

## **SCF COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

Marriott Library, Room 1705

Tuesday, September 12, 2017

12:00pm to 1:00pm

### **ATTENDEES**

Jeff Bates, Chandler Dean, Ananya Roy, Isabel Dulfano, Julia Franklin, Jacki Strenio, Ann Darling, Pat Tripeny, Adam Halstrom, Sara Booth, Lorelei Rutledge

### **EXCUSED**

Joann Yaffe, Debra Mascaro

### **INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **MINUTES (AVAILABLE ON CANVAS)**

April 27, 2017 Meeting Minutes (Julia Franklin moves to approve minutes, Chandler Dean seconds, unanimously approved)

### **CAMPUS-WIDE QUESTIONS**

#### *Report from CTLE (Pat Tripeny)*

- Pat Tripeny reviews the history of the committee and student course feedback
- Review of committee's charge for CTLE
- Committee will recommend changes to the Academic Senate Executive Committee
  
- CTLE proposes a new format and new question themes that reduces number of questions
  - Eventually the committee will need to decide whether we should recommend that other groups be allowed to add additional questions and what those groups should be (e.g. General Education, Online, Departments, Colleges, Instructors).
    - Will there be any guidelines or restrictions?

#### *Format*

- The current format is 7 course questions with a comment box and 7 instructor questions with a comment box.
- CTLE proposes that we ask one question at a time.
  - Ann Darling asks about the possibility of reordering the questions to limit the effects of survey fatigue.
    - This should be possible with most survey tools.
- The new format will develop a rhythm between questions
  - Quantitative question
    - Follow-up as needed
    - Open-ended prompt for each question
  - Final open-ended prompt

#### *Question themes*

- CTLE proposes the following question themes for the committee to review and discuss.
  - Recommend course and instructors
  - Objectives clearly stated
    - Follow-up: If yes, were they clearly met?

- Supplemental materials beneficial
- Openly Express and Defend Views
  - “Is the classroom a safe, comfortable, etc. space for students to be?”
  - If no, what are the contributing factors?
- Overall course and instructor comparison.
- General free-response.

### *Discussion of Format*

- Ann Darling comments that she hopes to find a way to randomize the question order.
- The committee generally agrees to move forward with the proposed format as presented.

### *Discussion of Themes*

- Isabel Dulfano asks about including what students have learned in the classroom.
  - Jeff notes that the committee has agreed in the past that the Student Course Feedback instrument is not sufficient to measure student learning.
  - Ann Darling suggests that this is the purview of a different committee.
  - This committee has generally agreed that the purpose of the student course feedback instrument is to measure student satisfaction with a course and instructor. It does not measure teaching effectiveness or student learning.
- Isabel Dulfano asks whether we should have different questions for different modalities (e.g. Online).
  - The standard campus-wide instrument should apply, if possible, to all credit-bearing courses including Lecture, Lab, Clinical, Online, and Hybrid formats.
- The committee will need to consider how to define “supplemental materials” without limiting it to a few known or common examples.
- Ann Darling asks that the committee consider an additional question theme about instructional process?
  - Example: Did the instructional processes used in this class help you learn?
  - We agree this additional theme will be reviewed and discussed by the committee at a later meeting.
- The committee would like to link the themes “Recommend this course and instructor” and “Overall course and instructor comparison” for discussion.
  - The committee questions whether these should be two different questions
  - The committee also questions whether we should distinguish between course and instructor (i.e. ask two different questions: one about the course and a second about the instructor).
  - Isabel Dulfano brings up a concern about asking students to “compare” their experience with other courses and instructors which may be very different.
- Can we find out more about why institutions ask the “comparison” question and how they use the information? Do they also have a recommendation question?
  - CTLE will find out which PAC12 institution asks the comparison question used as a sample and try to find out how they use the students’ response to this question.
- The committee suggests adding a theme about grading processes?
  - Chandler brings up a concern that this question would need to be worded very carefully.
  - CTLE will collect samples of questions that ask about grading processes for the committee to review and discuss at a later meeting.

- Ann Darling suggests that the committee consider each question based on what we plan to do with the information gathered. We can then work backwards through the responses and questions that will most likely give us the information we need.

#### *Other Discussion*

- The committee may need to consider the question of student confidentiality.
  - Are there situations that would void a student's right to confidentiality?
    - The University of Utah currently offers student complete confidentiality (not anonymity).
- The committee should also consider what students need to know about the standard instrument, both to complete the surveys and to use the information collected for RPT.
- The committee should discuss whether or not students can opt-out.

