

Report of the 2010-2011 AQIP Student Evaluation of Teaching Committee¹
Submitted to the Curriculum Council: 2/10/2011

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Committee Membership
- III. Introduction and Background
- IV. A Brief Review of the Literature
- V. Overview of 2010-2011 AQIP SET Committee's Work
- VI. Four Proposals
 - a. SET Instrument
 - b. Revised Administration Policy
 - c. Revised Use Policy
 - d. Policy for Continued Review
- VII. Appendices
 - a. Current Policy on Student Evaluations of Teaching Administration
 - b. SIUE Ethics of Instruction
 - c. Proposed SIUE Core SET Instrument (with references)
 - d. Frequently Asked Question Document (created for Departmental Liaisons)
 - e. References for Current and Proposed Policies
 - f. Summaries of Qualitative Findings from the Validation Survey
 - g. Content validity survey information
 - i. Overview of Process and Findings
 - ii. Summary Tables from Surveys
 1. Faculty
 2. Faculty Administrators
 3. Students

¹ Please direct correspondence or inquiries to Dr. Denise Cobb (Associate Professor, Sociology and Criminal Justice Studies, & Director of Assessment), pcobb@siue.edu, or Dr. Victoria Scott (Assistant Provost for Academic Innovation and Effectiveness), viscott@siue.edu.

I. Executive Summary

The 2010-2011 Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Committee was formed by the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Senate with approval by the University Quality Council. The committee included faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Education, School of Engineering, School of Nursing, School of Pharmacy, Library, and the Office of the Provost. The committee also included representation from Information Technology Services (ITS) and the student-body.

The purpose of this committee was to address a long-standing and recurring debate among faculty at SIUE regarding the improvement of policies regarding student evaluations of teaching. While student evaluations of teaching are informative, a guiding principle of this committee was that student evaluations of teaching should never be used as the sole source or indicator of teaching effectiveness. One of the central charges of this committee was to develop a core SET instrument that could be used campus-wide. This instrument would be a standard quantitative instrument with items tied to the Ethics of Instruction. The committee was also charged with reviewing and proposing changes to the policies on administration and use as well as developing a framework for continued review of the instrument. A guiding principle of this group was to engender faculty involvement and foster engagement through transparency and communication. This goal was accomplished by 1) creating and maintaining a website, 2) posting minutes from the main committee's meetings, 3) sending regular email updates to the campus community, 4) presenting updates to the Faculty Senate, 5) convening departmental liaison meetings, 6) holding validation brownbag sessions, 7) organizing an open meeting, 8) administering surveys, and 9) sharing information with the Deans' Council and Chairs' Councils. Faculty input provided through these venues was instrumental in shaping this proposal.

Core University-wide Instrument

The SET committee developed a core instrument based on multiple sources of evidence. Committee members conducted an extensive review of related literature and searched for best practices. The committee also sought input on the questions from faculty, faculty-administrators, and students. Accordingly, the committee recommends implementation of a standard university-wide core instrument containing the following eleven items².

- The course requirements were clearly communicated in the syllabus.
- The instructor was available to help students outside of class.
- The instructor provided timely feedback on student work (exams, assignments, creative activities, etc.).
- The instructor provided useful feedback on student work (exams, assignments, creative activities, etc.).
- The class was well-organized.
- The instructor was prepared for class.

² As appropriate, the directions will stipulate that students should leave items that are not applicable blank. For example, if a student never sought help outside of class, he or she could not speak to the availability of the professor for such assistance. We have not included a "not applicable" answer option since many departments use standard bubble sheets that have only five options for responses.

- The instructor was responsive to student questions.
- The instructor explained difficult material clearly.
- The instructor used teaching strategies that enhanced my understanding of course content.
- The activities/assignments were useful in helping me learn.
- Overall, the instruction in this course enhanced my learning of the course content.

As indicated earlier, this is a core instrument. These items would be standard across campus. Nevertheless, colleges/schools, departments, and individual faculty members **could add** items. In fact, we strongly encourage programs to add both qualitative and quantitative questions.

The proposed instrument uses a five-point scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Disagree Nor Agree, Agree, and Strongly Agree. While experts such as Berk (2006) suggest even numbered scales, the committee proposes the five-point scale since this scale is the most commonly used type reported by departmental liaisons. The AQIP SET Committee does not want to disrupt faculty members' abilities to track patterns longitudinally. As such, the proposed core SET instrument uses a five-point Likert-type scale.

Part of the committee's charge was to validate the proposed instrument. Working with the main SET Committee, the SET Sub-committee on Research Design and Validation led the following efforts to accomplish this goal.

- This team of experts reviewed the proposed items identified and developed by the SET main committee. They refined these items to adhere to proper measurement techniques.
- The Sub-committee on Research Design and Validation developed and administered surveys to students, tenure-track/tenured faculty, and faculty-administrators. The purpose of these surveys was to assess the extent to which these items were clear to students, how important students perceived them to be and to determine how well faculty members and faculty-administrators believed the items measured the ethics of instruction and key concepts defined in the literature as significant predictors of teaching effectiveness. The committee presented at least two options for wording for each ethic of instruction or concept. Based on analyses of these data and the qualitative findings from these surveys, the committee narrowed the items to a core set of ten items to be included in the pilot test. The committee excluded some proposed items (e.g. measures related to rapport between the instructor and student) because faculty and faculty-administrators ratings of these items were not as favorable. Additionally, both faculty and faculty-administrators found the originally proposed overall measures problematic. As such, the committee created a new overall item that was included in the pilot test. The new overall item addressed the concerns of faculty members and faculty administrators by focusing more on student learning.
- Primarily during the week of November 29th, 2010, the core instrument was pilot tested in 51 classes with 23 participating faculty volunteers. Faculty participants represented fifteen disciplines across the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Education, School of Engineering, School of Nursing and School of Pharmacy. The pilot included traditional and online courses. More than half of the participating

- faculty members were women and the sample was split almost evenly between tenured and non-tenured faculty members (46.5% were Assistant Professors; 51.4% Associate Professors; and 2.1% Professors). The sample for Study 1 of the pilot tests included course evaluations from 1131 students.
- Because the committee relied on volunteers, the sample is not representative. In fact, some of the professors have won teaching awards in recent years. Some may not have won awards but are well-regarded as teachers. This voluntary pool provided helpful information but has some empirical limitations as well. The sample does not fully reflect the racial diversity or international status of the faculty.
 - A second part of the pilot test was conducted during this same period. In this part, the committee selected two Interdisciplinary Studies (IS) courses and two general education one hundred level foundational courses. In two of these classes, students were asked to complete the pilot instrument based on the course in which they had the “most positive” course experiences. In the remaining two courses, students were asked to think about their “least positive” course experience this semester. The purpose of this study was to determine whether the instrument would yield variation in extreme circumstances. Because some of the measures are tied to the “Ethics of Instruction”, the items measure minimal expectations. As such, the Sub-Committee on Research Design and Validation wanted to be sure that the instrument would yield lower ratings for the least positive experience and higher ratings for the most positive experiences.
 - With permission from the University of North Texas (UNT), the committee used their validated instrument to further assess the quality of the proposed SIUE Core instrument.

The pilot test indicated that scores from SIUE items were strongly related to scores from UNT items designed to measure similar concepts. For example, both the SIUE core instrument and the UNT SET instrument contained items regarding the availability of the instructor for help outside of class. In such instances, similar items were highly and positively correlated suggesting they were measuring similar concepts in similar ways. Scores from all SIUE items were strongly related to an “overall” item about instruction enhancing learning. All SIUE items significantly differentiated between student groups rating their most positive and least positive class experience of the semester. The core items, excluding the overall item, were internally consistent (i.e., students responded very similarly across items). These findings in combination with the committee’s other validation efforts suggests the proposed instrument is internally consistent and shows evidence of validity. We will need further validity testing to understand the full range of variables that may influence outcomes and to consider the utility of the results.

At this time, the committee does not recommend reporting an overall mean of a professor’s scores on all items or composite score for analysis. While such an approach to analysis might be helpful for summative assessment, it does little to promote improvement. Aggregating results of each item into a single score obscures important information that instructors can use as they try to enhance their instructional approaches. Moreover, calculating an overall mean assumes equal weighting of items, which may be inappropriate (Berk, 2006). The committee believes that specific ratings and overall global items should be used together without unduly weighting any one item (Hobson and Talbot, 2001). Ultimately, colleges/schools and departments can

determine how these data should be reported in annual merit and promotion and tenure dossiers as long as their requirements are consistent with the university's approved Use Policy.

Policies on Administration and Use³

The 2004 Faculty Senate Committee made significant and thoughtful revisions to the existing policies on administration and use of student evaluations of teaching. In large part, the current committee made only minor recommendations to modify these policies. Perhaps, more importantly, this committee's work suggests that many faculty members were unaware that these policies existed. In the long-term, these policies can be more helpful to faculty when they are widely recognized, understood, and enacted in organizational practices.

The most essential aspects of the proposed **use policy** follow:

- Faculty members should employ multiple methods to evaluate their teaching effectiveness in addition to SETs. Specifically, faculty members, reviewers, and administrators should not use any single indicator as the sole source of evidence regarding teaching effectiveness.
- In the case of SETs specifically, faculty members and reviewers should not rely on data from a single question, nor should they rely solely upon a composite or overall score. Teaching effectiveness is multi-dimensional and should be measured accordingly.
- Faculty will be given the results from the standardized student evaluations of teaching in a reasonable time. An analysis of these results may be included in the candidate's supporting documentation for tenure and promotion. Any presentation in annual review materials or promotion/tenure dossiers should be done in accordance with university policy for use. The candidate should also consult college/school/unit and department policies that may be relevant to the presentation of materials and requirements regarding inclusion of SET results.
- Quantitative results must be presented as either number or percent of responses for each choice on each question. Additional representations may be used but are not required. Evaluators are cautioned to consult experts in the field of statistics of discrete quantities before attempting other analyses and are further cautioned that misleading or out-right erroneous evaluations of this type of data are common.
- Evaluations of teaching are to be used to assess achievement of declared goals. They may not be used for comparisons between faculty members, units, or disparate courses. They can and should be used by instructors to demonstrate improvements over time and other relevant patterns.
- The Chair and/or other review committee should provide either written or verbal feedback about teaching evaluations.
- No disciplinary action or complaint against faculty members may be based solely on anonymous evaluation methods.

The most notable elements of the **administration policy** are:

- The policy allows for online and written evaluations.
- No incentives or punishments for student participation should be permitted.

³ Again, there are few alterations to the administration and use policies. In the main text of this report, the committee has indicated proposed changes in blue

- Ideally, student evaluations should be administered as early as the $\frac{3}{4}$ mark of the semester but should not occur any later than the last week of instruction. In summer sessions, student evaluations of teaching should occur in the last week of the term. A faculty member may administer student evaluations of teaching at a later point than noted above with the approval of the Dean and/or department chairperson. The department chairperson should use his or her discretion to help the faculty member determine dates that will be most effective and likely to yield useful results.
- All practices must preserve student anonymity.

Continued Review

In order for a core SET to be effective, the university must engage in **on-going, careful, and systematic review** to better evaluate the quality of the items and what factors, including unintended factors, influence outcomes. We recommend that the committee for continuing review include the members of the Sub-committee on Research Design and Validation. The group will work with the proposed SET Implementation and Steering Committee, Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost. This group has significant expertise and experience that will be vital to that group's success. The committee must develop a clear plan for soliciting faculty participation in continuous review. If during the review process evidence emerges that suggests a change in content or procedures is necessary, this group will submit a proposed plan of action to the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost for their approval.

Implementation and Steering Committee

Finally, the committee proposes that the Faculty Senate approve the continuance of the AQIP Committee in modified form. The group will be transformed into **a new SET Implementation and Steering Committee**. This group would be charged with developing specific plans for the implementation of the university-wide core. This group must be cognizant of how the implementation could potentially affect faculty members at different ranks. Furthermore, this group will consider information provided by the committee charged with continuous review. They will work with the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost to determine what changes and improvements may need to occur.

Closing thoughts

As an institution and as a faculty, we are recognized for our thoughtful approach to teaching and our strong commitment to student learning. Student evaluations of teaching are important to faculty and students but provide only one source of evidence. The committee hopes that our work provides positive support to this process and remains committed to fostering fairness and encouraging improvement in student evaluation of teaching processes on our campus. Providing a validated instrument to faculty and students is further demonstration of our continued willingness to engage in critical self-evaluation and improvement.

II. Committee Membership

2010-2011 AQIP SET Committee

Rita Boyd (School of Nursing)
Denise Cobb (Chair, CAS and Office of the Provost),
Denise Degarmo (College of Arts and Sciences),
Lynn Fields (Library),
Julie Holt (College of Arts and Sciences),
Steve Huffstutler (ITS),
Andrzej Lozowski (School of Engineering),
Ramana Madupalli (School of Business),
Marisa Mathus (Graduate Student),
Jon Pettibone (Faculty Senate President and School of Education),
Laurie Puchner, (School of Education),
Cathy Santanello (School of Pharmacy),
Vicki Scott (Office of the Provost),
Victoria Taylor (Undergraduate Student),
Phil Weishaar (School of Education)

Sub-committee on Research Design and Validation:

Lynn Bartels (School of Education),
Denise Cobb (Chair, SET Committee),
Timucin Ozcan (School of Business),
Paul Rose (School of Education)

II. Introduction and Background⁴

In Fall 2009, the Curriculum Council of the Faculty Senate charged a university committee with two tasks. The first task was to survey peer institutions regarding their student evaluation of teaching (SET) practices. The second task was to create a standardized student evaluation of teaching instrument that could be used across campus. The survey portion of the committee's charge was completed in early Spring, 2010. The remainder of the Spring semester was spent discussing the following questions related to the development and implementation of a university-wide SET instrument.

- What is the rationale and purpose of developing a university-wide SET instrument at SIUE?
- What content should be covered in a university-wide SET instrument?
- How should a common SET instrument be administered ideally?
- How should data from a campus-wide SET instrument be used and what guidelines should exist to prohibit inappropriate use?
- How will the instrument be validated?

⁴ Parts of this report are derived from the previous SET Committee report to the Curriculum Council (modified 4/15/2010) and the approved AQIP Charge for the Committee. Excerpts of these reports and materials from the SET Committee's website were used for consistency and accuracy.

In April, 2010, the Curriculum Council of the Faculty Senate voted to continue the work of the Student Evaluation of Teaching Committee.

According to the 2009-2010 Faculty Senate SET Committee's report, because of the issues involved in the creation and validation of such a document, the process would be best continued by an AQIP committee in Fall 2010. The new committee would be chaired by a representative from the Provost's office and staffed by representatives from all schools and colleges at SIUE (including the Library and ITS) as well as a representative from the student body. The charge of the committee would be as follows:

1. To create an SET instrument.
2. To create documents detailing the administration of the instrument, the acceptable uses of the data from the instrument, and a framework for continued review of the instrument.
3. To pilot the instrument in Fall 2010 using departments who voluntarily agree to participate.
4. To openly document the progress and goals of the committee on-line for all faculty to observe.

For all parts of the charge, the committee was expected to follow the recommendations for this process as described in the remainder of this document. According to this same document, the results of this process should then be shared with the Faculty Senate and the Curriculum Council in Spring 2011, at which time a decision could be made regarding the full-scale implementation of a campus-wide SET program.

SET at SIUE – Background and Current Situation

Currently, there are few university-wide mandates regarding the content of student evaluations of teaching or the form in which questions are asked. Additionally, there are existing policies concerning the administration of student evaluations of teaching and the use of the resulting data. Current policies are available in the Faculty Handbook (<http://www.siu.edu/provost/fhb/StudentEvaluations.shtml>). These policies are also available in Appendix A of this report.

The current policy on SET content is intended to “increase the validity of the data collected in student evaluations of teaching”. The policy suggests that “each department/unit will develop a minimum “standard” set of items” to which instructors can add questions of interest. Further, the policy stipulates that the format of the instrument should be “conducive to thoughtful, objective, student participation.” However, to this committee's knowledge, there has been no systematic effort at the university, department or unit level to validate a core set of items for faculty use.

The form and content of student evaluation of teaching instruments is quite variable at SIUE. There can be wide variation within the Schools/Colleges, units or even departments. There are

departments and Schools that have developed excellent and thoughtful course evaluation procedures and policies, including a standardized form and formal policies on administration. Nevertheless, within several departments, multiple instruments exist and there is no departmentally mandated set of questions. In these instances, faculty members maintain the autonomy to design a set of questions appropriate to their courses. In other departments, faculty members are required to use a uniform instrument but the form may contain only qualitative questions. Furthermore, the purpose of a core SET in some departments has been to facilitate comparisons – a practice cautioned against in the existing use policy.

