

AGENDA
Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee
Thursday, April 19, 2007 3:30 pm
306 Education Building

Members: Andy Ash, Charles Beem , (Chair of Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee), Betty Brown, Anthony Curtis, Libby Denny (Chair), Susan Edkins, Ann Horton-Lopez, David Nikkel (Chair of Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee), Sandy Waterkotte (Vice Chancellor for Advancement), Bill Gash (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs), Neil Hawk (Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs)

Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of the Agenda
- III. Approval of the Minutes of the March 15, 2007 meeting
- IV. Reports from Administrators
 - A. Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 - B. Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs
 - C. Vice Chancellor for Advancement
- V. Reports from Subcommittees
 - A. Faculty Development and Welfare
 - B. Faculty Evaluation Review- See attached report about student evaluation of instruction
- VI. Old Business
 - A. Textbook proposal- Report on Faculty senate action
 - B. Tenure-track proposal - Report on Faculty senate action
- VII. New Business- List of possible issues to address next year
- VIII. Announcements
- IX. Adjournment

Attachment

FACULTY EVALUATION AND REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Report on the Desirability and Feasibility of an online system for student evaluations of faculty.

FERS has been engaged in compiling information concerning the implementation of online evaluations. We have uncovered a diversity of strategies and methodologies concerning online evaluations; what they have in common is a priority placed upon cost-effectiveness, features to encourage student participation and guarantee confidentiality, flexibility in implementation, and the means to compile and assess quantitative data. Given this data, FERS proposed the FIAC consider a motion to endorse a plan to construct a plan to implement online student evaluations of faculty here at UNCP.

Item #1: John Parnell's discussion with Jerry Alexander of the University of North Texas Science Center, Ft. Worth Texas, 2/13/07.

Online system is managed in-house. Feedback consists of *formative* evaluations, which can be submitted anytime during the semester, and can be accessed by both the instructor and the Dean. Summative feedback occurs at the end of the course- students have seven days to complete. Quality is good, very little "straight-lining"- no students have ever raised concerns over privacy. Response rate of 95%!!!!

Jerry's recommendations; start small (i.e. create a 'pilot' program) and expand to entire university when bugs are out. Let students be the advocates- if they participate in the design stage, they will promote it and use it.

Item #2: 5 universities that transitioned to online evaluations as of 2005.

UC Berkeley: average response rate was 20% (school of education reported 40% participation vs. 80% on paper.

Columbia University: students formulated requirements, planned implementation criteria, developed the system, and proposed the program. Student anonymity guaranteed by separating the authentication method from the database that collects, stores, and produces the data. Students must submit an evaluation or opt out to receive the final grades. Average response on paper; 50-60%. Average response online, 90%.

Drexel University: Questions standardized at the department level. Quantitative data is made available to students. Student identifiers removed from course evaluations to ensure anonymity. Incentives employed to boost response rates. Average student response on paper, 30-40%. Average student response online, 89% with incentives (cash drawings, palm pilot raffle, pizza parties).

Northwestern University: questions standardized at campus level, with capacity for course specific questions. In order to guarantee anonymity, students use their campus authentication credentials to access the evaluation site. Average student response on paper 35%/ Average student response online, 90-100% (with incentives.)

UC Irvine: system uses standard form which allows for four customized questions per course. Results of evaluations not published. No mandated incentives- some faculty give extra credit to participate. System is centrally administered, hosted on the course management system, and maintained by network and academic computing services.

Yale: decentralized system of formulating questions. Anonymity guaranteed by removing any reference to identifying information prior to inclusion in the database. Average student response on paper, 40%. Average response online, 100%.

Desired features: guaranteed anonymity of respondents, customization of questions, data security and availability, inclusion of incentives to successfully launch system, ease of maintenance, modification, and reporting capability.