### **FUTURE MEETINGS**

#### *October meeting*

- The committee will review and discuss the following themes: Recommend and Comparison, Objectives, and Supplemental Materials.
- The committee should consider the question text and scale.
- CTLE will distribute information about these themes before the October meeting.

#### *November Meeting*

- The committee will review and discuss the following themes: Confident to express views, Instructional Process, Grading, and General free-response.

#### *January Meeting*

- Overview of all questions and vote to send recommendation to Senate Executive Committee.

## **SCF COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

Marriott Library, Room 1705F

Tuesday, October 17, 2017

11:30am to 1:00pm

**ATTENDEES:** Isabel Dulfano, Ann Darling, Taylor Munro (for Ananya Roy), Jacki Strenio, Jeff Bates, Pat Tripeny, Adam Halstrom, Sara Booth

**EXCUSED:** Lorelei Rutledge, Julia Franklin, Chandler Dean, Joann Yaffe, Krista Carlson

### **INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### **APPROVE MINUTES (AVAILABLE ON CANVAS)**

September 12, 2017 Meeting Minutes (Motion by Jacki Strenio, Second by Isabel Delfano; unanimously approved)

### **CAMPUS-WIDE QUESTIONS**

Pat Tripeny proposes that the committee use a backwards design as we review and discuss the question themes.

Who will need this information?

What type of response do we need?

What question(s) will help us get the response we need?

Follow-up Questions?

### **QUESTION THEMES FOR REVIEW**

In general, the committee agrees that there should be an optional comment prompt for each of the quantitative questions/statements.

#### **Recommend the course and/or instructor**

Who are we writing this question for?

- Students – To be available for selecting classes
  - Department Chairs
  - Instructors
- Question about whether RPT Committees should use this?

The committee hears a suggestion to separate course and instructor.

- The committee agrees to separate course and instructor for this theme. There should be one question/statement about the course, and a separate question/statement about the instructor.

The committee discusses a variety of response and reporting options for quantitative questions.

- The discussion ranges from Likert scales producing numeric averages (and other statistical measures), to stars and smiley faces.
- There is some consensus that students would prefer and relate to graphic representations, e.g. stars, similar to Amazon customer reviews.

### Should the scale be a gradation or a binary?

- Student representatives on the committee would prefer a gradation.
- There is strong support for a graded scale for this question theme.
  - The committee agrees with the concern that students may be more likely to skip the question if forced into a binary (yes/no) rather than a more nuanced scale that allows for a range of positions.

The committee would like to recommend comments made on these questions be available to students.

- The committee would need to recommend how to deal with inappropriate comments.
  - Software may be able to filter inappropriate language, etc.
  - Another option is to have a bank of comments from which students may select comments that apply to their instructor or course.
  - We may need to have a process in place for individuals or departments to request that specific comments be stricken or kept confidential.

Possible question/statement text:

- How likely would you be to recommend this course to other students? Very likely,
- Thinking of students who would possibly take this course, I would recommend it to: All Students, Most Students, Some Students, No Students.
- If you had to retake this course, would you? Why?
- How satisfied are you with this course? Very satisfied, not satisfied, etc.

### Overall course and instructor comparison

Is this already covered by the recommendation question?

- The committee agrees we can eliminate this theme.

### Objectives clearly stated / Objectives met

Who are we writing this question for?

- Instructors
- Department Chairs

The committee discusses what students think of as “course objectives.” There may be some confusion among students about what this term means.

- The committee agrees that what we are really asking in this question is whether a student knew what they were supposed to learn and whether they learned it.

Possible question/statement text:

- Did you know what you were supposed to learn in this class? Yes, No.
  - Follow-up: How did you know this? Drop-down list of options: [e.g. Syllabus, Instructor.]
- Did you learn what you were supposed to learn? Yes, No.
  - Follow-up: What aspects of the course helped you learn? List of drop-downs: [e.g. Lectures, Class Discussions, Online Resources, Textbooks, Handouts, Videos.]
  - [There may need to be a separate follow-up question here if students respond No, indicating they did not learn what they were supposed to learn:e.g. “What aspects of the course were barriers to your learning?]

### Supplemental materials beneficial to your understanding in this course

Who are we writing this question for?

- Students – to know if they need to buy the supplemental material
- Faculty – to know if students find purchased materials helpful.

What are supplemental materials?

- Textbooks, readings, podcasts, etc.