These inconsistencies and the concern over appropriate use of student evaluations of teaching have led to a number of initiatives at SIUE to improve SET practices. Most recently, these issues were under scrutiny by the following groups:

- School of Education SET Committee (2004-2006),
- Faculty Senate SET Committee (2004-2005), and
- School of Nursing SET Committee (2008)⁵.

The Faculty Senate then re-energized this work by establishing an ad-hoc committee on SETs in 2009-2010 (2009-2010 Faculty Senate SET Committee) that has culminated with this 2010-2011 AQIP SET Committee's efforts. Regardless of the committee's formation, the central concerns remained largely consistent: content, administration policies, and appropriate uses.

Current Context

Students, faculty members, and administrators share interests in student evaluations of teaching. Although some state governments and accrediting bodies have mandated increasingly stringent requirements for SET and public disclosure of SET results, these circumstances are not the driving force for change at SIUE. Instead, the impetus to transform and improve the current SET system came from within the university as a shared initiative of the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost.

The impetus for the current AQIP SET Committee was based on faculty feedback, whereby some faculty members expressed genuine concern about the disparate standards for judging effective teaching between individuals and/or departments. These concerns have even entered into faculty grievances. This AQIP SET Committee's initiatives also allow the university to address recommendations made by external accreditors and stakeholders. This project is consistent with SIUE's 2006 AQIP Quality Check-Up, in which the Higher Learning Commission recommended that SIUE take a more "scholarly approach" to developing and implementing assessment measures. Additionally, in the 2007 Retention, Graduation, and Student Success Report the AASCU team found that SIUE could improve decision-making by using validated measures to make "data-driven decisions". The 2010 AQIP Strategy Forum encouraged the development and implementation of validated assessment measures. A validated Student Evaluation of Teaching form shows our continuous improvement efforts in this area.

⁵ For summaries of these committees' efforts please visit the SET Committee website at www.siu.edu/innovation/assessment/SET

In Fall 2009, the SET committee conducted a brief survey with 15 peer institutions. Findings from this effort suggest that most peer institutions surveyed (N = 11, or 73.33%) have a university-wide quantitative SET instrument. Of the four without university-wide instruments, one reported that they currently have a task force exploring it while a second reported repeated but failed attempts at adoption. These results speak to the national trend in assessment towards standardized student evaluation of teaching.

Understanding the national prevalence of SETs as a measure of teaching effectiveness is helpful, but the main reason for implementation of such a system at SIUE is that student evaluations of teaching are an integral part of SIUE's review processes. Accordingly, it is important to establish fair and supportive systems. One of the central concerns with current student evaluation of teaching practices at SIUE is the potential lack of reliability and validity. Most forms, often developed at the department level, used to evaluate "teaching" have not been validated; that is, there has not been systematic attempts to determine whether they measure the intended concept —effective teaching. Validating a form is a very time-consuming and complex process that requires appropriate data, time, and professional expertise. "Student rating forms that have not been constructed according to professional psychometric standards may be unreliable and thus able to be influenced by factors such as popularity, temperature in the classroom, instructor gender or anything else. Unfortunately, many institutions use student rating forms that have not been constructed and validated using professional psychometric standards. Without rigorous reliability and validity data on such forms, it is impossible to tell for certain what influences the final student rating" (Arreola, 2007). Without such validation, instructors and administrators should use such information with considerable caution.

III. A Brief Review of the Literature

Purpose and Importance of Student Evaluations of Teaching

As an AQIP institution committed to continuous improvement, the university community needs to develop practices and policies that reflect this logic and demonstrate administrators' commitments to valuing faculty. Other universities face similar challenges. Unfortunately, in spite of the widespread use of student evaluations of teaching and a vast literature addressing central debates, university campuses have been remiss in developing sound practices to validate their SET instruments or the use of the results (Hobson and Talbot, 2002).

While there is considerable debate regarding the validity, reliability, and appropriate use of student evaluations of teaching, what is clear is that student evaluations of teaching have become a mainstay in higher education. When SET instruments are designed in thoughtful ways, tested for reliability and validity, and considered as only one source of evidence regarding teaching effectiveness, they can be used to facilitate professors' efforts to improve the quality of their teaching and to promote student learning (Berk, 2005; Hobson and Talbot, 2001). Instructors may use student evaluations of teaching for formative assessment or diagnostic purposes. The results of student evaluations of teaching may lead to thoughtful consideration about how to revise class structure, alter instructional methods, change readings, or reconsider methods of assessing student learning. Student evaluations of teaching may also be used for summative assessment. Administrators and faculty committees may use SET results as one measure of effective teaching in the annual merit and promotion/tenure processes.

Best practices for evaluating teaching effectiveness

As indicated earlier, student evaluations of teaching should be only **one** source of evidence as individual faculty members, review committees, department chairpersons, and administrators consider a faculty members' teaching effectiveness. In spite of this advice, many universities continue to be overly-reliant on student ratings (Aleamoni, 1999; Seldin, 1999).

There is an extensive body of research regarding student evaluations of teaching and how they contribute to assessments of teaching effectiveness. Most institutions rely heavily on student feedback through student evaluations of teaching as a source of indirect evidence of instruction (Hobson and Talbot, 2001). As alluded to previously, there is considerable controversy over student evaluations of teaching among faculty in higher education. Nevertheless, there is significant empirical support suggesting that student evaluations are reliable, can be valid, and may be instructive (Cashin, 1995). Yet it is also clear that student evaluations of teaching can have significant and sometimes debilitating flaws when not designed, tested, and implemented in thoughtful and systematic ways. As previously noted, many universities rely on instruments that have not been validated. The questions may be poorly worded, procedures may not be standardized thus making comparisons even more flawed, and without on-going review and standardization, we cannot know how unintended extraneous factors, such as race, gender, student motivation, or course type, influence outcomes (Hoyt and Pallett, 1999).

According to Centra (1993), student evaluations of teaching can only facilitate improvement when professors are able to access new and valuable information from them. They must then understand how to translate the new evidence into action and must be motivated to do so (Centra, 1993).

“Despite discrepancies in opinions and research findings on the validity of student evaluations, it is essential for faculty to understand the SETEs⁶ (*student evaluations of teaching effectiveness*) are – and probably will continue to be – the primary institutional measure of their teaching effectiveness. (Hobson and Talbot, 2001: 9)” In light of this reality, faculty members need to understand the reliability and validity research specific to the instrument used on their campus. This knowledge combined with greater awareness of the literature regarding potential biases in student evaluations of teaching will support a system that should be rooted in critical self-reflection and fairness. When these student evaluations are well-developed and demonstrated as reliable and valid, they can be useful for accountability purposes but can also be helpful as professors reflect on their effectiveness and work to improve their approaches (Hobson and Talbot, 2001).

Consistently, scholars have called for “comprehensive systems” to assess instructional effectiveness (Aleamoni, 1999; Hoyt and Pallett, 1999; Paulsen, 2002). Assessments of teaching effectiveness should include multiple sources of evidence, both indirect and direct (Hoyt and Pallett, 1999). Ideally, these assessments ask students to provide feedback only on items that are within their abilities to address. For example, students cannot serve as valid assessors of professors' knowledge (Berk, 2006). Arreola (2006) and Berk (2006) have distinguished SET

⁶ SETE is the language used by Hobson and Talbot in this direct quote. The remainder of the report uses the more conventional U.S. acronym SET for student evaluation of teaching.

items that students can reliably and accurately judge. For some issues, faculty colleagues can best rate direct instruction or indirectly assess professors' contributions to student learning. They may do so through peer evaluations or peer coaching. Faculty members can also provide syllabi and portfolios for peer review to demonstrate the ways in which they promote student learning. (Hoyt and Pallett, 1999). Berk (2005) offers twelve sources of evidence for assessing teaching effectiveness for both formative and summative purposes. These include: "Student Ratings, Peer Ratings, Self-Evaluations, Videos, Student Interviews, Alumni Ratings, Employer Ratings, Administrator Ratings, Teaching Scholarship, Teaching Awards, Learning Outcomes, and Teaching Portfolios" (Berk, 2005: 49). Regardless of the sources used, Berk states, "the accuracy of faculty evaluation decisions hinge on the integrity of the process and the reliability and validity of the evidence you collect."

V. Overview of the AQIP Committee's Work

The 2010-2011 AQIP SET Committee undertook the following steps to accomplish its aforementioned goals.

Step 1: Reviewed the appropriate literature and best practices for student evaluations of teaching

Step 2: Continued the work of previous sub-committees to develop a core SET instrument, revised the university's administration policy, revised the university's use policy, and developed a framework for continued review of the instrument.

Step 3: Formed a sub-committee of experts well-versed in measurement, research design and validation

Step 4: Developed and implemented a communication plan to encourage faculty involvement and engagement

Step 5: Convened departmental liaison meetings to communicate the committee's work but also to learn about the SET practices already in place on campus. (The committee is aware of the vast differences in practices and policies. Additionally, the members of the committee wanted to be able to build on the strengths of some high quality practices on campus and think about how to develop systems compatible with current support systems.)

Step 6: Sought feedback from students, faculty and faculty administrators regarding their opinions about the committee's work, their preferences, and their perceptions of the clarity and/or importance of proposed items

Step 7: Pilot tested the instrument

Step 8: Analyzed the data

Step 9: Shared the results of the pilot test

Step 10: Developed a final report and proposals based on the evidence collected and analyzed

Step 11: Continued to share information about our efforts with Faculty Senate and the campus community.

What follows is the presentation of the four proposals borne out of this committee's efforts. It builds on the extensive work conducted by campus committees previously. Each section includes the AQIP SET Committee's charge given by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council, the 2009-2010 Faculty Senate SET Committee's related recommendations (Approved by Curriculum Council in April 2010), a brief summary of the current AQIP SET Committee's related actions, and the proposal that relates to that aspect of the charge.

VI: Four Proposals

Charge 1: Create and validate a SET instrument to be considered for full scale campus-wide implementation

Previous Committee's Recommendations (Approved by Curriculum Council 4/10):⁷

Given the wide variety of SET practices currently in use at SIUE, the committee decided that a standardized SET instrument would need to be composed of material that was relevant to all faculties and was short enough that it could be administered in addition to any instruments or procedures currently in use. Based upon this, the committee recommended that the proposed instrument:

- Be based primarily upon the SIUE ethics of instruction, with the addition of a small number of validated questions (see Feldman (1988, 1989, 2007) for examples) to assess core aspects of instruction not covered by the ethics of instruction.
- Be limited to 8 to 12 standard questions that would be administered to all programs.
- Responses to questions should be provided on a 5 point Likert Scale.
- Individual schools, departments, and instructors should be permitted to add additional questions to the instrument as they see fit.
- A bank of additional, validated questions should be created and made available for departments who wish to add to the instrument.
- Qualitative questions may be added by individual units
- Information about the student (i.e. expected grade, motivation for taking the course, self-reported attendance, self-reported study time outside of class) should be included in the standard form to aid instructors in the interpretation of results.
- Faculty feedback should be sought as to the content of the instrument prior to pilot testing.

2010-2011 AQIP SET Committee's Actions and Results:

The AQIP SET Committee's charge was to create and validate an instrument specifically related to SIUE's Ethics of Instruction. However, based on feedback provided during the departmental liaison meetings, the committee considered using an existing SET instrument or a commercial

⁷ All boxes in grey are direct quotes from the 2009-2010 Faculty Senate SET Committee report approved by Curriculum Council.

service. The committee reviewed two existing instruments commonly used in higher education: IDEA, a commercially managed system (Cashin 1990), and the Student's Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) (Marsh, 1984). The committee was almost unanimously opposed to using IDEA or another commercial product. Committee members believed the systems were too expensive, particularly since our university has faculty members with the expertise to design and validate an instrument. Additionally, the short-form version of IDEA is intended for summative purposes only. The long-form, however, is extensive and would have created a situation where faculty members may have felt uncomfortable adding questions of their own or any departmental items. The SEEQ is similarly long with thirty-five items in its most recent format. Perhaps, most importantly, committee members expressed concern over such systems because they do not focus on SIUE's ethics of instruction, an explicit element of the committee's charge. While IDEA and SEEQ have many benefits, faculty members were concerned about whether the university community would envision the items as an acceptable campus-wide core.

The responsibility of developing questions that fit across a wide array of disciplines, class types, and sizes, made the Ethics of Instruction a simple and agreeable conceptual framework from which to build. The Ethics of Instruction are, however, a set of minimum expectations for faculty. The committee strongly encourages colleges/units, departments, or individual faculty to add quantitative and qualitative items and items focused on student learning in order to facilitate formative assessment. The committee's charge was to develop a set of standard quantitative items. Nevertheless, there are strong justifications to support adding qualitative questions.

Because faculty members expressed concern over the length of the instrument, the standard core does not require information about the student or the course. Nevertheless, the proposed continuous review process will need to be developed in a way that considers the effects of student motivation, effort, expected grade, course type, etc. Tracking the potential influence of these variables and other factors beyond the professors' control (e.g. race, gender, age) is a significant benefit of developing a validated core. Understanding how these variables influence outcomes on these questions, on this campus, will require significant and on-going careful review.⁸

Validation

Part of the committee's charge was to validate the proposed instrument. Working with the main SET Committee, the SET Sub-committee on Research Design and Validation led the following efforts to accomplish these goals.

- This team of experts reviewed the proposed items identified and developed by the SET main committee. They refined these items to adhere to proper measurement techniques.
- The Sub-committee on Research Design and Validation developed and administered surveys to students, tenure-track/tenured faculty, and faculty-administrators. The purpose of these surveys was to assess the extent to which these items were clear to students, how important students perceived them to be and to determine how well

⁸ The continuous review process will necessitate that some faculty members add variables to measure factors such as those mentioned here. The eventual committee for continuous review will work with the Faculty Senate to establish sampling procedures and protocols for adding items required for on-going validation and review efforts.

- faculty members and faculty-administrators believed the items measured the ethics of instruction and key concepts defined in the literature as significant predictors of teaching effectiveness. The committee presented at least two options for wording for each ethic of instruction or concept. Based on analyses of these data and the qualitative findings from these surveys, the committee narrowed the items to a core set of ten items to be included in the pilot test. The committee excluded some proposed items (e.g. measures related to rapport between the instructor and student) because faculty and faculty-administrators ratings of these items were not as favorable. Additionally, both faculty and faculty-administrators found the originally proposed overall measures problematic. As such, the committee created a new overall item that was included in the pilot test. The new overall item addressed the concerns of faculty members and faculty administrators by focusing more on student learning.
- Primarily during the week of November 29th, 2010, the core instrument was pilot tested in 51 classes with 23 participating faculty volunteers. Faculty participants represented fifteen disciplines across the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Education, School of Engineering, School of Nursing and School of Pharmacy. The pilot included traditional and online courses. More than half of the participating faculty members were women, and the sample was split almost evenly between tenured and non-tenured faculty members (46.5% were Assistant Professors; 51.4% Associate Professors; and 2.1% Professors). The sample for Study 1 of the pilot tests included course evaluations from 1131 students.
 - Because the committee relied on volunteers, the sample is not representative. In fact, some of the professors have won teaching awards in recent years. Some may not have won awards but are well-regarded as teachers. This voluntary pool provided helpful information but has some empirical limitations as well. This group of faculty does not provide a representative view of all tenured or tenure-track faculty at SIUE. The sample does not fully reflect the racial diversity or international status of the faculty.
 - A second part of the pilot test, Study 2, was conducted during this same period. In this part, the committee selected two Interdisciplinary Studies (IS) courses and two general education one hundred level foundational courses. In two of these classes, students were asked to complete the pilot instrument based on the course in which they had the “most positive” course experiences. (Students could think of any course from the semester as long as it represented their “most positive” course experiences.) In the remaining two courses, students were asked to think about their “least positive” course experience this semester. The purpose of this study was to determine whether the instrument would yield variation in extreme circumstances. Because some of the measures are tied to the “Ethics of Instruction”, the items measure minimal expectations. As such, the Sub-Committee on Research Design and Validation wanted to be sure that the instrument would yield lower ratings for the least positive experience and higher ratings for the most positive experiences. The final sample for Study 2 consisted of 241 student evaluations.

- With permission from the University of North Texas (UNT), the committee used their validated instrument to further assess the quality of the proposed SIUE Core instrument⁹.

The pilot test indicated that scores from SIUE items were strongly related to scores from University of North Texas items designed to measure a similar concept. (SIUE measured adherence to the ethics of instruction and UNT's measured instructor, rather than course, effectiveness.) Scores from all SIUE items were strongly related to an "overall" item about instruction enhancing learning. All SIUE items significantly differentiated between student groups rating their most positive and least positive class experience of the semester. The core items, excluding the overall item, were internally consistent (i.e., students responded very similarly across items). These findings in combination with the committee's other validation efforts suggest we have developed an instrument that is internally consistent and shows evidence of validity. (Please see Appendix H for further details regarding the results of the pilot study and validation effort.)

