

Student Perception of Instruction Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee Report

September 17, 2009

Mason Cash

Tace Crouse

Richard Harrison II

Bernadette M.E. Jungblut

Charles Negy

Charlene A. Stinard

Dawn Trouard

Diane Wink

Ad hoc Committee

- Set up by Faculty Senate 2006
- In response to faculty requests for a new form which better reflects current practice and considers characteristics of classes

Committee Charge

- Revise Student Perception of Instruction form to put responses in context and to reflect current teaching practices of faculty
- Committee NOT charged with development of plan for on-line administration of SPol
- Committee NOT charged with determining if SPol data should or should not be collected

Committee Charge

Put the responses in Context

Ad hoc Committee Goals

Develop a tool which:

1. Helps faculty improve teaching
2. Empowers students to provide thoughtful, relevant, and useful feedback.
3. Provides information which contributes to the faculty evaluation process
4. Minimizes the impact of bias in the evaluation process
5. Provides context sensitive feedback (e.g. site, modality, level of student, required vs elective course vs GEP, student ability)
6. Clearly separates curricular from instructor based evaluation items

Ad hoc Committee Goals

Develop a tool which:

7. Clearly separates mandated components of the course (e.g. course text) from instructor based components
8. Allows students to comment on environmental and university factors (e.g. parking, room temp, function of WebCT, library, bookstore) in a section separate from evaluation of faculty
9. Ties evaluation to course objectives
10. Reflects delivery format of course (e.g. face-to-face, or web or ITV) or evaluates those courses separately
11. Allows meaningful data analysis for a variety of queries
12. Design response options specific to each item set

Ad hoc Committee

- Reviewed existing commercial and forms developed by other schools
- Developed drafts
 - Face to face and ITV
 - M mode
 - W mode
 - Faculty Perception of Instruction
- Feedback from faculty and students via the senate and student government and by open calls for feedback
- Student focus group - # students and feedback one by one on items
- Pilots with faculty and students

Form Development

- Faculty input on needed changes Fall 2006
- Requested feedback about
 - Length of form
 - Overall content
 - Specific items

University of Central Florida
Faculty Senate Student Perception of Instruction ad hoc Committee
Feedback on Goals and Additional Goals

For each of the following, rate the importance of each of the following objectives on a 1 – 5 scale with 5 being very important and 1 being unimportant.

Develop a tool which:	5	4	3	2	1	Comments
Helps faculty improve teaching	*					
Empowers students to provide thoughtful, relevant, and useful feedback.	**					
Provides information which contributes to the faculty evaluation process	*					
Minimizes the impact of bias in the evaluation process	*****					
Provides context sensitive feedback (e.g. site, modality, level of student, required vs elective course vs GEP, student ability)	**					
Clearly separates curricular from instructor-based evaluation items	*					
Clearly separates mandated components of the course (e.g. course text) from instructor-based components	*					
Allows students to comment on environmental and university factors (e.g. parking, room temp, function of WebCT, library, bookstore) in a section separate from evaluation of faculty	***					
Ties evaluation to course objectives	*					
Reflects delivery format of course (e.g. face-to-face, or web or ITV) or evaluates those courses separately	*					
Allows meaningful data analysis for a variety of queries	*					
Contains response options specific to each item set	*					

Additional Comments and suggestions (use back or go to a second page if needed):

Please return to a member of the committee or send to Latrecia Rice (Faculty Senate Office).
Please distribute in your department, school, or College to allow all faculty to offer comments and input.

Form Development Fall 2007

- Suggested items, format presented
- To all faculty
- Feedback summarized, reviewed, items altered.

Sample Feedback Fall 2007

2	Item Number	Total Votes	Comments
3	Item 1	11	1) Response options "c" and "d" are similar; may be hard to understand. 2) Move to middle or end -- why begin with a "preference"? Does that invoke an attitude? 3) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor -- it is the job of faculty (the experts on teaching) to be concerned with learning and developing web components as they see fit. It is superfluous to ask students who are not trained in teaching "what they like". Faculty should make these decisions.)
4	Item 2	12	1) Differentiate between response option b and e. 2) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor
5	Item 3	11	1) True/False vs. Agree/Disagree. 2) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor
6	Item 4	7	1) Include option "e. no choice of instructor offered" 2) Not needed because item 3 would include this factor. 3) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor. Most students take what they need for their programs and don't know about the professor, or it is a new professor, or the professor is changed in drop/add, etc. Again superfluous, (unless, perhaps a box is added that says, "N/A")
7	Item 5	9	1) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor. 2) Either change #5 to professor assigned most of texts or ask about how much of text student used as follow-up to assignments. 3) Would it be helpful to have feedback on the course materials, not just that they were used?
8	Item 6	11	1) Too vague, and unfair to instructor who doesn't choose course content; curriculum and degree program "choose " course content. 2) Curricular question; does not belong to Part I; place in Part II. 3) Does this belong in instructor section?
9	Item 7	11	If the question is meant to give a context for the student's attitude toward the instructor, what happens when the student doesn't accurately predict his/her grade? Students frequently miscalculate their final grade, so what does this question accomplish?
10	Item 8	12	1) Seems unfair and irrelevant to evaluating the instructor. 2) Spread cover insufficient range. Include 3-6 and 6-9. 3) Change response option to "c. more than 3 to 6 hours" and include option "d. more than 6 hours".

