



To: Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, Sam Gingerich
University of Alaska Anchorage

Fr: Monique Marron,
UAA Governance Office

Re: Motion to endorse development of an interactive student feedback tool

On December 2, 2016 the Faculty Senate approved the following motion, brought forth by the Faculty Senate Ad-hoc Committee on Student Feedback:

MOTION: The UAA Faculty Senate endorses the development of an interactive student feedback tool that will promote productive conversations among students and faculty on courses. We support development of a tool that will increase student response rates and facilitate student advising, which could eventually replace the IDEA.

Please see enclosed documents for more information.

If I may be of further assistance, please let me know.

Provost

Approved Disapproved

Comments:

March 15 2017

Sam Gingerich, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Date

Chancellor

Approved Disapproved

Comments:

16 Mar 2017

Tom Case, Chancellor

Date

Motion: The UAA Faculty Senate endorses the development of an interactive student feedback tool that will promote productive conversations among students and faculty on courses. We support development of a tool that will increase student response rates and facilitate student advising, which could eventually replace the IDEA.

The committee and administration need to know if faculty are willing to switch to this type of system before spending time developing specific questions and spending time and money on software implementation.

Major differences between IDEA or SDIS and this proposal are the following. The questions are largely commentary on syllabus information (see below). The proposed implementation is not an end of semester survey but rather a survey open all semester for students to respond and enter comments. Providing students with a more reliable source of information for choosing specific courses or sections will be a significant part of the purpose in addition to the current use by faculty to document teaching effectiveness. Access to the results would be greater.

The committee recommends the results be stored in an online, searchable database. Additionally, students will be able to up vote comments. Faculty will be able to respond to comments with information about changes made in response to feedback.

- a. Information desired by students
 - i. Syllabus information with student perspective on each
 1. Pedagogy
 - a. Lecture
 - b. Laboratory work
 - c. Field work
 - d. Working problems
 - e. Structured activity (POGIL/IBL/discovery)
 - f. death by PowerPoint
 - g. white boards
 - h. notes provided before/after
 - i. Groups (in/out of class)
 - j. Online/in person/combi
 2. Course Matches Descriptions (catalog, syllabus)
 - a. Balance between theory & practice
 - b. Matches the level of course
 - c. Labs/recitations/etc match course

3. Required materials
 - a. Textbooks: cost, where to buy, required/optional, which are actually used, old editions okay, alternate editions (packs), how readable, solutions manuals (required/recommended/useful)
 - b. Online homework
 - c. Other (cost, which are actually used): lab fees, calculators, lab equipment
 - d. Are materials provided or must students find themselves
4. Participation style
 - a. lecture only
 - b. occasional questions/interactions in class
 - c. group work in/out of class, how is group work graded
5. Attendance expectations
 - a. What is policy?
 - b. Is it upheld?
 - c. How are necessary absences handled?
6. Additional assistance
 - a. Office hour
 - i. Useful/not so much
 - ii. How easily accessible (number of slots, alternate times, distance)
 - b. responsiveness to email/other communication
 - c. Tutoring labs
 - d. What students found for themselves (online materials, free/subscription, quality), reference materials
7. How to succeed
 - a. What study techniques helped you succeed?
 - b. Which assignments helped you understand? (duplicated below)
 - c. What was needed to be prepared?
8. Time required (class time, assignments, studying, where you have to be)
9. Frequency of retaking (fail repeat)

10. Assignments: types (online), difficulty, percent of grade, grading type (e.g., right/wrong, partial), feedback mechanism, ability to improve
 11. Feedback: types, frequency, timeliness, usefulness, who grades (faculty/grader which grader, do graders respond the same)
- ii. Correlation between performance in this section & performance in following courses
- b. Information desired by faculty
- i. Objectives/effectiveness
 1. Did you know the objectives?
 - a. Was there a difference between your expectations and what happened?
 2. Did you understand the objectives (listed in syllabus, asked for each objective)?
 3. Did you recognize the connection between assignments and objectives? (asked for each objective)
 4. Were directions for assignments clear? (duplicated above)
 5. Did you see the connection between topics (flow of course)?
 6. Do you know more now than before?
 - ii. Interactions
 1. Managing discussions so all can participate and feel comfortable doing so
 2. Students feel comfortable asking questions in and outside class
 3. Students feel comfortable being wrong in class
 - iii. Course specific
 1. Improved writing
 2. Improved critical thinking
 3. Which assignments/activities worked and didn't
 - iv. How are faculty perceived
 1. helpful, approachable, scary, funny, rude, actively reach out/passive, culture issues, demeaning (faculty need explanation of why), interacts in class or is non-responsive
 2. Prepared, organized, flexible, knowledgeable
 - v. Feedback requirements
 1. Detailed comments
 2. Sufficient responses
 3. Timely