The Committee must engage in further validity testing to understand the full range of variables that may influence outcomes and to consider the utility of the results. Using a campus-wide core instrument will allow the university to investigate empirically how factors such as student motivation, class size, and demographics of the professor may influence outcomes of student evaluations of teaching. Documenting and tracking these patterns can help ensure a fair and supportive process for faculty members as this information will help them make sense of the results for their own improvement efforts and for the purposes of promotion, tenure, or annual review.

At this time, the committee does not recommend an overall mean or composite score for analysis. While such an approach to analysis might be helpful for summative assessment, it does little to promote improvement. Aggregating results of each item into a single score obscures important information that instructors can use as they try to enhance their instructional approaches. Moreover, calculating an overall mean assumes equal weighting of items, which may be inappropriate (Berk, 2006). The committee believes that specific ratings and overall global items should be used together without unduly weighting any one item (Hobson and Talbot, 2001). Colleges/Schools and Departments can determine how these data should be reported in annual merit and promotion and tenure dossiers as long as their requirements are consistent with the university's approved Use Policy. Based on the information noted throughout this section, the committee offers the following proposals.

Proposal 1: Adopt a university-wide core instrument with question bank

The Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt the following eleven questions as a core SET instrument to be used university-wide.

- The course requirements were clearly communicated in the syllabus.
- The instructor was available to help students outside of class.

⁹ Additional information regarding University of North Texas' validation process and student evaluation of teaching instrument can be accessed at (http://www.unt.edu/ir_acc/Assessment/PDFs/SETE_Spring_2010_FAQ_1101v1.pdf)

- The instructor provided timely feedback on student work (exams, assignments, creative activities, etc.).
- The instructor provided useful feedback on student work (exams, assignments, creative activities, etc.).
- The class was well-organized.
- The instructor was prepared for class.
- The instructor was responsive to student questions.
- The instructor explained difficult material clearly.
- The instructor used teaching strategies that enhanced my understanding of course content.
- The activities/assignments were useful in helping me learn.
- Overall, the instruction in this course enhanced my learning of the course content.¹⁰

The proposed instrument uses a five-point scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Disagree Nor Agree, Agree, and Strongly Agree.¹¹

This recommendation is made with the following caveats and addenda:

- 1) Colleges/schools, departments, and/or individual faculty **should** add qualitative questions to enhance the utility of student feedback. In order for this SET instrument to be most helpful to professors' improvement efforts, qualitative feedback is necessary.
- 2) Colleges/schools, departments, and/or individual faculty **should** add quantitative or qualitative items that allow them to better assess student learning in their classes.
- 3) The committee will continue work to develop a question bank that will include items validated on our campus or elsewhere. The bank will also include commonly-used SET items from the literature, other universities, or within campus.
- 4) The core SET instrument should be subject to rigorous and on-going evaluation. It is important to assess potential threats to validity, possible bias, and patterns over time.

Charge: Create documents detailing the administration of the proposed university-wide core SET

Previous Committee's Recommendations (Approved by Curriculum Council 4/10):

The committee recommended that existing policy on administration of SET continue to

¹⁰ This overall item tested was developed after considering the critical feedback we received regarding the potential overall items included in the content validity survey.

¹¹ While experts such as Berk (2006) suggest even numbered scales, the committee proposes the five-point scale since this type is the most commonly used scale type reported by departmental liaisons. The committee is sensitive to this issue and does not want to disrupt faculty members' abilities to track patterns longitudinally.

be used with the following additions:

- The policy should be modified to allow for both online and written evaluations.
- No incentive or punishment for student participation should be permitted.
- Student Evaluations of Teaching using paper should be administered during the 14th week of a 16 week semester.
- Online Student Evaluations of Teaching should be made available to students from the 12th to the 14th week of a 16 week semester.
- For the summer semester, both paper and online forms should be made available during the week prior to finals.

Current AQIP Committee's Actions and Results:

The SET main committee worked from the existing policy on use of student evaluations of teaching. The AQIP SET Committee reviewed the current policy along with suggested revisions. Additionally, they considered the feedback gathered through the departmental surveys, content validity surveys, and other information from faculty and administrators. Policy recommendations were vetted through the full AQIP SET Committee.

Proposal 2: Revised policies on administration of SETs

A. Process of administering the SETs during the required end-of-semester evaluation:

1. SIUE forms for Student Evaluations of Teaching include the approved campus-wide core. In addition, each department, school, or college can add a second section of multiple-choice questions and a section of open-ended questions.
2. Student evaluations of teaching may be administered in paper-pencil format or on-line. Regardless of mode of delivery, the process must ensure anonymity for students.
3. Before students take the evaluation, instructors should provide a standard statement in writing or verbally. This statement should instruct students about the importance and purpose of the evaluation as well as how the evaluations will be used.
4. The administrator should instruct students not to talk to each other while filling out SETs.
5. The process must assure student anonymity on the SETs.
6. The instructor must not be present while evaluations are being filled out.

7. The department should develop a plan regarding the administration of student evaluations of teaching. This plan should include designations for who will administer course evaluations. If a departmental designee is unavailable, the instructor can use a “signed envelope” procedure: In such an instance, the department chair or instructor must designate a student in the class to collect all evaluations in a single large envelope, seal it, sign it across the seal, and deliver it to the department secretary or other designated location.
8. Instructors must not have contact with **individual** SETs once they have been distributed (in the case of non-electronic administration, someone else must collect and give the completed SETs to someone in charge of processing them). *The instructor will not be allowed to see the original evaluation forms after they have been completed.*
9. Hand-written comments must be typed before the instructor receives them.
10. *If paper administration*, SET forms (both completed and blank) must be returned in the SET packet and accounted for. *For on-line administration*, faculty members and departments should make note of response rates and their potential impact on the results. Regardless of mode of delivery, evaluations are anonymous, including whether or not a student has completed the evaluation.
11. The final results are provided to the instructor *after the final grade submission period is over.*

B. Further suggestion

It is suggested that instructors administer an evaluation during the course of the semester in addition to the end-of-semester evaluation. (A mid-term evaluation may help instructors to identify problems and remedy them while they still have the opportunity).

In the case of the midterm evaluations, the evaluation practices should ensure anonymity. Departments should work to develop effective practices to support faculty members who wish to implement mid-term evaluations for the purpose of course improvement.

Charge: Create documents stipulating acceptable use of SET data.

Previous Committee’s Recommendations (Approved by Curriculum Council 4/10):
The committee recommends that a statement on the intended use of SET data collected from a standardized instrument be created based on the following guidelines:

- Faculty will be given the results from the standardized SET instruments. An analysis of these results may be included in the candidate’s supporting documentation for tenure and promotion (PartIII.B.2). Any presentation in annual review materials or promotion/tenure dossiers should be done in accordance with

university policy for use. The candidate should also consult college/school/unit and department policies that may be relevant to the presentation of materials and requirements regarding inclusion of SET results.

- SET data may be used by a review body composed of faculty with the intent of ensuring the validity and reliability of the instrument. In this case, identifying information must be removed from the data prior to analysis as much as possible.
- Faculty members should employ multiple methods to evaluate their teaching effectiveness in addition to SETs. Specifically, faculty members, reviewers, and administrators should not use any single indicator as the sole source of teaching effectiveness.
- In the case of SETs specifically, presenters and reviewers should not rely on data from a single question, nor should they rely solely upon a composite or overall score for each faculty member. Teaching effectiveness is multi-dimensional and should be measured accordingly.
- Quantitative results must be presented as either number or % of responses for each choice on each question. Additional representations may be used but may not be required. Evaluators are cautioned to consult experts in the field of statistics of discrete quantities before attempting other analyses and are further cautioned that misleading or out-right erroneous evaluations of this type of data are common.
- Evaluations of teaching are to be used to assess achievement of declared goals. They may not be used for comparisons.
- The Chair and/or other review committee should provide either written or verbal feedback about teaching evaluations.
- No disciplinary action or complaint against faculty beyond annual merit and P&T reviews may be based solely on anonymous evaluation methods.

Current AQIP Committee's Actions and Results:

A sub-committee continued to revise the Use policy initially revised by the 2009-2010 Faculty Senate Committee. The full AQIP SET Committee reviewed the current policy along with suggested revisions. Additionally, they considered the feedback gathered through the departmental surveys, content validity surveys, and other information from faculty and administrators. Policy recommendations were vetted through the full AQIP SET Committee.

Proposal 3: Revised policies on use of Student Evaluations of Teaching¹²

¹² Again, proposed changes to the policy appear in blue. All other text remains the same.

Policy on Use of Results of Student Evaluations of Teaching

A. Preamble

There is a wide body of research indicating that student evaluations of teaching (SETs) may be influenced by such factors as instructor gender, physical attractiveness, race, and other types of characteristics (see reference list, below). Prior student interest in the subject matter is also a factor, giving instructors of certain courses an advantage over others. For example, some instructors have the responsibility of teaching relatively unpopular courses, which may put them at a disadvantage.

Further, many faculty members have a responsibility to awaken students to discriminatory ideology and institutional practices that are hegemonic and oppressive to those not in the dominant group(s) in the world. Attempts to help students understand racism, sexism, and discrimination against those of non-dominant sexual orientation, ethnicity, or religious affiliation often leads to antipathy and confusion among students. These phenomena must be weighed when considering student evaluations of faculty teaching courses that expose racism, sexism, and homophobia. Although this issue may be more relevant to some disciplines than others, it can be a factor in all disciplines and in any course.

B. Policy on use of student evaluations of teaching

1. SETs shall¹³ not be used as the sole **or primary** indicator of faculty effectiveness - **neither as individuals, nor collectively**. Rather, multiple measures shall be used to evaluate faculty teaching. **Such measures may include peer evaluations, formative assessments, and content-based evaluations.**

2. The response to a single question on a SET shall never be used as the sole **or primary** indicator of faculty effectiveness taken from that instrument, even when that instrument is used in conjunction with other measures. **This applies both to individual faculty members and to collections of faculty members.** Also, with quantitative SETs, student response percentages for each answer category are more useful than the arithmetic mean for each item.

3. Results of SETs shall not be used to compare faculty **members or collections of faculty members for evaluation purposes**. Rather, they shall be used in one or both of the following ways:

- to document faculty improvement or changes in a faculty member's results in the same class over time.
- along with other indicators of teaching quality, to determine the quality of faculty teaching
- to assess the extent to which faculty use evaluation results to improve their teaching

¹³ "Shall" replaces "should" in most occurrences throughout this policy.

4. The Chair and/or other review committee should meet with faculty to interpret and discuss results of student evaluations of teaching.

5. Because student evaluations of teaching are anonymous, no disciplinary action may be based solely on student evaluations of teaching.

See Appendix E for related references that supported creation of this policy.

Charge: Propose a framework for continued review of the SET instrument.

Previous Committee's Recommendations (Approved by Curriculum Council 4/10):

Continued review of any SET instrument is vital to ensuring its validity and reliability in a changing environment. It is therefore recommended that following adoption, the instrument be reviewed by a committee of faculty created by the curriculum council of the faculty senate every three years. The committee should include representation from each school, the library, and ITS. Effort should be made to ensure that faculty with relevant statistical and quantitative skills are included. The results of this review should be made public and shared with the faculty senate in aggregate form in order to safeguard the confidentiality of faculty as much as is possible.

Current AQIP Committee's Actions and Results:

A sub-committee began developing a general plan for continued review of the SIUE Core Instrument. The specific framework for ongoing review will come from a committee comprised of experts in research design and measurement.

Proposal 4: Plan for Continued Review of the SIUE Core SET Instrument

The founding committee to be charged with continued review should grow out of the existing Sub-Committee for Research Design and Validation. For example, the current validation sub-committee has two members from the School of Education, one from the School of Business and one from the College of Arts and Sciences. If needed, the committee will include new members. Ideally, the membership of this committee should include multiple schools or colleges but the expertise of committee members is critical. The Office of the Provost will also have representation on this committee. For the founding committee, these members could be drawn from the existing membership of the SET committee. Doing so would allow for continuity of knowledge and build upon the established strengths, collaborative spirit, and knowledge of this group.

This committee will develop a framework and plan for continued review of the SIUE Core SET Instrument. Their plan should reflect the following characteristics:

- Communication with the Implementation and Steering Committee
- Multiple measures of validity and reliability

- Empirical investigation of possible sources of bias and difference not attributable to instruction
- Samples should be broadly representative (even if not randomly selected)
- Initial review should occur no later than the end of the second full-year after implementation

The committee should make recommendations to the Faculty Senate and Office of the Provost based on their analysis of the data to refine the content or processes for improvement purposes. This should allow for variability due to increasing familiarity with the instrument and process to be reduced, as well as provide a robust set of data for analysis. We recommend that the committee for continuing review include the members of the Sub-committee on Research Design and Validation. The group will work with the proposed SET Implementation and Steering Committee, Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost. This group has significant expertise and experience that will be vital to that group's success. The committee must develop a clear plan for soliciting faculty participation in continuous review. If during the review process evidence emerges that suggests a change in content or procedures is necessary, this group will submit a proposed plan of action to the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost for their approval.

Finally, the committee proposes that the current AQIP SET Committee continue with a revised charge to serve as the **Implementation and Steering Committee**. It is important to have a similar committee oversee and guide the implementation of a campus-wide SET. For example, the committee should be cognizant of how the system is introduced for faculty members pre-tenure and promotion. Furthermore, this committee would be charged with communicating related policy changes to the campus community. Improved policies can only lead to better practice when communicated and implemented. Additionally, as with any new venture, the committee needs to work with the campus community and discuss ways to improve the process, policies, and reflect on the information gathered from the continuous review process. This committee would need to work with the Office of the Provost and Faculty Senate to provide a thoughtful implementation plan and approach that reflects our university's commitment to continuous improvement.

Closing Thoughts

As an institution and as a faculty, we are recognized for our thoughtful approach to teaching and our strong commitment to student learning. Student evaluations of teaching are important to faculty and students. The committee hopes that our work provides positive support to this process and remains committed to fostering fairness and encouraging improvement in student evaluation of teaching processes on our campus. Providing a validated instrument to faculty and students is further demonstration of our continued willingness to engage in critical self-evaluation and improvement.

References:

- Abrami, P. C. and S. d'Apollonia. (1990). The dimensionality of ratings and their use in personnel decision. In *Student ratings of instruction: Issues for improving practice*. Ed. M. Theall and J. Franklin. New Directions for Teaching and Learning. 43. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Aleamoni, L. M. (1987). *Techniques for evaluating and improving instruction*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Arreola, R. A. (2007). *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barnes, B., Engelland, B.T. Curtis, F., (2008). Developing a psychometrically sound measure of collegiate teaching proficiency. *College Student Journal*.
- Berk, R. A. (2005). Survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(1), 48-62.
- Berk, R. A. (2006). *Thirteen Strategies to Measure College Teaching*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Cashin, W. E. (1989). Defining and evaluating college teaching. *IDEA Paper*, No. 21, IDEA Center, Kansas State University.
- Cashin, W. E. (1995). Student ratings of teaching: The research revisited. *IDEA Paper*, No. 32, IDEA Center, Kansas State University.
- Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, P. A. (1981). Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multisection validity studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 281-309.
- Feldman, K. A. (1988). Effective college teaching from the students' and faculty's view: Matched or mismatched priorities? *Research in Higher Education*, 28, 291-344.
- Feldman, K.A. (1989). The association between student ratings of specific instructional dimensions and student achievement: Refining and extending the synthesis of data from multi-section validity studies. *Research in Higher Education* 30: 583-645.
- Feldman, K. A. (2007). Identifying Exemplary Teachers and Teaching: Evidence from Student Ratings. In R.P. Perry and J.C. Smart (eds.), *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: An Evidence-Based Perspective*, 93-143.

