Student Response System Working Group

2020 Final Report & Recommendations

Student Response System Working Group

30-June-2020

Executive Summary

In December 2019, UBC established a Student Response System (SRS) Working Group for faculty and staff from both campuses. The group's purpose was to evaluate SRSs broadly and recommend which SRS(s) to support within UBC's Learning Technology Environment (LTE). As part of this process, the group: compiled market scans, usage statistics for UBC iClicker and Top Hat, and evaluation processes used at other institutions; conducted an SRS literature review; developed and conducted an SRS instructor survey; and demonstrated for each other select SRSs. This combined information led to developing a core set of criteria for evaluating systems against one another.

Whereas the majority of information gathering was completed prior to the pivot to online teaching and learning in March 2020, this shift presented an additional criteria of remote use vs. in-person use. Furthermore, feature development, increased use and demand for SRSs has resulted in substantial changes to the SRS space since March and therefore the evaluation of SRSs has become a moving target. The working group placed priority on systems that enabled remote use, in order to support the mostly online courses planned for fall 2020.

A shortlist of systems the working group determined most viable for campus-wide use was ranked by each member. The outcome identified three systems most members thought suitable for central support:

1. **Top Hat**, with a focus on supporting more advanced use cases. It seemed the most robust and flexible solution that fulfilled the highest number of criteria and offered the widest variety of question types.
2. **Poll Everywhere**, with a focus on supporting simple use cases. Many members thought it felt like the easiest system to quickly learn and use, particularly for those new to SRS, and therefore could promote adoption of SRS generally. In addition, workflow and reporting features may allow for more in-depth usage.
3. **iClicker Cloud**, with a focus on supporting instructors already familiar with the iClicker Classic workflow. Discontinuing use of this system when instructors are challenged with learning many new technologies seemed unfair, especially since the Cloud system met much of the core criteria well.

Additionally, the working group recommended that UBC support SRS use through:

- **Technical instruction for synchronous and asynchronous use**, ideally detailing how new centrally-supported systems or temporary solutions (e.g., web-conference built-in polling) work and map to iClicker Classic.
- **Pedagogical workshops or videos** to showcase instructors who have experience using the new systems and outlining good question design and classroom integration.
- **Community of Practice formation and coordination**, ideally organized and run centrally, to discuss best practices around SRS use as well as promote uptake.

■ ■ ■

Background

Objective

In December 2019, UBC established a Student Response System (SRS) Working Group for faculty and staff from both campuses. The group's purpose was to evaluate SRSs broadly and recommend which to support within UBC's Learning Technology Environment (LTE).

To support this process, the working group was asked to:

1. Analyze requirements from the UBC community to inform decision-making.
2. Based on this analysis and their own experience, determine the priority pedagogical and functional practices that should be supported by a tool.
3. Using these priorities, review and evaluate incumbent and other market tools.
4. Establish a rubric for making a comparative determination about the tools.
5. Make a recommendation to the learning technology governance groups about:
   ○ Whether to continue support of the incumbent tool (iClicker Classic)
   ○ Whether any new tools should be shortlisted for comparative pilot implementation or central adoption

Limitations

Completing any technical evaluations, official privacy impact assessments, security investigations, or budget-level cost analysis was considered outside the scope of the group. Recommendations were made primarily on the basis of pedagogical alignment.

Membership

UBC Vancouver	UBC Okanagan
Christopher Addison (Science)	Greg duManoir (Health and Exercise Science) - Chair
Bridgette Clarkston (Science)	Vania Chan (CTL)
Fred Cutler (Arts)	Tamara Ebl (Management)
Joy Dixon (Arts)	John Hopkinson (Physics)
Letitia Englund (CTLT)	
Jonathan Graves (Arts)	
Tim Kato (LT Hub)	
Tracy Kion (Science)	
Vivienne Lam (Science)	
Andrew Owen (Arts)	
Wayne Rawcliffe (Sauder)	
Zorana Svedic (Sauder)	
Joe Zerdin (CTLT)	

Evaluation Process

Information Gathering

To better understand the existing landscape around SRSs at UBC and beyond, the working group:

- Compiled SRS materials to review[1], including market scans, UBC iClicker and Top Hat usage statistics, and evaluation processes used at other institutions
- Conducted an SRS literature review[2]
- Developed and ran an SRS instructor survey[3] (in February / March 2020)
- Demonstrated for each other select SRSs that members had experience with

