

Report of the SITE Review Committee
September 2008

History:

The University Senate Ad Hoc SITE Review Committee was charged with the tasks of (1) reviewing the existing SITE instrument and procedures to determine whether changes to the system are indicated, and (2) if changes are indicated, developing a plan to begin the revision process. In earlier reports to the Senate, the committee outlined multiple problems with the current SITE and recommended revision of this system (11/07) and described the rationale for the committee's selection of the SIR II as an alternative to the SITE (3/08). Action on the report was tabled definitely at the April 2008 meeting of the Senate due to concerns about whether the SIR II would be compatible with SACS accreditation requirements and university initiatives such as the American Democracy Project. At the May 2008 Senate meeting, the committee reported that SACS compatibility is not an issue. SACS requires evidence that teaching effectiveness is being assessed in some manner, but does not dictate how an institution should carry out this assessment. The committee also reported that questions related to special university initiatives could easily be added to the SIR II if necessary. However, the committee asked that the report be tabled definitely until the September meeting of the Senate so that it could gather further information on the logistics of administering the SIR II at WKU.

Report:

The committee obtained detailed information on the procedures that would be used to administer the SIR II at WKU in a teleconference (May 15, 2008) with Nathaniel Hines and Karen Costantino representing ETS, Bob Cobb and Ryan Massa-McKinley representing Institutional Research, and Sharon Mutter representing the University Senate SITE Review Committee. Bob Cobb prepared a comprehensive set of notes from that conference and a cost comparison for the SITE and SIR II (see attachment). The SITE Review Committee met in early September to review these notes and to develop its final recommendations to the Senate.

Recommendations:

1. Proceed with adoption of the SIR II to evaluate teaching effectiveness at WKU. Though no instrument is perfect, the SIR II has undergone extensive testing for validity and reliability. Hence, its psychometric properties are better known than those of the SITE. Moreover, there is no interest in the university community in developing and validating an instrument specifically for WKU. However, the Senate did approve an earlier recommendation by the committee to "Design and implement an on-going study to establish the validity of the new SITE instrument." This recommendation would now apply specifically to the SIR II.
2. Selectively sample instructors/courses to evaluate. The SITE is currently administered in almost all of the courses offered each semester.

It is clear from Bob Cobb's cost comparison that administering the SIR II in this way is not cost-effective. The SITE Review committee had recommended previously that only a subset of courses should be evaluated with the SIR II both to reduce the cost of administration and to improve student motivation to respond. We further recommend that: recommend that:

- Each faculty member shall be evaluated in at least one course in both the Fall and Spring semesters.
- Each faculty member shall be allowed to select via Banner at least one course to be evaluated each semester. This selection must occur prior to a stated deadline.
- Any remaining courses to be evaluated shall be randomly selected by department chairs.

3. All departments and the SGA review the items in the SIR II to determine whether their evaluation needs are met. The SITE Review Committee determined that the questions on the SIR II provide sufficient overlap with the University level questions on the SITE. Departments and the SGA will have to make that determination for their own questions.

4. Use the online version of the SIR II to evaluate online courses at WKU. Currently, evaluation of online courses is idiosyncratic and piecemeal. The online version of the SIR II offers the opportunity to evaluate our online and classroom courses in similar ways.

5. Administer the SIR II on a trial basis in a select group of departments in Fall 2008; implement university-wide administration in Spring 2009. Dr. Burch, in consultation with the Deans of each college, should select one to two target departments in each college that will use the sampling method described above with SIR II. This trial run will allow Institutional Research to solve any logistical problems prior to university-wide implementation.

6. Appoint a committee to develop guideline on how the SIR II reports should be interpreted by faculty and administrators and how this information should be used in tenure, promotion, and merit pay decisions.

SITE Review Committee:

Dr. Mel Borland Gordon Ford College of Business
Dr. Marilyn Gardner College of Health and Human Services
Dr. Steve Haggbloom Council of Department Heads
Dr. Lora Moore Bowling Green Community College
Dr. Sharon Mutter University Senate
Dr. Les Pesterfield Ogden College of Science and Engineering
Dr. John Faine Potter College of Arts and Letters
Dr. Steve Wininger College of Education and Behavioral Science

Conference Call Notes: ETS and WKU

15 May 2008

WKU: Bob Cobb(270-745-3250), Ryan Massa-Mckinley(270-745-3250), Sharon Mutter(270-74515 May 2008

WKU: Bob Cobb(270-745-3250), Ryan Massa-Mckinley(270-745-3250), Sharon Mutter(270-7454389)

ETS: Nathaniel Hines (609-771-7842), Karen Costanitno (609-771-7173)

