

## **Executive summary: SEI re-envisioning committee, Spring 2024**

In November 2023, in response to recommendations from prior working groups, Vice Provost Malone charged the SEI Subcommittee of the Council on Academic Affairs to identify a new instrument and/or strategy for gathering student feedback on courses and instructors and present a draft recommendation to Helen Malone and Randy Smith, and then to the Committee on Academic Affairs.

The SEI subcommittee of CAA met biweekly in SP2024 pursuing the Vice Provost's charge of November 2024. During this time the committee

- reviewed existing literature and prior OSU reports,
- conducted a review of instruments and best practices developed by our peer institutions,
- sought input from faculty and students
- met with representatives of Explorance (the company that provides Blue which is the platform used for SEIs).

The charge to the committee included the following Guiding Principles:

- Leverage best practices developed and implemented by our peers rather than writing and testing new questions.
- Ensure compatibility of the approach with Blue, the software tool used to administer the SEI.
- Include a project plan for updating language on the Registrar's website as well as the SEI Handbook.
- Develop and share guidance on interpretation of the new tool relative to the current tool and its appropriate use going forward, especially for summative review of faculty.

In early meetings, the committee added these guiding principles for their work:

- Design should minimize bias to the extent possible
- Design should be appropriate for coursework taught in a range of modalities
- Design should maximize useful information for formative and summative evaluation

### **Development and review of proposed tool**

Guided by the committee's review of the literature and peer instruments, and input from the faculty survey, the committee developed a proposal for overarching changes to the instrument.

Overarching decisions made by the committee were:

1. The instrument should focus on elements that students directly observe or that directly impact their experience of learning.
2. Which elements to assess should be informed by existing literature, feedback from the faculty survey, and tools used by peer institutions.
3. The instrument should be renamed to clarify what the tool does and does not do ("Survey of Student Learning Experience" (SSLE) or similar).
4. No questions should address the "overall" quality of the course or instructor, as these questions and scores are most prone to bias and misuse.
5. The value of narrative responses should be increased by use of specific prompts.
6. The instrument should provide the ability to add 2-4 additional questions from a pre-approved question bank.
  - a. These questions might address specific course attributes (*e.g.* online, laboratory etc.).
  - b. The results from these additional questions should be used for formative feedback only, unless this is not possible in Explorance Blue.
7. There should be a justification process that engages CAA and the SEI subcommittee for units that wish to use additional or alternative instruments.

An initial draft was shared with Faculty Council and with CAA, and input from students was collected via focus groups run in Spring 2024. After this input the draft was further refined (the current draft being piloted can be found on pages 3-4 of this document)

### **INTERIM RECOMMENDATIONS**

Following our work in Spring 2024, the committee made the following recommendations:

1. The proposed instrument should be piloted in the GE Bookends in AU24. This pilot will engage 7000-10,000 undergraduate students from a range of backgrounds in the context of courses with well-defined learning goals.

*This pilot is underway in the 14-week bookends courses.*

2. A broader opt-in pilot should be completed in SP25, with the goal of gathering trial data across a range of colleges and course types.

*The committee is seeking partners to help us identify appropriate instructors and courses to make sure the SP25 pilot incorporates courses across multiple levels, colleges, and instructional modalities.*

3. The committee will collaborate with other relevant units/groups on campus to assess the results from the pilots.
4. OTDI and CAA should work with the Office of the University Registrar and with Explorance to pilot the use of MLY (an AI-assisted tool designed to summarize qualitative student feedback) for collation and analysis of text-based feedback (at least for Spring pilot)
5. The SEI subcommittee will continue its work in academic year 2024/25, culminating in a final report to CAA that includes:
  - a. A finalized tool, updated based on findings from the pilots.
  - b. A bank of approved questions that address specific course attributes.
  - c. Training plans and policies for units/ committee members/chairs in use of the new tool
    - i. Best practices for implementation and use in summative review.
    - ii. Recommendations for use of student feedback in combination with other assessment tools, including peer evaluation and teaching dossiers.
  - d. Transition plans, including guidance and policies for interpretation of the new tool relative to the existing tool.
  - e. Plans for updating language on the Registrar's website as well as the SEI Handbook.
6. Broad implementation of the new tool in AU 2025

## Proposed Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE)

### Instructions

*The Survey of Student Learning Experience is now open. Complete yours today!*

*While completing each course survey, remember that:*

- ***It's confidential.*** Your instructor will not know which students gave which responses. Instructors do not have access to SSLE reports until grades are posted.
- ***Focus on your own experience.*** Think about instructor behaviors and course design elements that affected your own learning and experience in the course.
- ***Try to be unbiased and constructive.*** Ohio State recognizes that student feedback may be influenced by students' unconscious and unintentional biases. Approach this feedback the same way you would expect your own work to be reviewed.

*Thank you for providing this important feedback!*

### Seven Standard Items

1. The instructor was available to answer questions and provide help if/when needed (in class, in person, by email, office hours, etc.)
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Neutral
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree
2. The instructor provided constructive feedback (during class meetings, in person, on my work, etc.) that helped me to learn.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Neutral
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree
3. The instructor used teaching methods (such as class activities, discussions, group work, projects, lecture) in ways that encouraged my learning.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Neutral
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree
4. This course design and instruction helped me actively engage in my own learning.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

5. The instructor demonstrated genuine interest in teaching.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

6. I felt welcomed in this course (for example, instructor expressed interest in students' well-being, welcomed students' perspectives).

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

7. The instructor created an environment that valued diverse perspectives and experiences.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

## Two open ended items

### Instructions before open-ended questions

*If you have additional information or examples to help explain any of your ratings of the items above, please feel free to provide them in your final comments below.*

*When providing comments:*

- **Focus on your own experience.** Think about instructor behaviors and course design elements that affected your own learning and experience in the course.
- **Be thorough, respectful, and constructive.** Comments in the form of insults or based on stereotypes, personal appearance, or personal characteristics are not appropriate.

1. What specific aspects of this course were effective in promoting your learning (for example, teaching practices, assignments, class material, class structure)?

2. What changes, if any, could be made to improve the learning experience for future students (for example teaching practices, assignments, class material, class structure)?