---

[1]-https://docs.google.com/document/d/1iwLUi-6TaBk7iVqOhDFdO-DB28DxNBWKpZM46hOLTk0/edit?usp=sharing
[2]-https://drive.google.com/open?id=1iu2sTJz-aZUCspqgQduJj5yaqox0j26z
[3]-https://docs.google.com/document/d/1JisQ4BWMpPlZfTqYTO_SUdRvzjsk6KmUhF9Ygn9mrEM/edit?usp=sharing

It should be noted the process of gathering information was complicated by the pivot to fully online teaching and learning at UBC in March 2020. This pivot spurred more rapid development of the systems being evaluated, muddling the process of comparing features of one to another; essentially, each system became a moving target. It also required members to prioritize systems that enabled remote use, in order to support the mostly online courses planned for fall 2020. As a result, the current recommendations represent a point-in-time view of available SRSs and given the moving target there may be additional features, tools and support available for the recommended SRSs that the working group was not aware of at the time of this report.

Literature Review Summary

- Finding results that show increased engagement is easy for SRSs, but it is harder to find learning benefits backed by research, in part because good studies are hard to design.

- But it is clear that to get learning benefits, questions themselves have to be well-designed and work well with the material; it is less about the system used.

- It is not easy to find studies that looked at variances in the systems themselves.

- Many of the studies are dated, at least of those that are more highly cited, and therefore don't cover more up-to-date technologies that rely on students bringing/using their own devices.

- A modern concern about phone use is that people may spend more time off-task when using these devices, since they have other native distractions. However, little research has been done regarding this concern, so it may be more a feeling than a fact.

Survey Results

Overall, 242 instructors completed the SRS survey[4] across sixteen Faculties / Schools, with highest response rates coming from Science (38%), Arts (24%), and Business (15%) for UBC Vancouver and Arts & Sciences (10%) and Health & Social Development (4%) for UBC Okanagan. The majority of respondents said they used a SRS in teaching regularly (64%) or sometimes (23%), with a minority never using it (13%, though more than half of those respondents intended to use it in the future).

In describing use cases in open-ended response, respondents noted five primary ways they used SRSs:

1. Checking student understanding of course topics
2. Giving students practice in answering questions
3. Getting student opinions about course topics or logistics
4. Generating student discussion during class
5. Keeping students generally engaged during lectures

The main SRS technical needs discussed in these use cases involved: asking students to answer multiple-choice questions (13%), taking attendance (13%), grading students based on responses (12%), giving students open-ended questions to respond to (9%), using the system in large courses (8%), and having a variety of question types to choose from (6%).

When asked to categorize their experience with any SRSs they'd tried, respondents showed the strongest preferences for Top Hat (close to 60% of 50 who'd tried it rated it their first choice), iClicker Classic (54% of 157 rated it their first choice) and Socrative (50% of 16 rated it their first choice). The systems that did not receive half or higher first-choice ratings still received more

---

[4] Although gathering feedback on SRSs was important to the working group, members noted there were limitations to the feedback received. Namely, that current use cases and needs may not reflect *all* potential UBC use cases and needs, especially since the incumbent iClicker Classic system significantly limits the question types instructors can consider using.

When the Faculty of Arts made Top Hat available at no cost to students, more than 120 instructors who had not previously used a SRS started using Top Hat. The assumption prior to supporting Top Hat had been that these systems were *only* capable of multiple choice. Similarly, by supporting systems centrally that offer a wider range of question types, group submissions, or other useful features, SRSs may achieve broader and more varied use at UBC.

favourable than unfavourable ratings overall, though iClicker Cloud[5] was notably lower; nearly 40% of 38 who'd tried it said they would not use it again. Comments revealed poor experiences were mostly due to unreliable performance, with the system sometimes crashing computers, failing to sync properly with Canvas, or not registering all student devices.

In open-ended responses explaining what they liked about their SRS experiences, respondents mainly discussed good usability (41%), the variety of question types available (18%), reliable performance (15%), the ability to grade students (15%), low or no costs for themselves or students (13%), and good integration with Canvas (10%).