- Gravestock, P. and E. Gregor-Greenleaf. (2008). *Student Course Evaluations: Research, Models and Trends*. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.
- Hobson, S. M. and D. M. Talbot. (2001). Understanding Student Evaluations. *College Teaching*. 49 (1): 26-32.
- Hoyt, D. P. and W.H. Pallettte. (1999). Appraising Teaching Effectiveness: Beyond Student Ratings. IDEA Paper, No. 36, IDEA Center, Kansas State University.
- Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76 no. 5, 707-754.
- Marsh, H. W. (1987). Student Evaluations of University Teaching: Research Findings, Methodological Issues, and Directions for Future Research. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 11: 253-388.
- Marsh, H. W. and L. A. Roche. (1997). Making Students' Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness Effective. *American Psychologist*. 52: 1187-97.
- Murphy, T., et al. (2009). Toward a Summative System for the Assessment of Teaching Quality in Higher Education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. 20 (2): 226-236.
- Paulsen, M. B. (2002). Evaluating Teaching Performance. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. 114: 5-18.
- Seldin, P. (1999). Self-evaluation: What works? What Doesn't?" In Seldin, P. & Associates, *Changing practices in evaluating teaching*, 97-113,. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Theall, M. and J. Franklin (1990). *Student rating of instruction: Issues for improving practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weimer, M. (1991). *Improving college teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Resources:

Carnegie Mellon, University Course Assessment
<http://www.cmu.edu/uca/index.html>

IDEA Paper: Student Ratings of Teaching/ The Research Revisited
http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/Idea_Paper_32.pdf

Iowa State University, Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching

<http://www.celt.iastate.edu/set/homepage.html>

University of Massachusetts, Office of Academic Planning and Assessment

<http://www.umass.edu/oapa/srti/>

University of Michigan, Office of Evaluations and Examinations

<http://www.umich.edu/%7Eeande/tq/index.htm>

North Carolina State University - Task Force: University-wide Evaluation of Instruction

http://www.ncsu.edu/provost/governance/task_forces/UEI/reports/uei_execsum.htm

University of Oregon – Academic Affairs

<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/student-evaluation-teaching-learning-procedure>

Appendix A: Current Policy on SET Administration

<http://www.siue.edu/provost/fhb/StudentEvaluations.shtml>

STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

(WC #06-06/07, Approved by the Chancellor effective 2/27/2007)

I. Policy on Administration of Student Evaluations of Teaching

A. Preamble

The goal of this policy is to increase the validity of the data collected in Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs).

1. Intra-Departmental Consistency: Each dept/unit will develop a minimum “standard” set of items (each instructor can add items to that set to address specific items of interest).
2. Formatting: The setting and format of the SET should be conducive to thoughtful, objective, student participation. The format should look professional and be free from spelling and grammar errors.

B. Process of administering the SETs during the required end-of-semester evaluation.

1. Before students take the evaluation, instructors should use a standard statement to instruct students about the importance and purpose of the evaluation as well as how the evaluations are used.
2. Instruct the students not to talk to each other while filling out SETs.
3. Assure student anonymity on the SETs.
4. Instructor must not be present while evaluations are being filled out.
5. Instructor must not have contact with SETs once they have been distributed (in the case of non-electronic administration, someone else must collect and give the completed SETs to someone in charge of processing them)
6. All SET forms (both completed and blank) must be returned in the SET packet and accounted for.

C. Further suggestion

1. It is suggested that instructors administer an evaluation during the course of the semester in addition to the end-of-semester evaluation. (A mid-term evaluation may help instructors to identify problems and remedy them while they still have the opportunity).

II. Policy on Use of Results of Student Evaluations of Teaching

A. Preamble

There is a wide body of research indicating that student evaluations of teaching (SETs) may be influenced by such factors as instructor gender, physical attractiveness, race, and other types of characteristics (see reference list, below). Prior student interest in the subject matter is also a factor, giving instructors of certain courses an advantage over others. For example, some instructors have the responsibility of teaching relatively unpopular courses, which may put them at a disadvantage.

Further, many faculty members have a responsibility to awaken students to discriminatory ideology and institutional practices that are hegemonic and oppressive to those not in the dominant group(s) in the world.¹ Attempts to help students understand racism, sexism, and discrimination against those of nondominant sexual orientation, ethnicity, or religious affiliation often leads to antipathy and confusion among students. These phenomena must be weighed when considering student evaluations of faculty teaching courses that expose racism, sexism, and homophobia. Although this issue may be more relevant to some disciplines than others, it can be a factor in all disciplines and in any course.

B. Policy on use of student evaluations of teaching

1. SETs should not be used as the sole indicator of faculty effectiveness. Rather, multiple measures should be used to evaluate faculty teaching, which may include peer-generated and faculty-generated evaluations in addition to student-generated ones.

2. The response to a single question on an SET should never be used as the sole indicator of faculty effectiveness taken from that instrument, even when that instrument is used in conjunction with other measures. Also, with quantitative SETs, student response percentages for each answer category are more useful than the arithmetic mean for each item.

3. Results of SETs should not be used to compare faculty members. Rather, they should be used in one or both of the following ways:

- along with other indicators of teaching quality, to determine the quality of a faculty member's teaching
- to assess the extent to which a faculty member uses evaluation results to improve their teaching

4. The Chair and/or other review committee should meet with all instructors to interpret/discuss these SETs.

¹The information and some of the wording in this paragraph is taken from Appendix I of the Operating Papers of the Department of Historical Studies, SIUE, 2004.

References

- Basow, S. (1994). *Student ratings of professors are not gender blind*. Retrieved September 28, 2004, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.awm-math.org/newsletter/199409/basow.html>
- Bennett, S. K. (1982). Student perceptions of and expectations for male and female instructors: Evidence relating to the question of gender bias in teaching evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*(2), 170-179.
- Freeman, H. R. (1994). Student evaluations of college instructors: Effects of type of course taught, gender and gender role, and student gender. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*(4), 627-630.
- Hendrix, K. T. (1993). *Guess who's coming to lecture? Two case studies in professor credibility*. Washington, DC: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western States Communication Association.
- Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (2000). Effects of grading leniency and low workload on students' evaluations of teaching: Popular myth, bias, validity, or innocent bystanders? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*(1), 202-228.
- Nast, H. J. (1999). 'Sex', 'race' and multiculturalism: Critical consumption and the politics of course evaluations. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 23*(1), 102-115.
- O'Reilly, M. T. (1987). Relationship of physical attractiveness to students' ratings of teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Dental Medicine, 51*(10), 600-602.
- SIUE Department of Historical Studies (2004). Operating Papers, Appendix I.

Appendix B: SIUE Ethics of Instruction

<http://www.siue.edu/policies/1q2.shtml>

Policies & Procedures

Miscellaneous

Ethics of Instruction - 1Q2

The following information dealing with responsibilities and minimum expectations in carrying out teaching assignments should be provided to all faculty annually, ideally in a regularly updated faculty handbook.

1. The statement on Academic Freedom-Rights and Responsibilities in the Statutes of the Board of Trustees.
2. The statement below on Minimum Expectations of Faculty as Teachers.

MINIMUM EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY AS TEACHERS

The following is a list of minimum expectations of University faculty in carrying out their teaching assignments. These expectations broadly define normal faculty behavior in a fair and open teaching/learning environment.

1. To inform students early in the term, by means of syllabi or other written statements, of planned course coverage, required textbooks, and an approximate schedule of assignments.
2. To inform students early in the term, by means of syllabi or other written statements, of the grading policy to be used, including a description of the relative weight to be assigned to different activities and of attendance requirements, if any.
3. To announce and adhere to a schedule of office hours which permits and encourages students to meet with the instructor in his/her office and to be available for special conferences as needed.
4. To attend promptly and fully each class meeting; to obtain permission from the chair in advance when class must be missed (except in cases of emergency); and when possible to provide an alternate instructor who has been given directions concerning planned class activities).
5. Not to reschedule class meetings without the permission of the dean or chair and the consent of the students enrolled. Not to reschedule final examinations without the permission of the dean, the Provost, and the consent of the students enrolled.

6. To return student work promptly except when announcement has been made to the class that work will not be returned (although such work should be available for student examination) and to retain any unreturned student work for at least one term.
7. To provide the student at his/her request with appropriate and helpful written and/or oral explanations for assigned grades and other evaluated work.
8. To provide teaching and learning experiences that are free of favoritism, prejudice, discrimination, or harassment.
9. To remain abreast of new developments in the subject field and to incorporate this new knowledge in course instruction.
10. To assist in instructional support activities such as curriculum development, textbook selection, course revisions and acquisition of publications and other library activities.
11. Not to become involved in amorous or sexual relationships with any student for whom the instructor currently has any teaching responsibility, including counseling and advising, supervision of independent studies, research, theses, and dissertation. (Effective 8/16/94)

Approved by Chancellor effective 6/9/94

This policy was issued on February 1, 1996, replacing the July 1, 1994 version.

Document Reference: 1Q2

Origin: OP 6/26/81; OP 10/13/89; OP 11/5/90; OP 4/10/91; WC 2-93/94

Appendix C: Proposed SIUE Core Instrument with References

Proposed SIUE Core SET Instrument with References¹⁴

1	SIUE Wording: The course requirements were clearly communicated in the syllabus. (blends questions from SIUE School of Education; College Student Journal (2008); University of Connecticut and previous Faculty Senate Committee)
2	SIUE Wording: The instructor was available to help students outside of class. (exact wording is not listed – appears to be an amalgam as above) Similar Item: My instructor was reasonably available to help students outside the class http://www.math.purdue.edu/resources/files/gta/InfoIEFEval.pdf
3	SIUE Wording: The instructor provided timely feedback on student work (exams, assignments, creative activities, etc.). (modified from examples in the College Student Journal, 2008 article) Similar Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>timely feedback of student work</i> is critical to successful knowledge and skill acquisition. <i>The instructor</i> was able to <i>provide feedback</i> at http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=1611917&userType=inst • The instructor provides timely feedback on student work www.kennesaw.edu/english/sp10evalsummary.doc
4	SIUE Wording: The instructor provided useful feedback on student work (exams, assignments, creative activities, etc.). (modified from examples in the College Student Journal, 2008 article) Similar Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The instructor provides useful feedback on student work www.kennesaw.edu/english/sp10evalsummary.doc
5	SIUE Wording: The course was well-organized. Same item: http://www.utexas.edu/academic/ctl/gsi/assessment/organized.php
6	SIUE Wording: The instructor was prepared for class. Similar Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The instructor was prepared for class and presented the material in an organized manner http://users.tricity.wsu.edu/~achaudh/eval.html • The instructor was prepared for class and presented the material in an organized manner http://econweb.rutgers.edu/yotsubo/jobmarket/teaching_statement.pdf • The instructor was prepared for class. http://www.surveymshare.com/surveytemplate/2surveytemplate.html
7	SIUE Wording: The instructor was responsive to student questions. (modified from examples in the College Student Journal, 2008 article) Similar Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The instructor was responsive to and respectful of student ideas and questions. http://www.law.berkeley.edu/students/courses/evaluations/pdf/tevals1-Large-Classes-and-Seminars.pdf • The instructor was responsive to student questions and viewpoints. http://acupuncture.edu/students/documents/classeval_new.php
8	SIUE Wording: The instructor explained difficult material clearly. (See University of Purdue and University of Baltimore below) Similar or Same Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The instructor explained material clearly</i> and understandably www.umich.edu/~eande/tq/tqreq.pdf

¹⁴ The notations in grey acknowledge the direct sources that informed the wording of the proposed core item. The “Similar Items” simply refer to SET items identified as similar through a quick internet search after the pilot test.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>My instructor explains difficult material clearly</i> • www.math.purdue.edu/~gerberry/teaching/evals.shtml • http://home.ubalt.edu/ntsbarsh/online.html • <i>My instructor explains material clearly</i> • www.indiana.edu/~best/multiop/manual.shtml
9	SIUE Wording: The instructor used teaching strategies that enhanced my understanding of course content. (similar to previous SIUE School of Education item)
10	SIUE Wording: The activities/assignments were useful in helping me learn. (similar to previous SIUE School of Education item)
11	Overall, the instruction in this course enhanced my learning of the course content. (SIUE School of Education and University of Connecticut)

Appendix D: Frequently Asked Questions from the Departmental Liaison Meetings

<http://www.siue.edu/innovation/assessment/set/faq.shtml>

Frequently Asked Questions

1. The committee should address why this conversation about developing a university-wide SET instrument and process has arisen again.

Because there is no SIUE requirement on SET form or content, there is wide variation within the Schools/Colleges, units or even departments. Faculty members across the various schools and colleges have expressed concerns about the way SETs are carried out within their departments. Some faculty members are genuinely concerned about the disparate standards for evaluating effective teaching between individuals and/or departments. Likewise, faculty members have expressed concerns about using instruments that have not been validated. Additionally, as an AQIP institution we must seek to identify opportunities for improvement and act upon them. The Higher Learning Commission has asked SIUE to take a more "scholarly approach" to assessment measures while demonstrating our commitment to "valuing people" by addressing concerns expressed by faculty. Therefore, this initiative is driven by the desire to create a SET instrument designed in thoughtful ways, tested for reliability and validity, and considered as only one source of evidence regarding teaching effectiveness that can be used to facilitate instructors' efforts to improve the quality of their teaching and document teaching effectiveness.

2. Is this a top-down initiative?

This is a joint initiative. Problems with student evaluation of teaching first emerged as a university concern in 2004 with the formation of a Faculty Senate Committee. The current committee was partially formed by Faculty Senate Curriculum Council in 2009-2010. That current AQIP Committee was jointly charged by the Faculty Senate and the Provost's Office to address faculty concerns regarding SET practices across campus. If the initiative was top-down (as is the case in several states with legislative mandates for university SETs), we would simply comply. SIUE is committed to continuous improvement. Providing faculty with a validated SET instrument supports those efforts.

3. Is this a centralized system?

No. The Provost's Office is not interested in administering or centralizing this process. Units and programs will still be responsible for their own SET implementation processes. The Committee is seeking information from departments so that we can better understand what programs' current practices are and how changes might affect them. The Committee will work with the Provost's Office to identify ways to help departments with the transition to a new core instrument and corresponding policies. To be clear, there will be no centralization of administration or analysis. Data will not be collected and stored centrally. The only effort to aggregate data will be related to the revalidation process every three years.

4. What does faculty have to gain from a standard SET instrument?

The central concerns with current student evaluation of teaching instruments at SIUE are the potential lack of reliability and validity. Most forms, often developed at the department level, used to evaluate "teaching" have not been validated; that is, there have not been systematic attempts to determine whether they measure the intended concepts. Creating an instrument that has been tested and checked for systematic biases will enhance fairness. "Student rating forms that have not been constructed according to professional psychometric standards may be unreliable and thus able to be influenced by factors such as popularity, temperature in the classroom, instructor gender or anything else. Unfortunately, many institutions use student rating forms that have not been constructed and validated using professional psychometric standards. Without rigorous reliability and validity data on such forms, it is impossible to tell for certain what influences the final student rating" (Arreola, 2007). Faculty will gain confidence that they are administering a validated SET form and can reasonably assume that the items are measuring constructs related to the ethics of instruction. Thus, as they respond to the results of their SETs, they can do so with greater confidence.

5. If we aren't developing a SET instrument to compare faculty, why do we need a standard SET form?

When SET instruments are designed in thoughtful ways, tested for reliability and validity, and considered as one source of evidence regarding teaching effectiveness, they can be used to facilitate instructors' efforts to improve the quality of their teaching and to promote student learning. The University can support faculty efforts in this regard. While some faculty members and departments may have strong instruments and practices in place, there are ample opportunities to improve SET practices on campus. Moreover, we have the opportunity to support faculty by offering them the opportunity to use SET items that have been tested in rigorous ways.

6. The committee needs to address the multiple ways to evaluate teaching effectiveness. SETs are only one way to evaluate teaching and are indirect measures. Peer review processes and other requirements for demonstrating teaching effectiveness vary throughout the university.

The Committee clearly recognizes that SETs are only one source of data related to teaching effectiveness. The committee has written a policy statement regarding use that calls for the use of multiple measures for high stakes decisions, "Faculty members should employ multiple methods to evaluate their teaching effectiveness in addition to SETs. Specifically, faculty members, reviewers, and administrators should not use any single indicator as the sole source of teaching effectiveness." The SET website also includes materials describing how faculty can demonstrate teaching effectiveness. The Office of Academic Innovation and Effectiveness will also create other resources that describe best practices for peer review and outline how peer review can be a supportive and instructive process to promote teaching effectiveness.

7. The committee needs to address response rates, if on-line administration is required.

The SET Committee is not requiring on-line administration. We recognize that some programs are concerned about response rates with on-line administration. As such, our proposal allows programs to choose on-line or paper administration. For programs that wish to use on-line administration procedures, the committee would like to encourage student response rates by sending students e-mail reminders, posting information around campus, and addressing the importance of encouraging a culture of assessment with students in Springboard. The hope is to educate students on the importance that SETs play in continuous improvement and embed these values into the culture for our students. Lessons from other campuses suggest that consistent timing of evaluations and campus-wide strategic initiatives, such as those named above, can improve response rates and be effective strategies. While there may be benefits to university-wide on-line administration, the Committee wants to allow for flexibility in practices. We are happy to continue these conversations and share what we have learned about on-line SET administration.

