toolbox includes extensive bibliographies and examples of best practices which was beyond the scope of the SFSWG.

Increasing Response Rates

- Offer small incentive, see Guidelines for Incentives Below.
- Instructors are encouraged to communicate the value of the SFS, explain and provide examples of how students' feedback has been used in the recent past to improve the course.
- A University-wide incentive should continue to be offered through the Provost's Office.
- Deliver as brief survey, ten questions or less, that can be completed quickly by students.
- Provide student email reminders.
    - Twice, one when the survey opens and one 48 hours before is closes
    - Explain the new questions are easy to respond to and should take less than 10 minutes
    - Include a note that if the question does not apply do not answer
- Provide faculty email reminders.
    - Include a reminder to encourage students to complete the evaluation and a concrete description of how they have used it to improve their course

Guidelines of Incentives

- Guidelines for small incentives should be determined at the unit level.
- Instructors are not to use the evaluation as a part of students' grade, other than a few points as incentive, or hold grades hostage for non-response.

References

Ballantyne, C. (2003). Online evaluations of teaching: An examination of current practice and considerations for the future, p 103-112 In D. Lynn Sorenson and Trav D. Johnson (ed.) Online Student Ratings of Instruction. New Directions for Teaching and Learning 96.

Barr, R.B., Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. Change. 13-25.

Berrett, W. (2015). Can the student course evaluation be redeemed? Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieve from: http://chronicle.com/article/Can-the-Student-Course/234369

Bennetta, L., Nairb C.S. (2010). A recipe for effective participation rates for web-based surveys *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. 35,4;pp357–365.

Berk, R. A. (2012). Top 20 strategies to increase the online response rates of student rating scales. *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning, 8*(2)*,* 98-107*.*

Bernhard, M. (2015). Everyone complains about evaluations. A Nobel laureate offers an alternative. Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved from: http://chronicle.com/article/Everyone-Complains-About/230885/?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en

Chickering, A.W. Gamson Z.F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. Washington Center News.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. (2015). Student evaluations: Feared, loathed, and not going anywhere. Retrieved from: https://chroniclevitae.com/news/1011-student-evaluations-feared-loathed-and-not-going-anywhere

Collings, D. Ballantyne, C. S. (2004). Online student survey comments: A qualitative improvement? Paper presented at the 2004 Evaluation Forum. Retrieved from: http://www.tlc.murdoch.edu.au/pubs/docs/Eval_forum_paper.pdf

Dommeyer, C.J., Baum, P., Chapman, K.S., Hanna, R.W. (2003). An experimental investigation of student response rates to faculty evaluations: The effect of the online method and online treatments." Paper presented at Decision Sciences Institute. Washington, DC. pp 22-25.

Huston, T. (2050) Seattle University Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning. Research Report: Race and Gender Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching. Retrieved from:

http://sun.skidmore.union.edu/sunNET/ResourceFiles/Huston_Race_Gender_Teaching Evals.pdf

Johnson, T.D. (2003). Online student ratings: Will students respond?" In D. Lynn Sorenson and Trav D. Johnson (ed.) Online Student Ratings of Instruction. New Directions for Teaching and Learning 96.

Johnson, T.D. (2003). (Ed) Online student ratings of instruction. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 96, Winter 2003, Jossey-Bass

Koon, J., Murray, H.G. (1995). Using multiple outcomes to validate student ratings of overall teacher effectiveness. Journal of Higher Education, 66 (1), 61-81.

Marsh, H.W., Roche, L.A. (1997). Making students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective. American Psychologist, 52 (11), 1187-1197.

McKeachie, W.J., Kaplan, M. (1996). Persistent problems in evaluating college teaching. AAHE Bulletin, pp. 5-8.

Richardson J.T.E. (2005). Instruments for obtaining student feedback: a review of the literature. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education.30,4;pp.387–415.

Sorenson, D. L., Johnson, T. D. (Eds.). (2003). Online student ratings of instruction. New Directions for Teaching and Learning (Vol. 96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sorenson, D. L., Reiner, C. (2003). Charting the uncharted seas of online student ratings of instruction. In D. L. Sorenson & T. D. Johnson (Eds.), Online student ratings of instruction. New Directions for Teaching and Learning (Vol. 96, pp. 1-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

University of Michigan, Center for Research on Teaching and Learning. (N.D.). Frequently asked questions about student ratings: Summary of research findings. http://www.crlt.umich.edu/tstrategies/studentratingfaq

Witt, J., Burdalski, D. (2003). Regarding the timing of student course/instructor. Evaluations. Journal of the Academy of Business Education. Retrieved from: http://www.abe.villanova.edu/proc2003/witt.p