When explaining what they did not like about their SRS experiences, respondents primarily mentioned the limited question types available (32%), cost for themselves or students (24%), technical issues with the software (21%), poor usability (21%), no or poor Canvas integration (16%), the necessity of students having a physical clicker (14%), technical issues with the hardware (10%), and the time commitment to get set up (10%).

When rating the importance of specific SRS features, ~60%+ of respondents selected the following as very or critically important:

- Support for multiple-choice questions (87% rated very or critically important)
- Students can be identified for grading purposes (80%)
- Participation can be exported into a spreadsheet (80%)
- Integration with Canvas classlist (72%)
- Instructors can preview responses before showing the class (71%)
- Spreadsheet export can include correct answers (70%)
- Free for students to use (70%)
- Shows distribution of numerical answers (69%)
- Integration with Canvas gradebook (66%)
- Responses limited to those physically in the classroom (63%)
- Students can use their own devices (56%)

Features which were rated very or critically important by less than 60% but given importance by ~70%+ of respondents included:

- Embeddable in PowerPoint/Keynote (51%)

---

[5] It is unclear whether any or all respondents were referring to iClicker Cloud or iClicker Classic with the Reef integration enabled. The latter allows students to use their own devices (with wi-fi) or the physical clickers for responding, but is a different software base than iClicker Cloud.

- Takes attendance (50%)
- Students can respond anonymously (50%)
- Support for free-response (text or numeric) questions (47%)
- Shows side-by-side histograms of quantitative answers (47%)
- Integration with Canvas groups (38%)
- Support for answering by clicking an image (33%)
- Embeddable in any presentation software (33%)
- Shows word cloud of text answers (31%)
- Shows full list of text answers (28%)

Finally, features which were rated very or critically important by less than 60% and given importance by less than 70% of respondents were:

- Support for mathematical questions (24%)
- Support for free-response questions up to a paragraph (23%)
- Allows self-paced polling in class (22%)
- Does not depend on wi-fi (21%)
- Support for gamification (20%)
- Allows self-paced polling outside of class (19%)
- Students cannot use their own devices (6%)

(Visualizations for all the survey results[6] are available in Qualtrics.)

Final Determination

The combined information led to developing a core set of criteria (see Appendix A for the full list) for evaluating systems against one another. A shortlist of SRSs the group determined most viable for potential campus-wide use included:

1. iClicker Classic
2. iClicker Cloud
3. Kahoot
4. Learning Catalytics
5. Mentimeter
6. Poll Everywhere

---

[6] https://ql.tc/boa0rt

7. Slido
8. Socrative
9. Top Hat
10. TurningPoint

Each member ranked the shortlist, based on fit for their own contexts and what they learned from the survey, to come up with a general group consensus around which systems to recommend. Fourteen members sorted the ten systems into one of three buckets: top preference, suitable for use, and misses the mark. This process was done considering both advanced and simple use of SRSs.

The outcome of the working group ranking identified three systems[7] that most working group members thought suitable for central support. Readiness for Canvas integration, ease of use, and support for a variety of question types were among the core considerations, in addition to the rest of the criteria.

■ ■ ■

Recommendations

Technology

Unlike this static report, the systems evaluated by this working group are still evolving during these rapidly changing times. The recommendations should therefore be seen as reflecting members' best effort at choosing the most suitable systems, given the available features and capabilities at the end of June 2020.

Overall, the working group would like to see UBC support *all or at least two* of these systems. Providing instructors with options to choose from ensures that all pedagogical use cases will be supported and that any instructor interested in using a SRS can find one that fits.

Assumptions

These recommendations were made with the assumptions that:

---

[7] The working group acknowledges that instructors are free to continue using any systems, regardless of these recommendations, but urges all instructors to understand their responsibilities regarding student privacy and complying with BC's FIPPA regulations.

- UBC will seek to fund any costs on both the instructor and student sides, so that use of centrally-supported systems is free, and instructors will not be constrained to the limitations of free versions of the systems, incur personal costs, or pass on costs to students to access full versions.

- UBC will ensure classrooms on both campuses are properly equipped with Internet connectivity, enabling continued use of online systems once in-person classes resume.

- UBC will provide guidance on how best to handle situations where students may not already have a suitable BYOD[8] hardware to participate, in order to provide access to everyone.

- New systems will undergo a post-rollout pilot to gather feedback and best practices to share across the university.