8. SET practices need to be flexible enough to allow for variation among programs. If we are to adopt a standard form, units need to have the ability to add unit or discipline specific questions. Likewise, SET procedures should not be too rigid (e.g., administration must occur in the 13th week of classes). The Committee should find ways to accommodate the diversity of class formats and durations. For example, it will be difficult for programs with 5 week classes to determine when they should be administered. Flexibility is important to the programs.

Given the wide variety of SET practices currently in use at SIUE, the SET committee recommends that the proposed standardized SET instrument would be based primarily upon the SIUE ethics of instruction, with the addition of a small number of validated questions to assess the core aspects of instruction not covered by the ethics of instruction. The instrument would be limited to 12-15 standard quantitative questions that would be administered to all programs. Allowing for flexibility, individual schools, departments, and instructors would be permitted to add additional quantitative and qualitative questions to the instrument as they see fit. The committee is seeking information from departments regarding their current SET practices to determine how such a strategy might affect department's current efforts.

Additionally, the SET committee has discussed the need to establish administration procedures that do not create barriers for individual programs. It will be necessary for department liaisons to help the SET committee identify potential problems in order for the committee to recommend appropriate and flexible procedures/policies. The committee is dedicated to sharing the information we have learned about best practices in administration. Nevertheless, the committee recognizes the need to attend to differences in class formats, lengths, etc. Additionally, the committee will offer recommendations regarding administration that reflect best practices but allow for the flexibility that individual instructors and departments need.

9. Some schools (School of Business) have concerns about the change in infrastructure if we move to a standard form. How will that be addressed?

The SET Committee will meet with the School of Business and representatives from other schools to determine how a standard SET could be administered using the current infrastructure.

10. Will the standard SET form be driven by student input? Some programs have developed forms specifically to address questions that students perceive as important, will this form do the same?

Because the questions are directly tied to the ethics of instruction and to constructs identified in the literature as consistently strong indicators of teaching effectiveness, student input will only be used to evaluate the clarity [and importance] of the items. While student input is critical to this effort, students will not determine the concepts of interest. In order to be confident about the validity of the proposed measures and to better understand how students make sense of the questions, their clarity and purpose, we must seek student feedback.

11. Many faculty liaisons expressed concern about the departmental survey. They felt uncomfortable "speaking" for their entire department. The week turn-around time seemed too short to collect all faculty input. If the committee is doing an individual survey, why is this necessary?

The Committee revised the questions on the liaison survey to rely on primarily factual information rather than collective sentiment. Specifically, the questionnaire was revised to focus on departments' current practices and the corresponding strengths and opportunities for improvement. The questionnaire also includes one open-ended question requesting general information regarding concerns the faculty would like to see the committee address regarding administration, use and content. The Committee believes that learning from the work of departments throughout campus is important to this process. Moreover, gaining this information will allow the committee to consider how the eventual recommendations will affect departments.

Appendix E: References for Current and Proposed SET Policies

- Basow, S. (1994). *Student ratings of professors are not gender blind*. Retrieved September 28, 2004, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.awm-math.org/newsletter/199409/basow.html>
- Bennett, S. K. (1982). Student perceptions of and expectations for male and female instructors: Evidence relating to the question of gender bias in teaching evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(2), 170-179.
- Freeman, H. R. (1994). Student evaluations of college instructors: Effects of type of course taught, gender and gender role, and student gender. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86(4), 627-630.
- Greenwald, Anthony G. and Gerald M. Gillmore. (1997). "Grading Leniency Is a Removable Contaminant of Student Ratings," *American Psychologist* 11: 1209-17.
- Hendrix, K. T. (1993). *Guess who's coming to lecture? Two case studies in professor credibility*. Washington, DC: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western States Communication Association.
- Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (2000). Effects of grading leniency and low workload on students' evaluations of teaching: Popular myth, bias, validity, or innocent bystanders? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(1), 202-228.
- Naftulin, Donald H., John E. Ware, and Frank A. Donnelly, (1973). "The Doctor Fox Lecture: A Paradigm of Educational Seduction," *Journal of Medical Education* 48: 630-5.
- Nast, H. J. (1999). 'Sex', 'race' and multiculturalism: Critical consumption and the politics of course evaluations. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 23(1), 102-115.
- O'Reilly, M. T. (1987). Relationship of physical attractiveness to students' ratings of teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Dental Medicine*, 51(10), 600-602.
- SIUE Department of Historical Studies (2004). Operating Papers, Appendix I.
- Sproule, R. (2000). "Student Evaluation of Teaching: A Methodological Critique of Conventional Practices", *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 8.50 (2000)
- Williams, W. M. and S. J. Ceci. (1997). "How'm I Doing?' Problems with Student Ratings of Instructors and Courses", *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 29: 12-23.

Appendix F:

Overview of Overall Qualitative Feedback from Faculty and Faculty-Administrators

Administrator Comments¹⁵

Positive

- ◆ I support this move. We need comparable questions across the university for tenure and promotion purposes and for improvement of our teaching. Faculty also need protection from random and inappropriate comments - especially the old CAS questions
- ◆ That resistance on the part of some faculty does not re-rail this effort.

Negative-diversity of departments and classes

- ◆ Different disciplines have quite different objectives in teaching. For a technical discipline such as engineering, a systematic delivery with good motivation is much more important than, for example, a group discussion. I am also very concerned with the over-reliance of teaching evaluation. I have seen some faculty teach less material and give less difficult problems in the exams to get good evaluation. I have seen a faculty evaluation with above 4 average in a 5 scale, with 3 or 4 students indicating that the instructor had problem solving problems and answering questions in class! Therefore, the student evaluations must account for, and be considered in conjunction with teaching expected material, peer evaluation, and student learning. I can support multiple forms such that disciplines with similar nature have the same evaluation form.
- ◆ A standardized instrument does not capture the varied pedagogical foci that different disciplines demand, so it seems other than very generalized questions that may not ultimately provide any real value, that the instrument is flawed to begin with. Also of concern is that this is yet one more move that the university is making toward standardization and that bothers me and many other faculty. We have a standardized test for general education and now for SET
- ◆ Variation must be included for level and type of course being evaluated. Graduate courses, seminars, upper division, gen ed, applied vs theoretical, lab courses. All courses are different. Allow the Departments to have their own evaluations instrument.
- ◆ SET's are most valuable when they are specific to the discipline and particular course. I do not feel the need for a university-wide SET. Such a policy seems to be more useful in making the administration feel comfortable than in actually helping students and faculty.

Negative-standardization is inappropriate

- ◆ It represents a dangerous trend of standardizing assessment and curriculum.

Negative-improper use of data

- ◆ The concern for how this evaluation will be used, now or further down the road, is paramount. There is a faculty morale issue here.

¹⁵ The coding that appears reflects a graduate student's efforts at categorizing the overall qualitative comments. The committee thanks Andrew Hale, a graduate assistant in Psychology and Educational Leadership, for his assistance in organizing these data in a much more usable format.

- ◆ how the data is used is essential. will the data be used to evaluate faculty members for merit or tenure, for example?

Negative-improper use of data- students' misuse/misunderstanding of SET

- ◆ I distrust the agenda behind the development of SET. And I am skeptical of standardized assessment of teaching across diverse areas of study, types of courses, and class levels. I would welcome the involvement of students in the development of the instrument because it's clear to me that the questions on the current instrument are misinterpreted by students (or at least not interpreted in the similar ways by most students).
- ◆ I am concerned that random comments by poor students who are forced to take my subject may reflect incorrectly on my teaching. One colleague has called student teacher evaluations "Drive-by shootings." I tend to agree. On a lighter note, I cannot read many student comments on the current computer forms because they use light pencil on a darkly printed background decoration. I would suggest much easier to read instruments.
- ◆ No department and no administration should take evaluations of teachers by their students seriously as long as their identities' remain anonymous. Students must be held accountable for their remarks, positive or negative. They learn which buttons to push to get a teacher in trouble--which remarks to write to get the negative attention of the administration. It is common knowledge that students who do not get the grade they think they deserve often use evaluations to retaliate. They fill out evaluation forms at the height of tension of the semester, during the last weeks, when final projects are due and final exams are eminent. I cannot think of an instance when a student who earned an A or a B complained about a teacher. Perhaps 400 or 500 level students are more mature and may be more knowledgeable about pedagogy than underclassmen, but they, even moreso, know precisely what to say if they want revenge. And believe me, too many of our students think they deserve A's or B's, even when they admit that they have never been proficient in particular areas, such as writing, math or history. It doesn't matter to them--so many of them have been raised to expect to be rewarded for just showing up and doing their work, no matter the quality. They are entitled--no two ways about it. And today, with helicopter parents at the helm, the pressure is smothering. The students feel they are worth the highest grade possible, and their parents reinforce this. I have students who, after I return assignments or exams, get on the phone immediately as they leave the classroom to tell Mom or Dad what the teacher "did" to them. The fear of student evaluation results also cause teachers to teach to that evaluation, and how best to deal with that but to lessen the load, and lower the standards one more time. It is not worth the aggravation or the stress to be an excellent, hard working teacher in an atmosphere that caters to students' whims and whines. How humiliating is it to be told that most of the students think I'm the greatest thing since the X-box, but 5% of my students believe I should be fired immediately? One of them claims I am sexist, another says I am racist and another writes that I favor pretty boys or maybe pretty girls over the others. How about the favorite: she talks about "inappropriate things"? Where does it end? All of these remarks can (and should) be swept under the rug, until the chair interrogates us and questions our integrity. I recall one department demanding that our evaluations ALL average "excellent" scores, even though the same was never expected of the students! Shouldn't it be the other way around? Student evaluations always need to be taken with a grain of salt and should

never be held against any teacher. And teachers should be allowed to confront their accusers, just as any US citizen is allowed in our judicial system.

Neutral-suggestions

- ◆ Having useful questions that provide useful feedback to the faculty and administrators
- ◆ a paper-based SET is not a good idea. It should be an online, anonymous procedure. Also, there should be room for department-internal modifications, particularly for large departments which have multiple (and sometimes quite different) sub-programs. While I agree that there should be some university-wide question types, the wide diversity of course types and course modes at SIUE should allow for department-internal modification
- ◆ Assuring that actual and perceived anonymity of the respondents are not compromised. Focusing on salient factors that students have the ability to assess. That "how the data is used" is not diluted to the point of rendering it useless yet restricted enough so it is neither abused or used inappropriately.
- ◆ Assuring anonymity is maintained and that the respondents' perception of anonymity is not compromised. Striking the right balance of how the data can be used. If too restrictive, it may easily render the information useless for evaluative purposes; too open, and the data could be used improperly and unethically. Permitting enough flexibility in administering the instrument to allow units to conduct the process properly, but without substantial burdens. For example, Department Chairs should be able to allow the instrument to be administered other than just during the 14th week (week-end course; 10-week graduate courses; end of year project conflicts, etc.).
- ◆ A paper-based SET is not a good idea. It should be an online, anonymous procedure. Also, there should be room for department-internal modifications, particularly for large departments which have multiple (and sometimes quite different) sub-programs. While I agree that there should be some university-wide question types, the wide diversity of course types and course modes at SIUE should allow for department-internal modification

Faculty Comments

*Comments in red signify they fall in multiple categories

Positive

- ◆ I think some consistency is important in a university wide SET. both so that students become familiar with an instrument, and so that people evaluating an individual's teaching are familiar with the instrument. I think that a SET instrument should be developed using the best data available on which sorts of questions, and which ways of asking them, yield the most informative and accurate results.
- ◆ This is the first university I have attended or taught at that did NOT use a unviwersity-wide SET. I think having a standardized SET is essential, for evaluating faculty, for improving teaching, and for accountability.
- ◆ I think having reliable, validated, useful questions is extremely important, as is having clear guidelines on the use of the information. Student input is helpful in making sure the form is understandable to students and considering issues of participation.

- ◆ Concerned that so much "input" is required such that nothing ever gets done. A uniform instrument would be very useful. I would even be happy with purchasing a nationally validated instrument
- ◆ I support this move. We need comparable questions across the university for tenure and promotion purposes and for improvement of our teaching. Faculty also need protection from random and inappropriate comments - especially the old CAS questions
- ◆ That resistance on the part of some faculty does not re-rail this effort.

Negative-diversity of departments and classes

- ◆ Different disciplines have quite different objectives in teaching. For a technical discipline such as engineering, a systematic delivery with good motivation is much more important than, for example, a group discussion. I am also very concerned with the over-reliance of teaching evaluation. I have seen some faculty teach less material and give less difficult problems in the exams to get good evaluation. I have seen a faculty evaluation with above 4 average in a 5 scale, with 3 or 4 students indicating that the instructor had problem solving problems and answering questions in class! Therefore, the student evaluations must account for, and be considered in conjunction with teaching expected material, peer evaluation, and student learning. I can support multiple forms such that disciplines with similar nature have the same evaluation form.
- ◆ goals, objectives, and emphasis on teaching vary across colleges and schools, so a university-wide instrument is too confining to support each entity well.
- ◆ Each class' experience is unique, so the more we try to "norm" evaluation, the less reliable it becomes. The primary value of evaluation is that it helps the teacher understand what students see as strengths and weaknesses of his/her courses. Secondary value comes from the use of evaluations by department chairs in annual and p/t reviews, but this use is only reliable because the department chair has some particular knowledge of the specific conditions of courses in his/her department, knowledge based in part on discussion directly with the teacher and, at times, with the students. While I can see that there might be some advantages to a campus-wide instrument, I believe that norming evaluation campus-wide would be likely to misrepresent the realities and damage morale because the data would not be culled via such human interactions.
- ◆ Courses in the Music Dept such as ensembles are not comparable to other academic courses.
- ◆ The issues with small classes and large classes are different. I am concerned that people who teach large classes will be put at a disadvantage by a "one size fits all" assessment
- ◆ THE most important concern: Not all classes are alike. Not all classes can or should be evaluated by the same criteria (beyond a very few broad questions). It seems to me that Student Evaluations potentially serve two major functions: 1. To provide feedback to the instructor which he or she may use to review and revise his or her pedagogical strategies. 2. To provide administrative bodies with data with which they may "evaluate" particular faculty members' performance, and which they may use to create "talking points" for use at various functions and in various publications. Given these two goals, and the larger variety of sizes and types of courses, a university wide SET can only be less effective than one tailored to class types and teaching styles. The ONLY way in which a standard form would be "useful" would be in the creation of "talking points," but in reality, those points would be relatively meaningless, since they would assume that

"success" in one course can be truly and *numerically* compared with "success" in another, very different course (when in fact, those course might *rightly* have very different definitions of success).

- ◆ Assessment of different types of classes could be difficult and skewed i.e. art studio classes vs a math classes
- ◆ Adopting a student teacher's evaluation that would not applies to the type of classes taught in the department
- ◆ Fairness with respect to the differences in schools across campus. For example, the criteria with which to evaluate a philosophy didactic class should be different from the criteria to evaluate a nursing clinical experience or a dental clinical experience.
- ◆ Because my area (music) has a lot of individual instruction of applied music, as well as several ensemble classes, the questions applied to much classroom instruction would not be applicable to our situation.
- ◆ **Student evaluations are already used like consumer reports on their quality of service at Best Buy. Departments have differing needs, concerns, and interests regarding student evaluations. A standardized form that makes college experience and P & T even more cookie cutter is the last thing we need.**
- ◆ The teaching methodologies that we use at our department are very unique. I do not believe that a university-wide SET instrument will be of any use whatsoever to evaluate the classes we teach. The SET initiative is a huge waste of money and resources that will provide no benefits to anybody. I am completely opposed to it.
- ◆ **program variation. student grade in course prior to use of any instrument stem item validity**
- ◆ Given the variability across departments, it is unclear what the point of a university-wide student evaluation would be.
- ◆ I am concerned that it will not be appropriate for non-traditional courses, such as labs, workshops, research, etc
- ◆ Potential biases on the basis of race-ethnicity, gender, nationality, etc.
- ◆ My major concern is that we do not focus on the right things. The questions that are in a common instrument communicate what we value. It would be much better to ask questions about the Baccalaureate Objectives. So are we going to value a clear syllabus or value for diversity? Or written and oral communication? Or ethics?
- ◆ Policy regarding use of these data- no matter how good the instrument is, how do you compare the feedback from classes with very rigorous standards versus an "easier" class? If a class is very difficult (and that's not a bad thing, is it?), poorly performing students may take it out on the instructor during the evaluation, no matter what the questions are.
- ◆ A standardized instrument does not capture the varied pedagogical foci that different disciplines demand, so it seems other than very generalized questions that may not ultimately provide any real value, that the instrument is flawed to begin with. Also of concern is that this is yet one more move that the university is making toward standardization and that bothers me and many other faculty. We have a standardized test for general education and now for SET

Negative-standardization is inappropriate

- ◆ It represents a dangerous trend of standardizing assessment and curriculum.

