MEMORANDUM

To: Provost Vicki Golich, Ph.D.
Cc: James Lyall, Ph.D.; Luis Torres, Ph.D.
From: Michael Erskine, Ph.D. (Chair); Donald Chang, Ph.D. (College of Business); Maria Garibay Campos (SGA); Bernice Harris, Ph.D. (ASA); Elizabeth Hinde (University Deans); Ed Jacobs, Jr. (ITS); Michael Kolb, Ph.D. (Center for Faculty Excellence); Cynthia Lindquist, PhD. (Council of Chairs and School of Education); Lisa Ortiz, Ph.D. (College of Professional Studies and Faculty Senate); Sheila Rucki, Ph.D. (College of Letters, Arts and Sciences and Faculty Senate); Luis Torres, Ph.D. (ASA)

Re: eSRI Implementation Team Status Report
Date: June 6, 2016

The eSRI Implementation Team met four times during the Spring 2016 semester and will continue to meet until the charge objectives are met. Members of the team committed to communicating regular updates about the eSRI implementation to various constituent groups, such as the Council of Chairs, Faculty Senate, IT Strategic Oversight Committee and SGA. Anyone interested in following the various conversations may request to join the eSRI Implementation Team SharePoint group that was recently launched to facilitate communication and provide transparency.

To meet the objective of determining a viable tool for eSRI collection, the team decided to test the usage of EvaluationKit, the tool currently used by MSU Denver to collect SRIs for all online courses. EvaluationKit has dramatically increased the SRI participation within online courses from a low of 17% during the Spring 2015 semester to a high of 57% during the Fall 2015 semester. Furthermore, the transition to EvaluationKit from a ‘home-grown’ solution that had been used for over ten years, was seamless and transparent to online students and faculty. Since these students and faculty were already familiar with EvaluationKit, it seemed that the transition to using this tool for face-to-face courses could also be as seamless and transparent. Additionally, the University was already licensed to deploy EvaluationKit for all courses, so adding additional courses would not increase the licensing cost, nor would an extensive implementation effort be required.

The decision was also influenced by the benefits MSU Denver has experienced from using EvaluationKit for online course SRI collection. These benefits include: greater convenience to students; reduced errors in the data collection, data entry and data evaluation processes; and the potential for faster feedback to faculty at the end of the semester. Additionally, ITS is expanding the capabilities of EvaluationKit to benefit online course SRI collection by automatically generating reports (EvaluationKit SOW 1.0) and populating DigitalMeasures (EvaluationKit SOW 1.2).

After determining which tool to test, the team discussed additional topics, such as conducting an effective pilot, communicating with students and faculty, and integrating any custom questions that departments may want to include in the eSRI collection process. Based on these discussions, the team decided to conduct a pilot consisting of two treatment groups (described below),
developed a series of messages for each treatment group, and showed eight department administrators how to add custom questions to the SRIs.

Voluntary faculty participants were recruited by the Academic Deans and Chairs. Of the more than 250 participating courses, each was randomly assigned to either Treatment Group One or Treatment Group Two. Treatment Group One received a series of emails requesting that they use EvaluationKit for the submission of their course SRIs (as online courses currently do). Treatment Group Two was asked to perform the current in-class procedure (paper and pencil) for SRI collection, except using the EvaluationKit tool.

Treatment Group One had a 62% response rate (1,434 responses) and Treatment Group Two had a 68% response rate (1,506 responses). The Treatment Group Two response rate was relatively similar to the 69% response rate achieved for paper SRI collection in Fall 2011, and only 4% less than the 72% response rate achieved during the Fall 2015 semester.

The pilot project revealed the following key findings:

- Using EvaluationKit with the process assigned to Treatment Group Two, the student eSRI response rate reached 68%. Some individual courses had response rates in the high 90% range. Furthermore, faculty and students reported few issues concerning the eSRI process.
- Managing individual courses within EvaluationKit is possible, but cumbersome. Thus, it is suggested that any future pilots or full implementations manage participation by academic department instead of by individual courses.
- The team identified a total of 10 departments that currently use custom questions, of which eight participated in the pilot. The administrators of these departments seemed to quickly learn how to add custom questions to EvaluationKit. However, departments may want to consider whether or not it is beneficial or detrimental to add custom questions to the SRIs.
- The communications used for the pilot produced adequate participation and generated very few questions, so this method should be used for any subsequent pilot tests.

Based on the successful implementation of EvaluationKit for online courses and the findings from the pilot (as described above), the eSRI Implementation Team recommends the following:

- In Summer 2016, conduct a more expansive pilot using an eSRI process as the primary SRI collection method for all academic departments. Provide an ‘opt-out’ option for any departments that prefer to continue using a paper-based process.
- Use the Treatment Group Two eSRI collection process for academic departments participating in the pilot.
- Work with departments that elected to ‘opt-out’ in order to remove barriers that may hinder eSRI adoption for Fall 2016.
Remaining eSRI Implementation Team tasks:

- Communicate information about the Summer 2016 pilot to various stakeholder groups (i.e., Council of Chairs, Faculty Senate, Student Government Assembly) as well as those students and faculty who will be participating.
- Clarify any ambiguity concerning current SRI collection processes. Specifically, determine which courses (defined by course code) should not have an SRI collected or reported. Furthermore, determine the minimum sample size required for reporting through DigitalMeasures. Any recommended definitions would need to be approved by an appropriate governance group and possibly included in the Faculty Handbook.
- Define the approach for a University-wide implementation of eSRI collection during the Fall 2016 semester, based on Summer 2016 pilot findings.