ALAMO COLLEGES DISTRICT

Executive Faculty Council:
Phase I Recommendations for a New End-of-Course Survey for All Alamo Colleges Classes

October 9, 2019

Prepared for: The Alamo Colleges District Tactical Leadership Team
The Alamo Colleges District Board of Trustees

Presented by: The Executive Faculty Council
William Thornton, EFC Faculty Fellow

Prepared by: Ad Hoc Committee Members:

Karla Kosub-Coronado, Faculty NLC
Brittany Chozinski, Faculty NLC
Megan Grimsley, Faculty NLC
Charles Hinkley, Faculty NVC
Amy Collins, Faculty NVC
Liza Chapa, Faculty SPC
Carlos Garcia, Faculty SPC-SWC
Kim Hochmeister, Faculty SAC
Lennie Irvin, Faculty SAC
Samuel Longoria, Faculty PAC
Alicia Moreno, Student PAC
Brandon Gillespie, Faculty NLC
Wesley Anderson, Faculty NVC
Christa Emig, DSO

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This report presents recommendations from the Executive Faculty Council (EFC) ad hoc committee working on the end-of-course student survey for the Alamo Colleges' academic classes. Because of faculty concerns about a new survey instrument implemented in Fall 2017, the United Faculty Senates (UFS) submitted a work proposal to the EFC in Spring 2018 to address these concerns.

In its work addressing the tasks in the EFC Work Proposal (see Appendix III), the ad hoc committee decided to split its work into two phases with Phase I focusing on crafting a new end-of-course survey that will be administered in all courses and Phase II focusing on creating new surveys appropriate for clinical and workforce/PTE courses.

This report contains recommendations for Phase I of the committee's work, and includes the following recommendations:

1. We recommend the adoption of a new end-of-course survey included in this report for all Alamo Colleges courses beginning in Spring 2020. This survey is considerably shorter and phrased in first-person to prompt students to consider their perceptions of the course. Until Phase II work is complete, this survey should be used in clinical and workforce/PTE courses as well.

2. We recommend to keep the current schema for when surveys open and close and how many reminders should be sent out to students and faculty.

3. We recommend that the wording of the emails sent to students and faculty be similar to what has been sent in the past.

4. We support District procedure D.7.1.1 for faculty evaluation which states, "Student surveys are part of the portfolio evaluation and shall be used primarily for the improvement of instruction," and end-of-course student survey results should not be used as the primary measure of teacher effectiveness for an instructor's performance evaluation or tenure or promotion dossiers, except as evidence that the faculty member is seeking student feedback to improve their instruction through the survey(s).

The ad hoc committee will continue its Phase II work to create specialized surveys for clinical and workforce/PTE classes and to formulate recommendations for a continual review of the survey process. The Phase II work is projected to be completed in Spring 2020.

Introduction

This report presents the Phase I recommendation of the Executive Faculty Council (EFC) ad hoc committee working on the end-of-course student survey for the Alamo Colleges academic classes. The bulk of the work for this initial recommendation was performed in Spring 2018 and then completed by a reformulated ad hoc committee in Fall 2018 and Spring 2019.

The committee learned in its work that specialized courses and teaching contexts, such as clinical courses and workforce and professional and technical courses, need more specialized end-of-course student surveys. The goal of this committee, then, evolved to create Arts and Sciences-specific, clinical-specific, and workforce/professional technical education (PTE)-specific end-of-course surveys.

Since the initial ad hoc committee completed most of the work for creating a general survey for Arts and Sciences classes, the reformulated ad hoc committee decided to split their work into two phases:

> Phase I: Complete the general survey for target implementation for all classes in Spring 2020.
>
> Phase II: Create the two new surveys for clinical and workforce/PTE classes for target implementation in Fall 2020.

The Phase I recommendations included in this report consist of a new set of survey questions for all academic courses that are ready for use in Spring 2020 as well as recommendations for how the survey results should be used in the faculty review process. Once Phase II is complete, the two new surveys will be rolled out in clinical and workforce/PTE courses.

