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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 co-chaired 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.”

Committee Members

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

Michael J. Webber (co-Chair)
Dean School of Management

Faculty:
Robert Burns
Professor School of Education

Paul Lorton
Professor School of Management

Mary Ellene Egan RSM
Assistant Professor School of Nursing

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

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

Bill Murry
Director of Student Learning Assurance
Office of Academic Affairs

Robert Bromfield
Assistant Dean and University Registrar
Academic and Enrollment Services

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.”

Beginning with the earliest CBA, in 1977, 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.” 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.
5. 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.)

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
"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 they 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.

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.
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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 parcelled 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%)**: *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-ended-questions. 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 post-terminal 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, WDTY 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. WDTY 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. WDTY 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scantron</td>
<td>Customizable questions if designing own survey with Class Climate’s questionnaire design tool.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Cannot block grades for students who don’t complete survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey is ADA compliant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey is accessible on iPad, iPhone, Blackberry, in addition to standard web browsers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class Climate accommodates team-taught courses – student completes only one survey with capability to evaluate each instructor separately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Cannot withhold access to faculty who have not submitted grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CollegeNet</td>
<td>USF will have a dedicated CollegeNet account manager and user contact. What Do You Think? (WDTY) is hosted on CollegeNet’s high-demand servers. WDTY 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.</td>
<td>Integration with Blackboard can't be simultaneously done through both Blackboard and USFconnect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CollegeNet will setup and configure WDTY to USF’s specifications. WDTY would also be branded for USF along with a customized look and feel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CollegeNet provides USF with interface for establishing authentication credentials, along with specifications for the course and enrollment data transfer interface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 WDTY is hosted on CollegeNet’s servers, students’ responses are 100% anonymous to USF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade hold (Grade Block) prevents students from seeing their grades or receiving their transcript until they submit their evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Real time status-tracking, faculty can see participation rates &quot;live.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>PDF reports are generated, which causes a little delay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. ConnectEdu</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Cannot block grades for students who don’t complete survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey is accessible on iPhone in addition to standard web browsers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CourseEval accommodates team-taught courses – student completes only one survey with capability to evaluate each instructor separately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Real time status-tracking, faculty can see participation rates &quot;live&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Cannot withhold access to faculty who do not submit grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>USF staff will also manage the survey design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Vendor Features and Cost Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Web Hosting from Vendor</th>
<th>Single Sign-on</th>
<th>Customizable Forms</th>
<th>E-mail to Students/Faculty</th>
<th>Student Anonymity</th>
<th>Real-time Participation Rate Tracking</th>
<th>Robust Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scantron Class Climate</td>
<td>No, host available through 3rd party vendor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes with Class Climate. No with ETS add-on. USF does all set-ups.</td>
<td>Yes. Initial and automatic reminder emails to students to complete survey.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CollegeNet What Do You Think?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Yes. Reminder emails are also sent to students who have not completed their evaluation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConnectEdu CoursEval</td>
<td>Both in-house and hosted available</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes. USF staff manages survey design.</td>
<td>Yes. Reminder emails are also sent to students who have not completed their evaluations.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Availability of Survey Results</td>
<td>Exportable Reports in PDF, Excel</td>
<td>Grade Hold.</td>
<td>Withhold Survey Results From Faculty</td>
<td>Mobile WebApp Version</td>
<td>ADA Compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scantron Class Climate</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Yes, also .csv and .sav</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Accessible on iPad, iPhone, and Blackberry.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CollegeNet What Do You Think?</td>
<td>48 hours after survey closes, usually within 24 hours</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes. Prevents students from seeing their grades until they submit their evaluations.</td>
<td>Yes. Reports are withheld from faculty until grades are submitted.</td>
<td>Accessible on iPad, iPhone, and Blackberry.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConnectEdu CoursEval</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Accessible on iPad, iPhone, and Blackberry. Faculty need browser.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Team-taught courses</td>
<td>References available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scantron Class Climate</strong></td>
<td>Onetime cost $29,000. SIR II $3,000 annually. $6,000 maintenance and upgrades thereafter.</td>
<td>Accommodates team-taught course. Students complete only one survey with capability to evaluate each instructor separately.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CollegeNet What Do You Think?</strong></td>
<td>One-time cost of $38,000. $19,000 annually thereafter.</td>
<td>Accommodates team-taught course. Students complete only one survey with capability to evaluate each instructor separately.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ConnectEdu CoursEval</strong></td>
<td>One-time costs of $15,000. $12,000 annually thereafter; $16,800 annually if hosted by vendor.</td>
<td>CoursEval accommodates team-taught courses. Student completes only one survey with capability to evaluate each instructor separately.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Oregon</th>
<th>Princeton University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sue Eveland, Registrar</td>
<td>Polly Winfrey Griffin, Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541-346-3195</td>
<td>609-258-6191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:seveland@uoregon.edu">seveland@uoregon.edu</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:polly@princeton.edu">polly@princeton.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://corp.collegenet.com/PDF/UOregon_Success_CN-F-190.pdf">http://corp.collegenet.com/PDF/UOregon_Success_CN-F-190.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanford University</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Regan, Stanford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Student Information Systems</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lbregan@stanford.edu">lbregan@stanford.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ConnectEdu**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agnes Scott College</th>
<th>Georgetown University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Dougherty</td>
<td>Charles Leonhardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leonhardt@georgetown.edu">leonhardt@georgetown.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404.471.6030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sdougherty@agnesscott.edu">sdougherty@agnesscott.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California Lutheran University</th>
<th>Catholic University of America – Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karissa Oien</td>
<td>Stuart Schept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:koien@callutheran.edu">koien@callutheran.edu</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:schept@law.edu">schept@law.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Wright</td>
<td>Lake Erie College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mjwright@callutheran.edu">mjwright@callutheran.edu</a></td>
<td>Barbara Arilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University Channel Islands</td>
<td>440-375-7015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Revard</td>
<td>barilson@lec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:nathan.revard@csuci.edu">nathan.revard@csuci.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. WDTV 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, WDTV 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 WDTV 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 WDTV 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, WDTV 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 WDTV 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 WDTV (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 WDTV. 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 WDTV 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.
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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 25\(^8\) 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

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 Very Descriptive N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. 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. Makes himself/herself clear, states objectives summarizes major points, presents material in an organized manner, and provides emphasis.

