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I. Trajectory
A. Winter 2010
   1. Instructional Development went live with electronic only distribution of ESCI reports in Winter 2010
   2. Distribution in electronic form has eliminated the printing of between 9,000 and 11,000 multipage reports per year over the past two years
B. Winter-Spring 2011
   1. Online ESCI Task Group convened by the EVC with Carol Genetti and I as Co-Chairs.
   2. During the winter and spring quarters the work group conducted research on approaches that other institutions took on online evaluations, systems that they used, incentives for their students, and effects on survey results. We developed a platform design and plan for distributing questionnaires online, collecting the results and importing them into the backend ESCI processing system. In May 2010 the work group submitted a proposal for the transition to online course survey collection to the EVC and the Academic Senate.
   3. In June 2011 we conducted a survey of the faculty about the transition to online surveys to gather data for our planning process for the pilot.
   4. We received a response from the Academic Senate on the proposal at the end of June 2011. Although overall faculty response was positive on both the proposal and survey, the senate requested that a broader constituency be involved in the continuation of the pilot and eventual transition to production mode.
C. Fall 2011
   1. During the fall quarter we built the initial delivery platform for online based on Drupal, and refined the necessary data transfer protocols between systems.
   2. We ran a test cycle for two Environmental Studies courses at the end of fall quarter as an initial test of the delivery system, and were dependent on the faculty members to remind their students to engage.
   3. During fall quarter we recruited additional representatives from the faculty, graduate students and under graduate students to form the Ad Hoc Committee on Electronic Course Evaluation, as a response to the issues raised by the Senate.
D. Winter 2012
   1. The Ad Hoc Committee met for the first time, was updated on progress to date, and determined the best strategy for moving forward. It was decided to form three sub-committees to deal with discrete areas of concern
      a) Academic Personnel
      b) Content of the Item Pool
      c) Implementation
   2. We contacted Student Affairs IT to obtain access to the web-service interface to get course and enrollment data. This was necessary for both online and paper-based survey strategies because we require the curriculum data each quarter to know what courses are offered so that departments can request surveys, and we need the enrollment data for both the ParScore system for test scoring and for the automated email reminder system for online ESCI. Although they were very quick to provide access to the test instance of the web-service, they were not in a position to provide access to the production web-service at that time due to personnel constraints that they were under for their major system transition.
   3. We did not run a test of the system in Winter quarter.
E. Spring 2012
1. The Academic Personnel subcommittee developed an excellent set of recommendations for moving forward designed to address concerns about possible negative impacts on personnel cases. The two biggest recommendations was clear labeling of ESCI reports to distinguish between traditional, online pilot, and online reports. The other major recommendation was to include whole departments at a time as a guard against disparities in results within departments due to any instrumentality effect.
2. The Content subcommittee embarked on an evaluation of the more then 5,000 items in the item pool. Their evaluation included flagging items that should no longer be used, flagging items in need of revision for clarity or appropriateness for online delivery. That work has continued to the present.
3. The Implementation subcommittee developed a short questionnaire to gauge student response to the new survey method. They also received permission to conduct pilot surveys for the Freshman Seminar courses from Dean Nisbet. These courses represented a good pool because they are all within one department, there are 30-40 of them each quarter, and the result do not have an effect on faculty members advancement cases because they are offered outside their home department.
4. We conducted a trial with 13 courses at the end of spring quarter, but had to gather the enrollment data directly from the faculty members via eGrades extracts to test the email reminder system.

F. Summer 2012
1. The Content subcommittee continued their work.
2. We used the online system for the course evaluations for the four Summer Online Pilot courses.
3. We added a new item type to the item pool for headers to be presented in the questionnaires to reflect the full wording of the paper questionnaires.

G. Fall 2012
1. The Ad Hoc Committee as a whole did not meet in Fall quarter because we were in a holding pattern on expansion of the pilot until we had access to the web-service, although the Content subcommittee did continue their work.
2. We got access to the production web-service for curriculum and enrollment data at the end of Fall quarter, but too close to the survey window to be able to use it for fall.
3. We did a trial with the Freshman Seminar courses and three Art courses for which the senior faculty member volunteered. There were 22 courses included in this sample.
4. We included the survey of student reaction to the online survey system in the fall quarter pool of surveys.
5. Carol Genetti stepped down as Co-Chair and Jeffery Stopple agreed to step in as the new Co-Chair. Jeffrey and I met in December to consult on the next steps for the Committee.

H. Winter 2013
1. We have reached out to the Committee of the whole to convene a meeting in the next two weeks to update everyone on progress so far, and to formulate our plans for continuing the pilot in an expanded form in Winter and Spring quarters.
2. We are testing the web-service, and ensuring that we will be able to use it for an expanded pilot starting this quarter.

II. Results to Date
A. Spring 2012 - 15 courses, mean response rate 54%, range 6% - 93%
B. Fall 2012 - 22 courses, mean response rate 61%, range 33% - 100%
C. Email reminders need to be supplemented with additional channels
D. Over all responses do not seem to me more negative, but the Freshman Seminar survey does not include A & B. For the two courses that did include A&B, results appear comparable to previous quarters. Need a bigger sample.
E. Student Response
   1. Save Drafts 42% Yes
   2. Online an improvement 70% Yes
   3. Thoughtfulness 32% Yes, 58% No Opinion, 10% No
   4. Optimal survey period: Two Weeks - 46%
   5. Confidence in anonymity: 65% Yes, 25% No Opinion, 11% No
   6. Wireless Device to Take Survey in Class: 76% yes, 24% No
   7. General responses: like the ability to write free form comments, want ability to save drafts, split on in class or at home

III. Future Plans
   A. Expand the pilot to test the web-service with both the FHSP courses and one whole department this quarter
   B. Expand the pilot to up to four departments in Spring depending on issues with cross listed courses and appropriateness of the items
   C. Gather more student response to the system from the larger pool of students
   D. Work to get integrated GauchoSpace reminders in Winter or Spring
   E. Develop online tool for departments to request surveys in Winter
   F. Redesign the report access tool for department representatives in Spring