Negative-validity-use psychometric term

- ◆ Internal validity [*Note: It is not clear that “internal validity” is negative.*]
- ◆ The instrument will not be valid, even with validation efforts; there is no good reason for doing it; takes away departmental/faculty flexibility; will create more work for departments who have already spent a lot of time on good evaluation instruments and policies
- ◆ program variation. student grade in course prior to use of any instrument stem item validity
- ◆ The appropriate interpretation of the scores. Student evaluations should not necessarily be considered a true reflection of student learning.
- ◆ program variation. student grade in course prior to use of any instrument stem item validity
- ◆ These evaluations must not be used to compare faculty in one department to faculty in another department. Such comparisons are not valid because of differences in disciplines. These data must not be used in isolation to determine tenure and promotion decisions. Departments with well-established sets of SET instruments need to be able to continue their use so that comparisons between old and new data can be made. Students should not be forced to fill out evaluations online. If they don't bother coming to class regularly, their input should not be included, or should be included separately.
- ◆ I am concerned about the validity and reliability of the instrument, and about the uses of the instrument later on. In particular, it could be that the instrument is a valid and reliable measure of student satisfaction with the course, but that does not mean that it is at the same time a valid measure of teaching effectiveness.
- ◆ Just because a question is valid does not mean that it's useful toward pedagogical improvement; conversely, questions that are quite pedagogically useful may not be statistically valid!
- ◆ I have two very major concerns: 1. Pilot testing must include a component of external validity. Instruments validated simply through basic factor analysis may provide insight into how particular questions load on given factors, but this provides no information at all as to whether these instruments hold any meaning in the real world. In other words, if such an instrument validation effort were to occur, it should validate not simply whether an instrument is internally consistent (e.g., the same person gets about the same value), but also has some actual meaning (e.g., students taught by professors with higher SET scores tend to get higher paying jobs). 2. While I appreciate the efforts the school is making at validating such an instrument, it is extraordinarily difficult for me to believe that SIUE is not reinventing the wheel. Surely, the committee does not seriously believe that such validation studies, on instruments at other universities, have not already been conducted? I am significantly concerned that the school is pointlessly wasting money on creating an instrument, when realistically, it seems likely we could use an already validated one. This isn't my area of expertise, so i could be wrong, but I would be willing to be that it has not only been done, but that a large percentage of other universities have also pointlessly reinvented the same wheel, for the same reasons (e.g., but our school is somehow different).
- ◆ That the instrument be validated, and that neither an instructor's "numbers" alone nor an individual number from a set of evals be used to make personnel decisions.

Negative-validity-SET does not assess teacher quality

- ◆ There is a tendency to judge the quality of teaching provided by an instructor according to student evaluations. This, I think, is a terrible mistake; multiple considerations should factor in to such a judgment (peer review of classroom teaching, syllabi, types of assignments e.g.). One fear that I have then is that a new SET instrument will exacerbate the mistaken view that student evaluations are the only or even the best way of assessing quality of teaching. In this light it is good to see the question about policy to govern administrators' use of the instrument.
- ◆ I think it is misguided to have students assessing teaching.
- ◆ The more general the survey, the less helpful.
- ◆ It seems to me that a standardized form indicates that the university has completely lost sight of what student course evaluations are for (that is, for the teacher to reflect upon her/his pedagogy based on student commentary and response so that she/he can make productive changes to pedagogy for the benefit of future students, the course, the department, the university). A standardized form, given its easy comparative potential among individual faculty members w/o regard to diversity (identity, subject, pedagogical approach) runs a serious risk of increasing the number of faculty members who specifically cater to pedagogies that will result in mere achievement of higher numbers on evaluations, and not more effective teaching. The numbers that would result from such a universal standard would be worse than meaningless.
- ◆ Student Evaluation of my teaching as a faculty is an insult on my Ph.D qualification. Faculty Senate can do a better job in evaluating faculty teaching that is independent of students or where student input should contribute less than 10%.
- ◆ The appropriate interpretation of the scores. Student evaluations should not necessarily be considered a true reflection of student learning.
- ◆ the information generated will not relate to teaching quality but to adherence to administrative rules (which should be enforced at the dept. level)
- ◆ Whether the evaluation purpose is to improve teaching approaches or punitive

Negative-improper use of data

- ◆ Assuring anonymity is maintained and that the respondents' perception of anonymity is not compromised. Striking the right balance of how the data can be used. If too restrictive, it may easily render the information useless for evaluative purposes; too open, and the data could be used improperly and unethically. Permitting enough flexibility in administering the instrument to allow units to conduct the process properly, but without substantial burdens. For example, Department Chairs should be able to allow the instrument to be administered other than just during the 14th week (week-end course; 10-week graduate courses; end of year project conflicts, etc.).
- ◆ Use on the data from evaluations.
- ◆ I would like to see pre-post differences of evaluations currently conducted of core, required, and "disliked" classes as they may be currently evaluated (optional review by students regularly attending) and the suggested new methods (as I understand it a 100% evaluation including students who are doing very poorly and those who do not regularly attend the class). Beyond the potential for this to be used now, openly, in the future, or under the table by administration to compare programs, departments, and schools I am

most concerned of how this procedure may result in lower teaching evaluations than methods used at peer institutes.

- ◆ How would the administration or a school's personnel committee use the results of the data obtained from SET?
- ◆ I'm concerned about how the data will be used. I'm also worried that the instrument will be worthless.
- ◆ First and foremost, the potential use of data to compare programs and potentially pit them against each other. Every program is uniquely structured in terms of its course offerings (service courses, major/professional courses, graduate courses, etc) as well as its respective enrollments across these categories, which in turn has an effect on evaluation results. Standardized results that are comparable across programs will not reflect course offering variables from program to program. The purpose of student evaluations of teaching should be to meaningfully identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas of improvement for individual faculty, and nothing more. I feel that any policy governing the use of data must reflect this. Second, continuity between existing and new questions in regard to presenting longitudinal trends in teaching effectiveness. The potential exists for new SET questions to be worded differently enough to affect comparability, yet similarly enough to obviate asking nearly the same question again for the sake of preserving continuity. This in turn would put an additional burden on all faculty to explain any continuity issues in annual reviews, retention documents, and tenure and promotion documents. I would much prefer a standard set of *guidelines* for programs to follow, adapt, and refine according to each program's unique circumstances, rather than a standardized top-down approach.
- ◆ Use of data
- ◆ How data are used. In my opinion, SET should be used for continuous teaching improvement.
- ◆ 1) The way in which the Administration uses the data. I want the data not to be used in capricious and arbitrary ways that are inappropriate to the way in which the data are gathered, or inconsistent with best practices regarding the analysis of the data. 2) Procedures governing the release of data. Since course evaluations are personnel records, they should not be released to the general university community. If the data ever are released, they need to be anonymized such that individual faculty cannot be pinpointed
- ◆ How administrators and personnel committees will use the data
- ◆ The concern for how this evaluation will be used, now or further down the road, is paramount. There is a faculty morale issue here.
- ◆ how the data is used is essential. will the data be used to evaluate faculty members for merit or tenure, for example?

Negative-improper use of data-tenure promotion

- ◆ Too much reliance on using SET in PT
- ◆ I don't see how basic questions like "Do you provide a syllabus?" can adequately address the deeper issue of the "Ethics of Teaching." And are students really qualified to assess the "Ethics of Teaching?" Also, I'm concerned as to how this new instrument will be used for promotion and tenure decisions and how the same instrument can evaluate teaching in the sciences with teaching in the arts, for example.

- ◆ I do not believe that students are qualified to evaluate instructors. Their comments are helpful for adjusting teaching style, but they are only that: comments. Student evaluations should never be used in promotion and tenure decisions.
- ◆ Student evaluations are already used like consumer reports on their quality of service at Best Buy. Departments have differing needs, concerns, and interests regarding student evaluations. A standardized form that makes college experience and P & T even more cookie cutter is the last thing we need.
- ◆ At best these are opinion surveys and there is no reason to believe students are answering truthfully. They are not harmless. If they are tied in any way to salary or P&T, they inevitably and predictably add to grade inflation and dumbing down of course content.
- ◆ Regardless of policies, SET will be used as primary if not only one factor in faculty evaluation by administration (by chairs and deans and so on). I have seen this happen. Even though we already have a clear policy statement on this. People will just not want to take the time to go extra mile and SET is easy to access.
- ◆ SETs are profoundly over-used in academe. They are very important and it is crucial that we use them. But more and more they are used as the sole determinant of teaching quality. Like all measurement instruments, they are imperfect and of only limited scope. It is very important that a SET policy include a statement about limitations to the use of the instrument and that an overall limitation on SET impact be enacted. E.g., a policy that "at most 60% of the assessment of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness may be based on student evaluations; the remainder must rely on other assessment instruments" would be very valuable. This is just an off-the-cuff example of the sort of thing I'd like to see, but it is crucial: I've seen far too many cases in which this instrument was relied on exclusively, which is unacceptable in my view.
- ◆ These evaluations must not be used to compare faculty in one department to faculty in another department. Such comparisons are not valid because of differences in disciplines. These data must not be used in isolation to determine tenure and promotion decisions. Departments with well-established sets of SET instruments need to be able to continue their use so that comparisons between old and new data can be made. Students should not be forced to fill out evaluations online. If they don't bother coming to class regularly, their input should not be included, or should be included separately.
- ◆ That the instrument be validated, and that neither an instructor's "numbers" alone nor an individual number from a set of evals be used to make personnel decisions.
- ◆ SET results should not be used for P&T evaluation

Negative-improper use of data- students' misuse/misunderstanding of SET

- ◆ My most important concern has to do with the purpose of the SET. I am not sure what involvement I want students to have, if I do not know the purpose. There is a difference between a purpose of authentically measuring if an instructor has reached the university's stated goals, and a purpose of measuring if the students feel if their instructor has reached the university's stated goals. Student efficacy about their learning and teacher effectiveness is two different things. It would be wise for this committee to first agree upon the purpose of the SET. Some students do not even know the purpose - they think that it is a forum for them to voice their frustrations, complaints, and often do so with disregard for the feelings of the instructor, and a lack of compassion for the instructor. They feel vindicated by "trashing" an instructor and are not proactive in solving

problems. This is the major issue with the SET's use as a factor of instructor effectiveness. A SET should be written to be as broad as possible.

- ◆ I think it is misguided to have students assessing teaching.
- ◆ I don't see how basic questions like "Do you provide a syllabus?" can adequately address the deeper issue of the "Ethics of Teaching." And are students really qualified to assess the "Ethics of Teaching?" Also, I'm concerned as to how this new instrument will be used for promotion and tenure decisions and how the same instrument can evaluate teaching in the sciences with teaching in the arts, for example.
- ◆ I do not believe that students are qualified to evaluate instructors. Their comments are helpful for adjusting teaching style, but they are only that: comments. Student evaluations should never be used in promotion and tenure decisions.
- ◆ At best these are opinion surveys and there is no reason to believe students are answering truthfully. They are not harmless. If they are tied in any way to salary or P&T, they inevitably and predictably add to grade inflation and dumbing down of course content.
- ◆ Student Evaluation of my teaching as a faculty is an insult on my Ph.D qualification. Faculty Senate can do a better job in evaluating faculty teaching that is independent of students or where student input should contribute less than 10%.
- ◆ The SETs don't consistently assess the quality of the teaching. Instead students use the SETs to voice anger over not getting an A or not being excused from class when they go on vacations, for example. If the questions on the SETs would be objective and not open-ended that might help.
- ◆ Students don't always know "how" to evaluate a faculty member. Too often a student can hold a grudge for what they perceive as infractions and ding a faculty member because they didn't get the outcome they wanted -- instead of what they earned. Personally, I've reduced me level of expectations just to encourage better reviews.
- ◆ That the instrument will be used as the sole basis for teaching performance evaluation. A policy on the use of SET in annual reviews needs to be established
- ◆ I am concerned that random comments by poor students who are forced to take my subject may reflect incorrectly on my teaching. One colleague has called student teacher evaluations "Drive-by shootings." I tend to agree. On a lighter note, I cannot read many student comments on the current computer forms because they use light pencil on a darkly printed background decoration. I would suggest much easier to read instruments.
- ◆ No department and no administration should take evaluations of teachers by their students seriously as long as their identities' remain anonymous. Students must be held accountable for their remarks, positive or negative. They learn which buttons to push to get a teacher in trouble--which remarks to write to get the negative attention of the administration. It is common knowledge that students who do not get the grade they think they deserve often use evaluations to retaliate. They fill out evaluation forms at the height of tension of the semester, during the last weeks, when final projects are due and final exams are eminent. I cannot think of an instance when a student who earned an A or a B complained about a teacher. Perhaps 400 or 500 level students are more mature and may be more knowledgeable about pedagogy than underclassmen, but they, even moreso, know precisely what to say if they want revenge. And believe me, too many of our students think they deserve A's or B's, even when they admit that they have never been proficient in particular areas, such as writing, math or history. It doesn't matter to them--so many of them have been raised to expect to be rewarded for just showing up and doing

their work, no matter the quality. They are entitled--no two ways about it. And today, with helicopter parents at the helm, the pressure is smothering. The students feel they are worth the highest grade possible, and their parents reinforce this. I have students who, after I return assignments or exams, get on

- ◆ they phone immediately as they leave the classroom to tell Mom or Dad what the teacher "did" to them. The fear of student evaluation results also cause teachers to teach to that evaluation, and how best to deal with that but to lessen the load, and lower the standards one more time. It is not worth the aggravation or the stress to be an excellent, hard working teacher in an atmosphere that caters to students' whims and whines. How humiliating is it to be told that most of the students think I'm the greatest thing since the X-box, but 5% of my students believe I should be fired immediately? One of them claims I am sexist, another says I am racist and another writes that I favor pretty boys or maybe pretty girls over the others. How about the favorite: she talks about "inappropriate things"? Where does it end? All of these remarks can (and should) be swept under the rug, until the chair interrogates us and questions our integrity. I recall one department demanding that our evaluations ALL average "excellent" scores, even though the same was never expected of the students! Shouldn't it be the other way around? Student evaluations always need to be taken with a grain of salt and should never be held against any teacher. And teachers should be allowed to confront their accusers, just as any US citizen is allowed in our judicial system.

Negative-good measures already in place

- ◆ I use a simple form I've designed myself. (I'm a tenured full professor, and the evaluations are mostly useful to me myself-- i.e. not as important for purposes of supervisory review.) My most important concern is that I be allowed to continue using the form that I myself have devised, which is extremely useful to me. I find quantitative measures useless in these matters, and would hate to be required to apply them by some University mandate.
- ◆ We strongly believe, in our department, that we have developed and are using an excellent evaluation instrument which meets our needs.
- ◆ This SET nonsense is an attempt to standardize what doesn't need to be standardized. The departments do a good job with their student evaluations without the help of a higher agency. The departments know what they need to find out about teaching. They are professionals and don't need your help. Just because some other universities do it doesn't mean we have to. Bureaucracy at SIUE is bad enough: This worsens it.

Neutral-suggestions

- ◆ Having useful questions that provide useful feedback to the faculty and administrators
- ◆ My most important concern has to do with the purpose of the SET. I am not sure what involvement I want students to have, if I do not know the purpose. There is a difference between a purpose of authentically measuring if an instructor has reached the university's stated goals, and a purpose of measuring if the students feel if their instructor has reached the university's stated goals. Student efficacy about their learning and teacher effectiveness is two different things. It would be wise for this committee to first agree upon the purpose of the SET. Some students do not even know the purpose - they think that it is a forum for them to voice their frustrations, complaints, and often do so with

disregard for the feelings of the instructor, and a lack of compassion for the instructor. They feel vindicated by "trashing" an instructor and are not proactive in solving problems. This is the major issue with the SETs use as a factor of instructor effectiveness. A SET should be written to be as broad as possible.

