



CHANGE THE WORLD FROM HERE

Online Evaluation of Teaching Means, Methods, and Constructs: A Report to the Provost and President of USFFA

Chapter I: Executive Summary	5
Chapter II: Charge to the Committee	7
Chapter III: Evaluation of Instruction	9
Chapter IV: Moving to an Online Teaching Evaluation System.	13
Chapter V: Methodology	17
A. Faculty Survey	17
1. Survey analysis and findings	17
2. Disaggregation of results	18
3. Overall findings	19
B. Faculty Evaluation Conference	20
C. Center for Teaching Excellence	22
Chapter VI: Teaching Effectiveness Constructs	23
A. Constructs and Their Measurement	23
B. The Construct of Teaching Effectiveness	24
1. Construct #1: Instructional Delivery	25
2. Construct #2: Instructional Design	26
3. Construct #3: Student Engagement	26
4. Construct #4: Student Learning	26
C. Summary	26
Chapter VII: Vendors Considered	27
A. Vendors	27
1. Scantron	27
2. CollegeNet	27
3. ConnectEdu	28
B. Summary of Vendor PROS and CONS	29
C. Vendor Features and Cost Comparison	34
D. Vendor References	37
E. Recommendations	37
F. Reference Check with WDYT Users	39
1. University of Oregon	39
2. Princeton	39
G. Implementation, Next Steps, and Additional Considerations	40
Chapter VIII: Bibliography	43
Chapter IX: Appendix	53
A. USF-CBE Excerpts	53
B. Sample USF Old Form Survey	56
C. Sample Old IDEA Survey	57
D. Sample Current SUMMA	61
E. Samples of New Surveys	64
1. Scantron: Class Climate	64
2. CollegeNet:	68
3. ConnectEdu: CourseEval	71
F. Faculty Survey	75
G. Faculty Survey Results	81
H. Construct Matrix	86

Chapter I: Executive Summary

A joint committee to evaluate and recommend a new online system for conducting student evaluations of teaching was empaneled and charged with reviewing and assessing both in-house and outsourced options for conducting online teaching evaluations, paying particular attention to effectiveness, feasibility, cost and administrative efficiency.

The committee began this effort by looking at the long and often cutting edge history of the evaluation of teaching since the formation of the USFFA over 35 years ago. In that time several instruments were used leading to the current SUMMA pencil and paper system in use for the past decade (Ch III).

The pencil and paper system, while efficient for its manual type, is a great burden on the administration and staff because of the volume of forms that are manually handled.

An online system would eliminate the manual handling of forms so evaluation and experiences in online systems were sought and obtained from the literature and from several other universities who have adapted such systems. From their experience several advantages to an online system were noted from lower cost to the more rapid availability of results (Ch IV).

The second step in the process was to survey the USF faculty on key questions about the current system and acceptance of an online system. The results of that survey (Ch V) confirmed the faculty's perceived need for a change in the system and an acceptance of that changed system being online.

Satisfied that an online system could be used at this University, the committee next examined the topic of measuring effective teaching. The result of that consideration was the development of an approach to assessing teaching effectiveness around four constructs elaborated in Ch VI:

- a. Instructional Delivery
- b. Instructional Design
- c. Student Engagement
- d. Student Learning

The final step (Ch VII) was to evaluate three vendors who had been identified in the experience of the several other universities with whom online evaluation was discussed. The three vendors (and their products) evaluated were Scantron (ClassClimate), CollegeNet (What-Do-You-Think, WDYT) and ConnectEdu (CoursEval).

CollegeNet's WDYT was the most favored by the committee under the criteria specified in the mandate (effectiveness, feasibility, cost and administrative efficiency). It was also concluded that the new system could be fully implemented by the start of the 2014/15 Academic Year allowing sufficient time to develop and test the items measuring the constructs, installing the WDYT system within the campus procedures and for faculty acceptance.

Chapter II: Charge to the Committee

The University of San Francisco (USF) and the University of San Francisco Faculty Association (USFFA) were asked by the Provost to establish a joint committee to evaluate and recommend a new online system for conducting student evaluations of teaching. The committee was charged with reviewing and assessing both in-house and outsourced options for conducting online teaching evaluations, paying particular attention to effectiveness, feasibility, cost and administrative efficiency. An invitation was sent to individuals on campus thought to have expertise in student evaluations as follows:

"The University and USFFA are designating a joint committee to evaluate and recommend a new online system for conducting faculty teaching evaluations. We'd like to ask you to serve on the committee, which will be cochaired by Associate Professor Ed Munnich (Psychology Department), and Professor Mike Webber, Dean, School of Management and former Associate Vice Provost for Academic Effectiveness.

The committee charge is to review and evaluate both in-house and outsourced options for conducting online teaching evaluations, in regard to effectiveness, feasibility, cost, and administrative efficiency. The committee will provide a report on the options and recommend a teaching evaluation system to the University and USFFA."¹

Committee Members

Chairs:

Edward Munnich (co-Chair) Associate Professor of Psychology College of Arts and Sciences

Faculty:

Robert Burns Professor School of Education

Mary Ellene Egan RSM Assistant Professor School of Nursing

Susanne Hoelscher Adjunct Professor of Modern and Classical Languages College of Arts and Sciences (Served through 8/10/11)

Administration:

John Bansavich Director Center for Instruction and Technology

Robert Bromfield Assistant Dean and University Registrar Academic and Enrollment Services Michael J. Webber (co-Chair) Dean School of Management

Paul Lorton Professor School of Management

Rick Roberts Adjunct Professor of Music and Rhetoric and Composition College of Arts and Sciences (Served since 8/10/11)

Bill Murry

Director of Student Learning Assurance Office of Academic Affairs

¹ Committee charge from Provost Jennifer Turpin and Elliot Neaman, President USFFA 9/22/2010

Chapter III: Evaluation of Instruction

Evaluation refers to the process of assessing the quality of attributes of things. In educational settings, there are two broad purposes of educational evaluation: a) accountability and b) instructional monitoring. Accountability refers to determining the quality of educational institutions, programs, and individuals. Typically such assessments are summative in nature, occur over longer periods of time, and done in such a way as to withstand legal challenges. Instructional monitoring, on the other hand, refers to the process of assessing how well instruction has been implemented. Typically such assessments are more frequent, more formative in the sense of providing feedback for course improvement, and are done in situations where quick turn-around time is important.

Both these purposes are inherent in university student course evaluation systems. Accountability is the underlying purpose for the summary statements of students' views of an instructor and course that are typically used as part of faculty yearly evaluation, as well as some of the evidence faculty provide about teaching for tenure and promotion decisions. Instructional monitoring occurs when faculty receive timely feedback about students' views of the instructor and course.

While teaching has been one of the three pillars of the faculty role at USF since its founding, the systematic evaluation of teaching performance only began with the advent of the Faculty Association and the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) with the University's administration.

"The requirement of student evaluations in all courses, and their mandatory role in Promotion/Tenure, was proposed by the USFFA in 1975 or possibly '76—the first (or second) collective bargaining agreement. Our intention was to try to make P&T [promotion and tenure] assessment in some way objective, rational, partly quantifiable."²

Beginning with the earliest CBA, in 1977,³ evaluation of instruction via a student-completed "descriptionnaire" was a part of the promotion and tenure process. The earliest instrument "named in the CBA was the Hildebrand-Wilson-Dienst (HWD), generated at Berkeley and UC Davis."⁴ The appended sections from the CBA from 1989 to 1994 name this instrument and a sample of the form is included in Appendix A.

Sometime before the drafting of the 1998 to 2003 CBA, the HWD was replaced by the IDEA instrument (see Appendix C), which was in use until replaced by the SUMMA (see Appendix D).

The University of San Francisco adopted the IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction System (published by Kansas State University) in 1994. However, faculty voiced a number of concerns about the instrument, many of which were expressed in the IDEA Joint Workgroup Report of

² Communication from Alan Heineman.

³ "The Union proposed a teaching evaluation and the University accepted it and it's been a part of the agreement since 1977 or 1978," communication from Michael Lehmann.

⁴ Heineman, *op. cit.*

September 2000. This group (another joint committee between the University and USFFA) was critical of the IDEA, and the minutes of their meetings indicate that faculty in the Sciences and Business were particularly aggrieved and even contemplated using alternative instruments.

Among the key concerns of the faculty at that time were the following:

- 1. The results of the evaluation of individual faculty were difficult to understand or use for purposes of improving teaching.
- 2. The IDEA system did not adequately reflect different class structures, e.g., seminars, laboratories, clinical experiences, internships, etc.
- 3. The "long form" version of the instrument was too long and was not always readily intelligible to the students.
- 4. There was a perception that the results could be manipulated by the individual faculty member's selection of objectives on Faculty Information Form.
- There were administrative concerns about the unpredictability of the return of the final results and the unresponsiveness of the developers to USF's specific concerns. (These concerns were among the many recorded in the USFFA Policy Board minutes of September 22, 1999.)⁵

After looking at a number of alternatives, the joint committee recommended that the University use the Student Opinion of Teaching (SUMMA). In the opinion of the committee, the SUMMA evaluation instrument had the following advantages:

- 1. It was a standardized system that provided comparative data within and across departments and schools/colleges.
- 2. It was more likely than other instruments to provide "reliable, valid and defensible data" as well as information about student learning that could be used to improve teaching effectiveness.
- 3. The instrument seemed to be sensitive to the evaluation of various pedagogical approaches in different classroom settings (seminar, lab, clinical, etc.).

⁵ IDEA forms

[&]quot;Buccheri said that there is some concern among faculty in the School of Nursing that adjusted scores always seem to be adjusted downward. The Dean in the School of Nursing spoke to the faculty about this issue during a faculty meeting on Monday and explained that the scores were now being compared only with similar nursing courses, resulting in the downward adjustment. Egan said that the major course evaluations tend to be adjusted down (nursing students have a high desire to take nursing courses). At the same time, GEC course evaluations tend to be adjusted up (the students indicating that that do not want to take another class in the field). Stump noted that in his GEC courses, the adjustment does not make up for low scores. Castro said that in A&S, the raw scores are provided to faculty. Heineman reminded us that the instrument was revised in Fall 1998 to include space for comments. Castro said that in A&S, the faculty must go to the Dean's office to obtain copies of the comments. Mitchell had concerns about being able to recognize student handwriting--even when seeing these comments after a course has ended. A number of questions came up relative to the instrument: 1. Do faculty get to see raw forms? -Is this appropriate? If so, the wording of the student announcement should be changed. 2. Is it appropriate for faculty to view written comments without having them typed first? Ultimately faculty should be informed about what is available (for example, long form, short form, space for prose, and how to obtain a copy of the comments), and perhaps suggest that faculty use the short form and a supplemental instrument of their own design if they so desire. Muenk reported that the Subcommittee on the IDEA is making progress and that he will bring these additional issues back to the Committee.

- 4. The survey was easy to understand and could be easily administered within an acceptable time frame without the need for "excessive faculty background information."
- 5. The committee thought that SUMMA was more likely to give timely and intelligible feedback to faculty than other instruments.

The process of replacing the IDEA with the SUMMA is documented somewhat by Side Letter M – Joint Committee to review the IDEA agreed to on July 29, 1998 (see Appendix A). Parallel administrations of the IDEA and SUMMA were carried out in Fall 2000. In Spring 2001, according to the USFFA Policy Board Minutes of May 9, 2001, the SUMMA was preferred and replaced the IDEA.⁶

The SUMMA evaluation system was implemented in Fall 2000. While it has generally been successful, there have been some concerns about the instrument itself, its administrative cost, and the timelines of feedback to the faculty.

⁶ Minutes, May 9, 2001

IDEA-SUMMA questionnaire. Ted announced that the initial results of the survey indicated an overwhelming preference for the SUMMA instrument, though the number of respondents (45) was quite low. The IDEA committee will await final results of the survey on Friday May 11 and a reminder will be sent out to all faculty. The PB will send out an official, anonymous ballot, since this issue will ultimately lead to a change in the contract. It was moved to recommend the replacement of the IDEA by SUMMA, subject to final ratification by the membership. There was some further discussion about how a change from IDEA to SUMMA would affect the tenure and promotion process. Alan responded that it is very difficult to tell what the impact will be in the future. A general discussion ensued about the relative weaknesses and strengths of both instruments. It was felt that student evaluations are in themselves problematic, with no good solution to the problem in sight as long as evaluations are contractually part of the tenure and promotion procedure. The motion passed 12-1.

Chapter IV: Moving to an Online Teaching Evaluation System.

Many universities have moved or are moving to an online teaching evaluation system in recent years, spurred on perhaps by the significant advantages of such a system. Among those moving toward web-based systems for administering course evaluations are the University of Illinois, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, Santa Clara University, Sacramento State University, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University and the University of Wisconsin.

The literature on moving to an online format identifies many of the advantages and disadvantages (see for example Anderson, McCain, & Bird, 2005; Anderson and Bird, 2005; Sorenson and Reiner, 2003; Miller, 1987; Kronholm, Wisher, Curnow, & Poker, 1999; Donmeyer, Baum, Hanna, & Chapman, 2004). Among the most pertinent reasons given for moving to web-based systems are that they:

- 1. Free up class time for instruction.
- 2. Provide students with more time to complete the evaluation and thereby raises the possibility of more thoughtful responses (particularly on open-ended questions).
- 3. Faster turnaround makes results available more quickly, enabling the faculty to use the data for course improvement.
- 4. Reduce institutional costs for paper, printing, distribution, collection, and storage.
- 5. Cut administrative costs associated with the written evaluation, particularly in terms of administrative time.
- 6. Offer greater flexibility since departments and individual faculty would be able to add their own questions.
- 7. Increase flexibility in terms of accessing reports, generating different types of reports, and making reports available to appropriate persons.
- 8. Easily adapt to web-based systems.
- 9. Give all students the opportunity to respond, not just those who attend on a particular day.
- 10. Reduce paper waste.
- 11. Reduce inappropriate teacher influence on in-class student evaluation instrument delivery.
- 12. Is preferred by students over paper surveys.
- 13. Enhance anonymity of student responses.

Nonetheless, there are some challenges:

- 1. Online evaluations tend to have a lower response rate than paper and pencil evaluations.
- 2. Students and faculty must be reassured that the online system is truly anonymous.
- 3. Concerns about who might have access to the data must be addressed, especially if the online evaluation is an in-house instrument.
- 4. Many fear that students will not take the online evaluation as seriously or will discuss their ratings with others before the evaluation is completed.
- 5. For the online teaching evaluation to work, students must have access to computers and must be assured that the online system is reliable and usable.

6. There may be resistance associated with changing from a long-established practice of using paper and pencil and moving to an online system.

While there are many potential benefits to switching to online teaching evaluations, the rest of this section will explore some of the challenges in greater depth.

One of the principal objections to switching to online teaching evaluations is that the **student response rates are low**. Most of the literature suggests that students have lower response rates to online teaching evaluations than in-class paper evaluations unless special steps are taken to encourage or compel their participation. While paper and pencil evaluations report response rates of around 70-75%, online response rates have hovered around 40-44%, with some as low as 29% (see Avery, et al, 2009; Dommeyer, et al, 2004; Robinson, et al, 2004; Johnson 2003). There is of course no predetermined level for acceptable response rates, but both students and faculty need to be assured that response rates are sufficient to minimize sampling error and that there should be no difference between the kinds of students who do and do not respond. However, other studies have been more encouraging, indicating that the response rates to an online format do not undermine either reliability or validity. Moreover, a number of top research universities (including Harvard, Northwestern, Berkeley, Stanford, Vanderbilt and Yale) have moved successfully to online evaluation instruments, with response rates of 70-85%.

Each of these institutions identified various strategies to enhance response rates. Among the more successful strategies were:

- 1. Frequent emails to students encouraging them to complete the evaluations.
- 2. Adequate information, advertising and publicity about the new system upon start-up.
- 3. Students are entered into a lottery when they complete their course evaluations.
- 4. Students can see their grades online only after they have completed their course evaluations.
- 5. A student can view the student ratings compiled for other courses only if he or she has completed the evaluations for all of his or her own courses from the past semester.
- 6. Helping students understand the importance of completing the evaluations.
- 7. Sending emails to non-respondents during evaluation period.
- 8. Faculty involvement in communicating with students about the need to complete the evaluations.

The other major concern about online evaluations concerns its **effect on student ratings** – are the scores on particular items consistent between online and paper evaluations? Most of the evidence seems to suggest that there are no significant differences between online and paper evaluations (see for example Johnson, 2003; Dommeyer, et al, 2004; Hardy, 2003; Kulik 2005; Heath, et al, 2007). Some concerns have also been raised about **student confidentiality**, though these can be addressed in more concrete ways by the vendors and by in-house Information Technology Services (ITS). It is of course imperative that no unique identifying information for the student be stored with the student's responses for a course. In this respect, confidentiality might be better served by having an off-campus vendor so no information is stored on campus. It is interesting to note that one of the unintended consequences of switching to online evaluations

is that many studies have reported that students are more likely to add written comments to their evaluations – one study found that students provided up to five times more commentary online (Hardy 2003).

Based upon the literature, it would seem reasonable to draw the following conclusions that online evaluation systems provide:

- 1. Significant cost savings to utilizing an online system.
- 2. Faster availability of feedback to faculty with greater reporting flexibility.
- 3. More student written comments.
- 4. Ability to append additional questions.
- 5. Potential to have at least the same if not higher response rates.
- 6. No significant difference between students' ratings between online evaluations and paper evaluations.

Chapter V: Methodology

Our committee employed several methods for determining

- 1. what constructs USF's teaching evaluation system should measure, and
- 2. what online evaluation tools are available to elicit this information.

To address point 1, we reviewed the scholarly literature on what constructs are predictive of teaching effectiveness (see Chapter VIII: Bibliography); we surveyed the USF faculty on its expectations for teaching evaluation (see Faculty Survey section below); and members of our committee attended the Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System Conference in Nashville, TN, last spring to learn about the latest work and best practices (see Faculty Evaluation Conference section below). As a result of this process, we arrived at the constructs discussed in Chapter 6 of this report. To address point 2, we solicited potential vendors, had phone conferences, and read materials from the most promising systems (see Selection of Vendors section below). As a result of this process we arrived at a list of possible vendors, and we discuss the pros and cons of each in Chapter 7 of this report.

A. Faculty Survey

In the Fall 2010 the committee discussed ways in which we should begin to determine the constructs related to teaching effectiveness. It was decided at the time to vet this question with USF faculty along with gathering additional related perceptions about the new faculty evaluation process. The "Survey" (see Appendix F) requested input from faculty concerning the new student-to-faculty evaluation system that would potentially replace the current SUMMA system and be administered online. Several questions dealt with perceptions of the current evaluation system, perceptions of the overarching construct of teaching effectiveness as a primary focus, and the implementation of an online system. In addition there was some demographic information to parcel out aggregate implications for specific groups.

Next, the survey requested responses to a series of open-ended questions having to do with factors important to faculty that should be evaluated, aspects of the SUMMA that should be retained, implications of online evaluations, and other considerations that faculty would be willing to share about faculty evaluations in general. Faculty had approximately three weeks to respond to our request for feedback. At the end of this period, analysis of the survey results began and was reported back to the committee.

1. Survey analysis and findings

Survey analysis was conducted utilizing generally accepted practices in the social sciences for obtaining statistically quantifiable results. The statistical software used for analysis was IBM-SPSS Statistics software for both qualitative and quantitative analytics. The most recent software version was utilized. While these analyses were not meant to be predictive, it was decided to report back only perceptual frequencies for ease of interpretation. Qualitative data was parceled into meaningful categories and translated also into quantitative relative frequencies. General findings regarding the demographics we collected are as follows.

The overall make-up of the sample population with approximately 235 (25% N=954) faculty members responding to our request for feedback was: 118 (51.8% n=228) were female and 127 (54.3% n=234) were full-time. All schools and colleges were represented in the sample with the largest proportion being in Arts & Sciences at 148 (63.5% n=233). Of the responding faculty, 167 (71.4% n=234) taught undergraduates and 103 (43.8% n=235) have worked 5 or fewer years at USF. A small proportion of the responding full-time faculty considered themselves term faculty at 20 (15.6% n=127), and of the responding part-time faculty 30 (28.0% n=107) were PSP members. It was determined that the sample received was a fair representation of the percentages in the total USF population (N=954), e.g., 48.7% female and 42% full-time. Additional disaggregated sample data are available in Appendix G).

In addition to the above, faculty were asked their opinion regarding the retention of the current SUMMA system and the primary focus of a new teaching evaluation system. A large segment of the faculty 129 (87.2% n=148 responses), felt that the current SUMMA system for evaluating faculty should be eliminated, or retained but with changes. An overwhelming number of faculty indicated that the overarching construct of teaching effectiveness should be the primary focus 157 (89.7% n=175 responses) but with some additional foci 92 (52.6% n=175 responses). Finally, 122 (77.7% n=157 responses) of the faculty indicated that an online evaluation system would be a viable solution for getting evaluation results back to faculty more quickly than with the current SUMMA paper-and-pencil approach.

