

Summary: Student Evaluation of Teaching Survey Results Presented by R. Miksicek, UCUE Chair

During February 2018, UCUE surveyed its members and selected stakeholders about Student Evaluation of Teaching. The survey population was small (26 teaching faculty who are members of UCUE or other standing committees) and therefore not necessarily representative, but the survey could be more widely administered. Key results of the survey are summarized below:

For most questions, the response options were: “Essential”, “Highly Desirable”, “Desirable”, and “Unnecessary or Undesirable”

- Most respondents preferred the ability to use a bank of vetted questions provided by the platform’s vendor, with the option to incorporate SIRS (or SOCT) questions; but continuing to use our current SIRS questions was not considered “essential”.
- The ability of instructors to customize question sets by adding, omitting, or revising questions was considered either “essential” or “highly desirable”.
- The ability to compare survey results from MSU with other institutions was generally considered “unnecessary” or only “desirable”; however, there was one comment that it might be useful for an instructor to have the ability to compare their individual survey results with similar courses across campus
- Likert-type questions with scalable response options were preferred, but most respondents felt that open-ended questions inviting comments and suggestions were an “essential” part of any survey platform.
- ADA-compliance of the survey platform and survey instruments, as well anonymity of survey results were both considered to be “essential” features.
- Ability of instructors to individually set up and configure course surveys was either “essential” or “highly desirable”
- Ability to integrate course and teaching surveys into a course management system such as D2L was considered “desirable”, but not necessarily essential
- Ability to administer midterm surveys to collect mid-semester feedback was considered either “essential” or “desirable”; however, concerns were expressed about making sure to separate out mid-semester feedback from end-of-semester summative evaluations so that they are not used for RPT decisions; one respondent suggested trying to implement a mechanism so that mid-semester feedback, and faculty responses to student suggestions, could be shared among students in the class
- Other features that were considered either essential or desirable include:
 - Customizable start and end dates for survey completion
 - Email notifications, alerts or reminders
 - Ability to collect peer evaluation from other students, especially for team-based, flipped, or laboratory courses
 - Robust reporting functionality (generating graphical or tabular reports), as well as built-in statistical capability
 - Transparent reporting of survey response rates
 - Flexible reporting and access tools for various teaching roles (instructor, co-instructors, TA’s, etc.)

- Features that were considered mostly “unnecessary or undesirable” include:
 - Automated use of penalties (or rewards) for survey completion (e.g., grade sequestration or early release of grades) (46.2% unnecessary or undesirable)
 - Ability to offer incentives (such as bonus points) for survey completion (61.5% unnecessary or undesirable)
- Mixed enthusiasm for:
 - Survey administrators to have the ability to unmask or associate survey results with student identifiers for the purpose of analyzing survey data and performing correlation studies; however, there was a comment about the desirability of having a “mechanism for accounting for student bias, esp in terms of sex, gender, race, etc.” (Obviously this would require individual identifiers.)
- Continuing to use SIRS questions as a component of teaching portfolios received neutral or negative reviews (7.7% Good, 53.9% Neutral, 38.5% Bad Idea)
- There was generally favorable endorsement of:
 - Centralized (institutional) delivery of teaching evaluations (53.9% Good / 46.2% Neutral / 0% Bad Idea)
 - Decision to opt-in or opt-out should be made at unit or department level (46.2% Good / 53.9% Neutral / 0 % Bad Idea)
 - Decentralized administration with individual instructor opt-in (38.5% Good / 46.2% Neutral / 15.4% Bad Idea)
 - Ability of chairs or unit administrators to auto-select questions or question sets to evaluate departmental or institutional teaching and learning goals across the unit (69.2% Good / 30.8% Neutral / 0% Bad Idea)