3. Is sensitive to the response of the class, encourages student participation, and welcomes questions and discussion.

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.

5. Enjoys teaching, is enthusiastic about the subject, makes the course interesting, and has self-confidence.

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: Among the very worst About Average Among the very best N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.)

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, indicate N/A.)
### Survey Form - Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses

**IMPORTANT!**

Your thoughtful answers to these questions will provide helpful information to your instructor.

**Describe the frequency of your instructor's teaching procedures, using the following code:**
1. Hardly Ever  
2. Occasionally  
3. Sometimes  
4. Frequently  
5. Almost Always

#### The Instructor:

1. Displayed a personal interest in students and their learning  
2. Found ways to help students answer their own questions  
3. Scheduled course work (class activities, tests, projects) in ways which encouraged students to stay up-to-date in their work  
4. Emphasized the importance and significance of the subject  
5. Formed "teams" or "discussion groups" to facilitate learning  
6. Made it clear how each topic fit into the course  
7. Explained the reasons for criticisms of students' academic performance  
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  
10. Explained course material clearly and concisely  
11. Related course material to real life situations  
12. Gave tests, projects, etc. that covered the most important points of the course  
13. Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject  
14. Involved students in "hands on" projects such as research, case studies, or "real life" activities  
15. Inspired students to set and achieve goals which really challenged them  
16. Asked students to share ideas and experiences with others whose backgrounds and viewpoints differ from their own  
17. Provided timely and frequent feedback on tests, reports, projects, etc. to help students improve  
18. Asked students to help each other understand ideas or concepts  
19. Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking  
20. Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, e-mail, etc.)

#### Twelve possible learning objectives are listed below. For each, rate your progress in this course compared with your progress in other courses you have taken at this college or university. (Of course, ratings on objectives which were not addressed by the course will usually be low.)

**In this course, my progress was:**

1. Low (lowest 10% of courses I have taken here)
2. Low Average (next 20% of courses I have taken here)
3. Average (middle 40% of courses I have taken here)
4. High Average (next 20% of courses I have taken here)
5. High (Highest 10% of courses I have taken here)

**Progress on:**

- Acquiring factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)
- Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories
- Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decision making)
- Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course
- Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team
- Developing creative capacities (writing, inventing, designing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.)
- Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)
- Developing skill in expressing oneself orally or in writing
- Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
- Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values
- Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view
- Acquiring an interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers
On the next three items, compare this course with others you have taken at this institution, using the following code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=Much Less than Most Courses</th>
<th>2=Less than Most Courses</th>
<th>3=About Average</th>
<th>4=More than Most Courses</th>
<th>5=Much More than Most Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Course:
33. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Amount of reading
34. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Amount of work in other (non-reading) assignments
35. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Difficulty of subject matter

Describe your attitudes and behavior in this course, using the following code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=Definitely False</th>
<th>2=More False Than True</th>
<th>3=In Between</th>
<th>4=More True Than False</th>
<th>5=Definitely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Self Rating:
36. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) I had a strong desire to take this course.
37. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) I worked harder on this course than on most courses I have taken.
38. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) I really wanted to take a course from this instructor.
39. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) I really wanted to take this course regardless of who taught it.
40. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) As a result of taking this course, I have more positive feelings toward this field of study.
41. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Overall, I rate this instructor an excellent teacher.
42. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Overall, I rate this course as excellent.

For the following items, blacken the space which best corresponds to your judgment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=Definitely False</th>
<th>2=More False Than True</th>
<th>3=In Between</th>
<th>4=More True Than False</th>
<th>5=Definitely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

43. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) As a rule, I put forth more effort than other students on academic work.
44. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) The instructor used a variety of methods—not only tests—to evaluate student progress in course objectives.
45. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) The instructor expected students to take their share of responsibility for learning.
46. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) The instructor had high achievement standards in this class.
47. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) The instructor used educational technology (e.g., Internet, e-mail, computer exercises, multimedia presentations, etc.) to promote learning.

EXTRA QUESTIONS
If your instructor has extra questions, answer them in the space designated below (questions 48-66):

48. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) 58. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Your comments are invited on how the instructor might improve this course or teaching procedures. Use the space below for comments (unless otherwise directed). Note: Your written comments may be returned to the instructor. You may want to PRINT to protect your anonymity.
49. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) 59. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
50. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) 60. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
51. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) 61. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
52. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) 62. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
53. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) 63. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
54. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) 64. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
55. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) 65. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
56. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) 66. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
57. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Institution: Instructor:
Course Number: Time and Days Class Meets:

Comments:
# Faculty Information Form

**Institution:** University of San Francisco  
**Instructor:** Lorton Jr. P

**Course Number:** 0303-471-01  
**Time and Days Class Meets:**

## Important!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name (Up to 11 letters)</th>
<th>Init.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objectives: (Scale - M = Minor or No Importance, I = Important, E = Essential)

1. Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)
2. Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories
3. Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)
4. Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course
5. Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team
6. Developing creative capacities (writing, inventing, designing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.)
7. Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)
8. Developing skill in expressing oneself orally or in writing
9. Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
10. Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values
11. Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view
12. Acquiring an interest in learning more by asking questions and seeking answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Class Meets</th>
<th>Department Code</th>
<th>Time Class Begins</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Number Enrolled</th>
<th>Local Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>5202</td>
<td>3031</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contextual Questions (Research Purposes):**

The IDEA Center will conduct research on these optional questions in order to improve the interpretation of student ratings.