2. Disaggregation of results

Disaggregation of the results along demographic characteristics was also performed with the following summary results. Three primary questions which were the focus of the disaggregation were posed:

- a. Do you believe the current student evaluation of faculty is a system we should retain with regards to the type or form of questions that are asked?
- b. Many new student-to-faculty evaluation systems focus primarily on the teaching effectiveness of the faculty (quality of teaching); do you believe this should continue to be our primary focus for considering a new evaluation system?
- c. The committee is considering moving to a total online survey system for the mode of the survey. Do you believe this to be a viable approach if, over the current SUMMA system, it can guarantee a quicker turnaround in the faculty feedback report?

From the overall findings above on these three questions, the results disaggregated in the following manner: Relative to the current faculty evaluation system, 58.3% of women indicated that the current system should not be retained. A majority of the sample (55.7%) represented by Arts and Sciences also indicated that the current system should not be retained, and faculty who taught undergraduate courses were the overwhelming supporters for moving away from the SUMMA. The replacement of the SUMMA was a common theme regardless of faculty rank, tenure, work status, school affiliation, or employment status.

The next step in our analysis was to examine the qualitative responses that faculty shared through the open-ended questions. The question of primary interest to our efforts asked faculty to respond to the following:

• Teaching evaluations are used for a variety of purposes, including rehiring, promotion and tenure decisions, and improving the effectiveness of teaching in our classes. To best serve these purposes, what teaching-related factors should be considered for inclusion in the ideal student-to-faculty evaluation of our teaching?

As would be expected for this type of question, responses were varied across a broad range of factors. To ascertain any patterns in the responses we utilized text analytic software also provided by IBM SPSS. This software is specifically designed to find patterns within survey responses and to cluster them into common response themes. The software will also show graphically the shared relationship between clusters. Like a factor correlation matrix in quantitative methods, the shared relationships become important for showing how clusters are linked together.

The results of this analysis revealed four primary factor clusters and two secondary clusters. These clusters aligned nicely in the following way with Feldman's (2007) multi-dimensional constructs for teaching effectiveness:

- Cluster 1 (45%)⁷: *Interaction with Faculty*, included common responses evolving around engagement, accessibility, responsiveness, feedback, and concern.
- Cluster 2 (50%), *Student Learning*, included responses involving achievement, learning, knowledge, developmental thinking, and growth.
- Cluster 3 (51%), *Course Content*, indicated commonalities in responses around objectives, content, innovation, clarity, rigor, strategies, and organization.
- Cluster 4 (27%), *Faculty Presentation*, aligned responses dealing with preparation, communication, enthusiasm, preparedness, presentation, and inspiration.

For further discussion of these constructs and the rationale behind their choice please see Chapter 6. There were two minor clusters that had fewer aligned responses. These clusters were, *Student Effort* (3%) which had little to do with teaching effectiveness, and *overall impression of teaching effectiveness* (4%), similar to a single item "overall" question that currently exists on the SUMMA. In addition to the low proportion of USF faculty whose written responses fit these clusters, Feldman (1989) found no reliable correlations between either of these clusters and student achievement, so we dismissed both from further consideration."

3. Overall findings

Overall the findings from our survey of the faculty were very positive. Most wanted to see a major revision of the evaluation process and were amenable to putting the survey online. Further, faculty indicated a considerable level of agreement as to the areas of importance when evaluating teaching effectiveness. These conclusions were very informative and useful in our further discussions concerning a new faculty evaluation process centered on the critical dimension of teaching effectiveness that is measurable, has reliability and validity, and can be utilized for

⁷ Note: n=94; percentages for all represented clusters are aggregate perceptions of faculty responding to the open-endedquestions. Individuals could mention a cluster within the same comment and is included in these percentages as a multiple response.

faculty development purposes. We also gathered additional support for these ideas from data collected at a teaching evaluation conference and in our selection of potential survey vendors.

B. Faculty Evaluation Conference

To further ensure that the committee was well informed about the development of a faculty evaluation system, two committee members attended a two-day workshop sponsored by the Center for Educational Development and Assessment on "*Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*" in March, 2011. The workshop was led by two leading researchers of faculty evaluation, Drs. Raoul A. Arreola and Lawrence M. Aleamoni. Both presenters have written extensively on the evaluation process and the development and implementation of instrumentation for faculty evaluations.

During the two-day workshop extensive time was devoted to learning about the development of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system; the roles and role components intrinsic to a well-developed system; the determination and use of a composite rating and its use in promotion and tenure, merit pay and other personnel decisions; peer review evaluations; summarizing faculty evaluation data; and the design of student rating forms (conference handouts are available for the committee). Further, the workshop integrated critical connections with a center for teaching and learning and faculty development programs. The attending committee members reported back to the full committee the following points in support of our efforts:

- 1. The development of a successful faculty evaluation system involves the integration of two distinct processes: the technical process of building reliable and valid measurement tools, and the political process of building consensus around shared values.
- 2. A comprehensive faculty evaluation program involves the systematic observation (measurement) of relevant faculty performance to determine the degree to which that performance is consonant with the values of the academic unit (e.g., department, division, college).
- 3. Evaluation must align with the values associated with mission of the university.
- 4. There are two primary purposes of a faculty evaluation system: to provide meaningful feedback for self-improvement and to provide data for personnel decisions.
- 5. It is important to provide both accurate and reliable summative information for the purpose of fulfilling #4 above.
- 6. For maximum effectiveness, faculty evaluations must be linked to faculty development programs.
- 7. A comprehensive faculty evaluation system can serve both feedback and personnel decision-making purposes if the detailed diagnostic information is provided in confidence to the faculty member for self-improvement purposes, and only summary data is forwarded for decision-making purposes.
- 8. Faculty and administration need to work together for a successful faculty evaluation system.
- 9. Feedback needs to be useful, helpful, given in confidence, and kept confidential from others.
- 10. Faculty development programs should focus on the additional skills and knowledge required of the meta-profession of college teaching, for which many faculty may have

had little or no prior formal education or training. This is particularly true for new postterminal degree faculty.

11. Faculty development services should be seen by the faculty as valuable resources that assist them to solve problems or achieve goals which both they and the administration consider important.

In addition to the above, specific information on building the faculty evaluation system was gathered and reported back to the committee. Several key points were taken away that are valuable for our purposes:

- 1. To begin the development process, a determination of the faculty role in the teaching process is needed. A consensus must be reached on the many activities in which faculty engage with students, and the consensus should be evaluated, particularly by students.
- 2. Faculty evaluations should document desired high levels of performance with corresponding actions for improvement.
- 3. Student learning fits especially well into a model of instructional delivery, instructional design, instructional assessment, and course management.
- 4. Student rating forms tend to measure student perceptions of and/or reactions to aspects of:
 - a. Course organization and planning;
 - b. Clarity, communication skills and characteristics;
 - c. Teacher-student interaction, rapport;
 - d. Course difficulty, related workload;
 - e. Grading and examinations;
 - f. Student self-rated learning.
- 5. It is not recommended that raw scores be compared among faculty. Comparisons only of faculty within a given discipline are the most appropriate.
- 6. Four major themes usually considered in developing a student rating form:
 - a. Student-instructor relationship;
 - b. Course value;
 - c. Instructor organization;
 - d. Teaching method (pedagogical methodology).
- 7. Questions for the evaluation should be framed from the perspective of the student, not the faculty.
- 8. The number of substantive items should be kept to a single page, usually 25-30 items.
- 9. Administration of student-rating forms should not be given within a week before, on the day of, or within a week after a major examination or homework deadline.

C. Center for Teaching Excellence

Prompted by the imperative to align assessment with faculty development, we met with Tracy Seeley and Mathew Mitchell from the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE). They indicated that CTE's efforts could dovetail nicely with online assessment, particularly in terms of formative assessment. They felt strongly that it would have to be clear to faculty that their discussions with CTE would have no bearing on Tenure and Promotion, and have proposed a focus on working with faculty to provide incentives for responding to surveys, rather than penalties for non-compliance.

Chapter VI: Teaching Effectiveness Constructs

A. Constructs and Their Measurement

In educational and psychological measurement, a construct is hypothesized to be the trait, characteristic or quality causing the scores on an instrument designed to measure that construct. Constructs have names (e.g., intelligence), they have definitions (e.g., intelligence is adaptive problem solving), and they have measurement procedures designed to generate scores that reflect the construct (e.g., the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales). Among other things, concerns can arise about the definition of the construct, about the measurement of the construct, or both.

In addition, social science constructs develop evidence over time about their "construct validity." Construct validity is the extent to which scores from a measurement can be interpreted as meaningfully reflecting the construct. Construct validity is currently seen by measurement experts as the most important type of validity and at the center of score validation procedures. For example, if intelligence test scores really reflect the construct of intelligence, then these scores should correlate with measures of work performance in work situations thought to require "intelligence." If they do, then positive evidence for the construct is generated; if they do not, then there is negative evidence. The construct validity of a construct at a particular point in time is this accumulated evidence.

Social science constructs are used in two primary ways. First, a researcher contemplating measuring a construct will name and define it, including how the new construct is similar to and different from other related constructs, and will implement test construction procedures that will ultimately generate a test or scale measuring the construct. After proper field test and revision procedures have been conducted, the administration of the test or scale to an appropriate sample will generate scores on the construct subject to construct validation procedures. The construct validation procedures generate evidence that allow a researcher to argue for or against the measurement of the construct.

A second way constructs are used in social science occurs when a researcher may wonder just what construct or constructs are being measured by one or more measures. In this situation, there are well-accepted statistical procedures (e.g., factor analysis; multitrait-multimethod procedures) that can be used to help clarify what construct or constructs are being measured by the instrument.

Constructs can be broad or narrow. Intelligence is a broad construct, hypothesized to operate in many human endeavors; interest in mathematics is a narrower construct, coming into play in fewer situations. The breadth of a construct definition is important for measurement because test or scale items measuring the construct must reflect the breadth of the construct. Generally, broader constructs will require more items than narrow constructs.

In addition to ranging along a continuum of generality, constructs also range along a continuum of complexity. Some constructs can be multi-faceted, composed of a network of other more specific sub-constructs, while others can be fairly circumscribed. Current theories of intelligence, for example, posit a hierarchical view of intelligence, with more general constructs at the top

organizing more specific abilities under them. This is important in both the test construction process and the validation process. Most of our constructs in the social sciences exist within a network of other related constructs.

Tests and scales are the two most common devices for measuring constructs, although other measurement techniques have been used, including interviews, observations, and other material collated in portfolios or other data-organizing procedures. Tests have right/wrong answers, while scales are attempts to find out where a person falls along a continuum with respect to the item being rated. The rating scale is the most common measure of a person's thoughts and perceptions about things, giving rise to the notion that such scales are just "perceptual."

B. The Construct of Teaching Effectiveness

The constructs of teaching effectiveness has been measured for almost 100 years (Kulik, 2001). An enormous literature has emerged from these efforts, with numerous constructs, definitions, and instruments developed and tested. The literature is voluminous (see bibliography).

The most common instrument used is student rating of instructors and their courses. Students are provided with statements about the characteristics of the instructors (e.g., The instructor appeared to have thorough knowledge of the subject matter) or their teaching (e.g., This course was helpful in developing my knowledge and skills in the subject), and students indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with the statement. Items are summed up, often into clusters that identify sub-constructs, and reported in local and/or national normative scores. Such instruments are ubiquitous; we have all used them in various configurations since we began university teaching. Companies specializing in developing instruments, administering and scoring the instruments, and providing feedback to administrators and faculty about college teaching performances are a multi-million-dollar industry.

It became obvious early on that teaching effectiveness is both (a) a general construct and (b) a complex, multidimensional construct. Indeed, one major review of student course ratings has identified 28 separate constructs measuring teaching effectiveness (Feldman, 2007). Given that measurement theory dictates that each construct be measured by multiple items (we are using five items as the bare minimum, and more would be better), and given that we are limited in the number of items that can be reasonably used in a student rating instrument (we are thinking in the 20-30 item range), it is a fact that we cannot measure all the constructs of teacher effectiveness that have been identified in the literature. Indeed, many are not complementary to the mission and values espoused at USF.

Consequently, to identify the key teaching effectiveness constructs, we have examined three sources of data:

- 1. an online USF faculty survey administered Fall, 2010, which identified dimensions of teaching effectiveness deemed important by our faculty;
- 2. the research evidence relating student ratings of teaching to student achievement and
- 3. our own year-long deliberations about what might constitute effective teaching at USF, including conversations with companies within the industry of student evaluation.

We have identified four teaching constructs that are good candidates for an effective new evaluation system: *instructional delivery, instructional design, student engagement, and student learning*. The first area is about *instructors* and their presentation skills, the second is about *courses* and their structure and organization, and the third and fourth areas are about *students* and their engagement and learning.

Within each of these four teaching constructs are a number of more specific sub-constructs that could be measured if the length of the student rating instrument were not a concern. For example, within instructional delivery, at least seven sub-constructs have been identified in the research literature as important to student learning: teacher stimulation of interest, teacher enthusiasm, teacher knowledge, teacher preparation, teacher clarity, teacher elocutionary skills, and teacher concern for class level and progress. If each sub-construct were measured with five items, this one area would need about 35 items on the evaluation form. While the other three teaching dimensions are not defined by as many sub-constructs as the instructional delivery dimension, just this first construct exceeds our self-imposed limit of 20-30 items. It is simply not feasible to measure all the specific sub-constructs within each of the four teaching constructs we have identified.

Instead, what we are proposing is to identify rating items across sub-constructs within the four teaching constructs that are best able to capture the gist of each teaching construct definition. This requires that each teaching construct to be defined conceptually, and that these definitions be used to screen rating items that are potential candidates for an instrument. To this end, and to inform the USF community about the teaching constructs being considered, each teaching construct is defined below, along with the associated sub-constructs that have been used to measure it. Further, based on Feldman's (2007) review, the average correlation coefficient between each sub-construct and student achievement is given. Illustrative items are included for each teaching construct.

1. Construct #1: Instructional Delivery

Instructional delivery is about the instructor's class-comportment and presentation of course content. Instructional delivery is what is seen by students when they attend the instructor's class. Did the instructor *stimulate interest* (.38), *demonstrate enthusiasm* (.27), *and show concern about class progress* (.30)? Was the instructor knowledgeable about subject matter (.34), prepared and organized (.57), and clear and understandable (.56)?

- a. The instructor stimulated interest in the course subject.
- b. The instructor was enthusiastic about the course material.
- c. The instructor appeared to have thorough knowledge of the subject matter.
- d. Instructor presentations were well organized.
- e. The instructor gave clear explanations to clarify concepts.
- f. The instructor made the course material understandable.
- g. The instructor was concerned about class progress.

2. Construct #2: Instructional Design

Instructional design is not about the instructor but rather about the observable features of instruction. It refers to the structure and organization of the instructor's course, and whether the course possesses instructional features commonly viewed as being important to student learning. Were the course objectives and requirements clear (.35), was the course material relevant and useful (.17), were the instructor's exams and grades fair (.26), and was student feedback prompt and constructive (.23).

- a. The objectives of the course were well explained.
- b. The content of this course was appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.
- c. The expectations for student work were made clear by the instructor.
- d. Course assignments were returned quickly enough to benefit me.
- e. The evaluation of student work was constructive.
- 3. Construct #3: Student Engagement

Student engagement refers to the instructor's willingness to engage and help students with the course materials and discussion. Did the instructor *encourage student discussion* (.36), *have a good rapport with students* (.23), *and demonstrate willingness to help students* (.36)?

- a. The instructor encouraged class discussion.
- b. The instructor developed a good rapport with students.
- c. The instructor was available and willing to help students.
- 4. Construct #4: Student Learning

Student learning refers to the student outcomes of the course, regarding both new knowledge and thinking or reasoning skills. Did the instructor's course *challenge students* (.25) and *increase their knowledge and skills* (.46)?

- a. This course was helpful in developing my knowledge and skills in the subject.
- b. I have become more competent in this area because of this course.
- c. This course challenged me intellectually.
- C. Summary

Based on the research literature, our survey of USF faculty, and our committee discussions, we propose that four teaching effectiveness constructs be included in a measurement instrument: instructional delivery, instructional design, student engagement, and student learning. We believe that given our measurement constraints, these are four reasonable, meaningful, and defensible constructs that all have demonstrated statistical relationships to student learning.

Chapter VII: Vendors Considered

The Committee solicited "Requests for Proposal" from three vendors: Scantron, CollegeNet, and ConnectEdu. The companies were selected based on their proven track records in the online course evaluations arena. The companies each presented webinar demonstrations of their course evaluation system.

A. Vendors

1. Scantron

Scantron's faculty-course evaluation system is called Class Climate. It is a web-based system that resides on the client-university's server – i.e. it would need to reside on a USF server, with ongoing maintenance assumed by the university. The Class Climate software comes with a questionnaire designer which the university would use to develop its online faculty-course evaluation survey, and for which Scantron would provide both technical and functional training. As an alternative, Class Climate can import a predefined survey from its business partner, Educational Testing Service (ETS), for which there is an annual usage fee to ETS. The ETS survey cannot be modified and additional questions cannot be added.

Class Climate would be accessed via single sign-on authentication through the university's campus portal -i.e. USFconnect. ITS would develop the protocol for this. ITS would also need to develop the interface for the course and enrollment data transfer to Class Climate. A Course Evaluation link would be added in USFconnect in order for students, faculty, and administrators to access the system.

Class Climate provides robust reporting capabilities in a variety of readable formats – HTML, PDF, Excel. Role-based reports are provided for faculty, deans, and administrators.

Scantron's cost for service is as follows:

- One Time costs between \$29,000, based on approximately 1000 faculty, 450 of which are full time.
- SIR II \$3,000 annually.
- Maintenance and upgrades second year \$6,000 (cost after second year to be determined).
 - 2. CollegeNet

What-Do-You-Think? (WDYT) is CollegeNet's faculty-course evaluation tool.

A web-hosted system, WDYT does not require participating institutions to install and maintain any software. Rather, the faculty-course evaluation tool is hosted on CollegeNet's web servers, and is available 24/7 to students, faculty, and administrators. WDYT provides single sign-on integration, software as a service (SaaS), customizable forms, comprehensive reporting, and participation rate tools.

CollegeNet provides all of the technical set-up and design of the survey based on the university's specifications. WDYT allows for a fully customizable survey. The university provides CollegeNet with the set of questions it wishes to use. Questions may be changed as desired.

Appropriate security roles govern a person's level of access to the system. Access to WDYT is done via a single sign-on/authentication through the university's campus portal – i.e. USFconnect. CollegeNet would provide ITS with the interface for establishing authentication credentials, along with specifications for the course and enrollment data transfer interface. A Course Evaluation link would be added in USFconnect in order for students, faculty, and administrators to enter the system.

What-Do-You-Think? would be branded for USF.

What-Do-Think? provides robust and comprehensive reporting of survey results. Role-based reports for faculty, deans, and administrators are generated by CollegeNet within 48 hours after the evaluation periods ends. Reports can be provided in either PDF or Excel format, and can be imported into Excel for further analysis.

CollegeNet's cost for service is \$38,000 one-time development fee; \$19,000 annual fee thereafter, all based on approximate student enrollment of 9,500.

3. ConnectEdu

CoursEval is ConnectEdu's faculty-course evaluation tool. It is a web-based tool and can be hosted either on the university's server or hosted by CoursEval. CoursEval may be accessed via single sign-on integration through USFConnect. CoursEval allows for the university to design institution-wide questions, as well as allow for each school, program, and faculty to set its own specific questions. Appropriate security roles govern a person's level of access to the system. The designated system manager at the university would oversee and manage the setup, survey design, security roles, etc.

CoursEval provides robust reporting capabilities. Reports are easy to read and survey data can be exported to .csv, .xls, or .dbf file formats for specialized analysis or institutional research purposes.

ConnectEdu's cost for service, based on approximately 10,000 student FTEs, is \$15K (includes set-up), with a \$12,000 annual renewal, \$16,800 annually if hosted by ConnectEdu.

B. Summary of Vendor PROS and CONS

Vendor	Pros	Cons		
1.Scantron	Customizable questions if designing own survey with Class Climate's questionnaire design tool.	Class Climate survey hosted on USF servers. USF assumes annual cost for maintaining servers along with associated staff cost. USF technical and functional staff need training to setup, design survey, run, and maintain Class Climate. Additional annual cost if using ETS survey. ETS survey is not customizable and additional questions cannot be added. Despite claim and assurance to students, survey returns are not anonymous by virtue of USF hosting and directly conducting the survey.		
	Initial and automatic reminder emails to students to complete survey. Save function – students may complete survey over a period of time within the survey period. Student receives certificate of completion when survey is submitted. Student cannot access the survey afterward.	Cannot block grades for students who don't complete survey		
	Survey is ADA compliant.			
	Survey is accessible on iPad, iPhone, Blackberry, in addition to standard web browsers.			
	Class Climate accommodates team-taught courses – student completes only one survey with capability to evaluate each instructor separately.			
	Robust reports for faculty/administrators. The faculty can view and print evaluation results for their own courses and access historical evaluation data from prior semesters.	Cannot withhold access to faculty who have not submitted grades.		

