

Summary Report: IDEA visit, February 25-26, 2013
Academic Affairs Subcommittee Report, March 7, 2013

After careful consideration, extensive conversation with faculty and representatives of IDEA, the Academic Affairs Committee offers the following talking points.

I. The usefulness of the IDEA tool depends on its ‘good use’ as recommended by the IDEA Center.

- A. The University is not using the IDEA system to its full potential.
- B. The University’s use of the IDEA scores is violating the recommendations of the IDEA Center for its appropriate and ‘good use.’

Explanation:

1. The IDEA Center requests that its scores are not to account for more than 30-50% of a faculty member’s teaching score as reported within an FES system.
 1. SHSU’s policy violates that suggestion by using the score as 100% of the FES 2 teaching score.
 - a. Academic Policy Statement 820317 (titled, The Faculty Evaluation System, revised September 23, 2009), states on page 5 of 12 in section 3.01 that “The IDEA ‘Summary Evaluation Score’ will be used as the FES 2 score.”
 - b. SHSU calls this FES score the “Student’s Rating of Teaching Effectiveness,” and the IDEA score is used for 100% of this teaching score. (See page 10 of 12 of the Academic Policy)
 - c. The IDEA center recommends that its “Summary Evaluation Score” count no more than 30-50% of the teaching score for a faculty member, and has directly called SHSU’s use of the score inappropriate.
 2. ‘Good Use’ of the IDEA tool would require SHSU to revise the way in which the teaching score is calculated. (Sections needing revision in the academic policy include 1.03, 1.04a, 2.03, and section 3, and all relevant FES forms and worksheets)
 3. Furthermore, according to the IDEA Center, their system is a “Report of Student Learning” not a “Faculty Evaluation Report”. Its intended use is to increase teaching effectiveness, and it is not intended to be used in a punitive way towards tenure and promotion. (Steve Benton)
 4. **The Academic Affairs Committee stands firm in its request to revise SHSU’s use of any teaching evaluation tool.**

Suggestions:

1. The committee recommends that the Faculty Senate first commit to revising the method that SHSU uses to calculate the teaching score within its FES system, whether using IDEA or another teaching evaluation tool.

2. The committee is recommending the following method, or something similar:
- One suggested option would be to create one category of teaching, which would include three items:
 - The Chair's rating*, which is not the IDEA summary score, but one that could include peer reviews or other methods used by the Chair to evaluate teaching. The "Chair's Rating of Teaching" would become part of this overall teaching score.
 - A portfolio* created by the faculty member, and reviewed by the DPTAC, which could include a myriad of items (see section 2.02 for a full list of suggestions in the existing policy)
 - The student's rating* through the IDEA score (or other system that the faculty votes to adopt), accounting for no more than one-third of this teaching category's final score.
 - Changes to the overall FES system could result in something similar to the following:

FES 1: Teaching * Chair's Rating of Teaching (33.5%) * Faculty's Teaching Portfolio (33.5%) * Student Evaluation Score (33%)	FES 2: Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishments	FES 3: Service	FES 4: (Omitted, or reserved for administrative duties or other)
<i>Weights to be determined for 3/3 and 4/4 loads; options could include:</i>			
.40	.40	.20	
.30	.40	.30	
.33	.335	.335	

II. The second talking point concerns whether or not to continue using the IDEA system. The committee would like to suggest one of the following options. (Note: The committee believed that changing to a different third party evaluation system was not a viable option.) All use of any evaluation system depends on changing the way teaching scores are calculated (see above discussions under 'Good Use.')

- Continue using IDEA's long form, but with a focus on faculty development as outlined later in this report.
 - There was a preference among some committee members to commit to using all raw or all adjusted scores across the University. The IDEA Center stated that taking the higher of the two scores, violates the good use of the system.

Furthermore, as there are factors of uncertainty in both the raw and the adjusted scores, the score with the inherent greater uncertainty and standard measurement of error is the adjusted score.

See IDEA's Research Report No. 6"

<http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/research6.pdf>

and "Technical Report No. 12."

<http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/techreport-12.pdf>

2. Page 3 of the Diagnostic Faculty Report would be used formatively for the development of teaching effectiveness.

B. The second option would be to continue using the IDEA system, but switch to the short form across the University, using the option of adding additional questions to the form. Departments would have the option of adding questions relevant to the college, department, or actual course. These added questions would not affect summary scores, but would be used formatively for development of teaching effectiveness.

1. Likewise, in choosing which score to use from the short form (raw or adjusted) we suggest a commitment to using all raw or all adjusted scores across the University. We believe that taking the higher of the two scores, violates the good use of the system.

Additional Information about IDEA

The following comments summarize several of the main points made by the IDEA representatives during their visit. Should SHSU continue using the IDEA system, the following issues need to be addressed before the Committee would support the continued use of this system.

I. Student Comments and Formative Assessment

A. Dr. Steve Benton, Senior Research Officer at the IDEA Center, discussed how page 3 of the Diagnostic Faculty Report and the student's written comments were "reserved for faculty development purposes only and should not be used in the assessment of the faculty member for issues of tenure and promotion."