The committee would like to distinguish between purchased items and “open-source” items?

- The committee agrees that the final follow-up question under “Objectives clearly stated/met” above, “What aspects of the course helped you learn,” can cover how students feel about the course materials more generally.
- This question can be specifically about materials students were asked to purchase and whether or not they were used or useful.

Possible question/statement text:

- Of the materials you purchased, which of these helped you learn? Item bank.
- A possible set of responses for this question, dealing only with purchased materials: I used them often, I used them rarely, I never used them, I didn’t buy them, I was not required to purchase anything in this course.

## **SUMMARY OF QUESTION THEMES FOR REVIEW**

The committee generally settled on the following five questions/statements to cover the question themes reviewed for this meeting. The committee recognizes there will be time to revisit each question once we see the full set take shape after reviewing all of the question themes. [The items in brackets were added after the meeting during the preparation of these minutes.]

1. Thinking of students who would possibly take this course, I would recommend it to: All Students, Most Students, Some Students, No Students.
2. Thinking of students who would possibly take this instructor, I would recommend it to: All Students, Most Students, Some Students, No Students.
3. Did you know what you were supposed to learn in this class? Yes, No.
  - Follow-up: How did you know this? Drop-down list of options: e.g. Syllabus, Instructor.
4. Did you learn what you were supposed to learn? Yes, No.
  - Follow-up: What aspects of the course helped you learn? List of drop-downs: e.g. Lectures, Class Discussions, Online Resources, Textbooks, Handouts, Videos.
  - [There may need to be a separate follow-up question here if students respond No, indicating they did not learn what they were supposed to learn. E.g. “What aspects of the course were barriers to your learning?”]
5. [Considering the materials I was asked to purchase for this course:] I used them often, I used them rarely, I never used them, I didn’t buy them, I was not required to purchase anything in this course.

## **SCF COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

Marriott Library, Room 1705

Tuesday, November 7, 2017

11:30am to 1:00pm

**ATTENDEES:** Krista Carlson, Chandler Dean, Sara Booth, Julia Franklin, Lorelei Rutledge, Isabel Dulfano, Ann Darling, CK Miller (for Jacki Strenio), Jeff Bates, Pat Tripeny, Adam Halstrom

**EXCUSED:** Joann Yaffe, Ananya Roy

### **APPROVE MINUTES (AVAILABLE ON CANVAS)**

October 17, 2017 Meeting Minutes (Motion by Chandler Dean, Second by Ann Darling; unanimously approved)

### **CAMPUS-WIDE QUESTIONS**

Pat Tripeny reviews questions from the last meeting. The committee will review and discuss all of the questions at the next meeting.

#### **Confident to Openly Express and Defend Views**

Who are we writing this question for?

- Instructors
- Students
- Administrators

What would the data be used for?

- Instructors should know the answers to this.
- Students should also have access to this.
- Administrators will need to be able to intervene if students do not feel comfortable expressing views.

What kind of response?

- The committee agrees there should be a scale to include a neutral response: All of the time, Some of the time, Never, Not Applicable

Responding to the sample given on the agenda, one committee member questions the word confident. The committee agrees that the word comfortable is more appropriate. The words defend and beliefs are also questioned.

Possible question/statement text:

1. I felt comfortable openly expressing and discussing my views in this class. All of the time, Some of the time, Never, Not Applicable
  - Follow-up: Which of these contributed to your answer (select all that apply): Instructor, Course Material, Classroom Environment, Other Students, Self, Other
  - Help us to understand why you answered the way you did?

### **Instructional processes**

Who are we writing this for?

- Instructors
- Students

What kind of answers do we want to get from this?

- Should we ask students to define the type of course?
  - Lecture, discussion, community-engaged learning
- One committee member suggests a ranking system.
  - Top three? Bottom three?
  - Perhaps students can move/select items into lists of Helpful / Not helpful. Unselected items are not applicable.

Possible question/statement text:

- Which of these instructional processes were the most helpful for your learning:
  - Classroom discussion
  - Lecture
  - Group work
  - Presentations
  - Flipped classroom
  - Team projects
  - In-class activities
  - Games
  - Case studies
  - Classroom technologies (Clickers, Top Hat)
  - Videos
  - Readings
  - Homework assignments
  - Reflective journals
  - Lab-based teaching
  - Studio-based teaching
  - Guest lectures
  - Pre/Post quizzes or assessments

Open box to ask for additional instructional processes not captured in the list or to elaborate.

