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**Total number of participants:**

**319 faculty**

**6,562 students**

**Current Overall Response Rate: (as of 5/1/12, closes 5/2/12)**

**61%**

**Communications planning and training** *(see attached formal communications from Campus Labs, faculty communications from colleges)*

CTL training resources include the following:

* + - Demonstration sessions and How-to Workshops for instructors
		- How-to Workshops for department chairs and others with greater access to reports
		- Webinars
		- Written how-to guides for instructors, administrators, and students at <http://myevals.uncc.edu>
		- Video how-to guides for instructors, administrators, and students at <http://myevals.uncc.edu>
		- Workshops on understanding evaluation results
		- Individual consultations available via CEME

 **Integration of student Banner data** **with Campus Labs***(describe process, problems/challenges, timeframe issues)*

Integration of student data in Banner involves capture of three components:

* + - Instructor data
		- Course data
		- Enrollment data

Instructor and course data should be loaded and finalized at least one month before entering the evaluation phase. Changes should not be allowed any closer than 14 days to evaluation kick-offs. Department committees should be formed and in place at the beginning of a term, and should immediately begin assessing their internal evaluation process to uncover the exceptions they have, and determine how to bring them in line with standard practice.

**Communications strategy for students** *( strategy,issues/challenges,incentives)*

* + - Kick-off message to students on April 16.
		- Message from Student Affairs encouraging participation April 16.
		- Three reminder messages (April 19, 24, 27); these messages only going to students who had not completed their evaluations.
		- Final reminder May 1, going only to students who had not completed their evaluations.
		- Four ¼ page ads in *NinerTimes* running each of the four April publications.
		- Plug on Front page of University Home Page.
		- Encouraging participating faculty to directly encourage students to participate.
		- Placement of posters in participating colleges.
		- Use of digital signage in participating colleges.

**Project management and documentation** (*describe documentation procedures)*

* Detailed project plan produced and maintained in ITS project management system (INNOTAS).
* Communications plan maintained.
* Data dump templates developed and maintained.

**Lessons learned** *(Describe take aways, lessons learned, include feedback from colleges in Phase 1, and process changes for Phase 2)*

* One college made significant requests for changes and exclusions right up until kick-off of surveys. This happened because departments within this college did not provide accurate information about courses at deadline. Two lessons arise from this: strictly enforce deadlines, and insist that each department reconcile their instruction configuration with Banner.
* Banner provides data of record for upload to CampusLabs, but Banner instructor of record does not always match instructors in the Colleges. Examples: Lab instructors not captured as instructors of record; secondary instructors not instructor of record, but still require evaluation; combined courses have shared instructors, and when these courses cross colleges problems occur in our college by college roll-out model.
* A variety of issues occurred with course data. Examples: Math Education courses are listed in the Math department, but instructors come from Education; this causes issues in the college by college roll-out model. Likewise, LBST courses are listed as CLAS courses, but are taught across the University; this too causes issues in our college by college roll-out. The issue becomes particularly thorny when courses are combined across colleges and one college is rolling out but the other is not.
* Graduate courses are included in the roll-out, but many of these courses, particularly thesis and dissertation courses have only one enrollee. These students get evaluations, but rarely fill them out. The result is a significant reduction in overall response rates. Policy decision on evaluation of thesis and dissertation courses is required, as well as a decision on whether to evaluate courses with fewer than three students. This is a significant issue with respect to response rate calculation.
* Uploads of enrollment data must take place after final drop day or withdrawn students will have an opportunity to evaluate the course. Classes with fewer than three enrollments may skew response rates, and compromise the confidentiality of respondents. The University should consider exempting such classes.

Vendor-related issues:

* Some students were mistakenly redirected to the wrong site for about 18 hours on Wednesday and Thursday. Campus Labs fixed the problem, but if students are still using the same browser, they have to clear their cookies and recent browsing history to avoid being redirected. Campus Labs was unable to determine how many students were affected, but the response rate remained steady during this time, so we believe the impact was minimal.
* On Monday, some students were able to log in, but they didn’t see any evaluations. Campus Labs fixed a problem with the accounts and the students were immediately able to see their evaluations. Again, we don’t know how many students were affected, but we believe the impact was minimal.

**Recommendations for Phase 2:**

* Document all the exceptions found, and use this list to build in an assessment of exceptions into the project plan for each subsequent college.
* Build a plan with each college for how to bring the exceptions into the standard process.
* Determine where each college deviates from Banner’s information of record and recommend that they either conform to the system of record, or make changes in Banner as necessary.
* Begin the departmental planning/assessment at the beginning of the semester or before.
* Create an earlier deadline for final instructor and course data loads.
* Ensure that fully online courses that are not coded as DE are included in the course evaluation process for the college.
* Continue to provide clear, strategic communications to students and faculty
* Provide marketing incentives to encourage student participation
* Encourage review and adoption of College of Education survey instrument as a model
* Provide funding resources to CEME to support faculty analysis of data, upon request