- ◆ The the rigor and difficulty of a course will not result in a lower teacher evaluation and that the ease of a course will not result in a higher evaluation.
- ◆ That the items are SENSIBLE, RATIONAL, and represent INTELLECTUAL quality of course work. Too many questionnaires do not assess the intellectual value and quality of the course, but rather measure if the student is 'happy' in the class. There should be a way to tap into quality of learning vs. how difficult the material is or how much work the student has to put into the class.
- ◆ I want an instrument that is not too labor intensive for students, but that will still provide the information that I need.
- ◆ I'm surprised that so many questions and 'testing/vetting' is being suggested. This is done all over the country. I can't imagine it needs to be constructed from scratch as these questions are implying.
- ◆ I would like to see pre-post differences of evaluations currently conducted of core, required, and "disliked" classes as they may be currently evaluated (optional review by students regularly attending) and the suggested new methods (as I understand it a 100% evaluation including students who are doing very poorly and those who do not regularly attend the class). Beyond the potential for this to be used now, openly, in the future, or under the table by administration to compare programs, departments, and schools I am most concerned of how this procedure may result in lower teaching evaluations than methods used at peer institutes.
- ◆ Generating items that reflect the most important areas of evaluation from both student and instructor perspectives. Also coming up with the most parsimonious sets of items so that students are more likely to complete the evaluations and take them seriously.
- ◆ A majority of students need to fill them out for the process to be worthwhile.
- ◆ One set of student evaluations should address classes training students to become professionals--nursing, pharmacy, teachers, and in addition to those CAS programs that are heavily involved in teacher certification. Than another set for classes that are germane to graduation, etc. but do not wholly pertain to the student's career as such. Thanks for all your hard work.
- ◆ First and foremost, the potential use of data to compare programs and potentially pit them against each other. Every program is uniquely structured in terms of its course offerings (service courses, major/professional courses, graduate courses, etc) as well as its respective enrollments across these categories, which in turn has an effect on evaluation results. Standardized results that are comparable across programs will not reflect course offering variables from program to program. The purpose of student evaluations of teaching should be to meaningfully identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas of improvement for individual faculty, and nothing more. I feel that any policy governing the use of data must reflect this. Second, continuity between existing and new questions in regard to presenting longitudinal trends in teaching effectiveness. The potential exists for new SET questions to be worded differently enough to affect comparability, yet similarly enough to obviate asking nearly the same question again for the sake of preserving continuity. This in turn would put an additional burden on all faculty to

explain any continuity issues in annual reviews, retention documents, and tenure and promotion documents. I would much prefer a standard set of *guidelines* for programs to follow, adapt, and refine according to each program's unique circumstances, rather than a standardized top-down approach.

- ◆ 1) gathering consistent and comparable data across university schools and departments; 2) valid instrument to ensure that the data measures what it purports to measure; 3) appropriate use of data to support measures of teaching effectiveness in various administrative contexts; 4) design of instrument suitable for reflexive improvement of teaching, not just numbers to place in categories for salary and promotion.
- ◆ I just want the process to be transparent. The history claims that the initiative came from the senate curriculum committee but the Provost went to the curriculum senate committee and told them to take up this task. This annoys me and makes me resistant. If the provost came out and discussed his concerns and admitted that this began from the Administration, I would feel less upset.
- ◆ Student and faculty input and transparency of the development and use process, whatever it turns out to be.
- ◆ I would like to see that this is more of a faculty-driven effort than a student-driven effort. While I believe student input is useful, SETs have very important implications for faculty career success.
- ◆ I do not know what kind of items will be on the SETs but I worry about my student evaluations getting quite lengthy. The quantitative part of my student evaluations is already typically 20-25 items.
- ◆ I think having reliable, validated, useful questions is extremely important, as is having clear guidelines on the use of the information. Student input is helpful in making sure the form is understandable to students and considering issues of participation.
- ◆ SETs are profoundly over-used in academe. They are very important and it is crucial that we use them. But more and more they are used as the sole determinant of teaching quality. Like all measurement instruments, they are imperfect and of only limited scope. It is very important that a SET policy include a statement about limitations to the use of the instrument and that an overall limitation on SET impact be enacted. E.g., a policy that "at most 60% of the assessment of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness may be based on student evaluations; the remainder must rely on other assessment instruments" would be very valuable. This is just an off-the-cuff example of the sort of thing I'd like to see, but it is crucial: I've seen far too many cases in which this instrument was relied on exclusively, which is unacceptable in my view.
- ◆ Having a flexible instrument that tends itself to modifications in line with course/discipline.
- ◆ I have two very major concerns: 1. Pilot testing must include a component of external validity. Instruments validated simply through basic factor analysis may provide insight into how particular questions load on given factors, but this provides no information at all as to whether these instruments hold any meaning in the real world. In other words, if such an instrument validation effort were to occur, it should validate not simply whether an instrument is internally consistent (e.g., the same person gets about the same value), but also has some actual meaning (e.g., students taught by professors with higher SET scores tend to get higher paying jobs). 2. While I appreciate the efforts the school is making at validating such an instrument, it is extraordinarily difficult for me to believe

that SIUE is not reinventing the wheel. Surely, the committee does not seriously believe that such validation studies, on instruments at other universities, have not already been conducted? I am significantly concerned that the school is pointlessly wasting money on creating an instrument, when realistically, it seems likely we could use an already validated one. This isn't my area of expertise, so I could be wrong, but I would be willing to bet that it has not only been done, but that a large percentage of other universities have also pointlessly reinvented the same wheel, for the same reasons (e.g., but our school is somehow different).

- ◆ Concerned that so much "input" is required such that nothing ever gets done. A uniform instrument would be very useful. I would even be happy with purchasing a nationally validated instrument
- ◆ It would be helpful if the committee would clearly indicate the reasons for having such an instrument, beyond the mention that it was at the behest of the Provost's Office and the Faculty Senate. I.e. why are we aiming to do this.
- ◆ To vote if we really want to keep it or not!
- ◆ That non-tenure track people will be left out of the process.
- ◆ Faculty not involved and/or allowed to vote to do or not to do
- ◆ I distrust the agenda behind the development of SET. And I am skeptical of standardized assessment of teaching across diverse areas of study, types of courses, and class levels. I would welcome the involvement of students in the development of the instrument because it's clear to me that the questions on the current instrument are misinterpreted by students (or at least not interpreted in the similar ways by most students).
- ◆ SETs are most valuable when they are specific to the discipline and particular course. I do not feel the need for a university-wide SET. Such a policy seems to be more useful in making the administration feel comfortable than in actually helping students and faculty.
- ◆ Assuring anonymity is maintained and that the respondents' perception of anonymity is not compromised. Striking the right balance of how the data can be used. If too restrictive, it may easily render the information useless for evaluative purposes; too open, and the data could be used improperly and unethically. Permitting enough flexibility in administering the instrument to allow units to conduct the process properly, but without substantial burdens. For example, Department Chairs should be able to allow the instrument to be administered other than just during the 14th week (week-end course; 10-week graduate courses; end of year project conflicts, etc.).
- ◆ a paper-based SET is not a good idea. It should be an online, anonymous procedure. Also, there should be room for department-internal modifications, particularly for large departments which have multiple (and sometimes quite different) sub-programs. While I agree that there should be some university-wide question types, the wide diversity of course types and course modes at SIUE should allow for department-internal modification
- ◆ Assuring that actual and perceived anonymity of the respondents are not compromised. Focusing on salient factors that students have the ability to assess. That "how the data is used" is not diluted to the point of rendering it useless yet restricted enough so it is neither abused or used inappropriately.

Appendix G: Content Validity Survey Information

Overview of Process and Findings

During the Fall 2010 semester, the SET Sub-committee on Research Design and Validation sought feedback from faculty, faculty-administrators, and students regarding the importance and clarity of proposed student evaluation of teaching items. The survey of faculty included as many as 203 respondents¹⁶ who hold tenure-track and tenured faculty appointments (47.6% response rate). These faculty members do not hold official administrative appointments. Faculty-administrators include chairs, assistant/associate deans, deans, provost-level administrators. The final sample from this group included 64 respondents (86% response rate). The survey of students was announced once and made available for one week. It was administered to SIUE campus email accounts. The final sample size for students was 935 students. Of course, for all groups, some questions have different numbers of respondents.

The primary purpose of this survey was to provide a validity check by asking faculty members to assess the extent to which the proposed items measured the concepts intended by the ethics of instruction or the concepts identified in the literature. Additionally, an important aspect of these surveys was to understand the extent to which students thought the proposed items were clear. Ultimately, students must understand the items in order for the measures to be most effective.

These findings were critical in narrowing the list of potential items into a manageable core SET instrument. Additionally, the qualitative findings helped the committee to refine the wording of some items for greater clarity and relevance. Summary tables from the survey follow:

¹⁶ Not all respondents finished the survey nor did they answer every question.

Faculty.SET.10.27.10 [Edit](#)

Default Report + Add Report

Response Summary

Total Started Survey: 203
Total Completed Survey: 182 (89.7%)

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. In general, to what extent do you support the implementation of a university-wide core student evaluation of teaching (SET) instrument? (By core, we mean that colleges/schools, departments and individual faculty could supplement the instrument with other quantitative or qualitative questions.) [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	I do not support it all			I support it somewhat			I support it very much	Rating Average	Response Count
	12.7% (22)	9.8% (17)	2.9% (5)	17.3% (30)	12.1% (21)	17.9% (31)	27.2% (47)	4.69	173
	answered question								173
	skipped question								30

2. Please rate the importance you place on each of the following factors in your willingness to support the implementation of a university-wide core SET. [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all important			somewhat important			very important	Rating Average	Response Count
Faculty involvement in the development of SET policies.	1.0% (2)	0.5% (1)	1.0% (2)	5.5% (11)	2.5% (5)	15.1% (30)	74.4% (148)	6.51	199
Faculty involvement in the development of the instrument.	1.0% (2)	1.0% (2)	0.5% (1)	4.5% (9)	4.0% (8)	16.7% (33)	72.2% (143)	6.48	198
Student involvement in the development of SET policies.	14.1% (28)	10.6% (21)	9.6% (19)	21.7% (43)	13.1% (26)	11.1% (22)	19.7% (39)	4.21	198
Student involvement in the development of the instrument.	14.1% (28)	10.1% (20)	8.6% (17)	22.2% (44)	13.1% (26)	13.1% (26)	18.7% (37)	4.24	198
Rigorous pilot testing with validation efforts.	1.5% (3)	2.5% (5)	1.0% (2)	8.0% (16)	6.5% (13)	20.1% (40)	60.3% (120)	6.17	199
Testing to assess potential biases on the basis of factors such as race, gender, etc.	3.5% (7)	2.0% (4)	2.0% (4)	11.6% (23)	7.5% (15)	20.1% (40)	53.3% (106)	5.91	199
Development of a clear policy to govern SIUE administrators/personnel committees' use of data.	1.5% (3)	1.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	3.5% (7)	5.1% (10)	12.1% (24)	76.8% (152)	6.53	198
Development of clear policies to govern the administration of the SET.	1.0% (2)	1.5% (3)	0.5% (1)	5.0% (10)	6.0% (12)	16.1% (32)	69.8% (139)	6.41	199
	answered question								199
	skipped question								4

3. Please describe your most important concerns:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	80
answered question	80
skipped question	123

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethics of Instruction #1 and #2: "To inform students early in the term, by means of syllabi or other written statements, of planned course coverage, required textbooks and an approximate schedule of assignments." "To inform students early in the term, by means of syllabi or other written statements, of the grading policy to be used, including a description of the relative weight to be assigned to different activities and of attendance requirements, if any." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethics of instruction stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The course requirements were clearly communicated in the syllabus.	2.2% (4)	2.2% (4)	3.2% (6)	17.7% (33)	12.9% (24)	22.0% (41)	39.8% (74)	5.62	186
The syllabus provided the information needed to succeed in the class.	20.0% (37)	8.1% (15)	13.0% (24)	19.5% (36)	8.1% (15)	14.1% (26)	17.3% (32)	3.99	185
	answered question								186
	skipped question								17

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	41
answered question	41
skipped question	162

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethic of Instruction #3: "To announce and adhere to a schedule of office hours which permits and encourages students to meet with the instructor in his/her office and to be available for special conferences as needed." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethic of instruction stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor was available to help students outside of class.	11.0% (20)	6.6% (12)	2.7% (5)	18.1% (33)	11.0% (20)	17.0% (31)	33.5% (61)	4.97	182
The instructor seemed willing to help students outside of class.	20.8% (38)	12.6% (23)	6.0% (11)	11.5% (21)	16.4% (30)	14.8% (27)	18.0% (33)	4.07	183
	answered question								183
	skipped question								20

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	52
answered question	52
skipped question	151

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethic of Instruction #4: "To attend promptly and fully each class meeting; to obtain permission from the chair in advance when class must be missed (except in cases of emergency); and when possible to provide an alternate instructor who has been given directions concerning planned class activities." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethic of instruction stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor attended class meetings promptly and fully.	8.2% (15)	7.1% (13)	7.1% (13)	17.4% (32)	14.7% (27)	17.9% (33)	27.7% (51)	4.88	184
The instructor fully devoted each class period to facilitating student learning.	16.7% (30)	7.2% (13)	11.7% (21)	16.1% (29)	14.4% (26)	17.2% (31)	16.7% (30)	4.23	180
	answered question								185
	skipped question								18

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	43
answered question	43
skipped question	160

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethic of Instruction #6: "To return student work promptly except when announcement has been made to the class that work will not be returned (although such work should be available for student examination) and to retain any unreturned student work for at least one term." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethic of instruction stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor provided timely feedback on student work (exams, assignments, creative activities, etc.).	4.0% (7)	5.6% (10)	4.0% (7)	14.7% (26)	15.8% (28)	20.9% (37)	35.0% (62)	5.36	177
The instructor returned student work in a reasonable amount of time.	10.1% (18)	8.9% (16)	7.8% (14)	17.9% (32)	17.3% (31)	16.8% (30)	21.2% (38)	4.59	179
	answered question								180
	skipped question								23

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	32
answered question	32
skipped question	171

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethic of Instruction #7: "To provide the student at his/her request with appropriate and helpful written and/or oral explanations for assigned grades and other evaluated work." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethic of instruction stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor provided useful feedback on student work (exams, assignments, creative activities, etc.).	3.4% (6)	3.4% (6)	4.0% (7)	15.3% (27)	20.9% (37)	26.6% (47)	26.6% (47)	5.33	177
The instructor provided helpful feedback on student work.	4.0% (7)	4.5% (8)	7.9% (14)	22.0% (39)	19.2% (34)	26.6% (47)	15.8% (28)	4.91	177
	answered question								178
	skipped question								25

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	29
answered question	29
skipped question	174

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethic of Instruction #8: "To provide teaching and learning experiences that are free of favoritism, prejudice, discrimination, or harassment." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethic of instruction stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The methods of evaluating my work were fair.	14.2% (25)	12.5% (22)	6.3% (11)	15.3% (27)	16.5% (29)	16.5% (29)	18.8% (33)	4.32	176
The instructor treated students fairly.	12.5% (22)	11.9% (21)	6.3% (11)	12.5% (22)	13.6% (24)	25.6% (45)	17.6% (31)	4.50	176
	answered question								176
	skipped question								27

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	41
answered question	41
skipped question	162

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. Effective instructors are generally well-organized and prepared. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the characteristics of effective teaching stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all		moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count	
The class was well-organized.	3.4% (6)	8.4% (15)	2.2% (4)	13.4% (24)	15.1% (27)	24.0% (43)	33.5% (60)	5.35	179
The instructor was prepared for class.	3.4% (6)	6.7% (12)	2.2% (4)	11.2% (20)	11.2% (20)	26.3% (47)	39.1% (70)	5.55	179
	answered question							179	
	skipped question							24	

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	21
answered question	21
skipped question	182

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. Effective instructors generally work toward positive teacher-student interaction or rapport. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the characteristic of effective teaching stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all		moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count	
The instructor was responsive to student questions.	3.4% (6)	4.5% (8)	6.7% (12)	12.8% (23)	14.0% (25)	22.9% (41)	35.8% (64)	5.41	179
The instructor created a supportive learning environment.	7.3% (13)	3.9% (7)	5.6% (10)	14.0% (25)	12.3% (22)	23.5% (42)	33.5% (60)	5.25	179
	answered question							179	
	skipped question							24	

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	23
answered question	23
skipped question	180

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. Effective instructors are generally clear and communicate effectively. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the characteristic of effective teaching stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor cleared up points of confusion.	4.5% (8)	8.5% (15)	10.2% (18)	23.9% (42)	11.9% (21)	17.6% (31)	23.3% (41)	4.76	176
The instructor explained difficult material clearly.	4.0% (7)	8.6% (15)	4.6% (8)	16.0% (28)	12.0% (21)	26.3% (46)	28.6% (50)	5.17	175
	answered question								176
	skipped question								27

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	31
answered question	31
skipped question	172

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. Effective instructors generally use techniques that help students learn. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the characteristic of effective teaching stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The in-class activities were useful in helping me learn.	5.6% (10)	8.4% (15)	9.0% (16)	19.7% (35)	15.2% (27)	18.0% (32)	24.2% (43)	4.81	178
The instructor used helpful teaching techniques.	8.4% (15)	10.7% (19)	10.1% (18)	16.3% (29)	18.5% (33)	17.4% (31)	18.5% (33)	4.52	178
The instructor used teaching strategies that enhanced my understanding of course content.	6.2% (11)	5.1% (9)	7.3% (13)	11.8% (21)	15.2% (27)	21.9% (39)	32.6% (58)	5.21	178
	answered question								179
	skipped question								24