### 1. Which of the following represents the primary approach to this course?

- Lecture
- Discussion/lecture
- Seminar
- Skill/activity
- Laboratory
- Field Experience
- Studio
- Multi-Media
- Practicum/practicum
- Other

### 2. If multiple approaches are used, which represents the secondary approach?

- Lecture
- Discussion/lecture
- Seminar
- Skill/activity
- Laboratory
- Field Experience
- Studio
- Multi-Media
- Practicum/practicum
- Other

### 3. Describe this course in terms of its requirements with respect to the features listed below. Use the following code to make your responses:

- **N** = None (or little) required
- **S** = Some required
- **M** = Much required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Oral communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Computer applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Group work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Mathematical/quantitative work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Critical thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Creative/artistic/design endeavor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Copyright © IDEA Center, 1998]
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### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A. Physical facilities and/or equipment
- B. Your previous experience in teaching this course
- C. Substantial changes in teaching approach, course assignments, content, etc.
- D. Your desire to teach this course
- E. Your control over course management decisions (objectives, texts, exams, etc.)
- F. Adequacy of students' background and preparation for the course
- G. Student enthusiasm for the course
- H. Student effort to learn
- I. Technical/instructional support

5. Please identify the principal type of student enrolling in this course:

- ① = Freshmen/sophomores seeking to meet a "general education" or "distribution" requirement
- ② = Freshmen/sophomores seeking to develop background needed for their intended specialization
- ③ = Upperclassmen non-majors taking the course as a "general education" or "distribution" requirement
- ④ = Upperclassmen majors (in this or a related field of study) seeking competence or expertise in their academic/professional specialty
- ⑤ = Graduate or professional school students
- ⑥ = Combination of two or more of the above types

### Is this class:

- a. Team taught?  ○ Yes  ○ No
- b. Taught through distance learning?  ○ Yes  ○ No
### D. Sample Current SUMMA

#### SURVEY OF STUDENT OPINION OF INSTRUCTION™

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SIDE 1**

Darken only one response circle for each item. If you feel the statement is not applicable, or you are not able to give a knowledgeable response, simply leave the item blank and proceed to the next. Please answer carefully and thoughtfully.

Indicate as accurately as possible your opinion of the instructor's performance in this class by responding to items 1-22 on a scale from five to one where five means "Strongly Agree" and one means "Strongly Disagree." Your opinions are to 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCEPTABLE MARKS</th>
<th>UNACCEPTABLE MARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✪ ✪ ✪ ✪ ✪</td>
<td>✗ ✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The clarity and audibility of the instructor's speech are excellent.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The contents of the assignments contribute to my understanding of the subject.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. The requirements of the course (projects, papers, exams, etc.) were explained adequately.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. The instructor's presentation often causes me to think in depth about this subject.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. The instructor has adequate means for evaluating my learning.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. The methods being used for evaluating my work (such as tests, projects, etc.) are reasonable.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Adequate opportunities are provided by the instructor for me to ask questions.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. The instructor is teaching the course material or skills clearly.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. The instructor seems to be well prepared.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. The instructor seems to care about my learning.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. The course appears to have been carefully planned.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Course objectives are being achieved.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. During the term, I looked forward to attending this class.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Compared with other courses on this level carrying an equal amount of credit, the effort I put into this course is as much as in other courses.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Course objectives have been expressed clearly.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. The instructor demonstrates a personal commitment to high standards of professional competence.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. The instructor provides useful feedback on student progress (identifying strengths and weaknesses).</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. In this course, I am learning much.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. The out-of-class assignments are challenging.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. The instructor supervises and helps in new experiences without taking over.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. The instructor relates underlying theory to practice.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. Overall, I rate this instructor a good teacher.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ ■ ■ ■ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Agree  O   O   O   O   O   O   Strongly Disagree

24. The time allowed to complete exams is adequate.
   Strongly Agree  O   O   O   O   O   O   Strongly Disagree

25. Examination questions are phrased clearly.
   Strongly Agree  O   O   O   O   O   O   Strongly Disagree

26. The textbooks contribute to my understanding of the subject.
   Strongly Agree  O   O   O   O   O   O   Strongly Disagree

27. This course is practical and useful to those students for whom it was specifically planned.
   Strongly Agree  O   O   O   O   O   O   Strongly Disagree

28. The clinical experiences, or laboratory, meet my learning needs for this course.
   Strongly Agree  O   O   O   O   O   O   Strongly Disagree

29. The instructor explains or illustrates laboratory or clinical techniques clearly.
   Strongly Agree  O   O   O   O   O   O   Strongly Disagree

30. Pre-laboratory assignments (assigned readings and exercises) contribute to my understanding of laboratory experiments.
   Strongly Agree  O   O   O   O   O   O   Strongly Disagree

31. The laboratory contributes to my understanding of the subject.
   Strongly Agree  O   O   O   O   O   O   Strongly Disagree

32. The laboratory manual adequately explains the procedures to be followed in the laboratory.
   Strongly Agree  O   O   O   O   O   O   Strongly Disagree

33. Equipment and materials needed to perform the laboratory experiments are organized and readily available for use during the laboratory.
   Strongly Agree  O   O   O   O   O   O   Strongly Disagree

34. My perception of the teaching method used in this course is
   Lecture  Discussion  Demonstration  Combination of these  Other

