

EvaluationKIT Steering Committee

Wednesday, February 11, 2015

Meeting Agenda

1. Edit/approve January 21 minutes – 11:00-11:02
2. Quick project status update – 11:02-11:15
 - a. Marketing campaign
 - b. UCAMM names?
 - c. Survey to investigate response rate causal factors
 - d. Meeting with NMSU
 - e. TEC meeting to consider UNM-wide questions
 - f. Other?
3. Examine [fall pilot follow-up survey](#) – suggest needed corrections for spring – 11:15-noon
 - a. Survey timing
 - b. Instructions to faculty in advance of survey
 - c. Survey content issues
 - d. Response rates
 - e. Other?

Attendees

- Stephen Burd
- Marcos Abeyta
- Glenna Doctor
- Aeron Hayne
- Charles Fledderman
- Diane Marshall
- Elisha Allen
- Karen Gardner
- Neke Mitchell

Minutes

A summary of discussions and decisions follows.

Approve Last Meeting's Minutes

Last meeting's minutes have been approved

Project Status Update

- Marketing Campaign:
 - Everyone got their flyer
 - The URL update won't be complete until Friday
- UCAMM Names:
 - No feedback yet
- Survey to investigate response rate casual factors:
 - Desired output would result in an ordered list of what's effective and ineffective
 - We forgot to put in a way to authenticate surveys
 - **Should we do another survey with one question in order to correlate responses?**
 - **Take Question 2 and an open ended text question sent out to the participants in an authenticated manner in order to link response rates.**
- Meeting with NMSU
 - Phone meeting with NMSU about EvKit
 - Big Takeaway: **We assumed there would be one EvKit system for UNM and everything would work under that. NMSU cut it up and runs 11 different instances of EvKit. They have a lot of variation in terms of survey timing and questions.**
 - **Makes it difficult to have UNM wide questions and compare data**
 - **NMSU EvKit use is voluntary**
 - Some academic units will want control to create projects
 - This discussion needs to wait for Aaron Baca and Moira Gerety
- TEC Meetings to consider UNM-wide questions
 - Meeting scheduled for February 20
 - Volunteers have agreed to come to the meeting
 - 2 meetings might be needed to come to a decision
 - Shooting for 3-6 questions
- Other
 - There are no other topics

Examine Follow-Up Survey

- Response Rate
 - Went out to 256 email addresses
 - Received 60 responses in 5 days
 - ASM is overrepresented in that sample
 - **Should we do a branching survey that asks if you responded to the first survey?**
 - **Should we re-open the survey and send out a reminder?**
 - We're going to do a separate 1-2 question survey
- Pre-Survey Communication with Faculty
 - We had a late start
 - **What do we tell them and when do we tell them?**
- Knowledge of project needs to be available

- Website updates should raise awareness
- **Short targeted email with links that comes from multiple people/roles sent out**
 - **Send an email in a week and another after spring break**
- Switching Roles
 - There is some confusion with roles (Instructor v. Student/Respondent)
 - Related help info needs to be displayed somewhere
- Timing of survey
 - Poor communication about open/close dates
 - Arch requested a later start/end date because of their studio courses
 - **It would be nice to get info out about what our date plans are to see if there are any issues that need addressed**
- Some faculty were concerned because not every student had a device to complete the survey in class
 - Raise awareness about ability to complete evaluations on a smartphones and tablets
- **Does EvKit need a NetID?**
- Once the website is up an email will be sent out to the steering committee for feedback on missing information
- Open/Close Dates
 - 3 options for fall pilot: Arch, Intersession, and All Others
 - Issues:
 - Some faculty hand out final grades the last day of class and don't want the survey open because of students who don't like their grade
 - Some faculty hand out grades the last day of class and give extra credit for survey participation
 - Some want it open into finals week
 - Opening the survey a week earlier for spring than the fall pilot would be a good idea
 - Closing the survey not early enough is a bigger concern than opening it too early
 - Keeping the survey open longer might be a reasonable solution
 - Every survey in a project has the same start and end date
- Student Response Rate
 - 36% at Gallup
 - 70% at ASM
 - IDEA was running just under 70%
 - There are things we can do to increase response rates
 - Instructors were generally dissatisfied with Fall Evaluation response rates
 - **Should we be doing something direct to students?**
 - **QR Code?**
 - **Faculty send info to class list?**
 - **Student volunteers?**