## **Grading**

Who are we writing this question for?

- Students: do they understand where their grade came from and was it fair?

What will the data be used for and by what stakeholder?

- Students want to know if grading criteria is clear.
- Instructors should know if students don't know how their grades are determined.

Possible question/statement text:

- I understood how grades were determined in this class. All of the time, some of the time, Never, NA.
- Open-ended box to elaborate.

## **General free-response**

The committee does not think there should be an additional general free-response option. With an open-ended response option attached to each question, students will have ample opportunities to write comments.

## **SUMMARY OF QUESTION THEMES FOR REVIEW**

The committee generally settled on the following three questions/statements to cover the question themes reviewed for this meeting. The committee recognizes there will be time to revisit each question once we see the full set take shape after reviewing all of the question themes. [The items in brackets were added after the meeting during the preparation of these minutes.]

1. I felt comfortable openly expressing and discussing my views in this class. All of the time, Some of the time, Never, Not Applicable
  - Follow-up: Which of these contributed to your answer (select all that apply): Instructor, Course Material, Classroom Environment, Other Students, Self, Other
  
2. Which of these instructional processes were the most helpful for your learning:
  - Classroom discussion
  - Lecture
  - Group work
  - Presentations
  - Flipped classroom
  - Team projects
  - In-class activities
  - Games
  - Case studies
  - Classroom technologies (Clickers, Top Hat)
  - Videos
  - Readings
  - Homework assignments
  - Reflective journals
  - Lab-based teaching
  - Studio-based teaching
  - Guest lectures
  - Pre/Post quizzes or assessments
  
3. I understood how grades were determined in this class. All of the time, some of the time, Never, NA.

## **OTHER BUSINESS OR DISCUSSION**

The committee should have some implementation plans to present to the Senate Executive Committee.

- Should there be a beta test or a pilot with a small group of classes?

Pat Tripeny will meet with Amy Wildermuth before December 2017 to discuss the implications of these changes to RPT. With Amy's advice, the committee should propose a plan to the Executive Committee to respond to potential concerns involving faculty who are in the midst of an RPT cycle.

## **FUTURE MEETINGS**

The committee will meet on December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017 from 11:30am-1:00pm to review the complete question set and make changes before a final review in January 2018. The goal is to propose a final question set to the Academic Senate Executive Committee in late-January 2018.

Committee members will receive a final version of the questions as discussed in committee and should review these questions and come to the next meeting prepared to discuss. Committee members should also consider whether we are missing any indispensable question themes.

## **SCF COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

Marriott Library, Room 1705

Tuesday, December 5, 2017

11:30am to 1:00pm

**ATTENDEES:** Krista Carlson, Chandler Dean, Julia Franklin, Isabel Dulfano, Ann Darling, Jacki Strenio, Jeff Bates, Pat Tripeny, Adam Halstrom

**EXCUSED:** Joann Yaffe, Ananya Roy, Sara Booth, Lorelei Rutledge

### **APPROVE MINUTES (AVAILABLE ON CANVAS)**

November 7, 2017 Meeting Minutes (Motion by Ann Darling, Second by Chandler Dean; unanimously approved)

Ann Darling reports on a student group working on a project about SCF.

- These students wanted to the course by relevance to their development of certain skills: written competency, critical thinking, technical skills.
- Committee members express concerns about students self-selecting into courses that meet certain competencies, undermining interdisciplinary and general education goals.

### **REVIEW PROPOSED STANDARDIZED INSTRUMENT**

#### **Recommend Course and Instructor**

Committee members express concern about this question as applied to a required course with only one instructor. How will students respond to this situation?

- The committee generally agrees that students can still answer this question, even for required courses and instructors.
- The value of this feedback for future students selecting classes may be limited in these cases.

In the case of multiple instructors, the recommend instructor question should be asked of each instructor teaching the course.

#### **Objectives Clear | Met**

Revise response options for “How did you know this?” to include:

- Instructor(s)
- Teaching Assistant
- Canvas
- Other (comment)

Should we include, or encourage the inclusion of, specific learning outcomes on the standardized instrument?

- The General Education outcomes are broad, but there has been now conversation about university-wide outcomes.
- The committee generally agrees this may be something individual units or instructors can add to the standard instrument.
  - Units would be able to add a question that includes a response item bank from which students select outcomes that were covered in the course.

- This bank of outcomes will be in addition to the response options under “What aspects of the course helped you learn.” The outcomes prompt might as students “which of these were most developed in this course.”

