



Petrina, S. (2015). iPopU: Innovation in Evaluation. *Workplace*, 27, 1-4.

MAYOR OF IPOPU  
*EDUTAINUM INFINITUM*

**iPopU**  
**INNOVATION IN EVALUATION**

Let's face it: Evaluation is silly. Reviews of programs and units in universities in this day and age are even sillier. Units put the Unit in Unitiversity, so what's to review? No one really believes the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education when they boast in the naval-gazing *Self-Study Guide* that "undertaking a self-study is a major enterprise" or "self-study cannot be done well under rushed conditions." Says who? These academic proverbs sell booklets with a wink wink and a chuckle.

That is the gist of the administrative genius of a major innovation in evaluation at iPopU. We drilled down to what is the core of the Review process and then inventoried trends to find that the Rating widget solves every problem of evaluation.

There are three types of evaluations, Conformative, Normative, and ~~Summative~~, or what I'm told is better known in the field nowadays as Corporative, and the Rating widget solves all three at once. Yes, I hear you nodding, quite the little workhorse that Rating widget!

Yet, it took iPopU to repurpose it to the depth work of admin.

When we announced that it was time for Reviews, the yawning started and then came the dragging of the heels, for years. Check, we hear you when you say evaluations never change anything. Check, we hear you when you say you have better things to do. Check, we hear you when you say self-studies can be completed by a grad student or staff member with a Fillitin app on their phones. Check, we hear you when you say accreditation is a carry-over make-work relic of the medieval scholiastics. Check, we see you when you ask there must be a better way.

In one School, we have fourteen senior administrators who are already bumping into each other. Assigning a few to oversee a Review just adds to this. Remember, a bustling administrative office is like hot air when heated with a fan, electrons expand and collide with each other. In the old days, we dragged out Reviews for years, from one to the next, thinking that the best review was the prolonged review. We had two Associate Deans of the Office of Review. When we reviewed our 65 programs some time ago, comic relief faculty lovingly referred to this as a three-ring circus and then posted it on iPopUtube as a keystone cops episode. So we made admin offices bigger to avoid that. But, I listen to you wondering, are these admins underworked? I answer to that, better to have many than few. Am I right?

So iPopU introvated and in 2014 did all Reviews with the Rating widget.

The findings of the iPopU process are startling (spoiler alert: short on time and long on information, senior admin readers already know this and can skip this section to check devices for an executive keyword tweet).

Figure 1 shows our Self-Study and External Review prototype of the Faculty of Social Sciences. Correct. There are no bothersome review committees, documents, or procedures. We merely crowd-sourced the name of the Unit (College of Social Sciences) and a link to its blog.

The prototype included two Rating widgets: The Likert Star type and the more user-friendly Nero thumbs up/down. The prototype revealed too much fence-sitting with the Likert Star system; what does 1,240 votes and four stars mean? Hence, like YouTube's innovation, we implemented the Nero thumbs variable for all reviews. Either you like it or you don't. In the prototype, 508 gave the College a 👍, in technical terms "like," while 244 reviewed it with a dreaded 🙄, "dislike."

**Star Rating Widget** — The star rating allows visitors to rate your content on a scale of 1-5.



**Nero Rating Widget** — The nero rating offers a simple, "thumbs up" / "thumbs down" rating.



Psychometricians report that this could be even more streamlined and reliable by eliminating the thumbs down response option to better capture the invariance. The simple 👍 only variable has been a longstanding corporate practice, perhaps most demonstrably standardized by Google+, Digg, and Yahoo Answers. Measurement reminds us that in meetings, we only give thumbs up or count hands up, as there is no such thing as counting hands down.

Three words: It's real world.

If it's close enough for government work, or fast enough for the swift currents of the market, then it's ideal for University work. No, the Social Sciences does not get a free pass with 244 🙄. If concerns arise, do the math and average with their stock closings or credit ratings over a two-day period. Yes, the Review is finished. It is that efficient. 'For what is this a prototype?' say naysayers. 'Is this prototype or protohype?' And their question is?