Additional Feedback 2007

- Student Government given form
- Feedback during focus session

Form Development

- Pilots with faculty and students Spring 08
 - Invited faculty who had won teaching awards to participate in pilot
 - 21 faculty participated
 - Students complete new form in addition to current SPoI in one or more classes
 - Several hundred students completed form
 - Students completed the revised SPoI as well as comments on questions
- Used feedback to revise items.

Form Development

- Requested feedback from Senate on revised items
 - April 2009
 - End of Summer 2009
 - August 2009
 - Item by item changes made as needed

Response to Feedback Spring and Summer 2009

- Item response revision
- Revised item
- Additional item

Item Response Options SPol

- **Old**

3. I had a strong desire to take this course.

- a. absolutely true
- b. mostly true
- c. I had no preference.
- d. mostly false
- e. absolutely false

- **New**

3. I had a strong desire to take this course.

- a. Strongly Agree
- b. Agree
- c. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- d. Disagreee.
- e. Strongly Disagree

Item Response Options FPol

Old

4. In general, the students showed interest in what was being taught in the course(s).
 - a) absolutely true
 - b) mostly true
 - c) mostly false
 - d) absolutely false

New

4. In general, the students showed interest in what was being taught in the course(s).
 - a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - d) Disagreee.
 - e) Strongly Disagree

Item Changes

Old

20. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to express their ideas.

New

20. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to express thoughtful or well-reasoned ideas.

Additional Question

21. The instructor provided opportunities for students to be intellectually or educationally challenged by this course.

(Rest of form renumbered accordingly)

Proposed SPol Forms

Three sections:

- Section I: Student Information Items (6)
 - *Desire to take class, take by this mode, expected grade*
- Section II: Face-to-Face and ITV Course Items OR Web items (varies)
 - Student behaviors (number of classes missed, study time, participation)
 - Logistics (parking, room)
 - Logistic for course delivery e.g. ITV site of origin
- *Sections I and II*
 - *Not used to evaluate instruction*
 - *Help put responses to other items in context.*

Proposed form

- Section III: Evaluation of Instruction Items 14/15 items plus two short answers
 - About actual course (syllabus, schedule) and faculty effectiveness (well organized, available, delivery of content, feedback, development of critical thinking)
 - Final item “Overall, this faculty member was an effective instructor.”
- Short answers
 - What did you like best about the way this faculty member taught this course?
 - What suggestions do you have for this faculty member to improve this course?

Data Analysis

NO averages suggested

Not valid for most ways they may be calculated

Output and Analyses: Overview

- **Seven sections (all available online and securely)**
 - Course/class context
 - Teaching modality, student effort expended, problems students experienced *outside* instructor's control
 - Instructor's ratings
 - Instructor's ratings compared to department and college
 - Instructor's ratings controlling for class context
 - Instructor's ratings controlling for teaching modality
 - Students' comments
- **Raw data also available to instructor (in machine-readable format)**

Output Section 1: Course/Class Context

1. In general, I prefer taking courses that are:
2. Which of the following is the most important reason you took this course?
3. I had a strong desire to take this course.
4. I had a strong desire to take a course with this instructor.
5. I used most of the required course materials (for example texts, articles, online resources, art supplies, computer programs, etc.).
6. The final grade I anticipate for this class is:

- **Bar graphs showing:**

- Total number of students in course/section (possible response rate)
- Total number of students responding to each question (actual response rate per item)
- Total number of missing responses for each question (missing responses per item)
- Headcounts for each response option
- Percentages for each response option

Output Section 2: Teaching Modality, Student Effort Expended, Problems Outside Instructor's Control

- F1. I spent ___ hours per week outside of class on this course.
- F2. I missed class ___ times this semester.
- F3. I was late to class or left early ___ times this semester.
- F4. Did this class have online assignments (for example, web readings, web modules, online discussions, etc.)?
- F5. I completed the online assignments.
- F6. Webcourses technical problems were minimal and did NOT impact my ability to complete assignments.
- F7. Parking on campus made it difficult for me to get to class on time.
- F8. The classroom was comfortable for learning: the temperature, sound, desks/chairs, and lighting were fine.