Proposal Background

In Fall 2017, a new survey instrument was implemented to collect student feedback on courses. However, faculty had concerns about the length of the survey, quality of the questions, timing, and ability to retake the survey. Because the results of the survey are included in the Faculty180 evaluation, it is important that the instrument and process be as valuable as possible. In Spring 2018, the SAC and NLC Faculty Senates brought this concern to the United Faculty Senates (UFS). The UFS submitted a work proposal to the Executive Faculty Council (EFC). The EFC accepted the End of Course (EOC) Student Survey Work Proposal and charged the EOC Student Survey ad hoc committee with the following:

1. Developing a set of survey questions vetted by all five colleges
2. Reviewing the date ranges for surveys to be administered and end dates
3. Reviewing the wording of emails sent to faculty and students
4. Addressing how evaluations are handled when there are more than one instructor for a class

5. Recommending how survey results will be used in the faculty review process (currently Faculty180 evaluation)
6. Addressing whether survey responses from students who dropped after the survey is sent out should be included in the results
7. Creating a process for continual review of the survey and survey process
8. Addressing any other changes needed to make the survey more effective and efficient

Methods: How These Recommendations Were Created

The Initial 2018 Ad Hoc Committee's Work

The initial Spring 2018 ad hoc committee split into two sub-groups:

Technical Questions and Implementation Group

One group worked with Christa Emig to focus on technical questions related to managing and designing end-of-course surveys. The work of this group served to address tasks #2, 3, 4, and 6 of the original charge (See Appendix II).

Under the guidance of Christa Emig, a technical specialist, this group examined the technical opportunities and limitations regarding several aspects of administering the end-of-course student survey. For example, coding within Banner correlates to one instructor per one CRN. However, when there are multiple instructors for a course with one CRN, it becomes unclear for the instructors and the students which instructor is evaluated by the survey. Similar concerns include a change in instructor within the semester, cross-listed classes, and open-listing courses. We learned the necessity of a technical expert to advise this group's work due to the limitations and challenges associated with the systems needed to administer the survey.

Survey Design and Validity Group

A second group researched survey design and the validity of student evaluations for faculty assessment. This group engaged in a thorough literature review regarding the reliability and validity of student evaluation of teacher surveys (or SETS). Appendix I presents the results of their research into the topics of Demographic Bias, Construct Validity, and Statistical Validity for SETS. The results of this research informed the recommendations for how survey results should be used in the faculty review process.

This group spent considerable time reviewing the current survey, comparing it to past surveys, and researching other surveys. This group also surveyed faculty from all five colleges regarding what they wanted in the end-of-course survey design. With this research and faculty input, the committee crafted a new version of the end-of-course student survey.

The initial Spring 2018 ad hoc committee created an incomplete draft of the recommendation.

Spring 2018 Ad hoc Committee Members

Ad Hoc Team Members	Department	College or DSO
1. Brittany Chozinski*	Faculty, Sociology	NLC
2. Megan Grimsley	Faculty, Kinesiology	NLC
3. Charles Hinkley	Faculty, Humanities	NVC
4. Amy Collins	Faculty, Mathematics	NVC
5. Liza Chapa	Faculty, Healthcare Science & Early Childhood	SPC
6. Kim Hochmeister	Faculty, English	SAC
7. Samuel Longoria	Faculty, Speech Communication	PAC
8. Alicia Moreno	Student	PAC
9. Christa Emig	Director of Curriculum Coordination & Transfer Articulation	DSO
10. Carlos Garcia	Faculty, Plumbing Technology	SPC-SWC

*Committee Chair

The Reconstituted 2018-2019 Ad Hoc Committee's Work

In Fall 2018, the EFC reviewed the draft recommendation report and determined that it was incomplete. Karla Kosub-Coronado stepped in as the new committee chair and formed a new ad hoc committee to complete the work. A number of members on the previous ad hoc remained, but some members declined to continue serving or had moved to another institution and could not serve.

Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 Ad hoc Committee Members

Ad Hoc Team Members	Department	College or DSO
1. Karla Kosub-Coronado*	Faculty, Biology	NLC
2. Megan Grimsley	Faculty, Kinesiology	NLC
3. Lennie Irvin	Faculty, English	SAC
4. Brandon Gillespie	Faculty, Philosophy	NLC

5. Liza Chapa	Faculty, Healthcare Science & Early Childhood	SPC
6. Kim Hochmeister	Faculty, English	SAC
7. Wesley Anderson	Faculty, Math	NVC
8. Samuel Longoria	Faculty, Speech Communication	PAC

*Committee Chair

This reconstituted ad hoc committee met multiple times during the end of Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 and determined that it would split its work into two phases. As mentioned earlier, this committee determined that three surveys will be needed: a survey targeted to general Arts & Sciences courses, a survey targeted to clinical courses, and a survey targeted to workforce/PTE courses. Because the previous ad hoc committee had completed most of the work for a general survey, the new committee has opted to complete this general survey in Phase I. The committee plans to continue its work to create the two other surveys in Phase II.

Below is a breakdown of the Phase I and Phase II work:

Phase I Tasks

1. Developing a set of survey questions vetted by all five colleges
2. Reviewing the date ranges for surveys to be administered and end dates
3. Reviewing the wording of emails sent to faculty and students
4. Recommending how survey results will be used in the faculty review process (currently Faculty180 evaluation)

Phase II Tasks

1. Developing a set of survey questions for two new surveys vetted by all five colleges for clinical and workforce/PTE courses
2. Addressing how evaluations are handled when there are more than one instructor for a class
3. Addressing whether survey responses from students who dropped after the survey is sent out should be included in the results
4. Creating a process for continual review of the survey and survey process
5. Addressing any other changes needed to make the survey more effective and efficient

To complete the Phase I work, the new ad hoc committee reviewed the previous draft proposal and other scattered documents from the original committee and solidified what had been previously completed. It sent the draft survey out to all five colleges for a fresh round of review and feedback from each college's Faculty Senates. Then, this feedback was used to make the final changes of the proposed end-of-course student survey in this report.

Following a recommendation from Tactical Leadership Team (TLT) in Spring 2019, the draft survey underwent a psychometric evaluation in Summer 2019 to improve this survey

instrument. The survey contained in this recommendation is based upon the feedback from this evaluation. See Appendix I for the psychometric evaluation of the proposed survey by Dr. Jeremy R. Sullivan.

Recommendations

This following section contains the recommendations for Phase I made by the reconstituted ad hoc committee.

Recommendation #1: Proposed New End-of-Course Student Survey

Purpose and intent of the end-of-course survey

The purpose of the end-of-course student survey is primarily to help faculty improve the quality of their courses. The survey is designed to examine the classroom experience, not the college experience. The survey focuses on the outcome of learning, steering away from questions that gauge whether or not the student liked the teacher. Questions are also organized around the topics of instructional design, instructional delivery, assessment, and course management, which are the same categories used in faculty evaluation as a whole.

Below is the recommended end-of-course student survey that was vetted by all five colleges and psychometrically evaluated by Dr. Jeremy Sullivan.

Evaluate each statement below with Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree.

1. The course assignments were clearly communicated to me.
2. The objectives of the course were clearly explained to me in the syllabus.
3. The grading system was adequately explained to me in the syllabus.
4. I clearly understood what was expected of me in this course as outlined in the syllabus.
5. Classes followed a calendar or meeting schedule as presented to me in the syllabus.
6. The materials were presented in a way that motivated me to learn in this course.