35. This course is
   In my major  General requirement  Elective  Required cognate  Other

36. My class is
   Freshman  Sophomore  Junior  Senior  Graduate

37. My grade point average to date is (round off)
   4.0  3.5  3.0  2.5  2.0  Under 2.0

38. The grade I presently have in this course is
   A  B  C  D  F

39. If I needed help outside of class, the instructor has given help to me.
   Yes  No  Have not needed help

Questions 40–50 Supplied by Instructor

40. O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O
   5  4  3  2  1

41. O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O
   5  4  3  2  1

42. O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O
   5  4  3  2  1

43. O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O
   5  4  3  2  1

44. O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O
   5  4  3  2  1

45. O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O
   5  4  3  2  1

46. O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O
   5  4  3  2  1

47. O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O
   5  4  3  2  1

48. O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O
   5  4  3  2  1

49. O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O
   5  4  3  2  1

50. O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O
   5  4  3  2  1
SURVEY OF STUDENT OPINION
OF INSTRUCTION™
INSTRUCTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE

The Instructor's Questionnaire is to be completed at the same time students respond to the survey. Darken only one response circle for each item. If you feel the statement is not applicable, or you are not able to give a knowledgeable response, simply leave the item blank and proceed to the next.

1. The physical environment in which the class is held is

   Highly Satisfactory  
   Satisfactory  
   Less Than Satisfactory  
   Unsatisfactory

2. The type of class is

   Lecture  
   Seminar  
   Skills  
   Laboratory  
   Other

3. The texts were

   Highly Satisfactory  
   Satisfactory  
   Less Than Satisfactory  
   Unsatisfactory

4. The texts were chosen by

   Me  
   The Department Committee  
   Another Method  
   No texts were used

5. The course outline given to students, including specific course requirements, was created by

   Me  
   The Department Committee  
   Other

6. Student enthusiasm for learning in this class has been

   Very High  
   High  
   Average  
   Low  
   Very Low

7. For a course of this type, the number of students in the class is

   Much Too Large  
   Too Large  
   About Right  
   Too Small  
   Much Too Small

8. Compared to courses of similar content I have taught, the time and effort I have put into this course is

   Much Greater  
   Greater  
   About the Same  
   Less  
   Much Less

9. This is a

   Service Course  
   Course primarily for Majors  
   Required  
   Elective  
   Other

10. Compared to other classes I have taught, the performance of this class is

   For Above Average  
   Above Average  
   Average  
   Below Average  
   For Below Average

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.

ACCEPTABLE MARKS

UNACCEPTABLE MARKS

Optional Questions

Questions 11-15 are optional and may be supplied locally.
E. Samples of New Surveys

1. Scantron: Class Climate
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 customised 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 e-mail, paper or LMS integration (e.g. Blackboard®, Moodle®, 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 links to instructors via email. You may also export directly to Excel or SPSS.

Capture & Feedback
Using a Scanntron imaging scanner - and with a push of a single button - the questionnaires are sorted, digitised 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 dean, and your instructors.

Examples of the most common reports and graphs

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Applications</th>
<th>360° Surveys</th>
<th>Alumni Surveys</th>
<th>Seminar Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Surveys</td>
<td>Student Opinion of Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Architecture
Class Climate Scanners and Workstation
Class Climate Servers
**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 & Benefits

#### 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 Mbps Network

#### Minimum Parameters
- Intel Pentium Processor (2.0 GHz)
- 200 GB Hard Disk
- 2048 MB Memory
- 100 Mbps 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

---

### Printer and Scanner Requirements

#### Printer Requirements
- Laser printer recommended

#### Scanner Requirements
- Scantron's INSIGHT™ scanners recommended (contact must be PRESS complete)

See System Requirements documentation 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) 722-6886 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. ©2009.
Online Course Evaluations A Hit!
New System Wins Raves from Students, Faculty, and Administration

Inside

University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Products:
What Do You Think?
Web-based Course Evaluation System

Evaluation Response Rates
The number of completed evaluations more than doubled in the initial rollout of the new system.

Why Move to a Web-based System?
- Saves time and effort
- Easy reporting capability
- Easy access for students, faculty, and administrators
- User-friendly
- Cost effective
- Ensures compliance with important state laws and university policies

The Savings:
Elimination of paper printing, scanning costs, and labor - a first year savings of over $200,000 and that's before factoring in the additional teaching and learning time returned to the classroom.

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 25,000 students in its undergraduate 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 meeting—often 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.
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 paper-based 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.
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 What-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 anytime, 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.
- View quantitative evaluation results of courses taught by other instructors, if permitted.
- Export reports in PDF or Excel format.

Academic Administrators can:

- View and print evaluation results for specific schools, 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 evaluate evaluation forms.
- Create and broadcast custom, timed evaluation-related emails and reminders to students and instructors.
- Track participation and response levels in real time.
- Import 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 800.873.6200.
3. ConnectEdu: CourseEval

CoursEval™ is a web-based tool which improves evaluation and assessment on every campus. It replaces "bubble sheets" and outdated on-line systems. You can create and deploy surveys of courses, faculty, and programs and then deliver reports of the results. On-campus management is easy with our training and support. CoursEval™ is in use by more than 150 colleges, universities and health sciences programs.

Students submit surveys for all courses anytime and anywhere
Fast and sophisticated reports with meaningful comparisons
Customizable survey formats
Anonymous and non-anonymous survey options
Securely stored data and reports
Multiple levels of permitted access
Thorough training and support
Affordable hosting option

Request a CoursEval™ demonstration and price quote for your campus

Academic Management Systems (718) 264-5464  www.academiamangement.com  sales@academicmanagement.com
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.

Working with course management systems...

MyCoursEval is a portal interface that connects with course management systems to display personalized messages within the interface.
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

For more information and a customized demo of CoursEval™ contact 'sales' at (716) 204-0464
Faculty, chairs, deans, directors and provosts are guided by student evaluations of courses and teachers -- Each of them can use CoursEval™ for their analysis

CoursEval™ is a web-based tool which improves evaluation and assessment on every campus. It replaces "bubble sheets" and outdated on-line systems. You can create and deploy surveys of courses, faculty, and programs and then deliver reports of the results. On-campus management is easy with our training and support. CoursEval™ is in use by more than 150 colleges, universities and health sciences programs.