Vendor	Pros	Cons
2.CollegeNet	USF will have a dedicated CollegeNet account	
	What Do You Think? (WDTY) is hosted on	
	CollegeNet's high-demand servers WDYT provides	
	single sign-on integration, software as a service (SaaS)	
	customizable forms, comprehensive reporting.	
	participation rate tools. No software and/or hardware	
	maintenance is required by USF.	
	CollegeNet will setup and configure WDYT to USF's	
	specifications. WDYT would also be branded for USF	
	along with a customized look and feel.	
	CollegeNet provides USF with interface for	Integration with Blackboard can't be simultaneously done
	establishing authentication credentials, along with	through both Blackboard and USFconnect.
	specifications for the course and enrollment data	
	transfer interface.	
	Students access a personal web page, via a single sign-	
	on via USF connect that presents evaluations only for	
	the courses they're enrolled in. Because WDYT is	
	hosted on CollegeNet's servers, students' responses are	
	100% anonymous to USF.	
	Students receive an email notification when the	
	evaluation period opens and closes. Reminder emails	
	are also sent to students who have not completed their	
	evaluation. Students may complete their evaluations	
	24/7, and may complete their evaluations in either one	
	sitting or save their evaluations in progress and return	
	to complete later within the evaluation period.	
	Grade hold (Grade Block) prevents students from	
	seeing their grades or receiving their transcript until	
	they submit their evaluations.	

Vendor	Pros	Cons
	Real time status-tracking, faculty can see participation rates "live."	
	Robust reports for faculty and the university. The faculty can view and print evaluation results for their own courses and access historical evaluation data from prior semesters. Reports are withheld from faculty until grades are submitted.	
	48-hour turn-around for faculty/administrators to view results of completed survey.Provost's office can view and print evaluation results for entire university. Reports can be exported in PDF or Excel format. CollegeNet will also export evaluation results in agreed-upon format and deliver it to USF as requested.	PDF reports are generated, which causes a little delay.
	System administrators add and maintain system users and set evaluation terms, including sessions within the standard academic term (e.g. online degree programs which have different semester dates); create and broadcast custom evaluation-related email messages to students and faculty; track participation and response rates in real time; can export raw evaluation results for further institutional analysis.	

Vendor	Pros	Cons		
3.ConnectEdu	CoursEval can be hosted on ConnectEdu's servers. CoursEval provides single sign-on integration, software as a service (SaaS), customizable forms, comprehensive reporting, and participation rate tools.			
	Students access a personal web page, via a single sign- on via USFconnect that presents evaluations only for the courses they're enrolled in. Because CoursEval can be hosted on ConnectEdu's servers, students' responses are 100% anonymous to USF.	Cannot block grades for students who don't complete survey.		
	Survey is accessible on iPhone in addition to standard web browsers.			
	CourseEval accommodates team-taught courses – student completes only one survey with capability to evaluate each instructor separately			
	Students receive an email notification when the evaluation period opens and closes. Reminder emails are also sent to students who have not completed their evaluation. Students may complete their evaluations 24/7, and may complete their evaluations in either one sitting or save their evaluations in progress and return to complete later within the evaluation period.			
	Real time status-tracking, faculty can see participation rates "live".			
	Robust reports for faculty/administrators. The faculty can view and print evaluation results for their own courses and access historical evaluation data from prior semesters.	Cannot withhold access to faculty who do not submit grades.		

Vendor	Pros	Cons
	System administrators add and maintain system users and set evaluation terms, including sessions within the standard academic term (e.g. online degree programs which have different semester dates); create and broadcast custom evaluation-related email messages to students and faculty; track participation and response	USF staff will also manage the survey design.
	rates in real time; can export raw evaluation results for further institutional analysis.	

C. Vendor Features and Cost Comparison

Vendor	Web Hosting from Vendor	Single Sign- on	Customizable Forms	E-mail to Students/Faculty	Student Anonymity	Real-time Participation Rate Tracking	Robust Reporting
Scantron Class Climate	No, host available through 3rd party vendor	Yes	Yes with Class Climate. No with ETS add-on. USF does all set-ups.	Yes. Initial and automatic reminder emails to students to complete survey.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
CollegeNet What Do You Think?	Yes	Yes	Yes. CollegeNet sets up and configures WDYT to USF's specifications. WDYT is branded for USF along with a customized look and feel. Instructors can also add their own questions.	Yes. Reminder emails are also sent to students who have not completed their evaluation.	Yes	Yes	Yes
ConnectEdu CoursEval	Both in- house and hosted available	Yes	Yes. USF staff manages survey design. Yes. Reminder emails are also sent to students who have not completed their evaluations.		Yes	Yes	

Vendor	Availability of Survey Results	Exportable Reports in PDF, Excel	Grade Hold.	Withhold Survey Results From Faculty	Mobile WebApp Version	ADA Complian t
Scantron Class Climate	Immediately	Yes, also .csv and .sav	No	No	Accessible on iPad, iPhone, and Blackberry.	Yes
CollegeNet What Do You Think?	48 hours after survey closes, usually within 24 hours	Yes	Yes. Prevents students from seeing their grades until they submit their evaluations.	Yes. Reports are withheld from faculty until grades are submitted.	Accessible on iPad, iPhone, and Blackberry.	Yes
ConnectEdu CoursEval	Immediately	Yes	No	No	Accessible on iPad, iPhone, and Blackberry. Faculty need browser.	Yes
Vendor	Price	Team-taught courses	References available			
----------------------------------	---	---	-------------------------			
Scantron Class Climate	Onetime cost \$29,000. SIR II \$3,000 annually. \$6,000 maintenance and upgrades thereafter.	Accommodates team-taught course. Students complete only one survey with capability to evaluate each instructor separately.	Yes			
CollegeNet What Do You Think?	One-time cost of \$38,000. \$19,000 annually thereafter.	Accommodates team-taught course. Students complete only one survey with capability to evaluate each instructor separately.	Yes			
ConnectEdu CoursEval	One-time costs of \$15,000. \$12,000 annually thereafter; \$16,800 annually if hosted by vendor.	CoursEval accommodates team-taught courses. Student completes only one survey with capability to evaluate each instructor separately.	Yes			

Note: CollegeNet indicated they may need up to 3 months to prepare for a pilot. Both Scantron and ConnectEdu said that they would need 1 week. However, it should be noted that CollegeNet does 95% of the set-up work, including survey design to USF's specifications, and delivers to the university a product that is ready to go. For both the Scantron and ConnectEdu products, the university does virtually 95 to 100% of the set-ups and survey designs, which will take more than 1 week, and more likely several weeks.

D. Vendor References

CollegeNet

University of Oregon Sue Eveland, Registrar 541-346-3195 seveland@uoregon.edu http://corp.collegenet.com/PDF/UOregon_S uccess_CN-F-190.pdf Princeton University Polly Winfrey Griffin, Registrar 609-258-6191 polly@princeton.edu

Stanford University Linda Regan, Stanford Manager, Student Information Systems Ibregan@stanford.edu

ConnectEdu

Agnes Scott College Susan Dougherty Faculty Services 404.471.6030 sdougherty@agnesscott.edu

California Lutheran University Karissa Oien koien@callutheran.edu Melinda Wright mjwright@callutheran.edu

California State University Channel Islands Nathan Revard nathan.revard@csuci.edu Georgetown University Charles Leonhardt leonhardt@georgetown.edu

Catholic University of America – Law Stuart Schept schept@law.edu

Lake Erie College Barbara Arilson Registrar 440-375-7015 barilson@lec.

Scantron

References available upon request

E. Recommendations

We reviewed three systems—ClassClimate by Scantron, What Do You Think? by College Net, and CourseEval by ConnectEdu—all of which met basic criteria for an online evaluation system that could work at USF. Specifically, all of these systems allow customizable forms so that our evaluation can be calibrated to our institutional values (except when ETS items are adopted as an add-on is used in ClassClimate—see below for discussion of comparative advantages of developing our own items vs. using items developed elsewhere). Specifically, items may be added to the evaluation by schools, departments, programs, and individual instructors, which may include, for example, a set of questions that the School of Nursing asks only of its students,

additional items that are specific to an online course, and qualitative items about a new course that instructors or departments might add to better understand what kind of experience students are having and what improvements might be made. All three systems have been used at universities the size of USF and larger, have a single sign on, are ADA compliant, and provide anonymity to students. To promote compliance, all three systems have the capacity to send reminder emails to students and faculty and all three provide real-time tracking of participation rates. At the reporting end, all three systems have rapid turnaround of results—at most 48 hours—all three provide reports in pdf and Excel formats, and all three provide robust reports—instructors may view and print evaluation results for their own courses and access historical evaluation data from prior semesters.

Our recommendation is that USF adopt What Do You Think? (WDYT) by CollegeNet, due to unique attributes that would increase compliance and expand functionality beyond what is possible in the other systems. WDYT is hosted offsite, which is also possible with CourseEval, but would require a third party vendor with Class Climate. Although all three systems have the capacity for customization, WDYT is unique in that it is set up and configured by CollegeNet to USF's specifications, so it has a similar flexibility to that of the other systems, and would be branded with a customized USF look and feel, but would not require additional staff resources on campus—in short, with WDYT we would gain the ability to customize evaluation without adding the responsibility for managing the technical side of the system. Although it would take CollegeNet up to 48 hours to send reports to USF, it is quite possible that onsite management with the other systems would introduce delays of that length or longer, and, in any case, we do not believe that this amount of delay would present any problems in terms of the purposes for which evaluations are used at USF.

Perhaps the greatest advantage of WDYT over other systems is that it has the ability to withhold grades from students until evaluations are submitted, which is a key factor in achieving a high response rate. For an online system to fully capture the effectiveness of teaching in a course, it is crucial that all or nearly all students complete evaluations, and our review of systems used across universities suggests that low compliance is a distinct possibility where the system contains only carrots (e.g., reminders) but no stick (e.g., not seeing grades until evaluations are submitted. In addition, WDYT is unique in its capacity to withhold reports from faculty until grades are submitted, so that students can give their honest impressions of courses without concern that negative comments could be seen by their instructors before their grades are determined.

If the cost of WDYT is unacceptable, or it is deemed necessary to adopt a platform that comes with a set of evaluation items, the next best choice would be Scantron's ClassClimate system; ClassClimate is less expensive than WDYT (see Vendor Features and Cost Comparison), and it allows a university to purchase a set of items developed by ETS. That said, we believe that the savings with ClassClimate are outweighed by the capacity to increase compliance and expand functionality that are possible in WDYT. Moreover, since the ETS items are proprietary, we have not been able to evaluate how they align with constructs that reflect the culture and values of USF. In short, we believe that the additional investment in time and money necessary to adopt WDYT is well justified.

F. Reference Check with WDYT Users

1. University of Oregon

We solicited comments on WDYT from Sue Eveland, the Registrar at the University of Oregon, which has been using the system since 2008 (the second university to adopt WDYT; they had processed approximately 70,000 course evaluations with WDYT as of last semester). Her account of how the system has worked out was very consistent with what we heard from CollegeNet. Prior to the adoption WDYT, Oregon had used bubble sheet and scantron sheets for course evaluations. Oregon conducted a pilot of WDYT in Fall 2007, and has been using it campus-wide since Spring 2008. A group of faculty chose the CollegeNet product before even involving the Registrar's Office. CollegeNet was very helpful in customizing the system, and was influential in designing what they are using today. Like USF, Oregon uses Banner SIS self-serve, and all users access WDYT through their portal (a "handshake takes" place), rather than through an LMS system like Blackboard.

At Oregon, WDYT reminds students of how many evaluations they need to complete. As students complete their course evaluations, reminders eventually go away. The following are some highlights of WDYT:

- The system is very easy to use.
- Oregon has had a 77% completion as of last semester, which is higher than their completion rate when they used paper.
- From faculty, promotional, perspective, they can see benefits.
- Security and access are very strong, and administrative support it is easy.
- Reporting capabilities are very powerful, flexible and
- Customizable and it is easy to retrieve aggregate information.
- They have automated many processes that used to be very time-consuming.
- Grades can be held back until the evaluation has been completed.
- At Oregon, the biggest challenge has been to educate first-year students about using the system. To address this, they conduct extensive promotion around the course evaluations, and faculty reminds students to complete evaluation. These efforts have been very effective for increasing evaluation completion rates.

2. Princeton

In addition, our Registrar, Robert Bromfield, was at Princeton during the period when that university adopted WDYT (Princeton was the third school to adopt WDYT in fall 2008, in a pilot with freshman seminars and writing seminars). The main undergraduate curriculum survey was added in spring 2009. Graduate departments were given the option to join (most have), and reports indicate that the transition has been very successful. Robert further reported that CollegeNet was very responsive to Princeton's needs, both during and after the implementation. Because of the grade block, Princeton has a 93% response rate on its course evaluation survey – slightly down from 96% from the former paper survey. Princeton's Dean of the Faculty office and the faculty, in general, are very pleased with WDYT's robust reporting and analytics.

G. Implementation, Next Steps, and Additional Considerations

If the decision is to move forward, we will need to develop a set of items that are aligned with the constructs we identified, which reflect the values and culture of USF. We believe that a committee should be formed with the charge of developing a set of items, testing and gathering data for psychometric validation, and finalizing the new instrument. We anticipate that this process would take approximately two years (based on the time it took Princeton to implement their system) with a full conversion slated for Fall 2014.

The Implementation Committee will need to address the following:

- A Brief review of additional systems, new developments in this rapidly expanding field, e.g., Blue by eXplorance is a new product that came to our attention as this report was being finalized [Fall 2012].
- Approve final vendor [Fall 2012].
- Approve recommended faculty evaluation constructs [Fall 2012].
- Develop and finalize a list of survey items for each approved construct [AY 2012 2013].
- Schedule an installation and field testing of new survey software as stated above [AY 2012 2013].
- Develop a *timeline* and *process* for the piloting of new and complete faculty evaluation survey [Spring 2013].
- Hold outreach meetings with faculty, staff, and students to vet the pilot survey items and process [Spring 2013].
- Finalize and test the new faculty evaluation instrument to run parallel with SUMMA [AY 2013-2014, this could include summer 2013].
- Perform psychometric testing for reliability and construct validity [Spring & Summer 2014].
- Finalize survey items based on psychometric properties [Summer, early Fall 2014].
- Determine need for overlapping SUMMA with new instrument for faculty in process of promotion and tenure [Summer 2014 in time for September meeting].
- Approve and implement replacement of SUMMA [Late Fall 2014].

An effective implementation committee would be selected with the following points in mind:

- Members of current committee who are able to serve would be highly desirable, as we are already familiar with the constructs that came out of our faculty survey and discovery process.
- The committee should reflect the diversity of the faculty of USF.
- The committee should include both part-time faculty and junior full-time faculty, as evaluations are particularly important for these two groups.
- The committee should include staff with expertise in evaluation and/or positions of relevance to evaluation.
- The committee needs members with expertise on data analysis and presentation to analyze items.

Should we want to implement a "pilot" faculty-course evaluation system based on the final instrument chosen, we propose the following:

- 1. The Registrar's office, ITS, and the designated vendor would concentrate on systems preparation, creation of a course evaluation link in Banner, creating the single sign-on integration, and setting up the various file transfers. Systems preparation would include the grade block and the dynamic release of the hold when students complete their evaluation.
- 2. The Registrar's office would also develop the email messages that both students and faculty would receive when the survey is launched and pre-launch communications to both students and faculty would be developed to prepare the campus for online course evaluations.
- 3. The Center for Teaching Excellence will need to interface with the Registrar's office on all pilot strategies.

Given the time and expertise needed to (a) develop, implement, and assess a teaching evaluation tool that all sides can trust, (b) develop and maintain lines of communication with students, faculty, staff, and administrators about the new tool, and (c) serve as a resource for administration and faculty association negotiators regarding evaluation issues that are subject to collective bargaining, we expect this committee's work to be quite labor intensive. As such, it is critical that committee members be compensated either monetarily, or by replacing current responsibilities (e.g., course release for full time faculty, or replacing other responsibilities of part-time faculty or staff). Given that an online evaluation system would save the university a considerable amount of money, while relieving staff from the many hours currently spent processing paper evaluations, and given that evaluations are only successful to the extent that they reflect the values and culture of an institution, we believe that the cost of adequately supporting the implementation committee is a prudent investment.

[Page left intentionally blank]

Chapter VIII: Bibliography

- A. Teaching Evaluations/ Improvements
- B. Statistics to separate extraneous features from evaluation
- C. Alignment Method
- D. Deindividuation
- E. Expectation of Grades
- F. Online Version vs. Paper
- G. Two Survey Method
- H. Thick vs. Thin Slice
- I. Multi-Method Evaluation

- J. Eastern Paradigm of Evaluation
- K. Physical Attractiveness
- L. Instructor Centered vs. Student Centered Approach
- M. Midterm Evaluations
- N. Standardized Evaluations
- O. Tennessee Value Added Assessment System
- P. Academic Field Differences
- Q. Extraneous Factors
- A. Teaching Evaluations/ Improvements
- (2005). A Preliminary Look at Systems of Evaluating Teachers in Institutions of Higher Education and at Evaluation Methods. Chinese Education and Society, 38(5), 48-60. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Aleamoni, L. M. (1976). Typical faculty concerns about student evaluation of instruction. National Association of Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture Journal, 20, 16-21.
- Aleamoni, L. M. (1999). Student rating myths versus research facts from 1924-1998. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13, 153-166.
- Al-Issa, A., & Sulieman, H. (2007). Student Evaluations of Teaching: Perceptions and Biasing Factors. Quality Assurance in Education: An International Perspective, 15(3), 302-317. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Barnett, C. W., & Matthews, H. W. (1997). Current procedures used to evaluate teaching in schools of pharmacy. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 62, 388-391.
- Barnett, C. W., & Matthews, H. W. (1997). Student evaluation of classroom teaching: A study of pharmacy faculty attitudes and effects on instructional practices. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 61, 345-350.
- Chen, Y., & Hoshower, L. B. (2003). Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness: An assessment of student perception and motivation. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28, 71-88.
- Clark, D. (1993, January 1). Teacher Evaluation: A Review of the Literature with Implications for Educators. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Cohen, P. A. (1980). Effectiveness of student-rating feedback for improving college instruction: A meta-analysis of findings. Research in Higher Education, 13, 321-341.

- Coulter, T., & Education Commission of the, S. (2007). Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness, The Progress of Education Reform, 2007. Volume 8, Number 4. Education Commission of the States, Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Dee, K. C. (2007). Student perceptions of high course workloads are not associated with poor student evaluations of instructor performance. Journal of Engineering Education, 96, 69-78.
- Denson, N., Loveday, T., & Dalton, H. (2010). Student Evaluation of Courses: What Predicts Satisfaction. Higher Education Research and Development, 29(4), 339-356. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Feldman, K. A. (1989). The association between student ratings of specific instructional dimensions and student achievement: Refining and extending the synthesis of data from multisection validity studies. Research in Higher Education, 30, 583-645.
- Feldman, K. A. Identifying Exemplary Teachers and Teaching: Evidence from Student Ratings. In R. P. Perry and J. C. Smart (Eds.), Effective Teaching in Higher Education: Research and Practice. New York: Agathon Press, 1997, pp. 368-395.
- Feldman, K. (1996). Identifying Exemplary Teaching: Using Data from Course and Teacher Evaluations. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, (65), 41-50. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Frick, T., Chadha, R., Watson, C., & Zlatkovska, E. (2010). Improving Course Evaluations to Improve Instruction and Complex Learning in Higher Education. Educational Technology Research and Development, 58(2), 115-136. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Giesey, J. J., Chen, Y. N., & Hoshower, L. B. (2004). Motivation of engineering students to participate in teaching evaluations. Journal of Engineering Education, 93, 303-312.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Gillmore, G. M. (1997b). No pain, no gain The importance of measuring course workload in student ratings of instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 89, 743-775.
- Greenwald, A. G. (1997). Validity concerns and usefulness of student ratings of instruction. American Psychologist, 52, 1182-1186.
- Guide to Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC 2007/08. (2007). Retrieved March 1, 2008 from University of British Columbia, Human Resources Web site: http://www.hr.ubc.ca/files/faculty_relations/pdf_files/sacguide0708.pdf
- Hardy, N. (2003). Online ratings: Fact and fiction. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 96, 31- 38.

- Harrison, P. D., Moore, P. S., & Ryan, J. M. (1996). College student's self-insight and common implicit theories in ratings of teaching effectiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 88, 775-782.
- Heckert, T., Latier, A., Ringwald, A., & Silvey, B. (2006). Relation of Course, Instructor, and Student Characteristics to Dimensions of Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness. College Student Journal, 40(1), 195-203. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Howell, A. J., & Symbaluk, D. G. (2001). Published student ratings of instruction: Revealing and reconciling the views of students and faculty. Journal of Educational Psychology, 93, 790-796.
- Johnson, T. D., & Ryan, K. E. (2000). A comprehensive approach to the evaluation of college teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 83, 109-123.
- Kalayci, N. (2009). The Underlying Student Reasons for Rating SET Questionnaire Items: How Student Solve the Problem of Filling Out Questionnaires. Educational Research Quarterly, 32(4), 36-60. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Katsuno, M. (2010). Teacher Evaluation in Japanese Schools: An Examination from a Micro-Political or Relational Viewpoint. Journal of Education Policy, 25(3), 293-307. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Kulik, J. (2001). Student ratings: Validity, utility, and controversy. <u>New Directions for</u> <u>Institutional Research</u>, 109, 9–25.
- Kwan, K. P. (1999). How fair are student ratings in assessing the teaching performance of university teachers Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 24, 181-195.
- Langbein, L. I. (1994). The validity of student evaluations of teaching. Political Science and Politics, September, 545-553.
- Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases and utility. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 707-754.
- Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making students' evaluation teaching effectiveness effective: The critical issues of validity, bias and utility. American Psychologist, 52, 1187-1197.
- McKeachie, W. J. (1987). Student ratings: The validity of use. American Psychologist, 52, 1218-1225.
- Moore, T. (2006). Teacher evaluations and grades: Additional evidence. The Journal of American Academy of Business, 9, 58-62.