Figure 2 shows the interface and *Final Report of the Review of the School of Business*. Business is always trending in iPopU but for its last Review, some time around 1998, got plonked by the External Review team (i.e., Nero's 🙄 in contemporary terms). We were immediately reminded to handsomely reward external reviewers who were team players on the next review. Quite understandably, the 1998 *External Report* was misplaced.

# REVIEW OF BUSINESS SCHOOL

© JUNE 2, 2014    [LEAVE A COMMENT](#)    [EDIT](#)

iPopU  
Innovation in Evaluation

## Evaluation of the School of Business



This is a Conformative Evaluation of the School of Business at iPopU. Click on the Nero's Thumb to register your Evaluation.



+177 0 Thanks for your vote.

This new 2014 Review validates effort at the top and its fourteen senior administrators will be bonused. Plus a fifteenth will be added to the School. Especially innovative is putting the selfie in self-study. Now that's what I'm talkin' about when we say iPopU's innovation in evaluation— Selfie-Study.

Units getting plonked by reviewers raise interesting measurement questions. Is Nero's insensitive? Is it an unnecessary response burden? Note that in 2015 we will deploy the experts' advice on delimiting Reviews to . The 177 of Business confirm the expert advice, as does the comments section of the Review (e.g., "What is not to like?"). Why not use emoticons and favicons because current research in evaluation proves the smiley face makes neurons snap which transmits more receptors and endorphins? Business's Associate Admin of Evaluation can prove that Nero's is the universal business favicon for and every bit as effective. I hear you nodding yes with me.

Why, I see you asking, has iPopU not put into policy what is already true in practice and resorted to the Rating widget for awards, course and peer evaluation, and the biggest laggard hold-out of all, ~~tenure and~~ promotion? Are you kidding, this is iPopU?

### Table 1. Rating widget installed (Polldaddy model)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awards (iPopUularity contest)          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Committee Practice              |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course Assessment (MOOC scalability)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>Tenure and</del> Promotion |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course Evaluation                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviews (Programs, Units)       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Peer Evaluation (iPopUularity contest) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hiring (can be gamed)           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Pay (iPopUularity contest) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Admissions (MOOC scalability)   |

For Merit and Incentive or Performance Pay, we simply repurpose the Favorites list from browsers. In just two steps we streamline the system of rewards. In the first step, Admin merely adds a faculty member to their Favorites list. In the second step at awards time, Admin then just pulls down the list and picks one of their Favorites. Award. Done, streamlining the iPopUularity contest thereby improving on the Polldaddy model.

Of course there are complainers and critics who opionate that awards should not be decided by the Office of iPopUularity with a contest or fandom, or that evaluation is too important for the Polldaddy model. So we introvated with the TalktotheHandathon, repurposing the Talkathon and Walkathon and Talk-About and Walk-About. We acknowledge that critics just need to vent so our TalktotheHandathon comments section scrolls 24/7/365/Decade.

At iPopU, we use Polldaddy and crowd-source an increasing range of evaluative activities. Ever cutting-edge, our Board of Governors approved a proposal by an early adopter to use the Rating widget for individual student assessment in her classes. With our iPopU MOOCs, the rating widget answers every tired question of assessment. For example, how many times do we have to deal with the stickie notes on whether a single vote or 👍 by an instructor constitutes assessment? Requests for the rating widget flooded our TalktotheHandathon section of our MOOCs. At iPopU, every innovation in evaluation is an innovation in assessment. No longer in either theory or practice do we distinguish between the two (a make-work exaggeration if there ever was one!). The workaround for all assessment and evaluation is a 👍 as that is all that is ever needed. Be sure to endorse with your finger and click on the iPopU favicon.

Dumbing down evaluation? No, smarting up administration.