Students submit surveys for all courses anytime and anywhere
Fast and sophisticated reports with meaningful comparisons
Customizable survey formats
Anonymous and non-anonymous survey options
Securely stored data and reports
Multiple levels of permitted access
Thorough training and support
Affordable hosting option

Request a CoursEval™ demonstration and price quote for your campus

Academic Management Systems (718) 204-6464 - www.academicmanagement.com - sales@academicmanagement.com
Welcome to this survey requesting your input concerning a potential new student-to-faculty evaluation system that could potentially replace the current SUMMA. 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
What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- 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?

- Undergraduate
- Graduate (Master's or Doctorate)
- Both equally
- Do not teach

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

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

What is your employment status as a USF faculty member?

- Full-time
- Part-time

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

- Tenure faculty
- Assistant professor
- Associate professor
- Full professor
- Not applicable

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

- PPT
- Non-PPT
- Not applicable
In what school are you primarily associated with?

- College of Arts and Sciences
- School of Business and Professional Studies
- School of Nursing
- School of Law
- 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?

- Yes
- No

Do you believe this should continue to be our primary focus for considering a new evaluation system?

- Yes
- No

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?

- Yes
- No

Back  Next  Exit Survey
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?
If you would like to share some additional comments regarding a new student-to-faculty evaluation system please feel free to do so below.
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 Murray at x5486 or wmurray@usfca.edu.
### G. Faculty Survey Results

**Survey of Faculty Perceptions Regarding a New Student Evaluation System**

#### Table of faculty survey frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>Yes, retain in its entirety</th>
<th>Yes, but with minor changes (you will have an opportunity to elaborate later in the survey)</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row N %</td>
<td>Col N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, retain in its entirety</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row N %</td>
<td>Col N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but with minor changes (you will have an opportunity to elaborate later in the survey)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row N %</td>
<td>Col N %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| What is your gender? | 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% |
| 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% |

| In what school are you primarily associated with? | 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% |
| 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% |
| 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 hours you teach in a single academic year (not counting summer or inter-session) what level of student do you primarily teach? | 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% |
| 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% |
| 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% |

Results are based on two-sided tests with significance level 0.05. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears under the category with the larger column proportion.
## Survey of Faculty Perceptions Regarding a New Student Evaluation System

### Table of faculty survey frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes, it should be only focused on the effectiveness of the faculty in the teaching environment</th>
<th>Yes, but with some additional foci (explained later in this survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row N %</td>
<td>Col N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what school are you primarily associated with?</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Business and Professional Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the &quot;typical&quot; 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?</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate (Masters or Doctorate)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both equally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results are based on two-sided tests with significance level 0.05. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears under the category with the larger column proportion.
Survey of Faculty Perceptions Regarding a New Student Evaluation System
Table of faculty survey frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>Yes, retain in its entirety</th>
<th>Yes, but with minor changes (you will have an opportunity to elaborate later in the survey)</th>
<th>No, not at all</th>
<th>Yes, if we can get feedback sooner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row N %</td>
<td>Col N %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is my first year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Than 15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is my first year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Than 15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your employment status as a USF faculty member?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row N %</th>
<th>Col N %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-PSP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results are based on two-sided tests with significance level 0.05. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears under the category with the larger column proportion.
Survey of Faculty Perceptions Regarding a New Student Evaluation System
Table of faculty survey frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For how many years have you taught at USF (either continuously or intermittently)?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes, it should be only focused on the effectiveness of the faculty in the teaching environment</th>
<th>Yes, but with some additional foci (explained later in this survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row N %</td>
<td>Col N %</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is my first year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Than 15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your employment status as a USF faculty member?</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you answered full-time in the previous question, please indicate your current position.</td>
<td>Term faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full professor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you answered part-time in the previous question, please indicate your position.</td>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-PSP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results are based on two-sided tests with significance level 0.05. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears under the category with the larger column proportion.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Shown by Correlation with Student Achievement</th>
<th>Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations</th>
<th>USF SUMMA</th>
<th>Duquesne University</th>
<th>SF State</th>
<th>The IDEA Center [Long Form]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**USF Faculty Construct of Faculty Instructional Delivery**

1 Numbers shown in parentheses indicates the rank order of item importance as indicated on page 115 of the Feldman article from "High Importance" to "Low Importance or No Importance."
| No. 7 Teacher's Enunciatory Style | Importance Shown by Importance Shown by USF SUMMA DisQue New University SF State The IDEA Center (Long Form) |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                  | Importance Shown by Student Achievement | Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| a. "the instructor has a good vocal delivery" | 25 (7.5) | 20 (5) | The clarity and audibility of the instructor's speech are excellent |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| b. "the teacher speaks distinctly, fluently and without hesitation" | 20 (5) | 20 (5) | The instructor's speech is clear and fluent |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| c. "the teacher varied the speech and tone of his or her voice" | 15 (4) | 10 (2) | The instructor varied their speech and tone |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| d. "the teacher has the ability to speak distinctly and be clearly heard" | 10 (2) | 10 (2) | The ability to speak distinctly and be heard is excellent |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| e. "the instructor changed pitch, volume, or quality of speech" | 5 (1.25) | 0 (0) | The instructor changed their pitch, volume, or quality |                                  |                                  |                                  |