- Murray, H. G. (1987). Acquiring student feedback that improves instruction. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 32, 85-96.
- Murray, H. G. (1997). Does evaluation of teaching lead to improvement of teaching International Journal for Academic Development, 2, 8-23.
- Peterson, K., & Peterson, C. (2005). Effective Teacher Evaluation: A Guide for Principals. Corwin Press. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Pounder, J. S. (2007). Is student evaluation of teaching worthwhile: An analytical framework for answering the question. Quality Assurance in Education, 15, 178-191.
- Richardson, J. T. E. (2005). Instruments for obtaining student feedback: A review of the literature. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30, 387-415.
- Ryan, J. J., Anderson, J. A., & Birchler, A. B. (1980). Student evaluation: The faculty responds. Research in Higher Education, 12, 317-333.
- Schmelkin, L. P., Spencer, K. J., & Gellman, E. S. (1997). Faculty perspectives on course and teacher evaluations. Research in Higher Education, 38, 575-592.
- Schuerger, J. M., & Witt, A. C. (1989). The temporal stability of individual tested intelligence. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 45, 294-302.
- Spencer, K. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (2002). Student perspectives on teaching and its evaluation. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 27, 397-409.
- Stake, R., & Cohernour, E. (1999). Evaluation of College Teaching in a Community of Practice. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Tang, T.L.-P. (1997). Teaching evaluation at a public institution of higher education: Factors related to overall teaching effectiveness. Public Personnel Management, 26, 379-389.
- Yukun, C. (2009). Evaluation of Undergraduate Teaching at Institutions of Higher Education in China: Problems and Reform. Chinese Education and Society, 42(2), 63-70. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Yanbao, L., Xiaomei, L., & Qiongfei, Q. (2009). Reevaluation of and Prospects for Undergraduate Teaching and Learning Evaluation. Chinese Education and Society, 42(1), 25-32. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- B. Statistics to separate extraneous features from evaluation
- Coulter, T., & Education Commission of the, S. (2007). Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness, The Progress of Education Reform, 2007. Volume 8, Number 4. Education Commission of the States, Retrieved from ERIC database.

C. Alignment Method

- Bastick, T. (2001). Improving the Quality of Tertiary Education through Student Evaluation of Teaching. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Bastick, T. (2002). The Alignment Method of Measuring Quality Teaching at Tertiary Level. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- D. Deindividuation
- Lindahl, M., & Unger, M. (2010). Cruelty in Student Teaching Evaluations. College Teaching, 58(3), 71-76. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- E. Expectation of Grades
- Matos-Diaz, H., & Ragan, J. (2010). Do Student Evaluations of Teaching Depend on the Distribution of Expected Grade. Education Economics, 18(3), 317-330. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Stumpf, S. A., & Freedman, R. D. (1979). Expected grade covariation with student ratings of instruction: Individual versus class effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 293-302.
- F. Online Version vs. Paper
- Barkhi, R., & Williams, P. (2010). The Impact of Electronic Media on Faculty Evaluation. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35(2), 241-262. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Brown, M., Baillie, M., & Fraser, S. (2009). Rating Ratemyprofessors.com: A Comparison of Online and Official Student Evaluations of Teaching. College Teaching, 57(2), 89-92. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Dommeyer, C., Baum, P., Hanna, R., & Chapman, K. (2004). Gathering Faculty Teaching Evaluations by In-Class and Online Surveys: Their Effects on Response Rates and Evaluations. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 29(5), 611-623. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Felton, J., Koper, P. T., Mitchell, J., & Stinson, M. (2008). Attractiveness, easiness and other issues: Student evaluations of professors on Ratemyprofessors.com. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33, 45-61.
- Gamliel, E., & Davidovitz, L. (2005). Online Versus Traditional Teaching Evaluation: Mode Can Matter. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 30(6), 581-592. Retrieved from ERIC database.

- Glass, G., & Arizona State Univ., T. (2004). Teacher Evaluation. Policy Brief. Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Arizona State University College of Education, Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Heath, N. M., Lawyer, S. R., & Rasmussen, E. B. (2007). Web-based versus paper-and-pencil course evaluations. Teaching of Psychology, 34, 259-261.
- Heilman, J., & Matsuzaki, T. (2009). Empowering Learners and Instructors through Online Class Evaluations. Online Submission, Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Hoffman, K. M. (2003). Online course evaluation and reporting in higher education. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 96, 25-29.
- Johnson, T. D. (2003). Online student ratings: Will students respond New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 96, 49-59.
- Kelly, H. F., Ponton, M. K., & Rovai, A. P. (2007). A comparison of student evaluations of teaching between online and face-to-face courses. Internet and Higher Education, 10, 89-101.
- Layne, B. H., DeCristoforo, J. R., & McGinty, D. (1999). Electronic versus traditional student ratings of instruction. Research in Higher Education, 40, 221-232.
- Llewellyn, D. C. (2003). Online reporting of results for online student ratings. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 96, 61-68.
- Nowell, C., Gale, L., & Handley, B. (2010). Assessing Faculty Performance Using Student Evaluations of Teaching in an Uncontrolled Setting. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35(4), 463-475. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Nulty, D. (2008). The Adequacy of Response Rates to Online and Paper Surveys: What Can Be Done. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33(3), 301-314. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Rhea, N., Rovai, A., Ponton, M., Derrick, G., & Davis, J. (2007). The Effect of Computer Mediated Communication on Anonymous End-of-Course Teaching Evaluations. International Journal on E-Learning, 6(4), 581-592. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Santhanam, E., & University of Western Australia, C. (2001). Student Feedback on Teaching: Reflections and Projections. Refereed Proceedings of Teaching Evaluation Forum (Perth, Western Australia, August 28-29, 2000). Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Silva, K., Silva, F., Quinn, M., Draper, J., Cover, K., & Munoff, A. (2008). Rate My Professor: Online Evaluations of Psychology Instructors. Teaching of Psychology, 35(2), 71-80. Retrieved from ERIC database.

- Sonntag, M., Bassett, J., & Snyder, T. (2009). An Empirical Test of the Validity of Student Evaluations of Teaching Made on RateMyProfessors.com. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 34(5), 499-504. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Sorenson, D. L., & Johnson, T. D. (Eds.). (2003). Online student ratings of instruction. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 96.
- Symbaluk, D., & Howell, A. (2010). Web-Based Student Feedback: Comparing Teaching-Award and Research-Award Recipients. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35(1), 75-86. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- G. Two Survey Method
- Finelli, C., Wright, M., & Pinder-Grover, T. (2010). Consulting the Delphi: A New Idea for Collecting Student Feedback through the Two Survey Method (TSM). Journal of Faculty Development, 24(2), 25-33. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- H. Thick vs. Thin Slice
- Tom, G., Tong, S., & Hesse, C. (2010). Thick Slice and Thin Slice Teaching Evaluations. Social Psychology of Education: An International Journal, 13(1), 129-136. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- I. Multi-Method Evaluation
- Algozzine, B., Beattie, J., Bray, M., Flowers, C., Gretes, J., Mohanty, G., et al. (2010). Multi-Method Evaluation of College Teaching. Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 21(1), 27-49. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- J. Eastern Paradigm of Evaluation
- Russon, C. (2008). An Eastern Paradigm of Evaluation. Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation, 5(10), 71-77. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- K. Physical Attractiveness
- Freng, S., & Webber, D. (2009). Turning up the Heat on Online Teaching Evaluations: Does "Hotness" Matter. Teaching of Psychology, 36(3), 189-193. Retrieved from ERIC dat
- L. Instructor Centered vs. Student Centered Approach
- Bullard, L., & Felder, R. (2007). A Student-Centered Approach to Teaching Material and Energy Balances 2: Course Delivery and Assessment. Chemical Engineering Education, 41(3), 167-176. Retrieved from ERIC database.

- Foster, D., & And, O. (1975). Evidence for a Student-Centered Course Evaluation Form. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Rutledge, M. (2008). Effectiveness of Elements of a Diversified Instructional Approach in an Introductory Biology Course. Bioscene: Journal of College Biology Teaching, 34(1), 24-29. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Wainwright, S. (2009). Using Self-Assessment to Assess the Effectiveness of Learner Centered Instructional Design and Delivery. Journal of Faculty Development, 23(3), 23-29. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- M. Midterm Evaluations
- Holt, M., & Moore, A. (1992). Checking Halfway: The Value of Midterm Course Evaluation. Evaluation Practice, 13(1), 47-50. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Theall, M., Powers, K., & Franklin, J. (2000). A Case Study in Faculty Evaluation and Development. Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development, 17(4), 215-28. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- N. Standardized Evaluations
- Glass, G., & Arizona State Univ., T. (2004). Teacher Evaluation. Policy Brief. Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Arizona State University College of Education, Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Goldstein, R. (1993). Some Thoughts about Standardized Teaching Evaluations. Perspectives on Political Science, 22(1), 8-11. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Kimball, S., & Milanowski, A. (2009). Examining Teacher Evaluation Validity and Leadership Decision Making within a Standards-Based Evaluation System. Educational Administration Quarterly, 45(1), 34-70. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Shannon, D. (1991). Teacher Evaluation: A Functional Approach. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Wolfer, T., & Johnson, M. (2003). Re-Evaluating Student Evaluation of Teaching: The Teaching Evaluation Form. Journal of Social Work Education, 39(1), 111-21. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- O. Tennessee Value Added Assessment System
- Kupermintz, H., Shepard, L., & Linn, R. (2001). Teacher Effects as a Measure of Teacher Effectiveness: Construct Validity Considerations in TVAAS (Tennessee Value Added Assessment System). Retrieved from ERIC database.

- P. Academic Field Differences
- Cashin, W. E. (1990). Students do rate different academic fields differently. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 43, 113-121.
- d'Apollonia, S., & Abrami, P. C. (1997). Navigating student ratings of instruction. American Psychologist, 52, 1198-1208.
- Q. Extraneous Factors
- Feldman, K. A. (1993). College students' views of male and female college teachers: Part II: Evidence from students' evaluations of their classroom teachers. Research in Higher Education, 34, 151-191.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Gillmore, G. M. (1997a). Grading leniency is a removable contaminant of student ratings. American Psychologist, 1997, 1209-1217.
- Heckert, T. M., Latier, A., Ringwald-Burton, A., & Drazen, C. (2006). Relations among student effort, perceived class difficulty appropriateness, and student evaluations of teaching: Is it possible to "buy" better evaluations through lenient grading College Student Journal, 40, 588-596.
- Kierstead, D., D'Agostino, P., & Dill, H. (1988). Sex role stereotyping of college professors: Bias in student ratings of instructors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 342-344.
- Marsh, H. W. (1980). The influence of student, course, and instructor characteristics on evaluations of university teaching. American Educational Research Journal, 17, 219-237.
- Marsh, H. W. (1983). Multidimensional ratings of teaching effectiveness by students from different academic settings and their relation to student/course/instructor characteristics. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75, 150-166.
- Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (2000). Effects of grading leniency and low workload on students' evaluations of teaching: Popular myth, bias, validity, or innocent bystanders Journal of Educational Psychology, 92, 202-228.
- Marsh, H. W. (2007). Do university teachers become more effective with experience A multilevel growth model of students' evaluations of teaching over 13 years. Journal of Educational Psychology, 99, 775-790.
- Ogier, J. (2005). Evaluating the effect of a lecturer's language background on a student rating of teaching form. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30, 477-488.
- Remedios, R., & Lieberman, D. A. (2008). I liked your course because you taught me well: The influence of grades, workload, expectations and goals on students' evaluations of teaching. British Educational Research Journal, 34, 91-115.

- Santhanam, E., & Hicks, O. (2002). Disciplinary, gender, and course year influences on student perceptions of teaching: Explorations and implications. Teaching in Higher Education, 7, 17-31.
- Sinclair, L., & Kunda, Z. (2000). Motivated stereotyping of women: She's fine if she praised me but incompetent if she criticized me. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26, 1329-1342.
- Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Measurement error in "Big Five Factors" personality assessment: Reliability generalization across studies and measures. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60, 224-235.

Chapter IX: Appendix

A. USF-CBE Excerpts

Collective Bargaining Agreement 1989 to 1994

21.96 *Teaching experience and ability* relates to the effort associated with a faculty member's specific course assignment as well as for courses the faculty member has taught or is projected to teach. The teaching standard includes performance in the classroom, course preparation, tutoring and assisting students in course or dissertation work, assessing student learning, advising, and other activity directly associated with course(s) assigned to a particular faculty member, including activities that are aimed at upgrading the faculty member's knowledge and skills in his or her teaching area. The results of the descriptionnaire specified in Article 25⁸ must be submitted with the application for promotion or tenure.

23.12 EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Every member of the faculty shall allow to be distributed and tabulated for each course in each semester a student descriptionnaire. The instrument used shall be the Hildebrand-Wilson-Dienst Form unless another standardized instrument mutually agreeable to the faculty member and the University is substituted. Deans shall distribute, collect and tabulate the descriptionnaire, and provide the results to the faculty member.

Collective Bargaining Agreement 1998 to 2003

21.96 *Teaching experience and ability* relates to the effort associated with a faculty member's specific course assignment as well as for courses the faculty member has taught or is projected to teach. The teaching standard includes performance in the classroom, course preparation, tutoring and assisting students in course or dissertation work, assessing student learning, advising, and other activity directly associated with course(s) assigned to a particular faculty member, including activities that are aimed at upgrading the faculty member's knowledge and skills in his or her teaching area. The results of the descriptionnaire specified in Article 23.12 must be submitted with the application for promotion or tenure.

23.12 Evaluation of instruction

(A) Every member of the faculty shall allow to be distributed and tabulated for each course in each semester a student descriptionnaire. The instrument used shall be the IDEA Form unless another standardized instrument mutually agreeable to the faculty member and the University is substituted. Deans shall distribute, collect and tabulate the descriptionnaire, and provide the results to the faculty member.

(B) Joint Committee: to Review IDEA Form (Article 23.12) (See side letter M, page 144)⁹

⁸ The article reference should read 23.12

⁹ While this side letter is included in the CBA for 2002 to 2007, this line of section 23.12 is not.

SIDE LETTER M. Joint Committee: To Review IDEA Form (Article 23) July 29, 1998

The parties agree to establish a joint committee, composed of six (6) individuals (three appointed by the USFFA and three by the University) to amend Article 23.12.

The joint committee's sole mandate shall be to review the IDEA student evaluation form, along with any other course evaluation instruments it deems appropriate, and to recommend to the parties whether the IDEA instrument should be retained or should be replaced by one or more alternative course evaluation instruments or methods.

Procedural Committee Guidelines

1. The committee will have two co-chairpersons, one appointed by the University and one appointed by the USFFA.

2. Meeting schedules shall be set in writing by the co-chairs and all committee members shall make every effort to attend all scheduled meetings. No substitutions for committee appointments shall be made unless mutually agreed to by the co-chairpersons.

3. It is expected that this committee will complete its task within one year of its first meeting. A written progress report shall be presented to the parties by May 1, 1999. The report shall identify, in detail, progress on the issue before the committee and any problems encountered. All timelines in regard to committee reports or recommendations may be extended by mutual agreement of the chief negotiators.

4. The committee will vote when a majority opinion is needed. In such cases, resolution shall be by majority vote of only those present when the issue is presented for a vote. There shall be at least one week notice in writing that a vote(s) will be taken. Absent such notice, the vote may not be valid unless the specific issue is mutually agreed to in writing by the two co-chairpersons.

5. All final recommendations shall be reduced to writing and submitted by the joint committee to the parties to the collective bargaining agreement. Final written recommendations must be formally approved by the chief spokespersons for the USFFA and the University and agreed to by respective constituencies before they are incorporated into the collective bargaining agreement. At such time, Article 23.12 shall be formally amended, and any other articles specifically citing the IDEA form shall be brought into conformity with any such amendment.

6. Should the committee not be able to reach any agreement(s), the parties agree to return to the bargaining table as of July 1, 1999. Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to force either party to amend the collective bargaining contract absent mutual agreement.

Collective Bargaining Agreement 2002 to 2007

21.96 Teaching experience and ability relates to the effort associated with a faculty member's

specific course assignment as well as for courses the faculty member has taught or is projected to teach. The teaching standard includes performance in the classroom, course preparation, tutoring and assisting students in course or dissertation work, assessing student learning, advising, and other activity directly associated with course(s) assigned to a particular faculty member, including activities that are aimed at upgrading the faculty member's knowledge and skills in his or her teaching area. The results of the descriptionnaire specified in Article 23.12 must be submitted with the application for promotion or tenure.

23.12 Evaluation of Instruction

(A) Every member of the faculty shall allow to be distributed and tabulated for each course in each semester a student descriptionnaire. The instrument used shall be the IDEA Form unless another standardized instrument mutually agreeable to the faculty member and the University is substituted. Deans shall distribute, collect and tabulate the descriptionnaire, and provide the results to the faculty member.

Collective Bargaining Agreement 2005 to 2012 & 2008 to 2013

17.9.6 *Teaching experience and ability* relates to the effort associated with a faculty member's specific course assignment as well as for courses the faculty member has taught or is projected to teach. The teaching standard includes performance in the classroom, course preparation, tutoring and assisting students in course or dissertation work, assessing student learning, advising, and other activity directly associated with course(s) assigned to a particular faculty member, including activities that are aimed at upgrading the faculty member's knowledge and skills in his or her teaching area. The results of the descriptionnaire specified in Article 19.1.2 must be submitted with the application for promotion or tenure.

19.1.2 Evaluation of Instruction

Every member of the faculty shall allow to be distributed and tabulated for each course in each semester a student descriptionnaire. The instrument used shall be the SUMMA Form unless another standardized instrument mutually agreeable to the faculty member and the University is substituted. Deans shall distribute, collect and tabulate the descriptionnaire, and provide the results to the faculty member.

B. Sample USF Old Form Survey

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO STUDENT DESCRIPTION OF TEACHERS

IMPORTANT: USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY ELT • MAKE HEAVY DARK MARKS • FILL BUBBLE COMPLETELY

 ERASE COMPLETELY TO CHANGE A RESPONSE

DEPARTMENT & COURSE NUMBER	
INSTRUCTOR	
TIME FILLED OUT (Date)	(Time)

PART I

The items below reflect some of the ways teachers can be described in and out of the classroom Using the scale below, please fill in the numbered space which indicates the degree to which you feel each item describes the instructor named above. If the item doesn't apply to the teacher, darken the N/A (not applicable) space

	Scale:	Not at all Descriptive					Ve Desci	N/A	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>N/A</u>
l.	Has command of the subject, presents material in an analytical way, contrasts various points of view, discusses current developments, and relates topics to other areas of knowledge		2	Э	4	3	6	7	Ð
2	Makes himself/herself clear, states objectives, summarizes major points, presents material in an organized manner, and provides emphasis	1	2	0	4	6	6	7	TA I
3	Is sensitive to the response of the class. encourages student participation, and welcomes questions and discussion.		٢	3	4	6	6		(III)
4	Is available to and friendly towards students, is interested in students as individuals, is respected as a person, and is valued for advice not directly related to the course	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	₩₽
5.	Enjoys teaching, is enthusiastic about the subject, makes the course interesting, and has self-confidence	Ξ	2	3	₫	5	6	7	m

PART II

Using the scale below (1 being "among the very worst" to 7 being "among the very best"), please answer the following questions Fill in the appropriate numbered space.

	Scale:	Amon very v	ig the vorst		About Average	:	Among very be	the st	N/A
1	How does the instructor of this course compare with other instructors you have had at this school? (If you have had fewer than 3 courses, indicate N/A)	Ē	2	3	٩	5	6		
2	How does the instructor of this course compare with other instructors you have had in this department? (If you have had fewer than 3 courses		2	3	(1)	5	6	7	WA
	indicate N/A)	⊗scan [®]	TRON®FOR	RM NO F-70	66-USF	C SCANTROM CO AUL POHIS RESER	RPCRAI/041 1959 VED	4469-0021	5432 553 655

emoior.