- **Bar graphs showing:**

- Total number of students in course/section (possible response rate)
- Total number of students responding to each question (actual response rate per item)
- Total number of missing responses for each question (missing responses per item)
- Headcounts for each response option
- Percentages for each response option

Output Section 3: Instructor's Ratings

7. The instructor provided a syllabus.
8. The instructor provided information about how grades are determined.
9. The instructor provided a course schedule.
10. The required course materials (for example, texts, articles, online resources, art supplies, computer programs, etc.) helped me learn the course content.
11. The assignments helped me learn the course content.
12. The instructor was available to assist me at prearranged times outside of class either online or in person.
13. The instructor was well organized.
14. The instructor displayed enthusiasm for teaching this class.
15. The instructor communicated the importance and significance of the subject matter.
16. The instructor communicated ideas and/or information clearly.
17. On average, I received feedback on the class assignments from the instructor.
18. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to ask questions.
19. The instructor answered student questions.
20. The instructor created an environment that encouraged students to express thoughtful or well-reasoned ideas.
21. The instructor provided opportunities for students to be intellectually or educationally challenged by this course.
22. Overall, this faculty member was an effective instructor.

- **Bar graphs showing:**

- Total number of students in course (possible response rate)
- Total number of students responding to each question (actual response rate per item)
- Total number of missing responses for each question (missing responses per item)
- Headcounts for each response option
- Percentages for each response option

Output Section 4:

Instructor's Ratings Compared to Department and College

Bar Graphs for Questions 7, 8, & 9:

- **Instructor's** Headcounts and Percentages of "Yes" and "No" responses
- **Department's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of "Yes" and "No" responses
- **College's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of "Yes" and "No" responses
- By course level: undergraduate or graduate

Bar Graphs for Question 10:

- **Instructor's** Headcounts and Percentages of "Strongly Agree", "Agree," "Neither Agree nor Disagree," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree" responses
- **Department's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- **College's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- By course level: undergraduate or graduate

Bar Graph for Question 17 (time until feedback received):

- **Instructor's** Headcounts and Percentages of "within one week," "within two weeks," "within three weeks," "by the end of the semester" responses
- **Department's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- **College's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- By course level: undergraduate or graduate

Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16, 18-22:

- **Instructor's** Headcounts and Percentages of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" (shown separately or combined)
- **Department's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- **College's** Total Headcounts and Percentages of these responses
- By course level: undergraduate or graduate

Output Section 5:

Instructor's Ratings Controlling for Class Context

- **Students' Most Preferred Teaching Modality**
 - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
 - Headcounts and Percentages of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses (shown separately or combined)
 - For students for whom the teaching modality of this course/section was their most preferred (e.g., F@F, Web-based, Web-mediated, etc.)
- **Students' Most Important Reason for Taking This Course**
 - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
 - Headcounts and Percentages of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses (shown separately or combined)
 - For students whose most important reason for taking this course included because they “wanted to”
- **Students Who Had a Strong Desire to Take This Course**
 - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
 - Headcounts and Percentages of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses (shown separately or combined)
 - For students who “Strongly Agreed” or “Agreed” they had a strong desire to take this course
- **Students Who Had a Strong Desire to Take a Course with This Instructor**
 - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
 - Headcounts and Percentages of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses (shown separately or combined)
 - For students who “Strongly Agreed” or “Agreed” they had a strong desire to take a course with this instructor
- **Students Who Used the Required Course Materials**
 - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
 - Headcounts and Percentages of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses (shown separately or combined)
 - For students who “Strongly Agreed” or “Agreed” they had used most of the required course materials
- **Students' Expected Grades**
 - Bar Graphs for Questions 11-16 and 18-22
 - Headcounts and Percentages of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses (shown separately or combined)
 - Broken down by all grade options (As, Bs, Cs, Ds, F, P, S, U, Other)

Output Section 6:

Instructor's Ratings Controlling for Teaching Modality

- **Face-To-Face/ITV Courses:**
 - For Questions 11-16 and 18-22
 - Correlations between students' responses on **effort expended-type questions** and "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Neither Agree nor Disagree," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree" responses
 - Correlations between students' responses on **problems outside of instructor's control-type questions** and "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Neither Agree nor Disagree," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree" responses
- **Web-Based Courses:**
 - Same as above
- **Web-Mediated Courses:**
 - Same as above
- **Instruments Specific to Other Teaching Modalities Could Be Added:**
 - As requested by faculty, departments, colleges
 - As determined by Faculty Relations and Faculty Senate

Output Section 7: Students' Comments

23. What did you like best about the way this faculty member taught this course?

24. What suggestions do you have for this faculty member to improve this course?

Questions??