7. Relevant examples were used in this course to help me understand concepts.
8. The assignments helped me to understand the lessons of the course.
9. The use of technology was effective for my learning in this course.
10. The instructor encouraged and supported student participation in this course.
11. I received helpful feedback on assignments to improve my knowledge, skills, and abilities.
12. The instructor was available to provide help and answer questions, either electronically or in person.
13. The instructor treated me with fairness and respect.

Overall Evaluation:

1 = Poor, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Excellent

14. My overall rating of this course is:

15. My overall rating of the teaching of this course is:

16. What, if anything, did you find particularly effective about this course? What would you keep the same?

17. What, if anything, would you like to see improved in this course? What would you change?

Recommendation #2: Date ranges for surveys to be administered and end dates

This ad hoc committee learned a lot about the complexities of administering end-of-course surveys. We recognize that one size does not fit all and how difficult it is to cover all contingencies with these surveys. Therefore, we present these recommendations with the caveat that the technicians administering these surveys may have to, in some cases, make choices outside these recommendations. Nevertheless, we feel these recommendations should cover most instances of end-of-course surveys.

1. How long should surveys be open?

Current schema:

4-5 week course: 1 week

6-8 week course: 2 weeks

9 weeks or longer: 3 weeks

We recommend no change.

2. When should surveys close?

Current schema: The end-of-course student survey remains open until 11:59 p.m. on Sunday of final-exam week (Week 16) with finals week beginning on Monday.

SAC feels strongly that surveys should be open through final-exam week. However, the other colleges believe that the survey should close on the Sunday prior to finals week. If surveys remain open through finals week, there is the potential for students to complete them after faculty have posted final grades within Canvas. This provides potential for bias and/or retaliatory responses in said surveys.

Therefore, the committee recommends that we maintain the current schema.

3. Open Learning:

Current schema: The end-of-course student survey opens seven days prior to the end of class, and the end date is calculated based on Learner Start Date and # Weeks defined in Banner SSASECT.

Through the research performed by the committee, we learned that open-learning courses are contingent and complex. For example, courses may vary in duration, start dates, and not conform to the Alamo Colleges academic schedule. Therefore, we recommend specialized surveys for these programmatic courses on a case-by-case basis.

4. How many and when should reminders be sent and to whom?

Current schema:

Automated Notification Type	VPs/Deans/ Chairs	Faculty	Students
Survey is Open		Monday	Monday
1st Reminder		Monday (+7 days from start Date)	Monday (+7 days from start date)
2nd Reminder		Friday (-2 days from end date)	Friday (-2 days from end date)
Results are Available	Friday the week after grades are due	Friday the week after grades are due	

The committee feels that no recommendation is necessary as the current schema is satisfactory.

Recommendation #3: Wording of emails sent to faculty and students.

The following is an example email that was sent out to students:

> Dear Student,
>
> Please help us improve the quality of your courses by providing your honest and specific feedback via this process. Completing the online survey will only take 10-15 minutes of your time.
>
> Although the system tracks whether you have completed the survey, your specific responses are anonymous and cannot be associated with you unless you choose to identify yourself in your comments.
>
> You will receive email reminders until you have completed your course survey(s).
>
> To save your answers and move onto the next section, just click "NEXT". Please remember to click the SUBMIT button after you complete each survey.
>
> If you are unable to complete the survey in one session, make sure to save your responses by clicking the SAVE button.
>
> This email is sent from an unmonitored email account. Replies to this email will not be answered. If you have any questions, please contact your instructor.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> [VP NAME]
> Vice President for Academic Success
> [COLLEGENAME]

The committee recommends a similar email be sent to students. We recognize that some of the technical instructions for accessing and submitting the survey may change depending on the survey instrument, but we like the tone, the invitation to improve instruction, and the assurance of anonymity.