Move “instructional processes” response options to the “aspects of the course helped you learn”

- The committee agrees to remove the question under the “Instructional Processes” theme since it overlaps closely with “What aspects of the course helped you learn.”

This question is for **instructors**, not students.

## **Materials purchased**

This question is for **students**. Instructors may be interested also.

The committee discusses whether students will think of materials they were required to use (course reserves) but not purchase.

- The committee generally agrees students will reflect on required open-source material (e.g. course reserves) under “What aspects of the course helped you learn.”
- This question explicitly asks students to consider purchased material.

The committee discusses a question about piloting the instrument on students.

- The committee agrees that this can wait and be part of an implementation plan presented to the Senate.

## **Expressing and Discussing Views**

Revise follow-up response options to include the following:

- Instructor(s)
- Teaching Assistant
- Change Self to Personal

## **Grading**

Revise the statement to: I understood how “my” grades were determined in this class.

The committee discusses changing “Not Applicable” to “I took this class for no credit.”

- The committee agrees that Not Applicable is unnecessary for this question.

Revise response options to the following:

- Always
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

## **OTHER BUSINESS OR DISCUSSION**

The committee will postpone the suggestion that “Recommend Course and Instructor” comments to be made available to students.

The committee will develop and present an implementation plan after the standardized instrument is approved.

## **MEETING MINUTES**

Senate Advisory Committee on Student Course Feedback  
Wednesday, January 24, 2018  
Marriott Library, Room 1705

ATTENDEES: Jeff Bates, Krista Carlson, Chandler Dean, Taylor Munro, Joann Yaffe, Julia Franklin, Isabel Dulfano, Sara Booth, Lorelei Rutledge, Ann Darling, Jacki Strenio, Adam Halstrom

EXCUSED: Pat Tripeny

### **APPROVE MINUTES (AVAILABLE ON CANVAS)**

December 05, 2017 Meeting Minutes (Motion to approve and seconded; unanimously approved)

### **REPORT ON EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

Jeff Bates reports that the Academic Senate Executive Committee had some feedback on specific items in the instrument, but most of their conversation centered on questions of implementation and RPT.

Members of the committee recommend that we provide more background in future proposals to the Executive Committee and Senate. We should specifically acknowledge that the Senate has tasked this committee with proposing a revised instrument to replace the existing one.

The SCF committee members were given a copy of the proposed standardized instrument with specific recommendations or comments from the Executive Committee (attached). Below are the committee's responses to the recommendations.

The committee agrees that the recommendation item can be clarified. The committee agreed to the following revision for the recommend course and recommend instructor item.

I would recommend this instructor to:

- All Students
- Students majoring in this discipline or a closely related field
- No Students

The committee considers whether a question asking why students took the course is appropriate. (E.g. What was the most important factor for taking this course? Gen Ed Requirement, Major Requirement, Elective). The committee agrees that this question may be one some departments choose to add.

The committee agrees that "Did you know what you were supposed to learn in this class" is an important item that should remain in the proposed instrument.

The committee agrees to remove the “yes/no” item from “Did you learn what you were supposed to learn?” And add an option to the response bank that allows students to indicate they didn’t learn.

The committee agrees to add “ask questions” to the “openly expressing and discussing views” item.

### **Implementation**

The committee will take the proposed instrument to groups of students for feedback.

- During the focus group, students will fill out the proposed instrument and answer questions about it.
- Short questionnaire should ask the following:
  - Who they are, what major they are, what kind of course are they thinking of?
  - Did you have any problems answering this question? (Open discussion taking each questions separately)
  - Focus groups can be structured to ask students to “think of a class you have good feelings about” or “think about a class you wish were different.” This is preferred to letting students “pick” the kind of class they are thinking of. We may want to ask them to think of “large classes, small classes, General Education electives, required major.”

The committee should have two members present at each focus group: one to lead the focus group and one to take detailed notes.

ASUU’s Student Success and Engagement Board can help recruit students to participate.

The committee will discuss these focus groups in more detail at the next meeting, February 21<sup>st</sup>. The goal will be to hold focus groups between the committees February and March meetings.

### **Impact on RPT**

Jeff Bates will talk to Pat Hanna about her proposal for the RPT Standards Committee.