C. Sample Old IDEA Survey

-	MPO	RTA	NT!	USE NO. 3	PENCIL ONLY	Proper Marks	Improper Marks
							$\odot @ @ \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot$
Y	our tho	ughtfu	lansw	ers to these questions	will provide helpful in	nformation to your ins	tructor.
	Describ 1=Ha	ardly E	requer ver	2=Occasionally	3=Sometimes	4=Frequently	code: 5=Almost Always
The	Instruct	tor:					8
1.0	0 0	3	(4)	5 Displayed a personal i	nterest in students and th	eir learning	
2.0	1 2	3	4	(5) Found ways to help still	idents answer their own	questions	14
3.0		3	(4)	(5) Scheduled course wor	k (class activities, tests, p	projects) in ways which end	couraged students to stay up-to-date in th
4.0		3	0	(5) Demonstrated the imp (6) Formed "teams" or "dis	cussion groups" to facilit	of the subject matter	
5.		0	G	5 Made it clear how each	topic fit into the course	ate learning	
7.0		3	((5) Explained the reasons	for criticisms of students	academic performance	
8.0	1) @	3	(4)	(5) Stimulated students to	intellectual effort beyond	that required by most cou	rses
9.0	1 2	3	4	(5) Encouraged students t	o use multiple resources	(e.g. data banks, library h	oldings, outside experts) to improve unde
10.0	1 2	3	4	(5) Explained course mate	rial clearly and concisely	2	
11.0	1 2	3	4	(5) Related course materia	al to real life situations		•
12.0	1. 2	3	4	6 Gave tests, projects, e	tc. that covered the most	important points of the co	urse
13.0	1) (2)	3	(4)	(5) Introduced stimulating	ideas about the subject		
14.0	1 2	3	(1)	(5) Involved students in "h	ands on" projects such a	s research, case studies, o	or "real life" activities
15.0	0 0	3	•	(5) Inspired students to se	t and achieve goals whic	n really challenged them	
16.0		0	0	Asked students to sha Provided timely and free	re ideas and experiences	reports projects starts to b	ounds and viewpoints unier from their ow
10 (0	0	(5) Asked students to help	each other understand i	deas or concents	eip students improve
10.0		3	A	(5) Gave projects, tests, o	r assignments that requir	ed original or creative thin	king
20.0	n a	3	(4)	(5) Encouraged student-fa	culty interaction outside	of class (office visits, phon	e calls, e-mail, etc.)
	not add	Iressee	by the	e course will usually be progress was:	low.)		
	In th	is cour 1-Low 2-Low 3-Ave 4-Hig	rse, my v (Iowe v Avera erage (I h Aver	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of niddle 40 percent of co age (next 20 percent of	courses I have taken herer urses I have taken herer courses I have taken	here) ere) here)	
Brou	In th	is cou 1-Lov 2-Lov 3-Ave 4-Hig 5-Hig	rse, my v (Iowe v Avera erage (i h Aver h (high	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of niddle 40 percent of co age (next 20 percent of est 10 percent of course	courses I have taken urses I have taken h courses I have taken here ses I have taken here	here) ere) h here))	
Prog	In th	is cou 1-Lov 2-Lov 3-Ave 4-Hig 5-Hig n: (3)	rse, my v (lowe v Avera erage (l h Aver h (high	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of niddle 40 percent of co age (next 20 percent of est 10 percent of course (6) Gaining factual knowle	courses I have taken urses I have taken h courses I have taken here ses I have taken here dge (terminology, classifi	here) ere) h here))	
Prog 21.(22.(In th gress or D ② D ②	is cour 1-Low 2-Low 3-Ave 4-Hig 5-Hig n: ③ ③	rse, my v (lowe v Avera erage (i h Aver h (high 4 4	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of niddle 40 percent of co age (next 20 percent of est 10 percent of cours 6 Gaining factual knowle 6 Learning fundamental	courses I have taken urses I have taken courses I have taken ses I have taken here dge (terminology, classifi principles, generalization	here) ere) h here)) cations, methods, trends) s, or theories	
Prog 21.(22.(23.(In th gress or D @ D @ D @	is cou 1-Lov 2-Lov 3-Ave 4-Hig 5-Hig 3 3 3 3	rse, my v (lowe v Avera erage (i h Aver h (high 4 4	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of niddle 40 percent of co age (next 20 percent of est 10 percent of cours 6 Gaining factual knowle 6 Learning fundamental 9 Learning to apply cour	courses I have taken urses I have taken courses I have taken ses I have taken here dge (terminology, classifi principles, generalization se material (to improve th	here) ere) h here)) cations, methods, trends) s, or theories hinking, problem solving, a	nd decisions)
Prog 21.(22.(23.(24.(In the gress of D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2	is cou 1-Lov 2-Lov 3-Ave 4-Hig 5-Hig 3 3 3 3	rse, my v (lowe v Average rage (h h Aver h (high (4) (4) (4) (4)	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of age (next 20 percent of est 10 percent of course (6) Gaining factual knowle (6) Learning fundamental (6) Learning to <i>apply</i> cour (6) Developing specific sk related to this course	courses I have taken urses I have taken courses I have taken ses I have taken here dge (terminology, classifi principles, generalization se material (to improve the ills, competencies, and p	here) are) h here)) cations, methods, trends) s, or theories inkting, problem solving, a oints of view needed by pr	nd decisions) ofessionals in the field most closely
Prog 21.(22.(23.(24.(25.(In the gress of D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2	is cou 1-Lov 2-Lov 3-Ave 4-Hig 5-Hig 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	rse, my v (lowe v Average (i h Aver h (high 4 4 4 4 4	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of age (next 20 percent of est 10 percent of course (age (next 20 percent of est 10 percent of course (because the course) (course	courses I have taken urses I have taken courses I have taken ses I have taken here dge (terminology, classifi principles, generalization se material (to improve ti ills, competencies, and p ing with others as a men	here) ere) h here)) s, or theories ininking, problem solving, a oints of view needed by pr her of a team	nd decisions) ofessionals in the field most closely
Prog 21.(23.(24.(25.(25.(In the	is could in the second	rse, my v (lowe v Average (i h Aver h (high 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of niddle 40 percent of co age (next 20 percent of est 10 percent of cours 6 Gaining factual knowle 6 Learning fundamental 9 Learning to apply cour 6 Developing specific sk related to this course 6 Acquiring skills in work 6 Developing creative co	courses I have taken urses I have taken courses I have taken des I have taken here dge (terminology, classifi principles, generalization se material (to improve ti IIIs, competencies, and p ing with others as a men pacities (writing, invention	here) ere) h here)) ications, methods, trends) s, or theories ninking, problem solving, a oints of view needed by pr nber of a team g, designing, performing it	nd decisions) ofessionals in the field most closely n art, music, drama, etc.)
Prog 21.(22.(23.(24.(25.(26.(27.(In the	is could in the second	rse, my v (lower v Avera prage (h h Aver h (high (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of niddle 40 percent of est 10 percent of course (e) Gaining factual knowle (f) Learning fundamental (f) Learning to <i>apply</i> cour (f) Developing specific sk related to this course (f) Acquiring skills in work (f) Developing creative ca (f) Gaining a broader und (f) Developing a broader und (f) Developing a broader und	courses I have taken urses I have taken courses I have taken des I have taken here dge (terminology, classifi- principles, generalization se material (to improve ti ills, competencies, and p ing with others as a men upacities (writing, inventin erstanding and apprecial	here) ere) h here)) ications, methods, trends) s, or theories ninking, problem solving, a oints of view needed by pr nber of a team (g, designing, performing in ion of intellectual/cultural a	nd decisions) ofessionals in the field most closely n art, music, drama, etc.) ictivity (music, science, literature, etc.)
Pros 21.(22.(23.(25.(25.(27.(28.(28.(In th gress of D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2	is could in the second	rse, my v (lower v Avera v Avera v Avera erage (h h Aver h (high (i) (i) (i) (i) (i) (i) (i) (i) (i) (i)	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of niddle 40 percent of co age (next 20 percent of est 10 percent of course (a) Gaining factual knowle (b) Learning to apply cour (c) Developing specific sk related to this course (c) Acquiring skills in work (c) Developing creative ca (c) Gaining a broader und (c) Developing skill in exp (c) Learning how to find a	courses I have taken urses I have taken courses I have taken courses I have taken ese I have taken here dge (terminology, classifi principles, generalization se material (to improve ti ills, competencies, and p ing with others as a men upacities (writing, inventin erstanding and apprecial ressing myself or ally or in a use resources for ano	here) ere) h here)) ications, methods, trends) s, or theories ninking, problem solving, a oints of view needed by pr nber of a team ig, designing, performing in ion of intellectual/cultural a n writing wering questions or exhibit	nd decisions) ofessionals in the field most closely n art, music, drama, etc.) ictivity (music, science, literature, etc.)
Prog 21.(22.(24.(25.(25.(27.(28.(29.(30.(In th gress of D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2	is could in the second	rse, my v (lowe v Averaz trage (i h Aver h (high (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a)	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of niddle 40 percent of co age (next 20 percent of est 10 percent of course (a) Gaining factual knowle (b) Learning to apply cour (c) Developing specific sk related to this course (c) Acquiring skills in work (c) Developing creative ca (c) Gaining a broader und (c) Developing skill in exp (c) Learning how to find a (c) Developing a clearer u	courses I have taken urses I have taken courses I have taken courses I have taken eses I have taken here dge (terminology, classifi principles, generalization se material (to improve ti ills, competencies, and p ing with others as a men upacities (writing, inventin erstanding and apprecial ressing myself orally or in nd use resources for ans nderstanding of and com	here) ere) h here)) ications, methods, trends) s, or theories ninking, problem solving, a oints of view needed by pr nber of a team ig, designing, performing it ion of intellectual/cultural a h writing wering questions or solvin mitment to, personal value	nd decisions) ofessionals in the field most closely n art, music, drama, etc.) activity (music, science, literature, etc.) g problems es
Prog 21.(22.(23.(25.(25.(25.(27.(28.(29.(30.(31.(In th gress of D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2 D 2	is could in the second	rse, my v (lowe v Avera trage (i h Aver h (high (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a)	st 10 percent of course ge (next 20 percent of niddle 40 percent of est 10 percent of course (a) Gaining factual knowle (b) Learning fundamental (c) Learning to <i>apply</i> cour (c) Developing specific sk related to this course (c) Acquiring skills in work (c) Developing creative co (c) Gaining a broader und (c) Developing skill in exp (c) Learning how to find a (c) Developing a clearer u (c) Learning to <i>analyze</i> ar	courses I have taken urses I have taken courses I have taken courses I have taken ses I have taken here dge (terminology, classifi principles, generalization se material (to improve ti ills, competencies, and p ing with others as a men upacities (writing, inventin erstanding and appreciat ressing myself orally or ir nd use resources for ans nderstanding of, and com ind critically evaluate idea:	here) ere) h here)) ications, methods, trends) s, or theories ninking, problem solving, a oints of view needed by pr nber of a team ig, designing, performing in ion of intellectual/cultural a h writing wering questions or solvin mitment to, personal valu s, arguments, and points o	nd decisions) ofessionals in the field most closely n art, music, drama, etc.) nctivity (music, science, literature, etc.) g problems es f view

	T=IVIU	ich Le	ess that	ms, compare this cours in 2=Less than	3=Abou	t Aver	age	taken 4	at this in = More th	istitution nan	5=Much More	J code.
	MO	ost Co	urses	Most Courses					Most C	ourses	than Most Co	urses
Co	urse:	~	~									
0	2	3	(4)	(5) Amount of reading								
1	(2)	3	(4)	(5) Amount of work in othe	r (non-reading)	assign	iments					
1)	(2)	3	(4)	(5) Difficulty of subject ma	ter							
De	scribe	vour	attitu	des and behavior in this	course, usi	na the	follo	vina c	ode:			
	1=De	finite	y	2=More False	3=In Bet	ween		4=	More Tru	le	5=Definitely	
	Fa	lse		Than True					Than Fal	se	True	
f Ba	tina:											
1	2	(3)		(5) I had a strong desire to	take this cours	e.					¥ .	
õ	2	3	(4)	(5) I worked harder on this	course than or	most	courses	s I have	taken.			
õ	2	3	(4)	(5) I really wanted to take	a course from ti	nis inst	ructor.					
õ	Q	3	à	(5) I really wanted to take	this course rega	rdless	of who	taught	it.			
õ	* @	3	à	(5) As a result of taking thi	s course. I have	more	positiv	e feelin	as toward	this field o	f study.	
õ	Q	3	Ĩ	(5) Overall, I rate this instr	uctor an excelle	ent teac	her.					
õ	2	3	ě	(5) Overall, I rate this cour	se as excellent.							
-	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	•						2.8		
Fo	r the f	ollow	ing ite	ms, blacken the space	which best co	orresp	onds	to you	ur judgm	ent:		1.
	1=De	finite	y	2=More False	3=In Bet	ween		4=	More Tru	le	5=Definitely	
	га	ise		Than True					inan rai	ise .	True	÷
	- 2								11			
	-	0	0	(5) As a rule I put forth m	re effort than o	thar et	Idente	00 000	demic wor	k.		
D	(2)	9	•	O As a rule, i par lorar ma	ne enert alan e	uner su	Juents	Unaca	dennie mor			
D	2	3	()	 The instructor used a v 	ariety of metho	dsnot	only te	osts-to	evaluate s	student pro	gress on course objectiv	ves.
11	2 2 2	33	•	 (5) The instructor used a v (6) The instructor expected 	ariety of metho d students to tal	dsnot ke thei	only te share	of resp	evaluate s onsibility f	student pro	ogress on course objection.	ves.
	2 2 2 2 2 2	000	• • •	 (5) The instructor used a v (6) The instructor expecter (6) The instructor had high 	ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s	dsnot ke thei tandar	only te share ds in th	of resp of class	evaluate s onsibility f s.	student pro	gress on course objecti J.	ves.
DDDDD EX	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	3 3 3 3 2UES	(4) (4) (4) (4) (4)	 The instructor used a v The instructor expecte The instructor had high The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to 	ariety of metho d students to tai a achievement s ucational techno promote learnin	dsnot ke thei tandar plogy (i g.	only te r share ds in th e.g., Int	of resp of resp is class ternet,	evaluate s consibility f s. e-mail, cor	student pro	gress on course objecti j. rcises, multi-media	ves.
1 1 1 1 1 E	(TRA (3 3 3 QUES	(4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (5) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7	 The instructor used a v The instructor expecte The instructor had high The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to 	ariety of metho d students to tail achievement s ucational techno promote learnin	dsnot ke their standar ology (r g.	sonly te r share ds in th e.g., Int	desig	evaluate s consibility f s. e-mail, cor nated be	student pro for learning mputer exe	gress on course objecti , rcises, multi-media stions 48-66):	ves.
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	(TRA C If you	3 3 3 QUES rr inst		 The instructor used a v The instructor expected The instructor had high The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to 	ariety of metho d students to tal a chievement s ucational techni- promote learnin	dsnot ke their tandar blogy (r g. n the s	space	desig	evaluate s consibility f s. e-mail, cor nated be	student pro for learning mputer exe slow (que	pgress on course objection, pricises, multi-media stions 48-66):	ves.
	(TRAC If you (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	3 3 3 3 3 0 UES 1 r inst	(a) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	 (a) The instructor used a V (b) The instructor expected (c) The instructor had high (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to (c) has extra questions, ar (c) (c) 	ariety of metho d students to tai a chievement s ucational technic promote learnin aswer them in 58. 59.	ther still dsnot ke their standar plogy (r g. n the s	space	desig	evaluate s ionsibility f s. e-mail, cor nated be	student pro for learning mputer exe slow (que	pgress on course objecti precises, multi-media stions 48-66): pomments are invited of ter might improve this	on how the
	(TRAC If you (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		 (a) The instructor used a V (b) The instructor expected (c) The instructor had high (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to (c) has extra questions, ar (c) (c) 	ariety of metho d students to tai a chievement s ucational technic promote learnin aswer them in 58.① 59.① 60.①	a the standar blogy (r g. a the s 2 2 2	space	desig (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)	evaluate s isonsibility f s. e-mail, cor nated be (5) (5) (5)	student pro for learning mputer exe slow (que Your co instruct teaching	pgress on course objection, purcises, multi-media estions 48-66): comments are invited of toor might improve this on procedures. Use the	on how the course or e snace below
	(TRAC) (CTRAC) (If you (CTRAC) (If you (CTRAC) (CTTRAC) (CT	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3		 (a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecte (c) The instructor had high (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) 	ariety of metho d students to tal a achievement s ucational technic promote learnin sewer them in 58.(1) 59.(1) 60.(2) 61.(1)	a the st a their a the st a th	space	desig (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)	evaluate s ionsibility f s. e-mail, cor nated be (5) (5) (5) (6)	How (que Your cc instruct teachin for con	gress on course objection, precises, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this no procedures. Use the proments (unless otherw	on how the course or e space below vise directed)
	(TRAC) (If you (If you (If good (If good)(If good)(If good)(If good)(If goo	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	Image: Structor Image: Structor <tr< td=""><td> (a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecte (c) The instructor had high (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) to presentations (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c)</td><td>ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s ucational technic promote learnin swer them in 58.(1) 59.(1) 60.(1) 61.(1) 62.(1)</td><td>a the standar blogy (r g. a the s a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a</td><td>space</td><td>desig desig</td><td>nated be</td><td>How (que Your co instruct teachin for com Note: 1</td><td>gress on course objection, precises, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ng procedures. Use the ments (unless otherw four written comment</td><td>on how the course or e space below vise directed).</td></tr<>	 (a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecte (c) The instructor had high (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) to presentations (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c)	ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s ucational technic promote learnin swer them in 58.(1) 59.(1) 60.(1) 61.(1) 62.(1)	a the standar blogy (r g. a the s a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	space	desig desig	nated be	How (que Your co instruct teachin for com Note: 1	gress on course objection, precises, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ng procedures. Use the ments (unless otherw four written comment	on how the course or e space below vise directed).
	(TRAC If you (Contraction) (Co	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	Image: Second state Image: Second stat <	 (a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecter (c) The instructor had high (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) to presentations (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c)	ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s ucational technic promote learnin 58.(1) 59.(1) 60.(1) 61.(1) 62.(1) 63.(1)	a the standar blogy (r g. a the s a the s a a the s a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	space age of the second secon	desig desig desig desig	evaluate sonsibility f s. e-mail, cor 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	student pro- for learning mputer exe slow (que Your co instruct teachin for com Note: 1 returne	gress on course objection precises, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ng procedures. Use the ments (unless other four written comment of to the instructor Ver-	on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be
	e e e f f you e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3		 (a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecter (c) The instructor had higt (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) to presentations (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c)	ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s ucational technic promote learnin swer them in 58.(1) 59.(1) 60.(1) 61.(1) 62.(1) 63.(1) 64.(1)	a the standar blogy (r g. a the s a the s a a the s a a the s a a the s a a a the s a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	space age of the second secon	desig desig (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)	nated be	student pro- for learning mputer exe slow (que Your co instruct teachin for com Note: N returne PRINT	gress on course objection increases, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ig procedures. Use the imments (unless otherw four written comment for the instructor. You to protect your anome	on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be but may want to vimity.
	CTRA C If you @@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@	© ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ④ ④ ④ ④ ④ ④ ④		 (a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecter (c) The instructor had high (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) to presentations (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c)	ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s ucational technic promote learnin swer them in 58.① 59.① 61.① 62.① 63.① 64.① 65.①	a the standar blogy (r g. 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	space a only terns in the e.g., Internet of the e.g., Internet of the e.g., and the e	desig desig desig desig	nated be (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6)	student pro- for learning mputer exe elow (que Your co instruct teachin for com <i>Note:</i> Y <i>returne</i> <i>PRINT</i>	gress on course objection rcises, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ng procedures. Use the ments (unless otherw four written comment four written comment of to the instructor. Yes to protect your anony	on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be ou may want to vmity.
	(CTRA (1 f you 2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③ ③	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	 (a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecte (c) The instructor had high (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) (c) The instructor used ed for the instructor used ed presentations, etc.) (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) 	ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s ucational techno promote learnin swer them in 58.① 59.① 60.① 61.① 62.① 63.① 64.① 65.① 66.①	dsnot ke their tandar g. (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	 a conty te er share ds in the e.g., Int a space a a<	desig de	evaluate sonsibility f s. e-mail, cor s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	student pro- for learning mputer exe elow (que Your co instruct teachir for con <i>Note:</i> Y <i>returne</i> <i>PRINT</i>	gress on course objection increases, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ing procedures. Use the imments (unless otherw four written comment four written comment of to the instructor. You to protect your anony	on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be bu may want to ymity.
	Image: Constraint of the second secon	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	(4) (5) (6) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7	 (a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecter (c) The instructor had high (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) (c) The instructor used ed for the instructor used ed presentations, etc.) (c) The instructor used ed presentation (to presentation), etc.) (c) The instructor used ed presentation (to presentation), etc.) (c) The instructor (to presentation), etc.) 	ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s ucational techno promote learnin 58.① 59.① 60.① 61.① 62.① 63.① 64.① 65.① 66.①	a the s ds-not ds-not tandar g. a the s 2 3	 a conty te e r share a space a <li< td=""><td>desig de</td><td>evaluate sonsibility f s. e-mail, cor s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s</td><td>Your co instruct teachin for con <i>Note:</i> Y <i>returne</i> <i>PRINT</i></td><td>gress on course objection increases, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ing procedures. Use the imments (unless otherw four written comment of to the instructor. You to protect your anony</td><td>on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be ou may want to vmity.</td></li<>	desig de	evaluate sonsibility f s. e-mail, cor s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	Your co instruct teachin for con <i>Note:</i> Y <i>returne</i> <i>PRINT</i>	gress on course objection increases, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ing procedures. Use the imments (unless otherw four written comment of to the instructor. You to protect your anony	on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be ou may want to vmity.
	8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	 (a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecte (c) The instructor expected (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) to presentations (c) The instructor used ed presentation (c) T	second that second that ariety of metho d students to tal a achievement s second technic promote learnin second technic promote lea	a the standar dos-not landar g, a the s a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	a contractor of the second sec	desig asts-to of resp is class is class desig a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	evaluate s ionsibility f s. e-mail, cor (s) (s) (s) (s) (s) (s) (s) (s) (s) (s)	Your or instruction of the second second of the second of the second of the second second of the second of the second of the second second of the second of	gress on course objection, precises, multi-media estions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ng procedures. Use the ments (unless otherwitten comment four written comment of to the instructor. Yes to protect your anony	on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be ou may want to vmity.
	(2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	 (a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecte (c) The instructor had higt (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to p (c) the instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to p (c) the instructor used ed p (c) the instructo	ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s ucational techni- promote learnin 58.① 59.① 61.① 62.① 63.① 64.① 65.① 66.①	a the s dsnot ke thei ke thei tandar g g a the s a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	a conty teer r share e.g., Int space 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 nstru	desig d	evaluate sonsibility f s. e-mail, cor s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	student pro- for learning mputer exe elow (que Your co instruct teachin for con <i>Note:</i> Y <i>returne</i> <i>PRINT</i>	gress on course objection increases, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ing procedures. Use the imments (unless otherw four written comment four written comment for to the instructor. You to protect your anony	on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be bu may want to vmity.
	(2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	© 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	() () () () () () () () () () () () () ((a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecte (c) The instructor had high (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) to p (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to p (c) The instructor used ed p<td>ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s ucational techni- promote learnin 58.① 59.① 60.① 61.① 62.① 63.① 64.① 65.① 66.①</td><td>a the standar dsnot ke thei ke thei tandar g. a the s a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a</td><td>a conty teer r sonty teer r share e.g., Int space 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 1</td><td>desig d</td><td>evaluate s oonsibility f s. e-mail, cor s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s</td><td>s Meets:</td><td>gress on course objection increases, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ing procedures. Use the imments (unless otherw four written comment four written comment for to the instructor. You to protect your anony</td><td>on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be ou may want to vmity.</td>	ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s ucational techni- promote learnin 58.① 59.① 60.① 61.① 62.① 63.① 64.① 65.① 66.①	a the standar dsnot ke thei ke thei tandar g. a the s a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	a conty teer r sonty teer r share e.g., Int space 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 1	desig d	evaluate s oonsibility f s. e-mail, cor s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	s Meets:	gress on course objection increases, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ing procedures. Use the imments (unless otherw four written comment four written comment for to the instructor. You to protect your anony	on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be ou may want to vmity.
	(2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	0 0 0 0	() () () () () () () () () () () () () ((a) The instructor used a v (b) The instructor expecter (c) The instructor had high (c) The instructor used ed presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) to presentations, etc.) (c) The instructor used ed for the inst	ariety of metho d students to tal achievement s ucational techno promote learnin 58.① 59.① 60.① 61.① 62.① 63.① 64.① 65.①	and the standard ddsnotic ddsnotic tandard g. and the standard and tandard	a conty teer conty teer r share space (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (b) (c) (c) <td>desig aststo of resp is class ternet, (aststo resp is class ternet, (aststo (aststo ternet, (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) ((aststo) ((astst</td> <td>evaluate s oonsibility f s. e-mail, cor s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s</td> <td>s Meets:</td> <td>gress on course objection increases, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ing procedures. Use the imments (unless otherw four written comment of to the instructor. You to protect your anony</td> <td>on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be ou may want to vmity.</td>	desig aststo of resp is class ternet, (aststo resp is class ternet, (aststo (aststo ternet, (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) (aststo) ((aststo) ((astst	evaluate s oonsibility f s. e-mail, cor s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	s Meets:	gress on course objection increases, multi-media stions 48-66): comments are invited of tor might improve this ing procedures. Use the imments (unless otherw four written comment of to the instructor. You to protect your anony	on how the course or e space below vise directed). s may be ou may want to vmity.