Preferred central SRS - Advanced

- [Top Hat][9]

Most of the group found Top Hat to be a robust and flexible solution that fulfilled the highest number of criteria and offered the widest variety of question types (e.g., multiple choice, open response, formula, heatmap, fill-in-the-blank, drawing, etc.). Some members did perceive a steeper potential learning curve. Other members expressed concern about Top Hat's overall LMS[10]-like platform overlapping with Canvas. However, as an advanced SRS system, the number of features, question types and workflow (i.e., to run slides and polls from one place, slides must be uploaded to Top Hat) and LMS-like features were also seen as a positive by some working group members.

The group agreed generally that the system would allow UBC instructors to meet their varying needs, from basic multiple-choice questions to more complex types of feedback.

---

[8] Bring Your Own Device
[9] https://tophat.com/
[10] Learning Management System

Preferred central SRS - Simple

- [Poll Everywhere][11]

Poll Everywhere also received a high ranking for support. Many members thought Poll Everywhere felt like the easiest system to quickly learn and use, particularly for instructors entirely new to SRSs, and therefore could promote adoption of a SRS generally. The main drawbacks members raised about Poll Everywhere were around perceived feature limitations (particularly when compared to the robustness of Top Hat) and how it also did not align with the familiar iClicker workflow (i.e., polls are embedded in slides instead of a floating toolbar). It should be noted that updates to Poll Everywhere appear to include more robust features including reporting features, however the workflow does not seem to have been altered.

Many members saw significant potential in Poll Everywhere; it seemed to nicely balance a good variety of features with high ease of use, and it was positively discussed by the instructors the working group reached out to who had deployed it recently (see Appendix B for the full feedback).

Preferred central SRS - Familiar

- [iClicker Cloud][12] / iClicker Classic

The group also gave iClicker Cloud a high ranking for support, largely because it offered a familiar workflow for the many existing UBC iClicker users, while also meeting much of the core criteria better than iClicker Classic. Some members questioned the lack of stability reported by survey participants using iClicker Cloud/Reef[13]. Other members felt that its floating toolbar approach might be counterintuitive to those not already familiar with this style of interactivity, particularly when screen real estate is at a premium right now, and raised significant concerns about the 140-character limit of its open responses.

---

[11] https://www.polleverywhere.com/
[12] https://www.iclicker.com/instructors/software/iclicker-cloud/

[13] Again, It is unclear whether any or all respondents were referring to iClicker Cloud or iClicker Classic with the Reef integration enabled. The latter allows students to use their own devices (with wi-fi) or the physical clickers for responding, but is a different software base than iClicker Cloud.

However, the group also noted that discontinuing use of this familiar system when instructors are already challenged with learning many new technologies seemed unfair, and several members emphasized benefits in the option to potentially merge BYOD and clicker use when in-person classes resume, the existing integration with Canvas, and the positive support from the survey participants for iClicker overall.

As part of supporting a transition to iClicker Cloud, the working group felt strongly UBC should also continue support of iClicker Classic (as a 'legacy' system), until such time as a majority of instructors have switched over to the new system. This also provides time for ensuring that UBC classrooms are properly equipped with Internet connectivity, testing that iClicker Cloud is a reliable software to use (i.e., it does not demonstrate the issues suspected for Reef), and determining whether continued support for physical base stations and remotes will be needed when in-person classes resume.

SRSs not suitable for central support

- Kahoot
- Learning Catalytics
- Mentimeter
- Slido
- Socrative
- TurningPoint

The systems above missed the mark for members largely due to missing core features, a perceived higher learning curve, and/or concerns around data and privacy handling.

Training

Beyond technology recommendations, the working group also discussed desired UBC support for SRS use.

Technical instruction for synchronous and asynchronous use

The working group (with support of survey respondents) would like technical documentation and hands-on training sessions to robustly support the rollout of any new systems. Instructions ideally include:

- How new systems map to the old one (iClicker Classic)
- What approaches are best for both synchronous and asynchronous SRS use

Many members also noted the importance of providing temporary recommendations and step-by-steps for using built-in polling for web-conferencing tools Collaborate Ultra and Zoom as well as for recording software like Camtasia or Kaltura. In short, instructors should be made aware of *all* their options going into fall term, even those not forming part of this official recommendation.