### **FUTURE MEETINGS**

Wednesday, February 21st, 1-2pm

Wednesday, March 14th, 1-2pm

Wednesday, April 18th, 1-2pm

**ATTACHMENT**

**Senate Advisory Committee on Student Course Feedback**  
Proposal for a Standardized “Student Course Feedback Instrument”  
per [Policy 6-100-III-N](#)

**Summary**

- ❖ The committee reviewed five (5) question themes: Recommend Course and Instructor, Objectives Clear and Met, Materials, Expressing and Discussing Views, and Grading.
- ❖ The committee wrote and approved seven (7) principal questions and an additional three (3) follow-up questions.
- ❖ Each of the seven (7) principal questions have an option for students to write a comment.

**Recommend Course and Instructor**

Thinking of students who would possibly take this course, I would recommend this course to:

- All Students
- Most Students
- Some Students
- No Students

Please explain:

Thinking of students who would possibly take a course from this instructor, I would recommend this instructor to:

- All Students
- Most Students
- Some Students
- No Students

Please explain:

**Commented [AH1]:** Senate Executive Committee (EC) members questioned the value and use of this scale. One recommended a statement like “I would recommend this course” with a Likert response similar to the current scale (“strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”).

Another EC member sent the following suggestion:

I would recommend this course:

- To fulfill a general education requirement or expand intellectual horizons
- For students majoring in this discipline or a closely related field
- For pre-professional students
- I would not recommend this course

I would recommend this instructor to:

- All Students
- Students majoring in this discipline or a closely related field
- For pre-professional students
- No Students

### Objectives Clear and Met

Did you know what you were supposed to learn in this class?

- Yes
- No

[Follow-up, if Yes:] How did you know this? (Select all that apply)

- Canvas
- Instructor(s)
- Syllabus
- Teaching Assistant
- Other: (comment)

Please explain:

Did you learn what you were supposed to learn?

- Yes
- No
- Some

[Follow-up, if Yes:] What aspects of the course helped you learn? (Select all that apply)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Case studies           | <input type="radio"/> Lecture                        |
| <input type="radio"/> Classroom discussion   | <input type="radio"/> Pre/Post quizzes or assessment |
| <input type="radio"/> Classroom technologies | <input type="radio"/> Presentations                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Flipped classroom      | <input type="radio"/> Readings                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Games                  | <input type="radio"/> Reflective journals            |
| <input type="radio"/> Group work             | <input type="radio"/> Studio-based teaching          |
| <input type="radio"/> Guest lectures         | <input type="radio"/> Team projects                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Handouts               | <input type="radio"/> Textbooks                      |
| <input type="radio"/> Homework assignments   | <input type="radio"/> Videos                         |
| <input type="radio"/> In-class activities    | <input type="radio"/> Other: (comment)               |
| <input type="radio"/> Lab-based teaching     |  |

Please explain:

**Commented [AH2]:** One EC member suggested removing this "Yes/No" question and replace the follow-up with:

The learning objectives for this class were clearly presented by/on (Select all that apply)

- Canvas
- Instructor(s)
- Syllabus
- Teaching Assistant
- Were NOT provided

**Commented [AH3]:** One EC member suggested removing this "Yes/No" question and replace the follow-up with:

Select from the following list the course activities that were most effective in promoting learning:  
[Same list]

**Commented [AH4]:** Some EC members recommended an option that allows students to indicate they learned some, but not all, of what they were supposed to learn.

### Materials

Considering materials I was asked to purchase for this course:

- I used them often
- I used them rarely
- I never used them
- I did not buy them
- I was not asked to purchase anything

Please explain:

### Expressing and Discussing Views

I felt comfortable **openly expressing and discussing my views** in this class.

- Always
- Sometimes
- Never
- Not Applicable

Follow-up: Which of these contributed to your answer? (Select all that apply)

- Classroom Environment
- Course Material
- Instructor(s)
- Other Students
- Personal
- Teaching Assistant
- Other: (comment)

Please explain:

**Commented [AH5]:** One EC member recommended adding “or ask questions” to accommodate disciplines that don’t ask students to “express personal views” (e.g. Thermodynamics).

**Grading**

I understood how my grades were determined in this class.