	E	aculty Infor	mation Form			
Institution: University	of San Francis	sco	Instructor: Lor	rton Jr. P		
Course Number:0303	- 471 - 01		Time and Days Clas	s Meets:		
IMPORTANT!	USE HO. 2 PENC		Proper Marks	Improper M ● Ø ⊗ ⊙	larks 🖵 🕀	
Last Name (Up to 11 letters)	Init. Object	tives: (Scale - M =	Minor or No Importance	e, I = Important, E =	Essential)	
Lorton Jr.	P 1		ual knowledge (terminolo		nethods trends)	
00000000000			damental principles, gen	eralizations, or theor	ries	
		OO Learning to	apply course material (to	improve thinking, pr	oblem solving, ar	nd decisions)
	₿₿4 . ○	O O Developing	specific skills, competend	cies, and points of vie	ew needed by pro	ofessionals in
	© ©	the field mos	st closely related to this c	course		
	© D 5. O	O Acquiring sk	ills in working with others	s as a member of a te	eam	
	E E 6. ()		creative capacities (writin	ng, inventing, designi	ng, performing in	art, music,
		Gaining a br	conder understanding and	d approxiation of into	llootual/outtural a	otivity (music
BEBERERE BEBERE	BB 7.0	science, liter	rature etc.)	a appreciation of inte	liectua/culturara	
	00 8.0		skill in expressing onesel	If orally or in writing		
000000000000	J 9. O	OO Learning hor	w to find and use resource	ces for answering qu	estions or solving	problems
K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K	₿₿ 10. ○		a clearer understanding	of, and commitment t	to, personal value	es
	L 11. O	O Learning to	analyze and critically eva	aluate ideas, argume	nts, and points of	view
		O Acquiring an	n interest in learning more	e by asking question:	s and seeking an	swers
	Days Class	Department	t Time Class Begins	Course	Number	Local
	(a) Meets					
	® ®	5202	2 3031	471	028	
8888888888	S S O Mon	$\bigcirc \bigcirc $		$\bigcirc \bigcirc $		$\bigcirc \bigcirc $
	Tues O Tues	0000			000	0000
$\bigcirc \bigcirc $	Wed O Wed	2 2 2 3		2222	2 . 2	2223
		3333		0000	000	
		0000	0000	0000	000	0000
		8888	888			
	-	0000		0000	0	0000
Contextual Questions (Research I The IDEA Center will conduct rese	Purposes):	questions in order to	improve the interpretation	on of student ratings		
t Which of the following			2. Describe this	na la tama - d la		
represents the primary approach to this course?	2. If multiple appl are used, which represents the approach?	oacnes n <u>secondary</u>	3. Describe this cour the features listed responses: N = None (or little)	below. Use the follow	owing code to n	n respect to nake your
1 = Lecture	1 = Lecture		S = Some required M = Much required			
② = Discussion/recitation	2 = Discussion	/recitation				
3 = Seminar	③ = Seminar		NSM			
(4) = Skill/activity	(4) = Skill/activit	У	OOO A. Writing	3		
(5) = Laboratory	5 = Laboratory	16	OOO B. Oral or	ommunication		
(6) = Field Experience	(6) = Field Expe	rience	OOO C. Compu	uter applications		
(8) = Multi-Media	(8) = Multi-Medi	a	OOO E Matha	work matical/quantitative v	vork	
(9) = Practicum/clinic	 Practicum 	clinic	OOO E. Mathe	I thinking		

Contextual Questions Continued:

4. Rate each of the circumstances listed below, using the following code to respond:
 P = Had a positive impact on learning I = Neither a positive nor a negative impact N = Had a negative impact on learning ? = Can't judge
PIN?
O O O A. Physical facilities and/or equipment
OOO B. Your previous experience in teaching this course
OOO C. Substantial changes in teaching approach, course
assignments, content, etc.
OOO D. Your desire to teach this course
OOO E. Your control over course management decisions
(objectives, texts, exams, etc.)
OOO F. Adequacy of students' background and preparation for
the course
OOO G. Student enthusiasm for the course
. OOO H. Student effort to learn
OOOI. Technical/instructional support



6. Is this class: a. Team taught? Yes b. Taught through distance learning? Yes No

D. Sample Current SUMMA

1

SURVEY OF STUDENT OPINION OF INSTRUCTION™

Darken only one response cir. not able to give a knowledgeable answer carefully and thoughtful Indicate as accurately as possis to Items 1–22 on a scale from fi Disagree." Your opinions are to	cle for each item. If you feel the statement is not applicable , or you a response, simply leave the item blank and proceed to the next. Ple ly. ble your opinion of the instructor's performance in this class by respon- ve to one where five means "Strongly Agree" and one means "Stro- be anonymous and you should feel free to answer honestly.
DIRECTIONS FOR MARKING FORM • USE A #2 PENCIL ONLY. • DO NOT USE INK OR BALLPOINT PEN. • ERASE ANY ERRORS COMPLETELY. • DO NOT MAKE ANY STRAY MARKS ON THIS FORM.	11. The course appears to have been carefully planned. Strongly O O O O Strongly Agree O O O Disagree
ACCEPTABLE MARKS UNACCEPTABLE MARKS ●●●●	12. Course objectives are being achieved. Strongly O O O O Disagree
1. The clarity and audibility of the instructor's speech are excellent. Strongly Agree ③ — ③ — ⑤ — ⑤ — ⑤ Strongly Disagree	13. During the term, I looked forward to attending this class. Strongly & () () () Strongly Agree & () () () Strongly Disagree
2. The contents of the assignments contribute to my understanding of the subject. Strongly Agree O O O O O O O O O O O	14. Compared with other courses on this level carrying a equal amount of credit, the effort I put into this cours is as much as in other courses. Strongly () () () Strongly Disagree
 3. The requirements of the course (projects, papers, exams, etc.) were explained adequately. Strongly Agree O O O Disagree 	15. Course objectives have been expressed clearly. Strongly Agree O O O Disagree
 4. The instructor's presentation often causes me to think in depth about this subject. Strongly Agree O O O Disagree 	16. The instructor demonstrates a personal commitment to high standards of professional competence. Strongly Agree S - Strongly Disagree
5. The instructor has adequate means for evaluating my learning. Strongly Agree O O O Disagree	17. The instructor provides useful feedback on student progress (identifying strengths and weaknesses). Strongly Agree O O O O Strongly Disagree
6. The methods being used for evaluating my work (such as tests, projects, etc.) are reasonable. Strongly Agree O O O O Disagree	18. In this course, I am learning much. Strongly Agree O O O Disagree
7. Adequate opportunities are provided by the instructor for me to ask questions. Strongly Agree O O O O O O O Disagree	19. The out-of-class assignments are challenging. Strongly Agree O O O O Disagree
B. The instructor is teaching the course material or skills clearly. Strongly Agree © O O O Disagree	20. The instructor supervises and helps in new experience: without taking over. Strongly Agree O - O - O Strongly Disagree
9. The instructor seems to be well prepared. Strongly S Strongly Agree S Strongly Disagree	21. The instructor relates underlying theory to practice. Strongly Agree
10. The instructor seems to care about my learning. Strongly Agree	22. Overall, I rate this instructor a good teacher. Strongly O O O O Strongly Agree O Disagree

i

OPTIONAL QUESTIONS

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SIDE 2: Your instructor may choose from among Items 23–39 or provide additional items (40–50) to cover special circumstances. Respond as appropriate to the items identified by your instructor.

 23. Examinations cover material or skills emphasized in the course. Strongly & Strongly Agree 24. The time allowed to complete exams is adequate. 	DO NOT MAKE ANY STRAY MARKS
Strongly O O O O Strongly Disagree	ON THIS FORM
25. Examination questions are phrased clearly.	36. My class is
Strongly Agree ③ — ④ — ③ — 〇 Strongly Disagree	Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate
26. The textbooks contribute to my understanding of the subject.	37. My grade point average to date is (round off)
Strongly Agree O O O Strongly Disagree	0 0 0 0 0 4.0-3.5 3.4-3.0 2.9-2.5 2.4-2.0 Under 2.0
 This course is practical and useful to those students for whom it was specifically planned. 	38. The grade I presently have in this course is
Strongly @ @ @ Strongly Agree @ @ @ Disagree	
28. The clinical experiences, or laboratory, meet my learning needs for this course.	39. If I needed help outside of class, the instructor has
Strongly S S Strongly Agree S Strongly	Yes No Have not
 29. The instructor explains or illustrates laboratory or clinical techniques clearly. Strongly Agree	Questions 40-50 Supplied by Instructor
laboratory experiments. Strongly &(3	40. 0 0 0 0 0
31. The laboratory contributes to my understanding of	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Strongly Agree G G O O Strongly Disagree	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
32. The laboratory manual adequately explains the procedures to be followed in the laboratory.	43 . O O O O O 5 4 3 2 1
Strongly () () () Strongly Agree () () Disagree	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
33. Equipment and materials needed to perform the laboratory experiments are organized and readily multiple for used during the laboratory.	45. 0 0 0 0 0 5 4 3 2 1
Strongly () () () () Strongly Agree	46 . O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O
	47 . O O O O O 5 4 3 2 1
34. My perception of the teaching method used in this course is	
34. My perception of the teaching method used in this course is O O O O O O O O O O O O Demon-Combination Other stration of these	$\left[\begin{array}{ccccccc} 48. & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc \\ 5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \end{array}\right]$
 34. My perception of the teaching method used in this course is O O O Combination Other 35. This course is 	$ \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

1

_ _

DII • US	PECTU				
• US		-			
DIRECT • USE A • DO NO • ERASE • DO NO ON THI			DIRECTIONS FOR MARKING FORM USE A # 2 PENCIL ONLY. DO NOT USE INK OR BALLPOINT PEN. ERASE ANY ERRORS COMPLETELY. DO NOT MAKE ANY STRAY MARKS ON THIS FORM.		
	UN			ARKS MARKS	
Questions 1	1-15 a	Optio re opti	nal Ques onal and	itions may be	sup pl ied
1.	1	2 O	3 ()	4 O	5 ()
2.	1)	2 ()	3 ()	4 O	5 ()
3.	1	2 ()	3 ()	4 O	5 ()
4.	1)	2 ()	з О	4 O	5 ()
	• En. • DO ON 11. 11. 12. () 13. ()	• ERASE A • DO NOT ON THIS 4 UN Questions 11-15 a 11. 1 0 12. 1 13. 1 0 14. 1 0	ENASE ANT E DO NOT MAKE ON THIS FORM ACCEPT UNACCEI UNACCEI 2 0 11. 1 2 0 12. 1 2 0 13. 1 2 0 14. 1 2 0	• ERASE ANT ERHORS • DO NOT MAKE ANY S ON THIS FORM. ACCEPTABLE M • ● ● ● UNACCEPTABLE M ØØØØ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	ERASE ANY EMONS COMPL OD NOT MAKE ANY STRAY M ON THIS FORM. ACCEPTABLE MARKS OPtional Questions Questions 11-15 are optional and may be 11. 1 2 3 4 0 0 0 12. 1 2 3 4 0 0 0 13. 1 2 3 4 0 0 0 14. 1 2 3 4 0 0 0 0 0

-

S FORM 1.7

Copyright® 1999 by Summa Information Systems, Inc. All rights reserved

R3515-PFI-2524232221

E. Samples of New Surveys

1. Scantron: Class Climate



(D) Class Climate*

SCANTRON[®]

Perform fast and effective course evaluations

Use Class Climate for automated, high-volume evaluations of courses, study programs and departments without the time and money of laborious data collection and reporting. You'll gain measurable feedback regarding attendee interest levels and instructor performance. Functions include reports on study courses and departments, as well as special formats for deans and department heads.

Paper AND Online Surveys

Class Climate can quickly and accurately process paper questionnaires and conduct online surveys.

Advantages of Paper Surveys

Paper-based evaluations tend to produce higher response rates than online surveys. Also, the resulting feedback is generated much more quickly.

Advantages of Online Surveys

Online surveys are cost effective and efficient, in terms of labor and other resources. Tasks can be set to run automatically.

With Class Climate, you can conduct evaluations as a paper-based questionnaire, an online survey, or both. This dual capability has numerous advantages, including:

- Results are immediately available with each scanned form or each time data is
 submitted online
- Written comments are automatically captured from both paper and online evaluations
- In-house printing lowers costs
- Scanned and online capture reduces the need for physical storage space of completed
 reports and evaluations
- · Web-based verification process reduces time and labor costs

time then	But a Tarrings	0
K House for Disarret		
 Cherrett and P. Personers The second se		
13 Per car ta mon avair d h	1 mig ²	
t hand yes		
ET Bablant Af dem	Challen Black	r 342

	And the second		
ind the Daniel	And in case of the	11000	-
Called a role that bourse	64	TETTE	tees
and not information that is and	100	errer.	Iner
A STATUS AND INCIDENTS IN PS ADDLARES .		TPTTT	free.
will wantered his Locar is set funds	444	PFFFF	Taura .
A NAME FOR NO. & COLORADORED IN THE		cerer	iters.
anna per bis anician a first head		+++++	ing a
A PRIVATE BLOCK THE SUBJECT VALUES.	100	100000	iter .
of your that most prepared of this togeter?"			
VE DEN TRAVISION REPORT OF TRAVELOUT		1	

Automation and Ease of Use

Class Climate automates many of the steps and processes in the creation, administration and reporting of course evaluations. Quickly and easily import survey data and create questionnaires. Generate thousands of paper or online surveys with just a few clicks using advanced automation features. Instant PDF reports are available as soon as you scan paper surveys or capture data online. Create customized reports, internal benchmarking and historical comparisons. Export raw data to advanced statistical programs. Lastly, Class Climate's quality management system enables you to identify high and low instructor performance using quality indicators.

Prepare System

Using a CSV or XML export from your information system, import the list of departments, instructors, and courses into Class Climate. The system quickly and easily manages mass generation of the paper or online surveys. Create a single questionnaire for both paper and online surveys using a simple wizard-based design tool. Build the survey using Class Climate's extensive list of question types, formatting features or import your own library.

Quality Management

With Class Climate, deans can be granted access to Quality Management views for one or more departments. In the QM view, they can see quality indicators as graphs or indexes, as well as target values on scaled questions. Deans can browse results and identify quality problems by comparing them to standards. They can also sort by highest and lowest quality rating. Use both internal and external quality indicators to drive continuous improvement. Class Climate also allows for benchmarking to measure against future evaluations.



Initiate Surveys

Save time and money with e-mail dispatch of online surveys or batch printing of the paper questionnaires for an entire department. Create and distribute personalized questionnaires automatically. For online surveys, invite participants via email, paper or LMS integration (e.g. Blackboard*, Moodle^{rs}, etc.)

Further Analysis

As soon as all online or paper evaluations have been completed, you can use the collected data in a variety of report formats. Create faculty profiles, study courses and department reports by using Class Climate's web interface. You can create aggregate reports for individual departments or for the organization as a whole. Filter data sets by specific responses or multiple criteria. Compare multiple results, including historical data, and then distribute comparison profile lines to instructors via email. You may also export directly to Excel or SPSS.

Capture & Feedback

Using a Scantron imaging scanner – and with a push of a single button - the questionnaires are sorted, digitized and processed into the corresponding course, along with an image of any handwritten comments. (Data can be scanned from scanners across multiple locations into a single database.) The raw data is then statistically analyzed and graphically prepared in a PDF evaluation report. Based on your requirements, the system can be configured to dispatch the reports to the instructors automatically or you can start a batch process to export or print the reports when needed.

Reports

You can configure the reports to display the information most relevant to you, your deans, and your instructors.

Examples of the most common reports and graphs

Header & Global Index

	Jane Hellman Effective Communications in Business (HN1012) No. of responses + 112	D
Overall indicators		
Slobal Index		2:32
. Speaker Evaluation		2:32
Course Evaluation		2:11



Very poor Excellent Very poor Excellent Very poor Excellent

Comments



This course has had a profound impact on me	4,74	AR IG BR UR BR	Dager	17.
* Students get the assistance they need	Ar1	DIS IS UNABAIN	Inger	101 101 101



......

Additional Applications

Class Climate is not just for course and faculty evaluations. Additional uses include:

.....

	Additional Applications	
360° Surveys	Alumni Surveys	Seminar Evaluations
General Surveys	Student Opinion of Learning Outcomes	Workforce Development

User Roles

Class Climate provides you with easy access to the functions you need by means of a web portal:

- Administrators can create organizational structure, design questionnaires, generate surveys, control the online survey process,
- and provide access of data to external individuals or departments.

- Deans can inspect result reports, and access quality management functions
- Report Creators can generate reports for system-wide or departmental use

A user role model provides different permissions based on the varied requirements of the users. Class Climate mirrors your organizational structure, with all its subdivisions, so that you can manage all surveys in a structured way. Subdivisions, the number and type of survey instruments, as well as report recipients, can all be individually set up.



LMS Integration

Class Climate users may connect directly with students through a variety of Learning Management Systems (Blackboard, Moodle, ANGEL, Sakai, etc.). Class Climate communicates with the LMS and sends the pending evaluations to the LMS's student portal interface. A direct survey link for each pending course evaluation appears for the student. The student can then click the displayed link and complete the course evaluation without any password entry. Scantron's Professional Services department can assist you with moving your data across any existing connectors.

