The Stop, Start, Continue, Change Method of Feedback Elicitation for Program Assessment

Matthew Carter, PhD, CCC-SLP
Crystal Randolph, PhD, CCC-SLP
Rudo Tsemunhu, PhD
Valdosta State University

Disclosure Statements

- Dr. Carter has no relevant financial or nonfinancial relationships to disclose

- Dr. Randolph received a travel scholarship from Valdosta State University to attend the conference. There are no relevant nonfinancial relationships to disclose.

- Dr. Tsemunhu has no relevant financial or nonfinancial relationships to disclose

Learning Objectives

- Upon completion, participants will be able to list pros and cons of various feedback elicitation methods.

- Upon completion, participants will be able to describe the stop, start, continue, change method of feedback elicitation.

- Upon completion, participants will be able to apply the stop, start, continue, change method of feedback elicitation to their respective departments.

"

Opinion is the medium between knowledge and ignorance.

~ Plato

BACKGROUND

Factors Contributing to Successful Degree Programs

- Degree program satisfaction (Suhre, Jansen, & Harskamp, 2007)
- Accreditation (Hendel & Lewis, 2005; Woodhouse, 1999)
- Faculty
  - Academic
  - Clinical-supervisory process (Carter et al., 2018

Factors Contributing to Successful Degree Programs

- ◉ Graduation Rate

- ◉ Diversity (Woods, 2015)

- ◉ Student factors
  - ○ IQ- contributes to completion and measure of program satisfaction
  - ○ Prior knowledge
  - ○ Motivation

Program Assessment

- Student evaluation
- Course evaluation
- Are these methods effective enough to determine program success?

Elicitation Methods

- Formative vs. summative methods
- Quantitative vs. qualitative
- Close-ended vs open-ended

Student Feedback

- How effective are my professor's instructional abilities (Clay, 2009; Uttl , White, & Gonzalez, 2016)?
  - Meta‑analysis: lack of significance for student evaluation of teacher effectiveness and faculty teaching effectiveness
- Student evaluation of teaching (SET) is more strongly related to   instructor's perceived   gender and to students' grade expectations   than they are to learning, as measured by performance on anonymously graded , uniform final exams (Boring, Ottoboni , & Stark, 2016).

Purpose of the Study

⦿ Compare two open‑ended methods   of program evaluation

  ○ Strengths and weaknesses vs.
  ○ Stop, Start, Continue, Change

Research Questions

◉ What are the a) quantitative and b) qualitative differences in the feedback elicitation methods used in the current research?

"

I cannot say whether things will get better if we change; what I can say is they must change if they are to get better.
~Georg C. Lichtenberg

METHODOLOGY

Participants

- 45 1st, 2nd, 3rd semester master's level CSD students
- 43 2nd year (seniors) undergraduate CSD majors

Procedures

- All procedures were approved by University IRB.
- Responses were kept anonymous.
- Participants were administered one of two feedback forms during class time or exit meetings:
  - Stop, Start, Continue, Change (SSCC)
    - 24 grad students, 21 undergrad
  - Strengths and Weaknesses of classroom and clinic (SW)
    - 21 grad students, 22 undergrad
- The forms alternated between participants.

Procedures
SSCC

- Please list specific elements you would recommend STOPPING regarding CSD program coursework/clinical experience.

- Please list specific elements you would recommend STARTING regarding CSD program coursework/ clinical experience.

- Please list specific elements you would recommend CONTINUING regarding CSD program coursework/ clinical experience.

- Please list specific elements you would recommend CHANGING regarding CSD program coursework/ clinical experience.

Procedures
SW

- Please list the strengths of the CSD program coursework.

- Please list the weaknesses of the CSD program coursework.

- Please list the strengths of the CSD program on - campus clinical experience.

- Please list the weaknesses of the CSD program on - campus clinical experience.

Measures

- A multi-tiered scoring system was used to judge student participant response depth and response theme. Word count was also calculated for each response using Microsoft Word.
    - Hoon, Oliver, Szpakowska, & Newton, 2015; Newton, Wallace, & McKimm, 2012

Measures
Depth of Responses

◉ Responses were categorized into one of four categories based on depth

0. No response
1. Descriptive
   - Problem/Positive identified
     - This was good/bad
2. Qualified
   - Problem/Positive identified and explained
     - This was good/bad because……
3. Constructive
   - Problem/positive identified, explanation offered, and constructive suggestion for change or development
     - This was good/bad because…. and could be made better by…..

Measures
Theme of Responses

- Responses were categorized into one of three categories based on theme

  P. Positive

  N. Negative

  X. Neutral

Measures

- A graduate research assistant who did not complete the survey categorized each response. The number of responses per category were calculated for each individual.

- A second graduate research assistant who did not complete the survey provided inter - rater reliability analyses on 10% of both graduate and undergraduate participant responses
  - Interrater reliability for the raters was high (Kappa = .78, $p =$ .002)

Analyses

- To answer the experimental question which asked if there were significant differences in the depth and theme of responses, a Mann-Whitney U Tests was conducted on the categorized response frequencies as a function of survey (SSCC vs. SW).

Analyses

- To answer the experimental question which asked if there were significant differences in the depth of responses as a function of school -status (graduate vs. undergraduate), a Mann-Whitney U Test was conducted on the response frequency data as a function of school status (graduate vs. undergraduate).