Pedagogical workshops or videos

Members also stressed the importance of supporting the rollout pedagogically, especially through workshops or videos that could showcase UBC instructors who have experience already using the recommended systems. These sessions should be structured to encourage instructors to think not only about how to engage students with a SRS, but how to support their learning through good question design and classroom integration.

Community of Practice formation and coordination

Finally, several members were interested in forming and participating in an ongoing Community of Practice (CoP) for SRSs, ideally organized and run centrally. This CoP could be a place to discuss best practices around use as well as a way to promote uptake and pedagogically sound implementation across both campuses.

■ ■ ■

Appendices

Appendix A: Evaluation Criteria

1) What pedagogical advantages does it offer overall?
2) Can it integrate with Canvas (basic classlist syncing)?
3) Can the integration include Canvas's groups?
4) Can the integration include Canvas's gradebook?
5) Does it seem FIPPA-compliant (no unnecessary data collection, all data stored in Canada, no PII shown to instructors)?
6) Is it dependent on wi-fi?
7) Is it compatible with VPN (Virtual Private Network) use?
8) Can it be used without a separate piece of hardware?
9) How many responses can it handle at once?
10) Is the experience the same across different devices (laptops, tablets, phones)?
11) Are there any accessibility concerns with using it?
12) How much will it cost students to use (estimated)?
13) Can students revisit questions outside of class?
14) How simple is it for instructors to get set up using it in a course?
15) How straightforward is the workflow for instructors creating questions?
16) Can students respond anonymously?
17) Can responses be linked with student identities for grading purposes?
18) Does it have ability to create and export reports?
19) Can reports include correct responses?
20) Does it have ability to create questions ahead of time?
21) Does it have ability to create on-the-fly questions?
22) Does it allow multiple-choice questions?
23) Does it allow free-response questions?
24) Does it allow mathematical notation questions?
25) Does it allow students clicking points on a provided image?
26) Does it allow file uploads as responses?
27) Does it allow groups submitting responses?
28) Does it have ability to embed questions in PowerPoint?
29) Does it use a floating toolbar, allowing questions on top of any presentation software?

30) Does it allow self-paced polling in class?
31) Does it offer gamification / competitive options for questions?
32) Does it allow descriptive statistics and histograms for numeric-response questions?
33) Does it allow side-by-side comparison of responses from two questions / same question twice?
34) Does it allow word cloud visualization for free-response questions?
35) Does it allow text wall / list of responses for free-response questions?
36) Does it allow student reactions (e.g., "I don't understand") in parallel to the actual questions?
37) Does it allow hiding responses until later?
38) Can it be used for attendance?
39) Does it have ability to track attendance across the semester, not just single classes?
40) Does it offer specific other features not available in other systems? (If so, what?)
41) Is training included from the vendor?
42) What technical support is offered by the vendor?
43) Is good vendor documentation available?

Appendix B: Poll Everywhere Feedback from UBC Instructors

Respondent #1:

> I have been quite happy with Poll Everywhere. I used it instead of the poll function in Collaborate Ultra and like it better than the one in Zoom. It allows me to save all the polls I've done in the past and also does word clouds, which are useful for some topics. I use it to ask student opinions about a topic before we discuss it, I have also used it for voting on which groups presented better in debates, and to answer open-ended questions for which the world cloud can be used. I haven't used iClicker. Poll Everywhere has worked well for me and if UBC would support it that would be great because I've been paying for it myself whenever I teach so I can get the version with more features and that allows me to poll more participants.

Respondent #2:

> I'd be happy to let you know how I've used Poll Everywhere in the past couple of years. It has mainly been in my [large] classes (which have about 130 students).
>
> I have previously also used iClicker and Kahoot! so am very familiar with using student response systems... but what I really liked about Poll Everywhere is that there was no need for students to bring a clicker to class... and it supported a much wider range of question types than iClicker and Kahoot. This was especially relevant, as I wanted to give students opportunities to practice a variety of question types... (e.g. multiple choice, multiple response, hot spot, ordering).

One of the other features that I used was to ask open-ended questions… sometimes in relation to class content… or "What questions do you have?"… and also to get student feedback on the course itself (e.g. "when should I schedule the exam review?"). I thought it was helpful and stimulated discussion when students saw all the students' answers popping up on the screen, and it also gave me a good chance to see if they had any misconceptions.

