SIR II Faculty Feedback

Question:

46. Assuming that students have the chance to make free-form comments on either form, in general:

5. I greatly prefer this new form
4. I somewhat prefer this new form
3. I am neutral about which form to use
2. I somewhat prefer the existing form
1. I greatly prefer the existing form

Summary:

Average = 3.71
% answered either 4 or 5 = 5/7 = 71.4%
% answered either 1 or 2 = 2/7 = 28.6%

Comments:

1) I strongly prefer the SIR II form

   The SIR II form provides much more detailed feedback, which will greatly help me improve my teaching.

   I recommend that ECS adopt the SIR II form as soon as possible.

2) I strongly prefer the existing ECS form (but ONLY because it is short). The SIR II form is WAY too long to use for every course each term (dept. policy), especially if we want students to write comments (which we do). The students DID not like doing such a long evaluation.

   I do think the SIR II adds useful data for evaluation of teaching. A better approach might be to reform the existing ECS form to try to incorporate the major points of the SIR II. Some of the existing ECS form does that, but there is NOT a question about supplementary instructional material or assignments, exams, and grading or class difficulty. Maybe look at changing the ECS form to augment it (but no more than 10 questions).
I really appreciate the Academic Council looking into this. We really do need to update our current form and doing the pilot gives useful data. I would be happy to participate in future pilots.

3) I am not enthused about the instrument it elicits answers to questions which are irrelevant. I don’t give a project or a term paper yet this technique was rated as effective or very effective. Same thing with role playing, etc. If my enthusiasm for the course is rated as ineffective does that mean I have no enthusiasm or that my enthusiasm does not enhance the course. This must be devised by professional educators (i.e. from Schools of Education).

4) I strongly prefer the SIR II form (#5) simply because it provides more information. It is a little more time consuming to collect and more direction should be provided to respondents when a "not applicable" situation exists, but I'm able to get a better understanding of where I can improve from the SIR II form than the existing ECS form. Student written comments (when they occur) are also helpful so I agree with keeping that feedback with either evaluation.

5) I strongly prefer the SIR II (new) evaluation form because it is more data dense, questions are worded more effectively than the SET form the College has been using, and it requires students to shed some light on their own efforts. It is a much more informative survey. Lastly, it compares results nationally, which give it more credence. I am puzzled about something though; Up to 100 students responded to the same question, and enrollment in the class was 45. How one gets 100 responses from 45 students is incongruous.

6) I somewhat prefer the SIR II form. With the additional questions on the SIR II, there are more opportunities for the students to highlight the negative and/or positive aspects of the class. However, while I find some comments and suggestions from students helpful, most student comments aimed at “improving” the class are, in fact, ways to make the class easier with a veil of practicality. The committees efforts to improve the current process should certainly be commended, but I would like to see the committee question the premise of using student evaluations to query faculty performance and research possible alternatives. I find it bizarre that students have the opportunity to formally judge the caliber of teaching at colleges and universities. To my knowledge, students don’t evaluate teachers at the K-12 level – nor should they – but at the collegiate level we seem to accept it because of student tuition and dues.

7) I somewhat prefer the new form. The new form may be too long. I appreciate that the new questions are more specific. But if the form is too long (or exhaustive), we may get fewer written comments. I am concerned that national averages may not take local variables into account.