- (1) SIR II forms have 45 standardized items.
- (2) Institutions may add a maximum of 10 supplemental items to the SIR II forms.
- (3) Supplemental items are not printed on the SIR II form. Institutions that need supplemental items either print them on separate sheets or write them on the classroom board. Students read the supplemental items and mark their answers on the SIR II form.
- (4) SIR II forms are provided in bulk to institutions in quantities of 100 form packets. It is the institution's responsibility to break-down and package the bulk forms into classroom packets for administration.
- (5) ETS advises that pricing for SIR II forms is prorated. The more you buy the less expensive they become. The approximate cost for 20,000 SIR II forms is about \$4,420 (\$22.40 per 100).
Using a base figure of 80,000 forms the non-prorated cost for purchasing SIR II forms would be approximately \$17,680 (\$4,420 x 4).
- (6) Processing of SIR II forms is prorated. Cost for processing 20,000 forms is \$0.45 per form. The approximate cost for processing 20,000 forms is \$9,000 (20,000 x 0.45). Using a base figure of 80,000 forms the non-prorated cost for processing SIR II forms is approximately \$36,000 (\$9,000 x 4).
- (7) The cost of shipping forms from ETS to the institution and from the institution back to ETS for processing is borne by the institution. Shipping cost will depend upon actual volume of forms shipped and the turn-around time required. Assuming 80,000 forms are shipped in 16 cases (10 reams of 500 forms per case) the estimated cost for shipping UPS ground second-day shipping is \$92.16 per case (to Princeton New Jersey). One way shipping total would be about \$1,474. Shipping both ways would cost the institution approximately \$2,949.
- (8) ETS does not provide transcription services. If student comments are desired they must be made on a separate sheet (not SIR II form). Sheets with comments can be returned in the SIR II packet. Comments would be transcribed locally.
- (9) In sum, ETS provides bulk SIR II forms, provides scanning and processing of completed SIR II forms, and provides a summary report of results. All logistics, form control, form management and oversight of the process is left to the institution.

To administer the SIR II in a hypothetical 100 course sections (with a combined enrollment of 20,000 students), the following procedure would be followed: 20,000 students), the following procedure would be followed:

(1) WKU would order 20,000 blank SIR II forms from ETS. ETS would ship the forms within a few days to WKU. Along with the 20,000 SIR II forms, WKU would receive 100 special demographic header sheets to be used to identify each course to be evaluated.

(2) After receiving the bulk shipment of forms, WKU would prepare 100 SIR II packets for distribution to each course scheduled to receive evaluation materials. Packets would contain (1) SIR II forms in a quantity to equal course enrollment, and (2) a header sheet for use in identifying the course evaluated.

(3) Packets would be sent to each department for administration. Prior to administering the packet the department would fill-out the header form that accompanies each packet. The header form is used to identify the course and faculty member evaluated. ETS uses this form when scanning the SIR II sheets.

(4) Students complete the 45 item SIR II and answer any supplemental questions as necessary. Students wishing to make written comments would record them on a separate sheet and return any comment sheets in the SIR II envelope.

(5) Upon return of the 100 SIR II packet the WKU SIR II coordinator performs the following:

- a) Unpacks SIR II forms from the class packet
- b) Orients SIR II forms and header sheet
- c) Packs the SIR II forms and accompanying header sheet for mailing to ETS
- d) Separately accounts for any transcription forms
- e) Prepares a header sheet for each packet to be transcribed
- f) Packages transcription forms for processing

(6) Upon receipt of SIR II forms from the institution, ETS will scan and process forms. ETS will produce and ship three copies of SIR II reports for the institution with 15 days. ETS does not screen SIR II forms for correct header sheet alignment. If SIR II forms become inter-mixed, it is not the responsibility of ETS to 'un-mix' them. They are processed as received.

(7) The institution has the option to purchase the raw SIR II data from ETS.

No raw data is provided as part of the base cost of SIR II.

ETS advises that another method for administering the SIR II is to invite students to rate courses electronically via Blackboard on the ETS Website. The logistics of how this would work have not yet been explored, but ETS quoted the cost associated with this type of processing is about \$1.50 per student response. Assuming 80,000 evaluations (student responses) were recorded on the ETS Web site, the cost to the institution would be approximately \$120,000.

SITE and SIR II Estimated Cost Comparison Primary Project Items Primary Project Items

Cost Item SITE SIR II

Paper Evaluation Forms (~80,000 per term) \$1,640 \$35,360
 University/Department Written Comments Open Ended
 Questions N/A \$50 (4,000 term)
 Paper Rosters & Reports \$240 (~20,000 term) \$80 (~7,000 term)
 Course List & Packet Envelopes (~5,000 per term) \$1,400 \$1,400
 Transport/storage boxes (~50) \$140 \$140
 Office Supplies \$40 \$40
 Scanning & Processing Services (~80,000 per term) N/A \$72,000 (0.45/ ea)
 Transcription Services \$10,000 \$10,000
 Two-way Shipping (~80,000 per term) N/A \$6,000
 Student Worker Time 1,2,3,4 \$1,600 (40%) \$2,000 (50%)
 Staff Time 1,2,3,4 \$7,000 (~20%) \$12,400 (~30-40%)
 Total (Annually)5 \$22,060 \$139,470

SITE and SIR II Estimated Project Days Comparison Primary Milestones

Time Element SITE SIR II

Coordinate Department Course and Course Counts 7-10 days 10-15 days
 Print Forms 12-13 days 8 days1
 Count, Package, and Deliver Forms 12-13 days 18-25 days2
 Receive and Prepare Forms for Scoring / Processing 2 days3 23-25 days
 Transport forms to and from scanning 6 days 0
 Process and Deliver Reports 10-11 days 14-15 days 4
 Total (Annually)5 49-55 days 73-88 days

1 In addition to the forms provided by ETS, WKU would be responsible for supplying open-ended questions for University/Departmental-specific questions and/or written comments.

2 Additional header sheets, labels, and question forms would need to be packaged with forms.

3 SITE process requires only that packets be logged and delivered for transcription.

4 ETS processes and prints reports, but WKU would still need to process transcription results, unpack and merge and organize reports with transcription report, prior to delivery.

5 Only most important project items and time elements have been identified.