| No. 8 Teacher's Sensitivity to, and Concern with, Class Level and Progress | Importance Shown by Importance Shown by USF SUMMA DisQue New University SF State The IDEA Center (Long Form) |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                  | Importance Shown by Student Achievement | Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| a. "the teacher was alert in observing student waiting" | 30 (10) | 15 (5) | The instructor was attentive to student needs |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| b. "the instructor was concerned when students failed to keep up in class" | 20 (5) | 10 (2) | The instructor was concerned about students' progress |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| c. "the instructor teaches near the class level" | 15 (4) | 10 (2) | The instructor taught at an appropriate level for the class |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| d. "the teacher takes an active personal interest in the progress of the class and shares a desire for student's learning" | 10 (2) | 0 (0) | The instructor was concerned with student's progress |                                  |                                  |                                  |

| No. 9 Clarity of Course Objectives and Requirements | Importance Shown by Importance Shown by USF SUMMA DisQue New University SF State The IDEA Center (Long Form) |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                  | Importance Shown by Student Achievement | Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| a. "the purpose and philosophy of the course were made clear to the students" | 35 (9.75) | 20 (5) | The course objectives have been well explained |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| b. "the instructor gave a clear idea of the student requirements" | 20 (5) | 10 (2) | The course requirements were clearly explained |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| c. "the teacher clearly defined student responsibilities in the course" | 15 (4) | 10 (2) | The instructor clearly defined student responsibilities |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| d. "the teacher tells students which topics are most important and what they can expect on tests" | 10 (2) | 0 (0) | The instructor told students which topics are most important |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| e. "the instructor gave clear assignments" | 5 (1.25) | 0 (0) | The assignments were clear and helpful |                                  |                                  |                                  |

| No. 10 Nature and Value of the Course Material (including its Teachfulness and Relevance) | Importance Shown by Importance Shown by USF SUMMA DisQue New University SF State The IDEA Center (Long Form) |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                  | Importance Shown by Student Achievement | Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| a. "the teacher has the ability to apply material to real life" | 17 (5.15) | 15 (5) | The instructor helped students apply material to real life |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| b. "the instructor explains the course practice" | 10 (2) | 0 (0) | The instructor explained the course practice |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| c. "there is worthwhile and informative material in lectures that doesn't duplicate the text" | 5 (1.25) | 0 (0) | The instructor provided worthwhile and informative material |                                  |                                  |                                  |
| d. "the course has excellent content" | 5 (1.25) | 0 (0) | The course content was excellent |                                  |                                  |                                  |

1 Numbers shown in parentheses indicates the rank order of item importance as indicated on page 115 of the Feldman article from "High Importance" to "Low Importance or No Importance."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education</th>
<th>Comparison Metric</th>
<th>Joint Committee Online Teaching Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This listing of 28 instructional dimensions first appeared in Feldman (1999) in a slightly different version. For each of the instructional dimensions, examples of evaluation items that would be classified under it are given. Refinements and modifications to this list of dimensions and attendant coding scheme, see d'Apuzzo, Arcuri, and Reasonfield (1993) and Arcuri, d'Apuzzo, and Reasonfield (1995). Numbers shown in parentheses indicates the rank order of item importance as indicated on page 115 of the Feldman article from &quot;High Importance&quot; to &quot;Low Importance or No Importance.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance Shown by Correlation with Student Achievement</td>
<td>Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations</td>
<td>USF SUMMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 11. Nature and Proficiency of Supplementary Materials and Teaching Aids:</strong> (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. &quot;the homework assignments and supplementary readings were helpful in understanding the course&quot;</td>
<td>-16 (17)</td>
<td>72 (14.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The contents of the assignments contribute to my understanding of the subject.</td>
<td>(2) The assignments were challenging at an appropriate level for the course.</td>
<td>(13) Effectively uses assignments to enhance learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. &quot;the teacher made good use of teaching aids such as films and other audio-visual materials&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. &quot;the instructor provided a variety of activities in class and used a variety of media (slides, films, projections, drawings) and outside resource person&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 12. Personal Outcome Impact of Instruction:</strong> (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. &quot;gaining of new knowledge was facilitated by the instructor&quot;</td>
<td>-46 (6)</td>
<td>-26 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) The Instructor was helpful in advancing my knowledge or skills.</td>
<td>(14) Contributes to knowledge of subject.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. &quot;developed significant skills in the field&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. &quot;developed increased sensitivity and evaluative judgment&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. &quot;the instructor has given me tools for attacking problems&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. &quot;the course has increased my general knowledge&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. &quot;apart from your personal feelings about the teacher, has he/she been instrumental in increasing knowledge of the course's subject matter&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) In this course, I am learning much.</td>
<td>(1) The Instructor helped me to understand the material in this course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USF Faculty Consensus of Engagement with Students:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 13. Teacher Fairness Importance of Evaluation of Students' Quality of Examinations:</strong> (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. &quot;grading is in the course was fair&quot;</td>
<td>-30 (14)</td>
<td>72 (14.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) The methods being used for evaluating my work (such as tests, projects, etc.) are reasonable.</td>
<td>(10) Evaluation criteria is clearly presented and the Instructor is fair in evaluating student work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. &quot;the instructor has defined standards and is impartial in grading&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. &quot;the exams reflect material emphasized in the course&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. &quot;test questions were clear&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. &quot;coverage of subject matter on exams was comprehensive&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 14. Nature, Quality, and Frequency of Feedback from the Teacher to Students:</strong> (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. &quot;the teacher gave satisfactory feedback on graded material&quot;</td>
<td>28 (14.9)</td>
<td>.87 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) The Instructor provides useful feedback on student progress (identifying strengths and weaknesses).</td>
<td>(9) The Instructor provided constructive feedback on course assignments and exams.</td>
<td>(14) Provides feedback on student progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. &quot;critiques of papers was helpful to students&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. &quot;the teacher told students when they had done a good job&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. &quot;the teacher is prompt in returning tests and assignments&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Numbers shown in parentheses indicates the rank order of item importance as indicated on page 115 of the Feldman article from "High Importance" to "Low Importance or No Importance."
### The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

