used. After narrowing the field, the group presented its recommendation to Provost Dobkin in early August 2012. At that meeting, with the Provost’s consent, we selected eXplorance Blue as SMC’s best solution.

Details about eXplorance Blue can be found in Appendix B. This system met all of our product requirements and, by virtue of its complexity and depth, offers the most promise in providing an effective and reliable course evaluation system.\(^1\) We were particularly impressed with Blue’s ability to present data longitudinally and for the multiple ways faculty could disaggregate their data. This system was demonstrated to Senate leadership and the academic deans in August 2012. At the end of this demonstration, the Senate Chair requested it be demonstrated again to the entire Senate and that a formal proposal to adopt the system be submitted.

**Goals, Tasks, and Timeline**

The adoption of an electronic-based course evaluation system is informed by three primary goals, which can be organized into phases:

- **Phase 1:** To investigate and select an electronic-based course evaluation system.
- **Phase 2:** To use an incremental approach in introducing this system to all SMC academic programs.
- **Phase 3:** To track student response rates for the new system while taking preventative measures to avoid a precipitous fall in response.

These goals inform the following tasks:

**Phase 1: Investigation**

1) Share investigation and implementation plan and secure funding.
2) Complete requirements document.
3) Narrow list of possible systems using requirements document.
4) Select a single system for adoption.
5) Adapt system for use at SMC.

**Phase 2: System Introduction**

1) Pilot system.
2) Improve the system based on evaluative feedback.
3) Introduce the system to approximately half of the academic programs.
4) Improve the system based on evaluative feedback.
5) Introduce the system to approximately half of the remaining academic programs.
6) Improve the system based on evaluative feedback.

**Phase 3: Student response**

1) During each introduction of the system, track student response rates.
2) Monitor communication about the system.

\(^1\) eXplorance Blue has the added benefit of being used by multiple Catholic colleges and universities, such as Los Angeles’ LMU or Loyola Maryland University. SMC would join our “sister institutions” in using this system.
3) If necessary, suggest policy on improving response to Senate.

The following faculty and administrators will be involved in these tasks:
- Provost Dobkin: offer input; ensure use of the system; support overall effort.
- Academic Senate: offer input; ensure use of the system, support overall effort.
- Chris Procello (IR): project manager; organize tasks during phases; communicate progress.
- Sheila Pallotta (ITS): collaborate with Chris; provide technical expertise.
- Peter Greco (ITS): stay abreast of developments; support overall effort.

These goals and tasks inform the following timeline:
Phase 1: Investigation
**Summer 2012:**
- Complete planning and requirements document.
- Develop list of possible systems for SMC.
- Narrow list and select a single system for piloting.

Phase 2: System introduction
**Fall 2012:**
- Share plans with and demonstrate the system to deans and Senate faculty.
- Adapt system for use at SMC.
- Prepare for piloting.
- Pilot. Test semesterly cycle of communication.
- Collect and review evaluative feedback.

**Spring 2013:**
- Introduce the system to approximately half of the academic programs.
- Collect and review evaluative feedback.

**Fall 2013:**
- Introduce the system to approximately half of the remaining academic programs.
- Collect and review evaluative feedback.

Phase 3: Track student response
**Spring 2014:**
- Report on student response over past year.
- If necessary, suggest policy on improving response (e.g., “grade blocking”) to Senate.

Note: The pilot will reduce risks to the overall process and untenured faculty. First, the existing capacity for paper administration will remain. If, for any reason, the electronic system fails we can revert to paper. Second, the pilot will involve neither non-tenured faculty nor associate professors—it will only involve full professors. This group is best protected if evaluation data is lost or unanticipated problems emerge. We intend to ask full professors to volunteer to be a part of the pilot.