- Always
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

Please explain:

## **MEETING MINUTES**

Senate Advisory Committee on Student Course Feedback  
Wednesday, February 21, 2018  
Marriott Library, Room 1705

**ATTENDEES:** Jeff Bates, Chandler Dean, Taylor Munro, Joann Yaffe, Isabel Dulfano, Sara Booth, Lorelei Rutledge, Ann Darling, Jacki Strenio, Adam Halstrom

**EXCUSED:** Pat Tripeny, Julia Franklin, Krista Carlson

## **APPROVE MINUTES (AVAILABLE ON CANVAS)**

January 24, 2018 Meeting Minutes (Motion to approve and seconded; unanimously approved)

## **PROPOSED INSTRUMENT BASED ON EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

### **STUDENT FOCUS GROUPS**

#### **1) Proposed dates**

Monday, March 5: 10AM-11AM (Taylor will lead)  
Tuesday, March 6: 11AM-12AM (Jeff will lead)  
Wednesday, March 7: 2PM-3PM (Isobel will lead)  
Thursday, March 8: 3PM-4PM (Health Sciences, Ann will lead)

7-12 students is advisable for each focus group. More than 12 makes discussion difficult.

#### **2) Location(s)**

Marriott Library, Faculty Center  
Eccles Health Sciences Library

Adam will book a space in the Marriott Library for Monday – Wednesday focus group, and Health Sciences campus for Thursday focus group.

#### **3) Focus groups**

The committee agrees that the focus group should maintain the following schedule and guidelines:

There should be a sign-in sheet that asks for major and academic level—NOT name.

**5 minutes:** Adam Halstrom will read a brief statement of purpose and procedure. The statement should advise student to think of a class they are taking this semester. They

will complete the survey then answer questions in a group discussion. We will collect and shred the surveys at the end.

**Icebreaker:** Students will introduce themselves by first name only. We will provide tent cards for first name. The facilitator will ask if any of the students know each other?

**10 minutes:** Students will take the survey. Adam will track how long it takes to complete the survey.

**15 minutes:** *Which of these items would help you select a course or get ready for a course you are about to take?*

Probe: Can you elaborate?

Probe: Would they be equally useful for online/lab courses? Why or Why Not?

Probe: Are these applicable to all formats?

**15 minutes:** *Which, if any, of these items are difficult to answer?*

Probe: Can you elaborate?

Probe: Is any of this language confusing?

**15 minutes:** *What are we not asking about?*

Probe: Can you elaborate?

**5 minute:** Wrap-up

The committee's general advice to facilitators is to ask one question at a time. Make sure to keep discussion for each question under 15 minutes. Be comfortable with silence, and encourage detail and elaboration.

#### **4) Advertising**

CTLE will advertise using Facebook Events and email. Committee members are encouraged to email students and colleagues. ASUU will help notify students.

#### **5) Other considerations?**

### **OTHER BUSINESS OR DISCUSSION**

#### **FUTURE MEETINGS**

Wednesday, March 14th, 1-2pm

Results of the focus group and report from meeting with Pat Hanna and Lincoln Davies; logistic and implementation.

Wednesday, April 18th, 1-2pm

Talk about logistic and implementation (visit from Mardi Clayton)

## **MEETING MINUTES**

Senate Advisory Committee on Student Course Feedback  
Wednesday, March 14, 2018  
Marriott Library, Room 1705

ATTENDEES: Jeff Bates, Taylor Munro, Sara Booth, Julia Franklin, Krista Carlson, Isabel Dulfano, Adam Halstrom, Pat Tripeny

EXCUSED: Chandler Dean, Lorelei Rutledge, Ann Darling, Jacki Strenio, Joann Yaffe

### **APPROVE MINUTES (AVAILABLE ON CANVAS)**

February 21, 2018 Meeting Minutes (Motion to approve Julia Franklin and seconded Krista Carlson; unanimously approved)

### **REPORT ON VARIOUS MEETINGS (Jeff Bates)**

- Jeff presented the instrument, Faculty Reviews Standards Committee, as a consolidation of the current instrument. In this light, the instrument was favorably received. The committee's only significant concern was in dealing with historical data, specifically in how the new instrument will line up with current practices to use the "overall effective course" and "overall effective instructor" ratings in RPT decisions.
- Jeff also met with Pat Hanna, Special Advisor to SVP for Faculty. Pat, like many others, doesn't like the term "effective." She wondered if there is a way to ask questions that imply effectiveness without using the problematic term "effective." She likes the new instrument in the context of Jeff's presentation (as a consolidation of the current instrument). Pat made the suggestion that some questions in the new instrument should not be included in faculty personnel files. Our committee members agree that this is not something this committee can mandate.
- Jeff also met with Dean Richard Brown, College of Engineering. Dean Brown expressed an interest giving students a bank of terms or phrases that can be identified as "effective," "mediocre," and "not effective." By rating these terms or phrases we could derive an "effectiveness score" based on the items students select to describe the course and instructor.
- Jeff asked all of these groups and individuals if "are we on the right track?" All of them said we are on the right track.
- In response to the recommendations of Pat Hannah and Dean Rich Brown, the committee will consider alternative ways to collect feedback on course and instructor effectiveness. Specifically we will consider terms and phrases that we can associate on an effectiveness scale.