Recommendation #4: How survey results will be used in the faculty review process

Research into Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) surveys revealed a number of relevant findings for how these types of surveys should be used in the faculty evaluation process:

Key findings from this research include:

- SET involve a number of forms of demographic bias, most prominently gender bias.
- SET scores are also not a reliable measure of teaching effectiveness and do not show a reliable association with learning outcomes.
- SET scores used as a measure of teaching performance lacks construct validity. SET scores may only be considered valid measures of student experiences.
- In terms of statistical validity, measures of central tendency are not appropriate for categorical variables, yet these have been the predominant measures used in SET. Distributions would be more appropriate to report.
- Additionally, because measures of central tendency cannot be used, comparison between classes or professors are also inappropriate.

(See Appendix II and its accompanying Reference page for a more detailed description of this research.)

Due to the demographic bias and lack of construct validity, the ad hoc committee recommends the following purpose and guidelines for the use of the results for end-of-course student surveys:

1. End-of-course student survey results should not be used as the primary measure of teacher effectiveness for an instructor's performance evaluation or tenure or promotion dossiers, except as evidence that the faculty member is seeking student feedback to improve their instruction through the survey(s).
2. No comparison should be made between faculty members or averages within a department, as such comparisons are statistically invalid.
3. Faculty supervisors should recognize that evaluations can give insight into student experience but cannot measure teaching effectiveness. A composite approach (i.e. teaching dossier, peer review, and class observations) more appropriately measures teaching effectiveness.

District procedure D.7.1.1 in its section on the performance evaluation of faculty states that the evaluation of faculty will be based upon evidence presented in a portfolio and that "Student surveys are part of the portfolio evaluation and shall be used primarily for the improvement of instruction."

Phase I Implementation Recommendations

The ad hoc committee recommends that the new version of the end-of-course student survey be used in all Alamo Colleges District courses starting Spring 2020, along with the recommendations related to the technical aspects of administering the surveys. We recognize that the recommended end-of-course student survey is not completely appropriate for clinical and workforce/PTE courses. However, we recommend that this survey temporarily be used until specialized surveys are developed in Phase II for these courses.

Likewise, the recommendations for how the end-of-course student survey results are used in the faculty evaluation process should be implemented in the next round of faculty evaluations starting Spring 2020 or Spring 2021. We further recommend that these recommendations be considered as the District policies and procedures for Employee Evaluation D.7.1.1 and Faculty Performance Evaluations D.7.1.2 undergoing their five-year review.

Conclusion

The ad hoc committee's work is not done. As the committee completes its Phase I work, it will continue to work on the main task of creating two new end-of-course student surveys appropriate for clinical and workforce/PTE courses with the goal of presenting a report with these surveys in Spring 2020.

Additionally, the ad hoc committee will work on recommendations for a continued review of the survey process. We hope to get this method of review in place with the Phase II recommendation in Spring 2020 so that this method can be used to review faculty input on the first-semester implementation of the end-of-course student survey recommended in this report.

Appendix I

Psychometric Evaluation of Proposed End-of-Course Student Survey

Overall: This is a good set of items—I just made a few minor edits and suggestions. There are always more questions we could ask, but adding more questions beyond what I suggest below is likely to reduce response rate. I also understand that a goal of this process was to reduce the number of items. I think this is a nice balance of brevity and coverage, and is a bit briefer than what many institutions use. Please let me know if there are any questions about my suggestions.

Proposed new end-of-course student survey questions as presented in the Phase I Recommendations to the TLT:

Option choices for questions below: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree

1. The course assignments were clearly communicated to me.
2. The objectives of the course were clearly explained to me in the syllabus.
3. The grading system was adequately explained to me in the syllabus.
4. I clearly understood what was expected of me in this course as outlined in the syllabus.
5. Classes followed a calendar or meeting schedule as presented to me in the syllabus.
6. The materials were presented in a way that motivated me to learn in this course.
7. Relevant examples were used in this course to help me understand concepts.
8. The assignments helped me to understand the lessons of the course.
9. The use of technology was effective for my learning in this course.
10. The instructor encouraged and supported student participation in this course.
11.
12. I received helpful feedback on assignments to improve my knowledge, skills, and abilities in this course.
13.
14. The instructor was available to provide help and answer questions, either electronically or in person.
15.
16. The instructor treated me with fairness and respect.