Key Features	 High degree of automation Paper and online surveys Detailed reporting & distribution functions Flexible evaluation options and raw data export Quality management and performance indicators Manages multiple surveys simultaneously Easily imports seminar and trainer information from many databases Captures handwritten comments ADA compliant
Key Benefits	 Saves time and costs by reducing manual constraints Immediate feedback reporting for stakeholders Reduces need for physical storage space Centralizes processes for consistency and manageability Facilitates evidence-based management for continuous improvement Generates thousands of surveys in seconds Utilizes web-based architecture for ease of access and use
System	Requirements for Class Climate
Recommended Parameters	Intel Pentium Processor (2.5 GHz) 500 GB Hard Disk (RAID system) 4096 MB Memory 100 MBit/s Network
Minimum Parameters	Intel Pentium Processor (2.0 GHz) 200 GB Hard Disk 2048 MB Memory 100 MBit/s Network
Supporting Operating Systems	Windows Server 2003 or 2008 Windows XP SP3 Windows Vista SP1 Windows 7 (32- or 64-bit)
Supporting Browsers	Internet Explorer 6.0 and greater Firefox 2.0 and greater
Printe	r and Scanner Requirements
Printer Requirements	Laser printer recommended
Scanner Requirements	Scantron's iNSIGHT ^{us} scanners recommended (scanner must be TWAIN compliant)
See System F	Requirements document for complete details.

Please visit us at www.scantron.com/classclimate for a complete overview of Class Climate's system requirements or call us at (800) 722-6876 for more information.

© 2010 Scantron Corporation. All rights reserved. Scantron and the Scantron logo are registered trademarks. Blackboard is a registered trademark of Blackboard Inc. P/N 277-133-005 SCANTRON[®]

2. CollegeNet:

Innovation, Efficiency, Balance

ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION

Online Course Evaluations A Hit!

New System Wins Raves from Students, Faculty, and Administration



year savings of over \$200,000 and that's *before* factoring in the additional teaching and learning time returned to the classroom.

© Photos provided by University of Oregon.

Business Profile

The University of Oregon, located in Eugene, was founded in 1876. The school has grown from an initial graduating class of five people to become a world class university, serving over 20,000 students in its under-graduate and graduate departments and its Law School. U of O is a public research university and a member of the elite Association of American Universities. It has a faculty of over 1,700 and offers a broad choice of studies in areas such as architecture, art, business, education, journalism, law, liberal arts, music, and dance, the University of Oregon is truly a well-rounded Institution.

The Problem

The university's Scantron® paper-based evaluation system had a number of known limitations. Its equipment and technology were outdated, and the process was labor intensive. Reams of paper forms had to be printed, distributed, collected, and processed manually. Once the forms were processed, it was difficult for deans, department heads, and faculty to access clear reports containing the correct subset of information. Perhaps most importantly, not all students had easy access to the evaluation system. Because the Scantron forms were distributed, filled out, and collected during a single class meetingoften a review session—students who chose not to attend that session were excluded from the evaluation process.

The Solution

With the introduction of the What•Do• You•Think? system, evaluations became available to each student via a personalized

secure web page that displayed only his or her courses and evaluation



forms. Evaluations could be completed at the student's convenience, 24 hours a day, eliminating lost teaching time. Faculty members and administrators could view completed evaluation data on the web.

Innovation, Efficiency, Balance



And by offering early access to their grades when students completed all their evaluations, the university saw response rates soar.

The Benefits

With the What• Do•You•Think? web-based course evaluation system, all evaluations are now completed by students online, at their own pace, and with a much higher rate of completion. Responses are truly anonymous, and since data is hosted at CollegeNET, nothing can compromise that anonymity. In addition, the new system closes a serious loophole from paperbased days when a student was able to sign another student's name on an evaluation. Faculty members can now securely access their evaluation feedback online and immediately after the course evaluation period ends, with no processing delays. Other stakeholders, such as university administrators, can easily access wider evaluation results. Security features in What•Do•You•Think? allow the university to comply with both state law and U of O's own University Senate policies. And of course, the cost savings are notable. In its first year using What•Do•You•Think? the university realized a savings of over \$200,000.

Want to Know More?

To discuss the many ways What•Do•You•Think? and CollegeNET's other products can save you time and money and improve efficiency, contact sales@collegenet.com.





CollegeNET, Inc., 805 SW Broadway, Suite 1600, Portland, OR 97205 • 503.973.5200 • corp.collegenet.com © 2010, CollegeNET, Inc. All rights reserved. Specifications are subject to change without notice. CN-F-190 12/10 CollegeNET and What Do You Think? are the registered trademarks or trademarks of CollegeNET Inc. All other company and product names may be trademarks of the respective companies with which they are associated.

What Do You Think? - What It Does



CollegeNET Products Why Choose Us Success Stories Customer Resources News & Events Contact Us



What It Does

Our flexible web-based course evaluation system lets students fill out evaluation forms online while providing your faculty and administrative users immediate and secure access to evaluation results. The system is accessed via the web, so it's always available to students and school personnel.

With the Whet-Do-You-Think?® evaluation system students can:

- · Access a personal web page that presents evaluations for only the courses they're currently enrolled in
- Be assured of the anonymity of their responses
- Complete paperless evaluations any ime, day or night 🛷
- · Save evaluations in progress and return to complete them later
- · Receive email notification when evaluation periods open and close, and when evaluation results are available
- · Get early access to grades when they've completed their evaluations, if you decide to offer this feature

Instructors can:

- * View and print evaluation results and reports for the courses they teach
- Access historical evaluation data from past terms
- Mew quantitative evaluation results of courses taught by other instructors, if permitted
- Export reports in PDF or Excel format 🛷

Academic Administrations care

- New and print evaluation results for specific echocie, departments, instructors, courses and, of course, for your entire Institution
- Export evaluation results for further analysis in PDF and Excel formats 🜌
- Your System Administrators can:
- Add and maintain system users and set evaluation terms
- Create and broadcast custom, timed evaluation-related emails and reminders to students and instructors
- · Track participation and response levels in real time
- Export evaluation data and perform XML raw data dumps for further institutional analysis

Request More Information

We'd be happy to discuss your course evaluation goals and explore how the What-Do-You-Think? online course evaluation system can help you meet them. Request a Demo or call us at 503.973.5200

Privsoy Policy | Context Us | Terms of Use

Overview What it Does How You Benefit

Success Stories

What•Do•You•Think? Faculty & Course Evaluation

> Did You Know? What+Do+You+Think? saved the University of

> > Oregon over \$200.000 in

paper, printing, scanning

and labor – in just the

first vear!

02012 CollegeNET. Inc.

corp.collegenet.com/products/wdyt_what.html

1/1

3. ConnectEdu: CourseEval


Management is clear, quick, and easy

Engaging students, faculty, and administrators...

CoursEval[™] provides an attractive and highly flexible email message manager to allow communication with students and faculty. Better messages build student and faculty response rates and interest. Messages can be scheduled automatically at preset times to maximize response rates.

Managing and launching CoursEval[™]...

CoursEval[™] offers a wide array of built-in features and options to manage surveys and reports. Reports and logs are used as effective management tools to increase the response rates. The on-campus manager can measure participation by day, course, student, department, and survey. Anonymity is protected. Training manual, documentation, and help screens guide the user.



CoursEval[™] is licensed annually and priced by enrollment. Cost includes installation, training, support, and updates.



Survey

Dear Dr. Deschain,

Course Number MTH 119

MTH 222

MTH 433

Results Available

Your performance was assessed in the following courses:

Introduction to Algebra

Unear Agebra Explorations in Abstract A

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about the renorts.

section Course Name

1204 6344

1234

We are pleased to announce the availability of the SEMESTER YEA course evaluation results. Please use the login information in this message to access your reports at our Survey Site.

Customized messages and reminders to students and faculty

Survey Close 09/08/200

09/05/2008

00004/000

User Name: rdeschair

Password: ka-19

Reports are focused and functional

CoursEval[™] reporting...

CoursEval[™] features timely analytical reports that provide anonymous data compiled from student surveys. Output conforms to campus policies.

Multiple reporting options are available. In addition to available formats, survey data is easily exported to create special reports. Results are safely stored for further analysis.

Faculty can view:

Student ratings and statistics for their courses Written comments that are detailed and legible Comparisons with departmental courses Comparisons among sections of a single course

Administrators can view:

Reports for all course sections Detailed evaluations of all faculty Summaries of courses, faculty and departments Summaries of schools and campuses

Universities can evaluate:

Courses offered by all schools on a campus Courses offered on multiple campuses Courses taught at remote sites Distance-learning courses Team-taught courses All course types (lec, sem, lab, rec) Clinical rotations, co-ops, field placements

CoursEval[™] can also be used for: Faculty evaluating students Faculty evaluating faculty A campus group evaluating itself Self-Assessment Surveys of non-course activities

CoursE√al ³	Saxophe Materie College of Are	n and Sciences		Action. Tota			Report.	•	-	n Outstan		n our	Name of
Comparative Reports												1.1.2.1	
Sorvey Tures (Standard W)	Formy lines:	Scrvty Path Torig (8	5	Survey Status Count w	Savey (2080	Spiro	20061	-			Survey II	144 A) (2140 6413
Repet for Course Deputre	n≪)© tocus une (Patrical Science	10 M	Distribute for Course	<u>@</u> 0							Gener	- the
		there and do	tatis								Survey Real	**	
	Course Reportment		Casese. Duckles	Contractillates	Estation	dda X	Res.	tru,	3	Recommend Centre	Recommend	Oread Score	Second States
Publical Science			PSC 12E	INAUP ISS POL SCI	Tointy 2129	1, 2xmi	17	192	241	14.	32	31	
Public Science			PSC 008	N/RO AMERICAN POLITICS	Fainty 2136		72	216	20%	4.8	4.4	4.3	1
Puttox Solarce			PSC 102	6400 NITENAT POLICE	Faculty 2100	1.0930	32	- 86	32%	36	35	38	
Policel Science			PSC 214	CONDERSIONAL PLECTORS	Floody 2181		15	41	375	4	61	4.1	1
Police Scince			PK 6	UNDERGLINESS PROPERTY.		Dene	21	82	27	4	61	40	1
Policel Science		Sumr	narv Re	ports for Ch	airs.	Dena	12	28	24%	33	34	33	11
Follow Science		D	D	I Oul	faint free	Dena	28	84	32%	43	43	43	1
Police Scence		Dean	s, Provo	osts and Uth	ers	Deco	27	85	52%	4.6	44	44	
fullowScience		Linner				Deto	27	72	27%	42	46	4.4	1
Potical Science			PSC 309	AMERICAN FIDERALION	Shutiers 1644	9, Seat.	19	17	40%	43	49	48	1
Potical Science			PSC 314	PUBLIC POLICY MAKING	FRO.Dy 2074	5,0660	11	. 29	20%	48	48	47	

3. Survey questions

For more information and a customized demo of CoursEval™ contact 'sales' at (716) 204-0464

5. Legible written

were ten

Source transm.

Source ten

Source ten

Comments

1. Report identification

2. At-a-glance summary

4. Detailed results



F. Faculty Survey

FacultyEval

Page 1 of 1

*USF UNIVERSITY of Student-Faculty Evaluation System
Welcome to this survey requesting your input concerning a potential new student-to-faculty evaluation system that could potentially replace the current SUXMA. At any time you may exit the survey and return by re-entering your random identification number. Once completed your responses cannot be changed. Your confidentiality and anonymity are assured.
Thank you,
Bill Murry
Director of Institutional Assessment
wmurry@usfca.edu
x5486
Next Exit Survey

file:///C:/Users/wmurry/AppData/Local/Temp/tmp3E45.html



What is your gender?

- C Female
- C Male
- C Prefer not to say

Given the "typical" number of credit hours you teach in a single academic year (not counting summer or inter-session) what level of student do you primarily teach?

- C Undergraduate
- C Graduate (Masters or Doctorate)
- C Both equally
- C Do not teach

For how many years have you taught at USF (either continuously or intermittently)?

- C This is my first year
 C 1-5
 C 6-10
 C 11-15
- C >15

What is your employment status as a USF faculty member?

- O Full-time
- C Part-time

If you answered full-time in the previous question, please indicate your current position.

- C Term faculity
- C Assistant professor
- C Associate professor
- C Full professor
- C Not Applicable

If you answered part-time in the previous question, please indicate your position.

C PSP C Non-PSP

C Not Applicable



file:///C:/Users/wmurry/AppData/Local/Temp/tmpF8D1.html



In what school are you primarily associated with?

- C College of Arts and Sciences
- $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ School of Business and Professional Studies
- C School of Nursing
- C School of Law
- C School of Education

In what program are you primarily associated with (please write in your response below)?

Do you believe the current student evaluation of faculty is a system we should retain with regards to the type or form of questions that are asked?

O No

- O Yes, retain in its entirety
- $\rm C$ Yes, but with minor changes (you will have an opportunity to elaborate later in the survey)
- O Not Sure
- C Indifferent

Many new student-to-faculty evaluation systems focus primarily on the teaching effectiveness of the faculty (quality of teaching); do you believe this should continue to be our primary focus for considering a new evaluation system?

 \odot No

- $\odot\,$ Yes, it should be only focused on the effectiveness of the faculty in the teaching environment
- $\odot\,$ Yes, but with some additional foci (explained later in this survey)
- O Not sure
- C Indifferent

The committee is considering moving to a total on-line survey system for the mode of the survey. Do you believe this to be a viable approach if, over the current SUMMA system, it can guarantee a quicker turn-around in the faculty feedback report?

C No, not at all C Yes, if we can get feedback sooner C Not sure C Indifferent



file:///C:/Users/wmurry/AppData/Local/Temp/tmp28F7.html



The following are the final questions for which you are asked to give us your thoughts in an open-ended format. Please do not mention the courses you currently teach or any other factors that could possibly identify you or any other individual. Please limit your responses to your own perceptions.

Teaching evaluations are used for a variety of purposes, including re-hiring, promotion and tenure decisions, as well as improving the effectiveness of teaching in our classes. To best serve these purposes, what teaching related factors should be considered for inclusion in the ideal student-to-faculty evaluation of our teaching?



What aspects of the current student's evaluation system (i.e., SUMMA) should be retained in a new system of teaching evaluation?



If we adopt an online evaluation system, what changes should be made from the way we currently evaluate teaching?

file:///C:/Users/wmurry/AppData/Local/Temp/tmp8C1E.html

If you would like to share some additional comments regarding a new student-to-faculty evaluation system please feel free to do so below.

		A.,
		-
r	Deale New Control	
	Back Next Exit Survey	

file:///C:/Users/wmurry/AppData/Local/Temp/tmp8C1E.html



Thank you very much for your responses! If you would like to share some additional thoughts about a new student evaluation system in private with one of the task group members please feel free to email Ed Munnich (emunnich@usfca.edu) or Michael Webber (webberm@usfca.edu), co-chairs of the committee. If you are having specific problems with the survey interface please contact Bill Murry at x5486 or wmurry@usfca.edu.



file:///C:/Users/wmurry/AppData/Local/Temp/tmp3FC6.html

G. Faculty Survey Results

Survey of Faculty Perceptions Regarding a New Student Evaluation System Table of faculty survey frequencies

Do you believe the current student evaluation of faculty is a system we should retain with regards to the type or form of questions that are asked?										stem we nat are	The committee is considering moving to a total online survey system for the mode of the survey. Do you believe this to be a viable approach if, over the current SUMMA system, it can guarantee a quicker turn-around in the faculty feedback report?					
		No	Yes, retain in its entirety Yes, retain in its entirety Yes, but with minor changes (you will have an opportunity to elaborate later in the survey)					No, not at all			Yes, if we can get feedback sooner					
		Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %
What is your conder?	Female	49	62.8%	58.3%	5	6.4%	27.8%	24	30.8%	58.5%	21	28.0%	63.6%	54	72.0%	45.4%
what is your gender?	Male	35	53.8%	41.7%	13	20.0%	72.2%	17	26.2%	41.5%	12	15.6%	36.4%	65	84.4%	54.6%
	College of Arts and Sciences	49	56.3%	55.7%	16	18.4%	84.2%	22	25.3%	53.7%	26	26.5%	74.3%	72	73.5%	59.0%
In what school are you primarily associated	School of Business and Professional Studies	19	65.5%	21.6%	2	6.9%	10.5%	8	27.6%	19.5%	5	15.6%	14.3%	27	84.4%	22.1%
with?	School of Nursing	7	53.8%	8.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	6	46.2%	14.6%	2	14.3%	5.7%	12	85.7%	9.8%
	School of Law	2	100.0%	2.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	2	100.0%	1.6%
	School of Education	11	64.7%	12.5%	1	5.9%	5.3%	5	29.4%	12.2%	2	18.2%	5.7%	9	81.8%	7.4%
Given the "typical" number of credit	Undergraduate	57	58.2%	65.5%	16	16.3%	84.2%	25	25.5%	61.0%	25	21.9%	71.4%	89	78.1%	73.6%
hours you teach in a single academic year (not counting summer	Graduate (Masters or Doctorate)	24	64.9%	27.6%	1	2.7%	5.3%	12	32.4%	29.3%	7	21.9%	20.0%	25	78.1%	20.7%
or inter-session) what level of student do you primarily teach?	Both equally	6	50.0%	6.9%	2	16.7%	10.5%	4	33.3%	9.8%	3	30.0%	8.6%	7	70.0%	5.8%

Survey of Faculty Perceptions Regarding a New Student Evaluation System Table of faculty survey frequencies

	Many new student-to-faculty evaluation systems focus primarily on the teaching effectiveness of the faculty (quality of teaching); do you believe this should continue to be our primary focus for considering a new evaluation system?												
		NoYes, it should be only focused on the effectiveness of the faculty in the teaching environmentYes, but with som foci (explained la survey							with some a plained later survey)	dditional [·] in this			
		Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %			
What is your conder?	Female	7	8.1%	43.8%	28	32.6%	44.4%	51	59.3%	57.3%			
What is your gender?	Male	9	11.0%	56.3%	35	42.7%	55.6%	38	46.3%	42.7%			
	College of Arts and Sciences	12	10.7%	66.7%	41	36.6%	63.1%	59	52.7%	64.1%			
In what school are you primarily	School of Business and Professional Studies	3	10.0%	16.7%	14	46.7%	21.5%	13	43.3%	14.1%			
associated with?	School of Nursing	1	6.3%	5.6%	7	43.8%	10.8%	8	50.0%	8.7%			
	School of Law	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	3	100.0%	3.3%			
	School of Education	2	14.3%	11.1%	3	21.4%	4.6%	9	64.3%	9.8%			
Given the "typical" number of credit hours you teach in a single academic year (not counting summer or inter-session) what level of student do you primarily teach?	Undergraduate	13	10.4%	72.2%	47	37.6%	72.3%	65	52.0%	71.4%			
	Graduate (Masters or Doctorate)	4	10.0%	22.2%	15	37.5%	23.1%	21	52.5%	23.1%			
	Both equally	1	11.1%	5.6%	3	33.3%	4.6%	5	55.6%	5.5%			

Survey of Faculty Perceptions Regarding a New Student Evaluation System Table of faculty survey frequencies

Do you believe the current student evaluation of faculty is a system we should retain with regards to the type or form of questions that are asked?											The committee is considering moving to a total online survey system for the mode of the survey. Do you believe this to be a viable approach if, over the current SUMMA system, it can guarantee a quicker turn-around in the faculty feedback report?					
		No		Y	es, retain entiret	in its y	Ye cl hav to	s, but with nanges (ye ve an opp elaborate the surv	n minor ou will ortunity later in rey)	No, not at all Yes, if we can get feedback sooner				n get oner		
		Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %
	This is my first vear	2	40.0%	2.3%	1	20.0%	5.3%	2	40.0%	4.9%	0	0.0%	0.0%	20	100.0%	16.4%
For how many years have	1-5	30	56.6%	34.1%	7	13.2%	36.8%	16	30.2%	39.0%	14	26.9%	40.0%	38	73.1%	31.1%
continuously or	6-10	23	65.7%	26.1%	3	8.6%	15.8%	9	25.7%	22.0%	8	22.2%	22.9%	28	77.8%	23.0%
intermittently)?	11-15	9	50.0%	10.2%	5	27.8%	26.3%	4	22.2%	9.8%	5	35.7%	14.3%	9	64.3%	7.4%
	Greater Than 15	24	64.9%	27.3%	3	8.1%	15.8%	10	27.0%	24.4%	8	22.9%	22.9%	27	77.1%	22.1%
What is your employment	Full-time	52	61.2%	59.8%	11	12.9%	57.9%	22	25.9%	53.7%	24	28.2%	68.6%	61	71.8%	50.4%
member?	Part-time	35	56.5%	40.2%	8	12.9%	42.1%	19	30.6%	46.3%	11	15.5%	31.4%	60	84.5%	49.6%
	Term faculty	5	41.7%	9.6%	3	25.0%	27.3%	4	33.3%	17.4%	5	33.3%	21.7%	10	66.7%	15.9%
If you answered full-time in the previous question,	Assistant professor	21	67.7%	40.4%	2	6.5%	18.2%	8	25.8%	34.8%	6	26.1%	26.1%	17	73.9%	27.0%
please indicate your current position.	Associate professor	12	57.1%	23.1%	6	28.6%	54.5%	3	14.3%	13.0%	7	31.8%	30.4%	15	68.2%	23.8%
	Full professor	14	63.6%	26.9%	0	0.0%	0.0%	8	36.4%	34.8%	5	19.2%	21.7%	21	80.8%	33.3%
If you answered part-time in the previous question,	PSP	17	68.0%	58.6%	3	12.0%	60.0%	5	20.0%	50.0%	3	16.7%	60.0%	15	83.3%	38.5%
please indicate your position.	Non-PSP	12	63.2%	41.4%	2	10.5%	40.0%	5	26.3%	50.0%	2	7.7%	40.0%	24	92.3%	61.5%

Survey of Faculty Perceptions Regarding a New Student Evaluation System Table of faculty survey frequencies

	Many new student-to-faculty evaluation systems focus primarily on the teaching effectiveness of the faculty (quality of teaching); do you believe this should continue to be our primary focus for considering a new evaluation system?											
	Yes, it should be only focused on the effectiveness of the faculty in the teaching environment						Yes, but with some additional foci (explained later in this survey)					
		Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %	Count	Row N %	Col N %		
	This is my first year	0	0.0%	0.0%	6	35.3%	9.2%	11	64.7%	12.0%		
For how many years have	1-5	6	11.8%	33.3%	17	33.3%	26.2%	28	54.9%	30.4%		
you taught at USF (either continuously or	6-10	2	4.4%	11.1%	12	26.7%	18.5%	31	68.9%	33.7%		
intermittently)?	11-15	2	9.1%	11.1%	9	40.9%	13.8%	11	50.0%	12.0%		
	Greater Than 15	8	20.0%	44.4%	21	52.5%	32.3%	11	27.5%	12.0%		
What is your employment	Full-time	10	10.1%	55.6%	38	38.4%	58.5%	51	51.5%	56.0%		
member?	Part-time	8	10.7%	44.4%	27	36.0%	41.5%	40	53.3%	44.0%		
If you anawarad full time	Term faculty	0	0.0%	0.0%	5	33.3%	13.5%	10	66.7%	18.9%		
in the previous question,	Assistant professor	3	10.3%	30.0%	6	20.7%	16.2%	20	69.0%	37.7%		
please indicate your	Associate professor	1	3.8%	10.0%	12	46.2%	32.4%	13	50.0%	24.5%		
current position.	Full professor	6	20.0%	60.0%	14	46.7%	37.8%	10	33.3%	18.9%		
If you answered part-time in the previous question,	PSP	3	12.5%	50.0%	9	37.5%	47.4%	12	50.0%	48.0%		
please indicate your position.	Non-PSP	3	11.5%	50.0%	10	38.5%	52.6%	13	50.0%	52.0%		

Survey of Faculty Perceptions Regarding a New Student Evaluation System Figure of faculty responses to open-ended questions by construct



Note: The larger the circles and the thicker the connectors the stronger the construct agreement and relationship respectively.