II. Converted Averages Within the Comparison of All Classes in the IDEA Database

A. The numbers in the large box with the shaded gray area on page 1 of the Diagnostic Faculty Report are not percentages, but rather T-scores in which the mean is 50 with a standard deviation of 10. So, a score of 62, for example, would be 1 standard deviation above mean, plus 2, which is a "very impressive score." It is not 62%. (Steve Benton)

1. The IDEA representatives gave the following as a quick guide for interpretation of the T-scores in correlation to the 5-point scale numbers.

5-Point Scale		T-Score Range
4.5+	=	63+ (Outstanding)
4.0-4.4	=	55-62 (Excellent)
3.5-3.9	=	45-54 (Good)
3.0-3.4	=	38-44 (Marginal, improvement needed)
below 3.0	=	below 38 (Below acceptable standards)

B. Dr. Benton discussed the misconception about the teaching scores found on the Diagnostic Faculty Report in the large box that contains the gray shaded area. He stated, "Scores in the gray area indicate teaching effectiveness. You should celebrate being in the gray area. Scores in that gray box are signs of effective teaching among many other good teachers in the database."

C. This committee recommends celebrating instructors whose T-scores fall into this gray box, and ending criticism of these scores.

D. Dr. Benton further stated that the following scores, 4.0, 4.1, and 4.2 "all belong in the same category of effective teaching."

III. The standard error of measurement

A. The standard error of measurement in the IDEA scores as reported by IDEA representatives ranges from .3 to 1.0. The measurement varies according to class size and other variables. See IDEA "Technical Report No. 12."

B. Because of the standard error of measurement, using the IDEA score in competitive situations as a large portion of a faculty member's teaching score is considered 'inappropriate use' according to the representatives from the IDEA Center.

IV. Sub Disciplines and Relevant Codes to Collect Data

A. IDEA is working to subdivide disciplines into more relevant categories. If we contact IDEA and learn the codes (not yet listed in the PDF link), their database will grow in the sub disciplines and eventually become part of the larger database. <http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/disciplinecodes.pdf>

V. When to Administer the Survey

A. The IDEA representatives recommend that faculty/departments be given the choice when to administer the surveys.

B. Dr. Shelley Chapman, Senior Educational Consultant, recommended that for online surveys (whether for on-ground or on-line classes), the survey should be made available to students only for 1 to 2 weeks near the end of the semester, ideally at the discretion of the faculty member.

C. Dr. Chapman also stated that as long as SHSU wants to continue using paper forms, that they will provide this service for us.

1. The only cost savings to the University for replacing the paper surveys with online surveys is the cost of postage. The other costs for their service remain the same, and there is no price reduction for us to move online.
 2. Since student participation rates for paper surveys is significantly higher than for online surveys, this Committee recommends the continuation of using paper surveys at the discretion of faculty members and departments.
- D. IDEA has a Blackboard Building Block that could be turned on and off like a test in the LMS (Learning Management System). This Committee suggests pursuing this option when administering the survey online.

VI. Group Study Reports (GSRs) can be created for a discipline, department, or course group of any choosing for only \$25.

- A. For instance, a department could order one for all history courses, or chemistry courses, or online courses, etc.

VII. Formative Assessment, Improving Teaching Effectiveness

- A. IDEA has shown correlation between the “Teaching Methods and Styles” listed on the Diagnostic Faculty Report, (left hand side of page 3), and the objectives chosen by the individual faculty member from the list of 12 on page 2 of the report (item Nos. 21-32).
- B. By looking on page 2 of the Diagnostic Faculty Report, under the column, “Percent of Students Rating” an instructor can see how much progress was reported by the student towards achieving the chosen objectives.
- C. Looking on page 3 of the report, in the far right hand column, will show IDEA’s recommendation to increase the use for particular teaching methods that they have found to be useful in achieving progress towards the chosen objectives.
- D. IDEA recommends going to the following websites in order to read about suggested teaching methods and styles they recommend for the instructor’s situation.

1. To interpret the formative information on page 3 of the faculty report in order to learn what steps to take to improve teaching effectiveness, visit:

<http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/InterpretativeGuideDiagForm.pdf>

2. To read about each of the 12 objectives and which teaching methods and styles are most relevant for each teaching objective, visit:

<http://www.theideacenter.org/research-and-papers/pod-idea-center-notes-learning>

3. To find the articles, called POD-IDEA Center Notes, to address particular teaching methods and styles, visit:

<http://www.theideacenter.org/research-and-papers/pod-idea-center-notes-instruction>

VIII. The short form of the survey is best used when:

- A. The instructor has small classes.
- B. When student background knowledge is a significant item for norming.
- C. When the class is a studio lesson, practicum, or some other non-traditional class

D. When the instructor wants to include particular questions relevant to a particular course; these questions are used for formative assessment

IX. Using Adjusted vs. Raw Scores

A. The IDEA representatives suggested the following:

1. In measuring how much the students learned, use raw scores.
2. In measuring what the instructor added to learning, use adjusted scores.
3. When wanting to compare scores among faculty across disciplines, use converted T-scores.