Results

Quantitative Contingency Table

Class	Survey	No Response	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Total
Undergrads	**SSCC**	18	23	21	41	20	59	6	85
	SW	0	47	48	15	58	52	0	110
	Total	18	70	69	56	78	111	6	195
Grads	**SSCC**	46	58	23	81	57	90	15	162
	SW	8	71	64	17	90	61	1	152
	Total	54	129	87	98	147	151	16	314
Combined	**SSCC**	64	81	44	122	77	149	21	247
	SW	8	118	112	32	148	113	1	262
	Total	72	199	156	154	225	262	22	509

Quantitative
Depth of Responses

- Significant differences found between number of no responses with SSCC ($Mdn. =1.0$) being associated with higher non-response rates than SW ($Mdn. =0.0$), $U=457.5$, $p<.001$, $r=-.52$

- Significant differences found between number of Level 2 responses with SSCC ($Mdn. =1.0$) being associated with less level 2 responses than SW ($Mdn. =2.0$), $U=400.0$, $p<.001$, $r=-.52$.

Quantitative
Depth of Responses

- Significant differences found between number of level 3 responses with SSCC (*Mdn.* = 3.0) being associated with more level 3 responses than SW (*Mdn.* = 0.0), $U = 301.0$, $p < .001$, $r = -.61$

Quantitative Theme of Responses

- Significant differences found between the proportion of positive responses with SSCC (*Mdn.* =25%) being associated with a smaller proportion of positive responses than SW (*Mdn.* =50%), $U =$ 311.5, $p < .001$, $r = -.59$

- Significant differences found between the proportion of negative responses with SSCC (*Mdn.* =67%) being associated with a larger proportion of negative responses than SW (*Mdn.* = 42%), $U = 561.5$, $p = .001$, $r = -.36$

Quantitative
Group Differences

⦿ Significant differences found between number of no responses by graduate students (*Mdn. =*2.0) being associated with higher non-response rates than undergraduate students (*Mdn. =*0.0), $U =$ 720.5, $p =$ .017, $r =$ -.42

"

Change is the law of life. And those who look only to the past or present are certain to miss the future. ~John F. Kennedy

Conclusion

Significant Differences between SSCC and SW

◉ The current study, as well as previous studies have shown more in-depth responses are associated with SSCC than free response formats (Hoon et al., 2015).

◉ The current study reveals that the increase in response depth may come at the cost of higher non-response rates.

Significant Differences between SSCC and SW

- ◉ In addition, the current study revealed significantly more positive comments were provided when using the SW format whereas significantly more negative comments were provided when using the SSCC format.

- ◉ The SSCC format possibly lends itself toward more critical thinking regarding the topic of discussion.

Limitations

- Students were still enrolled in on‑campus portion of studies. It is possible that the current results would not generalize to student response patterns when students are not physically present at the university.

- Despite a relatively large N, it is possible that lurking variables (ex: groupthink) could have affected the current findings. This could affect the generalizability of the findings to other cohorts or other universities.

Implications

- The current research suggests that the quality, quantity, and type of feedback that students provide can differ dramatically depending upon the manner in which it is obtained.

- The current research also suggests that students are a viable resource for program improvement analysis.

Recommendations

- Programs should consider implementing feedback elicitation methods from their students.

- In addition, it is possible that utilizing multiple question types would yield far more valuable information than singular methods.

Recommendations

- Research investigating the factors that affect student feedback is extremely lacking and should become a focus.

- In addition, a joint action plan should be developed by faculty and student representatives to address reasonable student concerns.

- Finally, action research should be implemented to assess the effects of the action plan on both students and faculty.

Conclusion

- This process yielded valuable information for the Communication Sciences and Disorders program at Valdosta State University. Much information was obtained from the students that would not have been obtained otherwise.

- Individual programs should consider the current methods when assessing their own   program quality.

"

For changes to be of any true value, they've got to be lasting and consistent. ~Tony Robbins

Thanks!

ANY QUESTIONS?

Contact:

Matt Carter

mdcarter@valdosta.edu

References

Clayson, D. E. (2009). Student evaluations of teaching: Are they related to what students learn? A meta-analysis and review of the literature. Journal of Marketing Education, 31(1), 16–30. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0273475308324086.

Hendel, D. D., & Lewis, D. R. (2005). Quality assurance of higher education in transition countries: Accreditation-accountability and assessment. *Tertiary Education & Management*, *11*(3), 239-258.

Hoon, A., Oliver, E. J., Szpakowska, K., & Newton, P. (2015). Use of the 'Stop, Start, Continue' method is associated with the production of constructive qualitative feedback by students in higher education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 40,* 755-767.

Newton, P. M., Wallace, M. J., & McKimm, J. (2012). Improved quality and quantity of

written feedback is associated with a structured feedback proforma. *Journal of Educational Evaluation for Health Professions, 9,* 1-7.

Suhre, C. J., Jansen, E. P., & Harskamp, E. G. (2007). Impact of degree program satisfaction on the persistence of college students. *Higher Education*, *54*(2), 207-226.

Woodhouse, D. (1999). Quality and quality assurance. In H. Wit de & J. Knight (eds.), Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 29–44.

Woods, D. R., Taylor, S., Austin, D., Beck, J., Chung, K., Couch, S., ... & Kupers, E. (2015). Building an Inclusive, Accessible, and Responsive Campus at California State University East Bay, 2010-2015. *Perspectives on Communication Disorders and Sciences in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) Populations*, *22*, 44-63.