Overall evaluation:

1 = Poor, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Excellent

My overall rating of the course is:
My overall rating of the teaching of this course is:

Open-ended questions:

1. What, if anything, did you find particularly effective about this course? What would you keep the same?
2. What, if anything, would you like to see improved in this course? What would you change?

Jeremy R. Sullivan: Consider adding an opening statemen
Jeremy R. Sullivan: **Deleted:** in the syllabus
Jeremy R. Sullivan: **Moved (insertion) [1]**
Jeremy R. Sullivan: **Moved (insertion) [2]**
Jeremy R. Sullivan: **Moved (insertion) [3]**
Jeremy R. Sullivan: **Deleted:** I was
Jeremy R. Sullivan: **Deleted:** to
Jeremy R. Sullivan: **Deleted:** te
Jeremy R. Sullivan: **Moved up [3]:** The assignments
Jeremy R. Sullivan: **Moved up [1]:** I clearly understood
Jeremy R. Sullivan: **Moved up [2]:** Classes followed a
Jeremy R. Sullivan: At my institution, we use these two

Appendix II

Research into Student Evaluation of Teaching Surveys

Demographic Bias

Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark (2016) found that student evaluations of teaching are more influenced by the gender of the student and the student's expectation of the grade they feel they will earn in the course than by any actual measure of teaching effectiveness. Students who expect to receive a higher grade in the course score professors higher.

Multiple studies have shown that gender bias in SET scores is large and statistically significant. This bias impacts every level of student evaluation, from perception of teaching methods to more objectively observed areas of evaluation such as the promptness of assignment grading and return. The majority of bias stems from male students scoring male professors more favorably; no such pronounced pattern exists for female students (Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark, 2016; Mengel, Sauermann, & Zolitz, 2017). Because of the pervasiveness of gender bias, more effective instructors (as measured by a validated instrument) may actually be scored lower by students because of gender bias (Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark, 2016). Even in online classes, where an instructor's gender may only be assumed from their name, students rated instructors with a presumably male name higher than instructors with a presumably female name (in this particular study the two "instructors" were actually the same person, in the same online class, operating in a co-teaching capacity) (MacNeil, Driscoll, & Hunt, 2015).

Multiple studies have shown that student evaluations are influenced by the gender, ethnicity, age, and physical attractiveness of the instructor (Watchtel, 1998; Marsh & Dunkin, 1992; Worthington, 2002; Andersen & Miller, 1997; Basow, 1995; Cramer & Alexitch, 2000). African American and Asian professors have been found to receive lower SET scores than White professors (Smith & Hawkins, 2011; Reid, 2010). In fact, demographic bias is so notable that Ambady and Rosenthal (1993) found that student evaluations of faculty can be predicted from showing the student a silent, 30-second video clip of the instructor teaching. Visible demographic markers and perceived physical attractiveness influence student evaluations.

While SET scores are biased both by the student evaluator's gender and by the subject of the course (e.g., Mengel, Sauermann, & Zolitz, 2017, found that gender bias is most pronounced in math courses), the overall bias in SET is influenced by so many different factors that it is not possible to control for bias in statistical analysis. Thus even attempts at controlling for bias will fail to produce valid results (Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark, 2016).

Such bias in SET, if SET is factored into personnel decisions such as promotion, can disproportionately penalize women and minority faculty. Additionally, Mengel, Sauermann, and

Zolitz (2017) found that gender bias is more pronounced for women who are more junior in their career, thus creating additional potential for a negative impact on career progression.