H. Construct Matrix

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Comparison Matrix Joint Committee Online Teaching Evaluations

This listing of 28 instructional dimensions first appeared in Feldman (1989b) in a slightly different version. For each of the instructional dimensions, examples of evaluation items that would be classified into it are given. For refinements and modifications to this list of dimensions and attendant coding scheme, see d'Apollonia, Abrami and Rosenfield (1993) and Abrami, d'Apollonia and Rosenfield (1996).	Importance Shown by Correlation with Student Achievement	Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations	USF SUMMA	Duquesne University	SF State	The iDEA Center (Long Form)
USF Faculty Construct of Faculty Instructional Delivery						
No. 1 Teacher's Stimulation of Interest in the Course and Its Subject Matter : (2)	.38 (4)	.20 (1)				
a. "the instructor puts material across in an interesting way"				(10) The instructor used methods that help students learn.		
b. "the instructor gets students interested in the subject"					(7) Encourages student participation.	
c. "it was easy to remain attentive"						
d. "the teacher stimulated intellectual curiosity"				(5) The instructor helped me consider alternative perspectives on the topics presented. (16) The instructor stimulated my thinking.		(13) Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject.
No. 2 Teacher's Enthusiasm (for Subject or for Teaching): (13)	.27 (11)	.46 (8)				
a. "the instructor shows interest and enthusiasm in the subject"				(6) The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching.		
b. "the instructor seems to enjoy teaching"					(11) Is enthusiastic in teaching.	
c. "the teacher communicates a genuine desire to teach students"						
d. "the instructor never showed boredom for teaching this class"						
e. "the instructor shows energy and excitement"						
No. 3 Teacher's Knowledge of Subject Matter: (12)	.34 (9)	.48 (9)				
a. "the instructor has a good command of the subject material"					(9) Has command of the subject, including new developments in the field.	
b. "the teacher has a thorough knowledge, basic and current, of the subject"					(9) Has command of the subject, including new developments in the field.	
c. "the instructor has good knowledge about or beyond the textbook"						
d. "the instructor knows the answers to questions students ask"						
e. "the teacher keeps lecture material updated"						
No. 5 Teacher's Preparation Organization of the Course: (4)	.57 (1)	.41 (6)				
a. "the teacher was well prepared for each day's lecture"			(9) The instructor seems to be well prepared.	(25) The instructor was well prepared for class.		
b. "the presentation of the material is well organized"						
c. the overall development of the course had good continuity"			(11) The course appears to have been carefully planned.		(1) Organizes the course effectively.	
 "the instructor planned the activities of each class period in detail" 						
No. 6 Clarity and Understandableness : (1)	.56 (2)	.25 (2)				
a. "the instructor made clear explanations"			(8) The instructor is teaching the course material or skills clearly.	(22) The instructor's explanations were clear.	(10) Presents dass material in a clear and organized way.	(10) Explained course material clearly and concisely.
b. the instructor interprets abstract ideas and theories clearly"			(21) The instructor relates underlying theory to practice.			
c. "the instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations to get across difficult points"				(2) The instructors use of examples helped to get points across in class.		
d. "the teacher effectively synthesizes and summarizes the material"					(4) Makes the course material meaningful and shows significance of the subject.	
e. "the teacher answers students' questions in a way that helps students to understand"						

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Comparison Matrix

Joint Committee Online Teaching Evaluations

This listing of 28 instructional dimensions first appeared in Feldman (1989b) in a slightly different version. For each of the instructional dimensions, examples of evaluation items that would be classified into it are given. For refinements and modifications to this list of dimensions and attendant coding scheme, see d'Apollonia, Abrami and Rosenfield (1993) and Abrami, d'Apollonia and Rosenfield (1996).	Importance Shown by Correlation with Student Achievement	Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations	USF SUMMA	Duquesne University	SF State	The iDEA Center (Long Form)
No. 7 Teacher's Elocutionary Skills : (11)	.35 (7.5)	.49 (10)				
a. "the instructor has a good vocal delivery"			 The clarity and audibility of the unstructors speech are excellent 			
b. "the teacher speaks distinctly, fluently and without hesitation"						
c. "the teacher varied the speech and tone of his or her voice"						
d. "the teacher has the ability to speak distinctly and be clearly heard"				(14) The instructor clearly articulated material.		
e. "the instructor changed pitch, volume, or quality of speech"						
No. 8 Teacher's Sensitivity to, and Concern with, Class Level and Progress : (8)	.30 (10)	.40 (5)				
a. "the teacher was skilled in observing student reactions"						
 the teacher was aware when students failed to keep up in class "the instructor teaches near the class level" 				 (21) The assignments were challenging at an appropriate level for the course. (1.8) The course material was presented at an appropriate level of understanding. 		
d. "the teacher takes an active personal interest in the progress of the class and shows a desire for students to learn"			(10) The instructor seems to care about my learning.	(3) The instructor was concerned with whether or not the students learned the material.		 Displayed a personal interest in students and their learning.
USF Faculty Construct of Instructional Design						
No. 9 Clarity of Course Objectives and Requirements : (7)	.35 (7.5)	.45 (7)				
a. "the purposes and policies of the course were made clear to the student"			(15) Course objectives have been expressed clearly.	(17) The objectives of the course were well explained.	(2) Defines the course objectives, learning activities, requirements,	
b. "the instructor gave a clear idea of the student requirements"			(3) The requirements of the course (projects, papers, exams, etc.) were explained adequately.	(4) The instructor made it clear how students would be assessed.	(2) Defines the course objectives, learning activities, requirements, and grading policies clearly.	
c. "the teacher clearly defined student responsibilities in the course"						
d. $\ \ \ \ ^{\prime\prime}$ the teacher tells students which topics are most important and what they can expect on tests $\ \ \ \ ^{\prime\prime}$						(12) Gave test, projects, etc. that covered the most important points of the course.
e. "the instructor gave clear assignments"				(24) The assignments were helpful in acquiring a better understanding of course objectives.		
No. 10 Nature and Value of the Course Material (Including Its Usefulness and Relevance) : (20)	.17 (16)	.70 (13)				
a. "the teacher has the ability to apply material to real life"						(4) Demonstrated the importance and significance of the subject matter. (31) Related course material to real life situations.
b. "the instructor makes the course practical"			(27) This course is practical and useful to those students for whom it was specifically planned.			
c. "there is worthwhile and informative material in lectures that doesn't duplicate the text"						
 "the course has excellent content" 						
e. "the class considers what we are learning worth learning"				(19) The instructor helped me to understand the relevance of this course.		

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Comparison Matrix Joint Committee Online Teaching Evaluations

This listing of 28 instructional dimensions first appeared in Feldman (1989b) in a slightly different version. For each of the instructional dimensions, examples of evaluation items that would be classified into it are given. For refinements and modifications to this list of dimensions and attendant coding scheme, see d'Apollonia, Abrami and Rosenfield (1993) and Abrami, d'Apollonia and Rosenfield (1996).	Importance Shown by Correlation with Student Achievement	Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations	USF SUMMA	Duquesne University	SF State	The IDEA Center (Long Form)
No. 11 Nature and Usefulness of Supplementary Materials and Teaching Aids : (22)	11 (17)	.72 (14.5)				
a. "the homework assignments and supplementary readings were helpful in understanding the course"			(2) The contents of the assignments contribute to my understanding of the subject.	 (21) The assignments were challenging at an appropriate level for the course. (24) The assignments were helpful in acquiring a better understanding of course objectives. 	(3) Effectively uses assignments to enhance learning.	
b. "the teacher made good use of teaching aids such as films and other audio-visual materials".						
c. "the instructor provided a variety of activities in class and used a variety of media (slides, films, projections, drawings) and outside resource persons"						(14) Involved students in "hands on" projects such as research, case studies, or "real life" activities.
No. 12 Perceived Outcome or Impact of Instruction : (3)	.46 (3)	.28 (3)				
a. "gaining of new knowledge was facilitated by the instructor"				(9) The instructor was helpfulo in advancing my knowledge or skills.	(14) Contributes to knowledge of subject.	
b. "I developed significant skills in the field"						
c. "I developed increased sensitivity and evaluative judgment"						
d. "the instructor has given me tools for attacking problems"						
f. "apart from your personal feelings about the teacher, has he/she been instrumental in increasing knowledge of the course's subject matter"			(18) In this course, I am learning much.	 The instructor helped me to understand the material in this course. 		
USF Faculty Construct of Engagement with Students						
No. 13 Teacher's Fairness Impartiality of Evaluation of Students Quality of Examinations : (15)	.26 (12)	.72 (14.5)				
a. "grading in the course was fair"			(6) The methods being used for evalutaing my work (such as tests, projects, etc.) are reasonable.		(6) Evaluation criteria is clearly presented and the instructor is fair in evaluating student work.	
b. "the instructor has definite standards and is impartial in grading"					(6) Evaluation criteria is clearly presented and the instructor is fair in evaluating student work.	
c. "the exams reflect material emphasized in the course"			(23) Examinations cover material or skills emphasized in the course.			
d. "test questions were clear"			(25) Examination questions are phrased clearly.			
e. "coverage of subject matter on exams was comprehensive"						
No. 15 Nature Quality, and Frequency of Feedback from the Teacher to Students : (21)	.28 (14.5)	.87 (17)				
a. "the teacher gave satisfactory feedback on graded material"			(17) The instructor provides useful feedback on student progress (identifying strengths and weaknesses).	(8) The instructor provided constructive feedback on course assignments and exams.	(5) Provides feedback on student progress.	
b. "criticism of papers was helpful to students"						(7) Explained the reasons for criticisms of students' academic performance.
c. "the teacher told students when they had done a good job"						
d. "the teacher is prompt in returning tests and assignments"				(11) The instructor returned graded materials within the appropriate time frame.		(17) Provided timely and frequent feedback on tests, reports, projects, etc. to help students improve.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education **Comparison Matrix**

Joint Committee Online Teaching Evaluations

This listing of 28 instructional dimensions first appeared in Feldman (1989b) in a slightly different version. For each of the instructional dimensions, examples of evaluation items that would be classified into it are given. For refinements and modifications to this list of dimensions and attendant coding scheme, see d'Apollonia, Abrami and Rosenfield (1993) and Abrami, d'Apollonia and Rosenfield (1996).	Importance Shown by Correlation with Student Achievement	Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations	USF SUMMA	Duquesne University	SF State	The IDEA Center (Long Form)
No. 16 Teacher's Encouragement of Questions and Discussion, and Openness to Opinions of Others : (9)	.36 (5.5)	.60 (11)				
a. "students felt free to ask questions or express opinions"			(7) Adequate opportunities are provided by the instructor for me to ask questions.	(15) The instructor created a learning environment in which students felt comfortable asking questions.		
b. the instructor stimulated class discussions"						
c. "the teacher encouraged students to express differences of opinions and to evaluate each other's ideas"						
d. "the instructor invited criticisms of his or her own ideas"						
e. "the teacher appeared receptive to new ideas and the view points of others"						
No. 18 Teacher's Concern and Respect for Students Friendliness of the Teacher: (16)	.23 (14.5)	.65 (12)				
a. "the instructor seems to have a genuine interest in and concern for students"					(8) Is sensitive and responsive to students as individuals.	
b. "the teacher took students seriously"				(7) The instructor treated students with respect.		
c. "the instructor established good rapport with students"						
d. "the teacher was friendly toward all students"						
No. 19 Teacher's Availability and Helpfulness : (14)	.36 (5.5)	.74 (16)				
 "the instructor was willing to help students having difficulty" 						
b. "the instructor is willing to give individual attention"						
c. "the teacher was available for consultation"						
d. "the teacher was accessible to students outside of class"				 (20) Communication with the instructor outside of class was helpful. (23) Assistance from the instructor outside of class was readily available if I sought help. 	(12) Is available for discussion outside class time.	(20) Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, e-mail, etc.)
USF Faculty Construct of Student Learning						
No. 17 Intellectual Challenge and Encouragement of Independent Thought (by the Teacher and the Course): (10)	.25 (13)	.33 (4)				
a. "this course challenged students intellectually"				(13) The instructor challenged me intellectually.	(13) Stimulates students to think independently/critically.	
b. "the teacher encouraged students to think out answers and follow up ideas"			(4) The instructor's presentation often causes me to think in depth about this subject.			(2) Found ways to help students answer their own questions.
c. "the teacher attempts to stimulate creativity"						(19) Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking.
 "the instructor raised challenging questions and problems" 						
Feldmen constructs that had no correlation with student achievement						
No. 4 Teacher's Intellectual Expansiveness (and Intelligence) :						
a. "the teacher is well informed in all related fields"						
b. The teacher has respect for other subject areas and indicates their relationship to his or her own subject of presentation"						
c. "the teacher exhibited a high degree of cultural attainment"						
No. 14 Personality Characteristics ("Personality") of the Teacher: (18)						
a. "the teacher has a good sense of hum or"						
b. "the teacher was sincere and honest"						
c. "the teacher is highly personable at all times in dress, voice, social grace, and manners"						
d. "the instructor was free of personal peculiarities"						
e. "the instructor is not autocratic and does not try to force us to accept his ideas and interpretations"						
f. "the teacher exhibits a casual, informal attitude" g. "the instructor laughed at his own mistakes"						
b. one more access megned to use one missages						

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Comparison Matrix Joint Committee Online Teaching Evaluations

This listing of 28 instructional dimensions first appeared in Feldman (1989b) in a slightly different version. For each of the instructional dimensions, examples of evaluation items that would be classified into it are given. For refinements and modifications to this list of dimensions and attendant coding scheme, see d'Apollonia, Abrami and Rosenfield (1993) and Abrami, d'Apollonia and Rosenfield (1996).	Importance Shown by Correlation with Student Achievement	Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations	USF SUMMA	Duquesne University	SF State	The IDEA Center (Long Form)
No. 20 Teacher Motivates Students to Do Their Best High Standard of Performance Required : (6)						
a. "Instructor motivates students to do their best work"						
b. "the instructor sets high standards of achievement for students"			(16) The instructor demonstates a personal commitment to high standards of professional competence.			
c. "the teacher raises the aspiration level of students"						(15) Inspired students to set and achieve goals which really challenged them.
No. 21 Teacher's Encouragement of Self-Initiated Learning :						
 "Students are encouraged to work independently" 						
b. "students assume much responsibility for their own learning"						
c. "the general approach used in the course gives emphasis to learning on the students' own"						
d. "the teacher does not suppress individual initiative"			(20) The instructor supervises and helps in new experiences without taking over.			
No. 22 Teacher's Productivity in Research Related Activities :						
a. "The teacher talks about his own research"						
b. "instructor displays high research accomplishments"						
c. "the instructor publishes material related to his subject field"						
No. 23 Difficulty of the Course (and Workload)—Description : (23)						
a. "the workload and pace of the course was difficult"				(28) The pacing of each class session was appropriate. (Reversed)		
b. "I spent a great many hours studying for this course"						
c. "the amount of work required for this course was very heavy"						
d. "this course required a lot of time"						
e. "the instructor assigned very difficult reading"						
No. 24 Difficulty of the Course (and Workload)—Evaluation : (24)						
a. "the content of this course is too hard"						
b. "the teacher's lectures and oral presentations are 'over my head' "						
c. "the instructor often asked for more than students could get done"						
d. "the instructor attempted to cover too much material and presented it too rapidly"						
No. 25 Classroom Management: (17)						
a. "the instructor controls class discussion to prevent rambling and confusion"						
b. "the instructor maintained a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning"						
c. "students are allowed to participate in deciding the course content"						
d. "the teacher did not 'rule with an iron hand' "						
No. 26 Pleasantness of Classroom Atmosphere : (19)						
a. "the class does not make me nervous"						
b. "I felt comfortable in this class"						
c. "the instructor created an atmosphere in which students in the class seemed friendly"						
d. "this was not one of those classes where students failed to laugh, joke, smile or show other signs of humor"						
e. "the teacher is always criticizing and arguing with students"						
No. 27 Individualization of Teaching :						
a. "instead of expecting every student to do the same thing, the instructor provides different activities for different students".						
b. "my grade depends primarily upon my improvement over my past performance"						
c. "in this class each student is accepted on his or her own merits"						
d. "my grade is influenced by what is best for me as a person as well as by how much I have learned?"						
e. "the instructor evaluated each student as an individual"						
- August and a subsect of the second of a share man						

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Comparison Matrix Joint Committee Online Teaching Evaluations

This listing of 28 instructional dimensions first appeared in Feldman (1989b) in a slightly different version. For each of the instructional dimensions, examples of evaluation items that would be classified into it are given. For refinements and modifications to this list of dimensions and attendant coding scheme, see d'Apollonia, Abrami and Rosenfield (1993) and Abrami, d'Apollonia and Rosenfield (1996).	Importance Shown by Correlation with Student Achievement	Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations	USF SUMMA	Duquesne University	SF State	The iDEA Center (Long Form)
No. 28 Teacher Pursued and/or Met Course Objectives : (5)						
a. "the instructor accomplished what he or she set out to do"				(12) The pacing of the course was appropriate for its goals and objectives.		
b. "there was close agreement between the announced objectives of the course and what was actually taught"						
c. "course objectives stated agreed with those actually pursued"			(12) Course objectives are being achieved.			
Items in each comparison survey that had no alignment with the Feldmen constructs						
Items for which there is no dose match			 (5) The instructor has adequate means for evaluating my learning. (13) During the term, I looked forward to attending this class. (14) Compared with other courses on this level carrying an equal amount of credit, the effort 1 put into this course is as much as in other courses. (19) The out-of-class assignments are challenging. (22) Overall, I rate this instructor a good teacher. (24) The time allowed to complete exams is adequate. (26) The textbooks contribute to my understanding of the subject. 	 (27) Regular class attendance was necessary for understanding the course material. (30) The instructor followed the course schedule presented in the syllabus and in class. (26) The instructor encouraged students to seek help outside of class if needed. (29) The instructor responded to my communications in a timely manner 	(15) Rate the overall teaching effectiveness of the instructor.	 (3) Scheduled course work (class activities, tests, projects) in ways which encouraged students to stay up-to-date in their work. (5) Formed "teams" or "discussion groups" to facilitate learning. (6) Made it dear how each topic fit into the course. (8) Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses. (9) Encouraged students to use multiple resources (e.g. data banks, library holdings, outside experts) to improve understanding. (16) Asked students to share ideas and experiences with others whose backgrounds and viewpoints differ from their own. (18) Asked students to help each other understand ideas or concepts.