I also liked that Poll Everywhere let me embed a window showing a website right into my PowerPoint… for example, when I teach about [certain topics], I tell students that we use [specific] guidelines… then I use Poll Everywhere to embed a window right in my PowerPoint slide that linked to the [guidelines] website, so that I can scroll through the website and even show the students how to use some of the decision-making tools (without needing to close my PPT).

I also liked that Poll Everywhere let me save PowerPoint slides as images… that I can present to students on their mobile devices… I had been planning to use this in the coming year with my [off-campus] group, because the rooms we use for our conferences often don't have a computer or LCD projector. This would allow me to show students some PPT slides (maybe with some embedded questions) without needing any of the equipment to give a presentation.

I've also used the competition feature a few times. It isn't as visually appealing as Kahoot, but it's nice to have this additional feature included.

Respondent #3:

To encourage participation in class, and to motivate students to complete pre-class readings, I awarded some grades for the Poll Everywhere questions. I usually had about 10-12 Poll Everywhere questions scattered throughout my classes each week.

The first year that I used it, I gave participation points (1%) to complete at least half of the questions posed during the class. My goal was to encourage attendance in class, help students stay engaged in the class, and assess their understanding (since I got immediate feedback on their answers, I was able to correct misconceptions).

The next year, since I felt more confident that the technology was working, I awarded grades for the Poll Everywhere questions in class. Again, it was only a small percentage (3% per quiz… and I dropped the students' lowest score at the end of the term).

Respondent #4:

I've been using the free version of Poll Everywhere for the past year to run polls, contests, and mini assessments in class. The Powerpoint integration works well (with some training) and students haven't had any problems on my end. At least not that they have indicated.

I integrated some Poll Everywhere questions in my slides. I've also run a contest on key concepts that was well received.

I've not been able to test any of the export or quiz options for grading, but if they have licensed versions we can try I'd be happy to give those features a review.

Respondent #5:

I had to stop using Poll Everywhere this past year because it was going to cost the department a lot of money to facilitate the number of students using it, so I've been using Mentimeter; but I really enjoyed using Poll Everywhere when I was using it. I never assigned participation marks for it, and primarily used it to do check-in questions with students, or to solicit thoughts from students to spur discussions. I made use of the various forms of questions that they have available, and really enjoyed it. I would've stuck with it had it not been for the high cost.

Respondent #6:

It has been really helpful to use Poll Everywhere for me in my teaching since five years ago.

Respondent #7:

I'm happy to provide you my limited experience with Poll Everywhere.

Respondent #8:

First of all, I don't teach students, but I have added Poll Everywhere questions for a couple of faculty members' presentation slides using an account that I set up under my name. I have used Poll Everywhere purely for audience/student engagement, not for marking or tracking specific students' answers. I have not used it in the past year, so I may be unaware of updates, but here's my perspective based on the free higher education version I have used:

PROS
- Variety of survey questions that can be asked
- Real-time results
- Ability to hide responses as they come in so as not to influence others' answers
- Ability to embed questions into PowerPoint
- Numbers of responses is displayed so one can decide when to reveal answer
- Easy for respondents to answer
- Control of respondent options (change answer, only answer once, etc.)
- Ability to group questions into folders

- ● Variety of means to access a poll (text, URL)
- ● Ability to clear results and lock results

CONS
- ● Interface is not entirely intuitive for first time users
- ● Free account has limited number of respondents permitted per question
- ● Free account does not let you indicate the correct answer
- ● Editing questions is a little cumbersome
- ● No control over URL assigned (free account); could mean more typing for respondents to access URL

Overall, I found Poll Everywhere useful for our faculty members' purposes (audience engagement, checking for understanding...). It took me some time to become familiar with the interface, but once I figured it out, it did the job.

Respondent #9:

I've stopped using Poll Everywhere (only used once) and I found it's not flexible in term of dealing with logic (eg. if.. else.. type of questions) perhaps maybe I was using the free version. I wish I could have a bit more helpful regarding to this.

Respondent #10:

I have used Poll Everywhere in my classes. I have mainly used in two scenarios:

1. With the tool of Poll Everywhere, I can simply insert a placeholder image in any of my slides with a url in the comment area, and in the classroom, this translates to loading the website automatically. This is a very cool feature students have loved. We do not need to jump in and out of slides in order to visit a webpage.