Construct Validity

As shown by Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark (2016) SET scores do not show a reliable association with learning outcomes. They are also not a reliable measure of teaching effectiveness. Uttl, White, and Gonzalez (2017) performed a meta-analysis of research studies into the correlation between SET ratings and learning and found no significant correlation. They conclude that SET ratings are unrelated to student learning, that students do not learn more from professors with higher SET ratings, and recommend that "institutions focused on student learning and career success may want to abandon SET ratings as a measure of faculty teaching effectiveness" (22). The "Statement on Student Evaluations of Teaching" (2019) from the American Sociological Association also reiterates that SETS are not a reliable measure of teaching effectiveness, citing much of the same research presented here.

While SET scores are not reliable measure of teaching effectiveness, they can provide insight into student experiences. Such information, however, should not be confused with or treated the same as a measure of teaching performance (Stark & Freishtat, 2014).

SET scores used as a measure of teaching performance lacks construct validity. SET scores may only be considered valid measures of student experiences.

Statistical Validity

Ideally, all students would participate in the end of course survey, thus making it a census measurement. This ideal scenario, however, does not reflect reality. Because not all students participate in end of course surveys, inferences about faculty performance are being drawn from a sample of the student population. Inferences about the views of the entire population can only be extrapolated from a sample if the sample is unbiased. Because students "volunteer" to complete the end of course survey, the sample inherently suffers from selection bias, or more specifically, volunteer bias. Volunteer bias is a form of systematic error because there may exist important differences between those who choose to take or not take the survey. For example, students who have done well in the class may be more inclined to complete the survey, thus artificially inflating instructor scores, or, conversely, students who have had a less than favorable experience in the class may feel more inclined to complete, thus artificially deflated instructor scores. Without further information on which students are more inclined to volunteer, it would also be impossible to determine if the resulting data was skewed away from or towards the null (i.e., whether the scores were artificially high or low). This problematizes

the validity of any results obtained from the end of course surveys, as validity is defined as the relative absence of systematic error or bias. As such, any results obtained from end of course surveys are not a valid measure of instructor performance and should not be used in official instructor evaluations.

Additionally, SET scores are often presented as measures of central tendency (mean, median, or mode), but this is not statistically logical. SET use Likert scales as a scoring mechanism. Likert scales present ordinal categorical variables (i.e., from 1 to 5, with 1 being the best and 5 being the best). Each "number" in the ordinal scale should be thought of as a categorical label, not a number. It does not make sense to take an average or the median of labels. A professor who scored a 1 and a 5 would be evaluated similarly to a professor who scored two 3s, even though these are clearly not comparable scenarios. Or to rely on the old joke: Three statisticians go hunting. They spot and deer. The first statistician fires and his bullet goes to the left of the deer. The second statistician fires and his bullet goes to the right of the deer. "We got him!" the third statistician proudly proclaims. Measures of central tendency are not appropriate for categorical variables, yet these have been the predominant measures used in SET. Distributions would be more appropriate to report. Additionally, because measures of central tendency cannot be used, comparison between classes or professors are also inappropriate.

Appendix III

EFC Work Proposal

Alamo Colleges

Executive Faculty Coun

Name of Work Proposal	End of Course Student Survey
Initiator	Julie Engel & Brittany Chozinski
Contact	PHONE: 60340 / 65267 EMAIL: jengel2@alamo.edu / bchozinski@alamo.edu
BACKGROUND	

Please provide a brief background including what the problem is and why it is important (250 words or less).

A new survey is being used to get student feedback on courses. Faculty have concerns about the length, quality of the questions, timing, and ability to retake the survey. Because the results of the survey will be included in the Faculty 180 evaluation, it is important that the instrument and process be as valuable as possible.

What has been done to address this issue?

Senates have been collecting concerns from faculty members at each of the colleges. The United Faculty Senates has met with Dr. Christa Emig to discuss concerns. Some of the issues are system and communication issues which she is working to correct. The main issues listed above are still in need of being addressed by a district-wide committee.

1. Charge and Work Products

   In 150 words or less:

   Develop a set of questions that has been vetted by all colleges and those with expertise in the area of survey creation. Ensure that questions cover all modes of assessment, not just exams.

