

SACSCF Report to Academic Senate 4/3/17

The Senate Advisory Committee on Student Course Feedback has met four times this year. The composition of the committee: One tenured faculty member who chairs the committee, one tenure line faculty, two career-line faculty, one faculty representative of the Undergraduate Council, one faculty Representative of the Graduate Council, and four student representatives. The Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Studies serves as a voting member of the committee, and the CTLE Director and SCF administrator are non-voting members.

Discussion this year has been around 3 issues:

1. What to do about falling response rates?

- a. When we first started online, response rate was high. See the attached figure showing the response rate by semester. Much of the early high response may have been due to incentive: Complete SCF, get grade early. As we move to more transparent online grading via Canvas, we've lost that incentive.
- b. There is some sentiment for moving the process of evaluation back into classroom, but still online.
- c. By one estimate, 97% of students bring at least one smartphone, tablet or laptop to three classes per week.

2. What questions should/should not be asked on the SCF instrument?

- a. There have been as many as 80 questions on these instruments. Some colleges/departments have added student learning assessments. Other administrative units have asked to have particular questions asked in particular ways. General Education courses have several questions related to student experiences in those classes.
- b. The Committee believes that the focus in the SCF instrument should be on the student experience, rather than to assess student learning.
- c. The Committee would like to reduce the number of questions on these instruments. We would like to include a small number of standard questions, but also offer limited numbers of questions specific to different kinds of learning experiences, like practica, labs, discussions, and perhaps specific to administrative units.

3. How should results of SCF instrument be disseminated/used?

- a. Discussion has been about the desire for students to know about faculty teaching style before enrollment, about the role of student course feedback in instructor self-correction, and about the role of student course feedback in the RPT process, both by Student Advisory Committees and by faculty peer-review.
- b. For student information RE instructors: Quantitative information is available by instructor and course. We want to make sure that the questions are those that students find valuable.
- c. Faculty self-correction: CTLE has been very helpful in helping faculty to design and implement mid-course evaluations. The proposed streamlined SCF may not prove to be useful for this purpose.

- d. RPT
 - i. Students need guidelines on how to interpret SCF. We would like to generate such a statement. There have been questions raised about how students are trained in using the Student Course Feedback instrument (including qualitative comments) in SAC reports. There is some evidence that some students cherry pick the data to find support for their pre-existing assessments of teaching.
 - ii. RPT advisory committees, department chairs and deans should not be making sole use of SCF for evaluating teaching. Most colleges and departments are moving to a form of peer-reviewed teaching.

The SACSCF will meet one more time in March and probably once more before May 15. We will make recommendations to CTLE and respond to their suggested solutions in the Fall.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joanne Yaffe
Professor of Social Work
Adjunct Professor of Psychiatry
SACSCF Chair 2015-2017