## **STUDENT FOCUS GROUP RESULTS**

- The committee agrees that we should consider some changes to the instrument based on the focus group results.

### **What aspects were used and what helped you learn.**

- Students were often confused by the list of “aspects” of the course. Students in all four focus groups want to be able to identify which aspects are used and then provide feedback on whether they helped them learn.
- Committee members generally approve of a suggestion to ask students “Which of these aspects were used in the course” and then a follow-up would only show students the options they select to ask if they were helpful.
- The committee agrees that a prompt “if you don’t know what it is, it probably wasn’t used” would be helpful.
  - Committee members approve of an option for students to click on each aspect for a definition or more information.
- Committee members are asked to think of a complete lists of course aspects to discuss at the next meeting. Committee members are also encouraged to ask colleagues for advice on the list.
  - Adam will look at existing comments to find common terms that recur in student feedback.

### **Recommend versus effective**

- Committee members agree that the recommendation items can be confusing aren’t applicable for some students.
- The committee discussed the difference between an item that asks whether a student recommends the course or instructor and one that asks if the course or instructor was effective. The committee members generally agree that they prefer asking students if they would recommend the course or instructor.
- The committee agrees that a simpler expression of the recommendation items would benefit students.
- An example the committee will consider is:  
I would recommend this instructor / I would recommend this course. On a scale from disagree to agree.
- The committee will discuss the relative merits of different recommendation and effectiveness items at the next meeting.

## **IMPLEMENTATION**

- Pat Tripeny suggests we take the proposed instrument to the Senate Executive committee asking for a vote on the instrument alone, with the idea that it won't be implemented before Fall 2019
  - Implementation will require a separate proposal and vote.
- The committee agrees that implementation would need to include how this revised instrument affects career-line, tenure-track, RPT.
- A committee member suggests including Department Chair feedback – and possibly feedback from the Deans.

## **OTHER BUSINESS OR DISCUSSION**

### **FUTURE MEETINGS**

Wednesday, April 18th, 1-2pm (Request to move meeting to April 4<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup>)  
April 4<sup>th</sup> is preferred.

Approve Minutes: Moved by chandler, seconded Julia. Unanimously approved.

#### Recommendation/Effectiveness Items

Jeff reviewed literature on effective teaching.

The current instrument seems to guide students, using previous questions, to Overall effective.

This is not true given the background of the current instrument.

#### List of Ineffective, Mediocre, Effective

The items could be numerically weighted to give administrators a quantitative score, which they seem to want.

This might be a happy medium to satisfy administrators while still giving students a way to provide feedback.

One committee member likes the idea of providing examples that drive toward “effectiveness.”

Another committee member doesn’t think the “recommend” item is as necessary.

Would help the professors to have open comments to explain why they may have selected “ineffective.”

This may be a backwards step when we’ve already made efforts to distance the instrument from “effectiveness.” Don’t have to explain what recommend means.

One of the reasons we don’t know what “effectiveness” is because people have different relationships.

The elimination of the SAC vote is also a consideration—we shouldn’t make it easy for administrators to rely on a single “number.”

We will encounter opposition to removing an “effectiveness” question but we will also have support.

This is designed to help students get data they need—this is not an instrument designed to evaluate effective teaching.

There are some on campus who oppose taking away the “overall effectiveness” questions on the current instrument.

We do not want to include in this instrument an item that measures effectiveness.

The recommendation item:

The committee agrees we should revert back to a simple statement with a scale.

I would recommend this course/instructor. Yes, Neutral, No

There could be provision to work through current RPT processes.

**Aspects of the course:**

Add

Podcasts (possibly an example in a description)

In-class demonstrations

Community Engaged Learning

Research application

Research-based projects

Presentations >> guest lecturers versus student presentations

Exams

Organize in-class versus out-of-class

Technologies, Instructional Learning, Student-led

Give this to a group of student and ask them to organize and identify category labels.

In presentation to Executive Committee:

Jeff will preface the instrument with more background

Ask for a vote of approval on the instrument

Jeff is meeting with Executive Committee on April 16<sup>th</sup>.

Brief explanation for each questions

Get feedback from Liz before next Thursday.