   Make recommendations:

   - Date ranges for surveys to be administered and end dates.
   - Wording on emails sent to faculty and students.
   - How to address evaluation when there are more than one instructor for a class.
   - How survey results will be used in the faculty review processes (currently Faculty 180).
   - Should responses from those students who dropped after the survey is sent out be included in the results?
   - How continued review of the survey process will be handled.
   - Any other changes needed to make the survey more effective and efficient.

   There are no known costs associated with this proposal.

2. Known Constraints, Criteria, or Design Principles

   The only known constraints would be those imposed by the IOTA 360 software.

3. Relevant Strategic Objectives

Which of the Alamo Colleges' Strategic Objectives is served by the work?

a. Student Success
b. Principle-Centered Leadership
c. Performance Excellence

4. Sponsor of the Work[1]

Vice Chancellor for Academic Success (or Interim VCAS)

5. Internal Stakeholders or Constituents

Faculty
Students
Administration
HR
IR

6. Preliminary List of Team Members

Faculty members from each of the five colleges (If colleges already have faculty groups working on the topic, ensure representation from those groups.)

Chair

IR representative

Subject matter expert on survey creation

Student

Christa Emig

7. Deadline for Work Product

March 2018 so that any accepted recommendations can be implemented for Fall 2018.

1 The role of the sponsor is to support the faculty by removing barriers, securing needed resources and providing an administrative lens to the considerations.
2 EFC Administrative Members include Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Academic Success, Associate Vice Chancellor – HR, College President, College Vice President for Academic Success and College Vice President for Student Success.

References

Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1993). Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of nonverbal behavior and physical attractiveness. *J Pers Social Psychol, 64*(3), 431–441.

American Sociological Association (2019). Statement on Student Evaluations of Teaching. Retrieved from https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa_statement_on_student_evaluations_of_teaching_sept52019.pdf

Andersen, K., & Miller, E. D. (1997). Gender and student evaluations of teaching. *PS: Political Sci Politics, 30*(2), 216–219.

Basow, S. A. (1995). Student evaluations of college professors: When gender matters. *J Educat Psychol, 87*(4), 656–665.

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. Retrieved from https://www.scienceopen.com/document?vid=818d8ec0-5908-47d8-86b4-5dc38f04b23e

Cramer, K. M., & Alexitch, L. R. (2000). Student evaluations of college professors: Identifying sources of bias. *Can J High Educ, 30*(2), 143–164.

MacNell, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. (2015). What's in a name: Exposing gender bias in student ratings of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 40*(4), 291-303.

Marsh, H. W., & Dunkin, M. J. (1992). Students' evaluations of university teaching: A multidimensional perspective. *Higher education: handbook of theory and research, 8*, 143–223.

Mengel, F., Sauermann, J., & Zolitz, U. (2017). Gender bias in teaching evaluations. *Journal of the European Economic Association*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1093/jeea/jvx057

Reid, L. D. (2010). The role of perceived race and gender in the evaluation of college teaching on RateMyProfessors.Com. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3*(3), 137-152.

Smith, B., & Hawkins, B. (2011). Examining student evaluations of black college faculty: Does race matter? *The Journal of Negro Education, 80*(2), 149-162.

Stark, P., & Freishtat, R. (2014). An evaluation of course evaluations. Retrieved from https://www.scienceopen.com/document?vid=42e6aae5-246b-4900-8015-dc99b467b6e4

Uttl, B., White, C. A., & Gonzalez, D. W. (2017). Meta-analysis of facultys teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 54*, 22-42. doi:10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.08.007

Wachtel, H. K. (1998). Student evaluation of college teaching effectiveness: A brief review. *Assess Eval High Educ, 23*(2), 191–212.

Worthington, A. C. (2002). The impact of student perceptions and characteristics on teaching evaluations: A case study in finance education. *Assess Eval High Educ, 27*(1), 49–64.