

Resolution to Reestablish the Ad-Hoc Student Course Feedback Evaluations Committee

PREAMBLE: This resolution seeks to reestablish an ad-hoc committee to oversee student course feedback evaluations and procedures. The current Course Feedback instrument was originally established 30 years ago and was modified in 2016-2017 to its present form. At that time, it changed from a handwritten response to an online version of the prior established structured set of questions through Blue. The current Course Feedback instrument is mostly based on a paradigm where the system itself is outdated and limiting. This paradigm has not reflected a legitimate way of students' course feedback or the educational quality and making visible the decision-making process possible for using evidence-based practices. As a result, the current Student course feedback has the potential to be an invaluable source of information regarding faculty/instructor pedagogical quality and curriculum structure. In addition, there is evidence that students are not trained to use the open-ended space professionally so to focus on curriculum and instructional delivery. Instead, in the absence of such needed guidance, student write broad, biased, and/or irrelevant comments that directly focus on the faculty/instructor and not the curriculum such as: the faculty/instructors' physical appearance, accent or dialect, demeanor, personality, or other factors unrelated to the curriculum and/or the quality of course instruction. The Course Feedback instrument should provide important data about faculty/instructor progress in achieving SUNY Old Westbury's educational goals.

to me, this is confusingly written

student (or peer) comments will always be biased

we can ignore such comments... in

these could potentially be related to The quality of course instruction

WHEREAS, there has been significant improvement in the quality of such instruments, including validity and reliability measures; and

WHEREAS, the current Course Feedback instrument criteria and items therein have restricted capabilities to provide faculty/instructors useful feedback intentionally modify and/or improve their course design and delivery to address student needs/concerns; and

WHEREAS, the current Course Feedback instrument lacks sufficient structure or guidance for students to follow to offer appropriate constructive feedback and/or beneficial data; and

WHEREAS, high response rates on the student course feedback are necessary for valid and reliable assessment and there is a need for an adjusted and robust assessment tool;

WHEREAS, currently there is no College policy, shared responsibility, incentive, or other methods of promoting completing these assessments, nor there is demonstrable effort to increase awareness about the shared responsibility, role, and the overall importance of course feedback;

WHEREAS, the College is in the process of creating a culture of assessment, and increased student participation in the completion of the Course Feedback instrument are consistent with supporting the increased reliability and validity of the instrument and dialogue into working towards establishing and maintaining a shared campus culture of assessment; and

WHEREAS, the student Course Feedback instrument results play a critical role in faculty appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions; and

CULTURE OF ASSESSMENT IS THAT SOME ASSESSMENT SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR EVALUATIVE PURPOSES - I GUESS -

WHEREAS, College developed or integrated established metrics by which the inclusion and exclusion criteria are evidence-based models of acceptable minimum thresholds for response rates to be considered in the faculty's appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.

confusing / unclearly written

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate endorses the reestablishment of the Ad-Hoc Student Evaluations Committee with the following Charges:

- report*
- Assess current practices and develop a revised Course Feedback instrument reflecting current evidence-based research and best practices
 - Ensure that the Course Feedback instrument reflects the College's values
 - Update the Course Feedback instrument to reflect current evidence-based research and best practices that is consistent with the College's cultural assessment goals to offer excellent and rigorous teaching programs to all students. *culture of?*
 - Conduct a pilot study to ensure validity and reliability of the updated Course Feedback instruments and regularly monitor response rate and other metrics of the instrument
 - Develop procedures and policies for implementation of course feedback that maximize response rates and ensure reliability and validity of assessment *& repeat*
 - Develop student guides and tutorials to increase awareness of their shared responsibility in the Course Feedback process to ensure proper and professional standards/guidelines for the student to remain ethical and fair, and to report useful, feasible, and accurate constructive feedback on the curriculum, its design, and delivery and not personal comments of the faculty/instructor
 - Recommend guidelines for increasing student response rates.
 - Identify and recommend what minimum response rates would be considered a statistically valid sample and provide guidance for best practices in analyzing these evaluations based on response rates.
 - Recommend guidelines for all Departments and ARPT to consider as a standardized procedure for inclusion and/or exclusion criteria for Course Feedback to be used in the faculty's appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.
 - Recommend a basic standardized guideline for scoring and ranking student Course Feedback responses and ranking across all Departments
 - Recommend a standardized procedure for Department's peer-teaching observations for both non-tenure-track and tenure-track faculty.
 - Recommend a faculty/instructor response to the Course Feedback for each course as a part of the culture of assessment tool to close the loop following the end of each semester.
 - Revisit the Course Feedback instrument **annually** to maximize its utility, need for modification, and meaningful use as a part of the College's culture of assessment.
- it's not clear that this goal can be ensured.. improved maybe*
- not possible*
- Unclear if recommendations will be binding - for instance, if not binding, and the department doesn't follow, will candidates complain*
- ok, but does it need to be this frequent? how can growth be accurately measured if the instrument is constantly changing*
- such as? is a low response rate better or worse than no data/info at all? why not let individual Departments & ARPT set their own guidelines/standards, which is the case for many other parts of the file*

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ad-Hoc Student Evaluations Committee membership shall be in accordance with the following.

- One faculty member who specializes in statistics as they relate specifically to survey and assessment methods *from https://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2014/09/26/345515451/student-course-evaluations-get-an-f*
- One faculty representative from TLRC
- One faculty representative from ARPT
- One faculty representative from FRRC

Then there's the problem of averaging the results. Say one professor gets "satisfactory" across the board, while her colleague is polarizing: Perhaps he's really great with high performers and not too good with low performers. Are these two really equivalent? Finally, there's the simple fact that faculty interactions with students and the student experience in general vary widely across disciplines and types of class. Whether they're in an upper-division seminar, a studio or lab, or a large lecture course, students are usually asked to fill out the same survey.

- One faculty representative from UUP
- One student representative from SGA
- If not already represented from above, a minimum of the following faculty numbers: 3 from SAS, 1 from SOE, 1 from SOB

Sponsored By:

Christos Noutsos, Assistant Professor of Biological Sciences

Youngoo Kim, Associate Professor of Chemistry and Physics

Erik Benau, Assistant Professor of Psychology

Lorentz Neuwirth, Assistant Professor of Psychology

Meesuk Ahn, Lecturer of Psychology

Mohamed Khalefa, Assistant Professor of Computer science

Jennie D'Ambroise, Assistant Professor of Mathematics