

Examining faculty developer involvement in midcourse feedback for engineering faculty (WIP)



Michael R. Berta, Ed.D.

Preferred Name: Mike

Pronouns: he/his/him

INTRODUCTION

- Midcourse process restarted in Fall '18
- Process involves faculty developer as intermediary in data collection and interpretation.
- Faculty developer consults with faculty to share results, discuss ideas, make recommendations, and guide response to students.

METHOD

- Faculty invited to participate in post-academic year survey
- Net Promoter Score Data plus reflective questions

RESULTS

- N = 46; Response Rate = 21 (45.7%)
- Reported NPS = +33 (Scale -100/+100)
 - 11 Promoters; 6 Passives; 4 Detractors
- 76.2% (16) made a facdev or student recommended change; mostly EBIP
- 91% of respondents summarized findings with students (19)

DISCUSSION

- ERAU Midcourse student feedback is collected through surveys or SGID/GIFT and primarily by faculty developer
- Data is shared through faculty development meeting before next class meeting
- Aggregate and analyzed data is shared with college leadership giving student voice to teaching, decisions, and needs of the college.
- Net Promoter Score is imperfect due to faculty culture, departmental requirements, and limited measurement of complex questions

Engineering faculty members valued & applied the advice of faculty developers on how to interpret, use, & respond to midcourse student feedback.



About the Midcourse Process

- Midcourses run for ~4 weeks during each semester.
- Faculty and Graduate Instructors
- Data collection, facdev consultation, and closing the loop with students takes place between class meetings (usually in 24 hours)
- Some departments require involvement
- All graduate instructors required
- Feedback collected by CTLE or Faculty administered survey or via GIFT
- Anonymous and confidential

Types of Changes Made by Faculty

- Explanation of Teaching Decisions
- Checking the pace
- Connections and Relevance
- Student Collaborations
- Classroom Assessment Techniques
- Lower Stakes Assessment

Fun Facts

- >2500 Student voices in 3 semesters
- 189 Sections between F'18 and F'19
- 2018-19 Key themes were empathy and relevance related
- Data from midcourse surveys aided in COE Teaching Symposium

Future Studies

- Examining Teaching Center Professionals as Critical Colleagues in Formative Teaching Feedback
- Understanding Midcourse Student Feedback in Engineering Courses as a Tool for Student Agency

Next Steps

- Interviewing faculty about the process
- Including EOCS data and perceptions

Wild Ideas

- AI collection of data and consultation (e.g. Google Home)
- Student-collection of data