**Comparison Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Committee Online Teaching Evaluations</th>
<th>Importance Shown by Correlation with Student Achievement</th>
<th>Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations</th>
<th>USF SUMMA</th>
<th>Duquesne University</th>
<th>SF State</th>
<th>The IDEA Center (Long Form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 10 Teacher's Encouragement of Questions and Comments, and Openness to Opinions of Others</strong></td>
<td>-0.89 (18)</td>
<td>0.0 (11)</td>
<td>-0.89 (18)</td>
<td>0.0 (11)</td>
<td>-0.89 (18)</td>
<td>0.0 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. &quot;students felt free to ask questions or express opinions&quot;</td>
<td>(3) Adequate opportunities are provided by the instructor for me to ask questions.</td>
<td>(3) The instructor created a learning environment in which students felt comfortable asking questions.</td>
<td>(3) The instructor created a learning environment in which students felt comfortable asking questions.</td>
<td>(3) The instructor created a learning environment in which students felt comfortable asking questions.</td>
<td>(3) The instructor created a learning environment in which students felt comfortable asking questions.</td>
<td>(3) The instructor created a learning environment in which students felt comfortable asking questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the instructor stimulated class discussions&quot;</td>
<td>(4) The instructor provided opportunities to express thoughts and ideas.</td>
<td>(4) The instructor provided opportunities to express thoughts and ideas.</td>
<td>(4) The instructor provided opportunities to express thoughts and ideas.</td>
<td>(4) The instructor provided opportunities to express thoughts and ideas.</td>
<td>(4) The instructor provided opportunities to express thoughts and ideas.</td>
<td>(4) The instructor provided opportunities to express thoughts and ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. &quot;the instructor invited criticisms of his or her own ideas&quot;</td>
<td>(5) The instructor invited criticisms of his or her own ideas.</td>
<td>(5) The instructor invited criticisms of his or her own ideas.</td>
<td>(5) The instructor invited criticisms of his or her own ideas.</td>
<td>(5) The instructor invited criticisms of his or her own ideas.</td>
<td>(5) The instructor invited criticisms of his or her own ideas.</td>
<td>(5) The instructor invited criticisms of his or her own ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. &quot;the instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and the viewpoints of others&quot;</td>
<td>(6) The instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td>(6) The instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td>(6) The instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td>(6) The instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td>(6) The instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td>(6) The instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and the viewpoints of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 15 Teacher's Concern and Respect for Students Responsibilities of the Teacher</strong></td>
<td>0.69 (15)</td>
<td>0.65 (12)</td>
<td>(7) The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
<td>(7) The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
<td>(7) The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
<td>(7) The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. &quot;the instructor seems to have a genuine interest in and concern for students&quot;</td>
<td>(8) Is sensitive and responsive to students as individuals.</td>
<td>(8) Is sensitive and responsive to students as individuals.</td>
<td>(8) Is sensitive and responsive to students as individuals.</td>
<td>(8) Is sensitive and responsive to students as individuals.</td>
<td>(8) Is sensitive and responsive to students as individuals.</td>
<td>(8) Is sensitive and responsive to students as individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. &quot;the teacher took students seriously&quot;</td>
<td>(9) The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
<td>(9) The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
<td>(9) The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
<td>(9) The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
<td>(9) The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
<td>(9) The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. &quot;the instructor established good rapport with students&quot;</td>
<td>(10) The instructor established good rapport with students.</td>
<td>(10) The instructor established good rapport with students.</td>
<td>(10) The instructor established good rapport with students.</td>
<td>(10) The instructor established good rapport with students.</td>
<td>(10) The instructor established good rapport with students.</td>
<td>(10) The instructor established good rapport with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 19 Teacher's Availability and Helpfulness</strong></td>
<td>0.62 (11)</td>
<td>0.65 (16)</td>
<td>(11) Communication with the instructor outside of class was helpful.</td>
<td>(11) Communication with the instructor outside of class was helpful.</td>
<td>(11) Communication with the instructor outside of class was helpful.</td>
<td>(11) Communication with the instructor outside of class was helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. &quot;the instructor was willing to help students having difficulty&quot;</td>
<td>(12) Assistance from the instructor outside of class was readily available if I sought help.</td>
<td>(12) Assistance from the instructor outside of class was readily available if I sought help.</td>
<td>(12) Assistance from the instructor outside of class was readily available if I sought help.</td>
<td>(12) Assistance from the instructor outside of class was readily available if I sought help.</td>
<td>(12) Assistance from the instructor outside of class was readily available if I sought help.</td>
<td>(12) Assistance from the instructor outside of class was readily available if I sought help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. &quot;the instructor was accessible to students outside of class&quot;</td>
<td>(13) Is available for discussion outside of class time.</td>
<td>(13) Is available for discussion outside of class time.</td>
<td>(13) Is available for discussion outside of class time.</td>
<td>(13) Is available for discussion outside of class time.</td>
<td>(13) Is available for discussion outside of class time.</td>
<td>(13) Is available for discussion outside of class time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USF Faculty Construct of Student Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. 17 Intellectual Challenge and Encouragement of Independence Thought</strong></td>
<td>-0.32 (13)</td>
<td>0.32 (4)</td>
<td>(14) The instructor's presentation often causes me to think in depth about the subject.</td>
<td>(14) The instructor's presentation often causes me to think in depth about the subject.</td>
<td>(14) The instructor's presentation often causes me to think in depth about the subject.</td>
<td>(14) The instructor's presentation often causes me to think in depth about the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. &quot;this course challenged students intellectually&quot;</td>
<td>(15) Stimulates students to think independently/critically.</td>
<td>(15) Stimulates students to think independently/critically.</td>
<td>(15) Stimulates students to think independently/critically.</td>
<td>(15) Stimulates students to think independently/critically.</td>
<td>(15) Stimulates students to think independently/critically.</td>
<td>(15) Stimulates students to think independently/critically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. &quot;the teacher encouraged students to think out answers and follow up ideas&quot;</td>
<td>(16) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(16) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(16) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(16) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(16) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(16) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. &quot;the teacher attempts to stimulate creativity&quot;</td>
<td>(17) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(17) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(17) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(17) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(17) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(17) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. &quot;the instructor raised challenging questions and problems&quot;</td>
<td>(18) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(18) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(18) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(18) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(18) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
<td>(18) Encouraged student faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, email, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers shown in parentheses indicates the rank order of item importance as indicated on page 115 of the Feldman article from "High Importance" to "Low Importance or No Importance."