2. I have used it in a few lectures for real-time surveys. The variety of the questions is much better than iClicker or the basic function in Zoom. And similarly, I can use the placeholder slide to load real-time results.

I hope we would be able to get campus-wide license for Poll Everywhere.

Respondent #11:

Great to hear from you, and also SO GLAD to hear there's a working group set up for this.

I have used SO MANY of the clicker-like systems, and my two favourite options are Poll Everywhere and Sli.do.

Respondent #12:

I'm a pretty casual user - I just use it for review quizzes that have no graded component. It works fine and I like how it is integrated with PowerPoint - I would be happy to have an institutional licence and would use it more if we did. The biggest drawback is that it seems to be constantly updating every time I open PowerPoint.

Respondent #13:

I had great experience with Poll Everywhere -- but I am the member of this working group, so have already shared my comments and demoed my use of Poll Everywhere.

Respondent #14:

I have used it for a few years now. I have about 200 students in my class and I use surveys throughout the class in order to promote engagement. Usually I start with a pretest before the lecture and then I do a post test after the lecture and I look at changes in responses. I find it works quite well. I only have the basic option so it only accepts a max of 40 responses. Having an institutional account would definitely improve the student experience.

● I have been using Poll Everywhere probably since 2015, and found it useful, but with limitations:
● As I am using a free education account, I can only have a maximum of 30 responses for every poll. That's limiting.
● Each word is counted as an entry, and that makes displaying answers as a word cloud etc not making sense
● The web interface is not too user friendly, though navigation is reasonably intuitive
● Metering responses using url or texting is cumbersome.

Because of its limitations, I used it only for 6-10 learning activities per academic year.
None-the-less, it is still a simple tool to enable class interactivity. Better and more appealing than iClicker for sure.

I hope my 2 cents worth are helpful. Let me know if you want to know more and to have a conversation on such.

Respondent #15:

Happy to have a quick phone conversation about my experiences, which are quite positive.

Respondent #16:

I have not used Poll Everywhere that much, but I am happy to share my experience.

I only used the free version of Poll Everywhere, and I did not use it for grades. I found it very easy to create questions and administer the polls. I started using Poll Everywhere integrated with Powerpoint. I can't remember why I stopped that but most of the time I used the stand alone (cloud) program, where students connected with their browser only (no texting option). I did not create questions that had math or special symbols and so I can't comment on that. I found it easy to copy and group questions. [A colleague] mentioned that one serious problem with Poll Everywhere is that if you want to use the same set of questions for two different sections of the same class, the students in the latter class can log in while the first class is in session, and by doing so will see an advanced copy of the questions. This would not be a problem [for us] because we published the iClicker questions with our class notes the day before the lecture.

So overall, I had a good experience with Poll Everywhere. I would be happy to answer specific questions you may have.

Respondent #17:

Yes I purchased a short term licence for Poll Everywhere to use in one of the classes I teach where students work as groups and present material and then ask the class 3 MCQ questions related to the presentation. As we are a distributed program we needed to come up with something other than iClicker and I am not a fan of Kahoot which has been used in the program.

I thought Poll Everywhere worked fabulously. Students had no problem accessing it either on their phone / tablet or logging through the website. I had no complaints from students about access.

I really appreciated having it integrated into my PowerPoint so that the poll was not live until I actually got to that slide. When I have used other program (I forget the other one a co-instructor used) I had to close my PPT and then open the other and then back again, very disruptive.

I also liked the flexibility of either showing the results as they came in, or hiding results until all completed. I appreciated seeing how many responses came in, and while I never actually used it for marking responses, I understand that you can use it this way. I have dreams of starting a class with a quiz that test pre-reading using Poll Everywhere!

So by all accounts I would highly endorse Poll Everywhere!

Respondent #18:

I've been using Poll Everywhere for a while now in workshops and information sessions and I feel that it's a great tool for groups of 40 or less (at least with the free version). Once you hit that number (it might actually be less - I'd need to check), you reach your maximum number of submissions.

Recently, our [group] facilitated a survey using Mentimeter, a similar program that seems more casual/fun. I've used it twice now and appreciate that it allows for more participants, although I don't think it offers as many polling/engagement options as Poll Everywhere.

■   ■   ■