---

1 Numbers shown in parentheses indicates the rank order of item importance as indicated on page 115 of the Feldman article from "High Importance" to "Low Importance or No Importance."
The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education
Comparison Matrix
Joint Committee Online Teaching Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 10</th>
<th>Teacher Motivates Students to Do Their Best (High Standard of Performance Required)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(15)</th>
<th>(15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>The instructor motivates students to do their best work.</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>The instructor sets high standards of achievement for students.</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>The instructor sets high standards of achievement for students.</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>The instructor sets high standards of achievement for students.</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>The instructor demonstrates a personal commitment to high standards of professional competence.</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Inspired students to set and achieve goals which really challenged them.</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. 21: Teacher's Encouragement of Self-Focused Learning

a. | Students are encouraged to work independently. | (6) | (6) | (10) | (15) | (15) |
| b. | Students are encouraged to work independently. | (6) | (6) | (10) | (15) | (15) |
| c. | Students are encouraged to work independently. | (6) | (6) | (10) | (15) | (15) |
| d. | Students are encouraged to work independently. | (6) | (6) | (10) | (15) | (15) |

No. 22: Teacher's Productivity in Research-Related Activities

a. | The teacher talks about his own research. | (6) | (6) | (10) | (15) | (15) |
| b. | The teacher talks about his own research. | (6) | (6) | (10) | (15) | (15) |
| c. | The teacher talks about his own research. | (6) | (6) | (10) | (15) | (15) |
| d. | The teacher talks about his own research. | (6) | (6) | (10) | (15) | (15) |

No. 23: Difficulty of the Course (and Workload)—Description: (23)

a. | The workload and pace of the course was difficult. | (23) | (23) | (23) | (23) | (23) |
| b. | The workload and pace of the course was difficult. | (23) | (23) | (23) | (23) | (23) |
| c. | The workload and pace of the course was difficult. | (23) | (23) | (23) | (23) | (23) |
| d. | The workload and pace of the course was difficult. | (23) | (23) | (23) | (23) | (23) |

No. 24: Difficulty of the Course (and Workload)—Evaluation: (24)

a. | The content of this course is too hard. | (24) | (24) | (24) | (24) | (24) |
| b. | The content of this course is too hard. | (24) | (24) | (24) | (24) | (24) |
| c. | The content of this course is too hard. | (24) | (24) | (24) | (24) | (24) |
| d. | The content of this course is too hard. | (24) | (24) | (24) | (24) | (24) |

No. 25: Classroom Management: (157)

a. | The class did not feel engaged. | (157) | (157) | (157) | (157) | (157) |
| b. | The class did not feel engaged. | (157) | (157) | (157) | (157) | (157) |
| c. | The class did not feel engaged. | (157) | (157) | (157) | (157) | (157) |
| d. | The class did not feel engaged. | (157) | (157) | (157) | (157) | (157) |

1 Numbers shown in parentheses indicates the rank order of item importance as indicated on page 115 of the Feldman article from "High Importance" to "Low Importance or No Importance."
### The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

**Comparison Matrix**

**Joint Committee Online Teaching Evaluations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 28 Teacher Pursued and/or Met Course Objectives: (5)</th>
<th>Importance Shown by Correlation with Student Achievement</th>
<th>Importance Shown by Correlation with Overall Evaluations</th>
<th>USF SUMMA</th>
<th>Duquesne University</th>
<th>SF State</th>
<th>The IDEA Center (Long Form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. &quot;the instructor accomplished what he or she set out to do&quot;</td>
<td>(1) The pacing of the course was appropriate for its goals and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. &quot;there was close agreement between the announced objectives of the course and what was actually taught&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. &quot;course objectives stated agreed with those actually pursued&quot;</td>
<td>(2) Course objectives are being achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Items in each comparison survey that had no alignment with the Feldman constructs

- The Instructor has adequate means for evaluating my learning.
- The instructor, I look forward to attending this class.
- Compared with other courses on this level, the effort I put into this course is as much as in other courses.
- The out-of-class assignments are challenging.
- Overall, I rate this instructor a good teacher.
- The time allowed to complete exams is adequate.
- The textbooks contribute to my understanding of the subject.
- Regular class attendance was necessary for understanding the course material.
- The instructor followed the course schedule presented in the syllabus and in class.
- The instructor encouraged students to seek help outside of class whenever needed.
- The instructor responded to my communications in a timely manner.
- Rate the overall teaching effectiveness of the instructor.

#### Items for which there is no close match

- (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.
- Made it clear how each topic fit into the course.
- Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses.
- Encouraged students to use multiple resources (e.g., data banks, library holdings, outside experts) to improve understanding.
- (1) Asked students to share ideas and experiences with others whose backgrounds and viewpoints differ from their own.
- (3) Asked students to help each other understand ideas or concepts.

---

1 Numbers shown in parentheses indicates the rank order of item importance as indicated on page 115 of the Feldman article from "High Importance" to "Low Importance or No Importance."