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	34
answered question	34
skipped question	169

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. Effective instructors generally use effective activities and assignments. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the characteristic of effective teaching stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all well			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The requirements of the course enhanced my learning.	11.6% (20)	10.4% (18)	10.4% (18)	16.2% (28)	14.5% (25)	17.9% (31)	19.1% (33)	4.42	173
The activities/assignments were useful in helping me learn.	4.0% (7)	6.3% (11)	4.0% (7)	16.1% (28)	19.5% (34)	24.1% (42)	25.9% (45)	5.17	174
The activities/assignments supported my understanding of the course content.	5.2% (9)	6.9% (12)	4.0% (7)	17.2% (30)	17.8% (31)	20.7% (36)	28.2% (49)	5.10	174
	answered question								174
	skipped question								29

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	20
answered question	20
skipped question	183

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. Students generally have opinions about the overall effectiveness of instructors and courses. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure these "overall" opinions? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor was effective.	13.2% (23)	6.3% (11)	11.5% (20)	16.1% (28)	10.3% (18)	16.7% (29)	25.9% (45)	4.57	174
The course was effective.	15.5% (27)	8.6% (15)	11.5% (20)	20.1% (35)	9.8% (17)	16.1% (28)	18.4% (32)	4.22	174
	answered question								174
	skipped question								29

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	44
answered question	44
skipped question	159

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. It is often helpful to know some of the characteristics or experiences of the students who complete course evaluations. Please indicate which student characteristics you think should be measured on a student evaluation of teaching. [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	Should NOT be included	Should be included	Rating Average	Response Count
How much effort the student put into learning the course material.	17.1% (30)	82.9% (145)	1.83	175
The grade the student expects to receive in the course.	28.6% (50)	71.4% (125)	1.71	175
Whether the course is a required or elective course.	18.2% (32)	81.8% (144)	1.82	176
The student's year in school (freshman, sophomore, etc.).	24.0% (42)	76.0% (133)	1.76	175
		answered question		176
		skipped question		27

2. Are there any other student characteristics you think should be measured?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	41
answered question	41
skipped question	162

Admins.SET.10.27.10 [Edit](#)

Default Report [+ Add Report](#)

Response Summary

Total Started Survey: 64
Total Completed Survey: 60 (93.8%)

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. In general, to what extent do you support the implementation of a university-wide core student evaluation of teaching (SET) instrument? (By core, we mean that colleges/schools, departments and individual faculty could supplement the instrument with other quantitative or qualitative questions.) [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	I do not support it all			I support it somewhat			I support it very much	Rating Average	Response Count
	8.9% (4)	4.4% (2)	4.4% (2)	22.2% (10)	6.7% (3)	17.8% (8)	35.6% (16)	5.09	45
	answered question								45
	skipped question								19

2. Please rate the importance you place on each of the following factors in your willingness to support the implementation of a university-wide core SET. [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all important		somewhat important			very important	Rating Average	Response Count	
Faculty involvement in the development of SET policies.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.6% (1)	12.5% (8)	7.8% (5)	23.4% (15)	54.7% (35)	6.17	64
Faculty involvement in the development of the instrument.	0.0% (0)	1.6% (1)	7.9% (5)	3.2% (2)	9.5% (6)	19.0% (12)	58.7% (37)	6.13	63
Student involvement in the development of SET policies.	14.1% (9)	9.4% (6)	10.9% (7)	32.8% (21)	10.9% (7)	12.5% (8)	9.4% (6)	3.92	64
Student involvement in the development of the instrument.	14.3% (9)	15.9% (10)	15.9% (10)	17.5% (11)	14.3% (9)	11.1% (7)	11.1% (7)	3.79	63
Rigorous pilot testing with validation efforts.	1.6% (1)	3.1% (2)	1.6% (1)	9.4% (6)	14.1% (9)	21.9% (14)	48.4% (31)	5.91	64
Testing to assess potential biases on the basis of factors such as race, gender, etc.	6.3% (4)	7.8% (5)	1.6% (1)	12.5% (8)	6.3% (4)	25.0% (16)	40.6% (26)	5.42	64
Development of a clear policy to govern SIUE administrators/personnel committees' use of data.	0.0% (0)	1.6% (1)	3.1% (2)	12.5% (8)	12.5% (8)	15.6% (10)	54.7% (35)	6.02	64
Development of clear policies to govern the administration of the SET.	1.6% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	7.8% (5)	14.1% (9)	25.0% (16)	51.6% (33)	6.14	64
	answered question								64
	skipped question								0

3. Please describe your most important concerns:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	18
answered question	18
skipped question	46

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethics of Instruction #1 and #2: "To inform students early in the term, by means of syllabi or other written statements, of planned course coverage, required textbooks and an approximate schedule of assignments." "To inform students early in the term, by means of syllabi or other written statements, of the grading policy to be used, including a description of the relative weight to be assigned to different activities and of attendance requirements, if any." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethics of instruction stated above?

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The course requirements were clearly communicated in the syllabus.	3.3% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	19.7% (12)	9.8% (6)	23.0% (14)	44.3% (27)	5.79	61
The syllabus provided the information needed to succeed in the class.	18.3% (11)	15.0% (9)	6.7% (4)	23.3% (14)	5.0% (3)	13.3% (8)	18.3% (11)	3.95	60
	answered question								61
	skipped question								3

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	17
answered question	17
skipped question	47

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethic of Instruction #3: "To announce and adhere to a schedule of office hours which permits and encourages students to meet with the instructor in his/her office and to be available for special conferences as needed." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethic of instruction stated above?

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor was available to help students outside of class.	5.0% (3)	1.7% (1)	3.3% (2)	13.3% (8)	16.7% (10)	23.3% (14)	36.7% (22)	5.52	60
The instructor seemed willing to help students outside of class.	11.5% (7)	8.2% (5)	18.0% (11)	14.8% (9)	13.1% (8)	13.1% (8)	21.3% (13)	4.34	61
	answered question								61
	skipped question								3

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	15
answered question	15
skipped question	49

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethic of Instruction #4: "To attend promptly and fully each class meeting; to obtain permission from the chair in advance when class must be missed (except in cases of emergency); and when possible to provide an alternate instructor who has been given directions concerning planned class activities." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethic of instruction stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor attended class meetings promptly and fully.	10.0% (6)	11.7% (7)	6.7% (4)	23.3% (14)	8.3% (5)	15.0% (9)	25.0% (15)	4.53	60
The instructor fully devoted each class period to facilitating student learning.	14.8% (9)	11.5% (7)	9.8% (6)	16.4% (10)	9.8% (6)	18.0% (11)	19.7% (12)	4.28	61
	answered question								61
	skipped question								3

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	20
answered question	20
skipped question	44

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethic of Instruction #6: "To return student work promptly except when announcement has been made to the class that work will not be returned (although such work should be available for student examination) and to retain any unreturned student work for at least one term." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethic of instruction stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor provided timely feedback on student work (exams, assignments, creative activities, etc.).	3.3% (2)	6.6% (4)	6.6% (4)	13.1% (8)	14.8% (9)	21.3% (13)	34.4% (21)	5.31	61
The instructor returned student work in a reasonable amount of time.	6.7% (4)	5.0% (3)	13.3% (8)	25.0% (15)	15.0% (9)	11.7% (7)	23.3% (14)	4.65	60
	answered question								61
	skipped question								3

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	14
answered question	14
skipped question	50

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethic of Instruction #7: "To provide the student at his/her request with appropriate and helpful written and/or oral explanations for assigned grades and other evaluated work." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethic of instruction stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor provided useful feedback on student work (exams, assignments, creative activities, etc.).	5.0% (3)	8.3% (5)	6.7% (4)	8.3% (5)	13.3% (8)	23.3% (14)	35.0% (21)	5.27	60
The instructor provided helpful feedback on student work.	8.3% (5)	6.7% (4)	8.3% (5)	25.0% (15)	13.3% (8)	15.0% (9)	23.3% (14)	4.67	60
	answered question								60
	skipped question								4

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	13
answered question	13
skipped question	51

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. SIUE Ethic of Instruction #8: "To provide teaching and learning experiences that are free of favoritism, prejudice, discrimination, or harassment." If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the ethic of instruction stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The methods of evaluating my work were fair.	13.1% (8)	6.6% (4)	9.8% (6)	16.4% (10)	9.8% (6)	16.4% (10)	27.9% (17)	4.64	61
The instructor treated students fairly.	13.3% (8)	6.7% (4)	5.0% (3)	21.7% (13)	10.0% (6)	25.0% (15)	18.3% (11)	4.57	60
	answered question								61
	skipped question								3

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	21
answered question	21
skipped question	43

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. Effective instructors are generally well-organized and prepared. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the characteristics of effective teaching stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The class was well-organized.	6.6% (4)	0.0% (0)	6.6% (4)	14.8% (9)	14.8% (9)	21.3% (13)	36.1% (22)	5.39	61
The instructor was prepared for class.	3.3% (2)	6.6% (4)	1.6% (1)	18.0% (11)	13.1% (8)	19.7% (12)	37.7% (23)	5.41	61
	answered question								61
	skipped question								3

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	15
answered question	15
skipped question	49

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. Effective instructors generally work toward positive teacher-student interaction or rapport. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the characteristic of effective teaching stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor was responsive to student questions.	3.3% (2)	5.0% (3)	3.3% (2)	21.7% (13)	10.0% (6)	21.7% (13)	35.0% (21)	5.35	60
The instructor created a supportive learning environment.	8.3% (5)	5.0% (3)	8.3% (5)	15.0% (9)	10.0% (6)	21.7% (13)	31.7% (19)	5.05	60
	answered question								60
	skipped question								4

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	18
answered question	18
skipped question	46

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. Effective instructors are generally clear and communicate effectively. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the characteristic of effective teaching stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor cleared up points of confusion.	5.0% (3)	5.0% (3)	5.0% (3)	16.7% (10)	26.7% (16)	23.3% (14)	18.3% (11)	4.98	60
The instructor explained difficult material clearly.	3.3% (2)	1.7% (1)	6.7% (4)	25.0% (15)	5.0% (3)	25.0% (15)	33.3% (20)	5.35	60
	answered question								60
	skipped question								4

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	9
answered question	9
skipped question	55

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. Effective instructors generally use techniques that help students learn. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the characteristic of effective teaching stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The in-class activities were useful in helping me learn.	6.7% (4)	5.0% (3)	5.0% (3)	11.7% (7)	20.0% (12)	28.3% (17)	23.3% (14)	5.12	60
The instructor used helpful teaching techniques.	8.3% (5)	8.3% (5)	8.3% (5)	18.3% (11)	16.7% (10)	28.3% (17)	11.7% (7)	4.58	60
The instructor used teaching strategies that enhanced my understanding of course content.	1.7% (1)	6.7% (4)	5.0% (3)	15.0% (9)	13.3% (8)	23.3% (14)	35.0% (21)	5.42	60
	answered question								60
	skipped question								4

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	12
answered question	12
skipped question	52

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. Effective instructors generally use effective activities and assignments. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure the characteristic of effective teaching stated above? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all well			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The requirements of the course enhanced my learning.	14.0% (8)	8.8% (5)	8.8% (5)	26.3% (15)	21.1% (12)	12.3% (7)	8.8% (5)	4.04	57
The activities/assignments were useful in helping me learn.	0.0% (0)	3.5% (2)	5.3% (3)	22.8% (13)	14.0% (8)	21.1% (12)	33.3% (19)	5.44	57
The activities/assignments supported my understanding of the course content.	1.8% (1)	7.1% (4)	14.3% (8)	17.9% (10)	8.9% (5)	28.6% (16)	21.4% (12)	4.96	56
	answered question								57
	skipped question								7

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	10
answered question	10
skipped question	54

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE:

1. Students generally have opinions about the overall effectiveness of instructors and courses. If the following questionnaire items were included in a student teaching evaluation, how well would they measure these "overall" opinions? [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not well at all			moderately well			very well	Rating Average	Response Count
The instructor was effective.	15.5% (9)	6.9% (4)	6.9% (4)	20.7% (12)	13.8% (8)	20.7% (12)	15.5% (9)	4.34	58
The course was effective.	25.9% (15)	15.5% (9)	8.6% (5)	15.5% (9)	10.3% (6)	12.1% (7)	12.1% (7)	3.53	58
	answered question								59
	skipped question								5

2. Comments:

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	14
answered question	14
skipped question	50

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. It is often helpful to know some of the characteristics or experiences of the students who complete course evaluations. Please indicate which student characteristics you think should be measured on a student evaluation of teaching. [Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	Should NOT be included	Should be included	Rating Average	Response Count
How much effort the student put into learning the course material.	23.3% (14)	76.7% (46)	1.77	60
The grade the student expects to receive in the course.	46.7% (28)	53.3% (32)	1.53	60
Whether the course is a required or elective course.	33.3% (20)	66.7% (40)	1.67	60
The student's year in school (freshman, sophomore, etc.).	28.8% (17)	71.2% (42)	1.71	59
		answered question		60
		skipped question		4

2. Are there any other student characteristics you think should be measured?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	17
answered question	17
skipped question	47

SET.Student.10.27.10 [Edit](#)

Default Report + Add Report

Response Summary

Total Started Survey: 935
Total Completed Survey: 784 (83.9%)

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The course requirements were clearly communicated in the syllabus."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat			very		Rating Average	Response Count
How clear is this questionnaire item?	0.2% (2)	1.1% (10)	1.2% (11)	7.7% (72)	8.9% (83)	21.8% (203)	59.1% (550)	6.26	931
How important is this questionnaire item?	1.3% (12)	1.7% (16)	2.0% (18)	12.0% (110)	11.9% (109)	21.2% (195)	49.9% (459)	5.95	919
								answered question	934
								skipped question	1

2. Any comments? (Comments are optional.)

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	66
answered question	66
skipped question	869

3. "The syllabus provided the information needed to succeed in the class."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat			very		Rating Average	Response Count
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.8% (17)	1.9% (18)	3.5% (32)	16.0% (148)	13.8% (128)	19.1% (177)	43.9% (407)	5.71	927
How important is this questionnaire item?	2.6% (24)	4.9% (45)	5.6% (51)	13.6% (125)	12.6% (116)	20.0% (184)	40.6% (373)	5.51	918
								answered question	932
								skipped question	3

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	83
answered question	83
skipped question	852

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The instructor was available to help students outside of class."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all			somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count
How clear is this questionnaire item?	0.7% (6)	0.5% (4)	1.0% (9)	5.4% (48)	6.9% (61)	17.8% (157)	67.8% (599)	6.42	884
How important is this questionnaire item?	0.3% (3)	0.6% (5)	0.7% (6)	7.1% (62)	9.3% (82)	20.6% (181)	61.4% (540)	6.32	879
								answered question	887
								skipped question	48

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	59
answered question	59
skipped question	876

3. "The instructor seemed willing to help students outside of class."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all			somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.2% (11)	1.1% (10)	1.7% (15)	7.5% (66)	6.4% (57)	18.3% (162)	63.7% (563)	6.26	884
How important is this questionnaire item?	1.9% (17)	1.8% (16)	1.4% (12)	9.1% (80)	7.6% (67)	19.6% (172)	58.5% (513)	6.12	877
								answered question	887
								skipped question	48

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	77
answered question	77
skipped question	858

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The instructor attended class meetings promptly and fully."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all	somewhat	very	Rating Average	Response Count	
					answered question	863
					skipped question	72

1. "The instructor attended class meetings promptly and fully."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

How clear is this questionnaire item?	0.8% (7)	1.2% (10)	2.6% (22)	7.2% (62)	9.2% (79)	17.8% (153)	61.2% (525)	6.21	858
How important is this questionnaire item?	1.9% (16)	1.8% (15)	2.8% (24)	13.9% (119)	11.1% (95)	20.8% (178)	47.7% (408)	5.84	855
answered question									863
skipped question									72

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

		Response Count
 Show replies		79
answered question		79
skipped question		856

3. "The instructor fully devoted each class period to facilitating student learning."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all	somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count		
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.0% (9)	1.9% (16)	2.8% (24)	9.9% (85)	10.7% (92)	17.7% (152)	56.0% (482)	6.05	860
How important is this questionnaire item?	1.9% (16)	1.4% (12)	2.0% (17)	11.4% (98)	11.3% (97)	20.5% (176)	51.5% (441)	5.96	857
answered question									863
skipped question									72

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

		Response Count
 Show replies		65
answered question		65
skipped question		870

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The instructor provided timely feedback on student work (exams, assignments, creative activities, etc.)."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all	somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count		
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.2% (10)	0.8% (7)	0.7% (6)	4.4% (37)	6.1% (51)	16.0% (133)	70.7% (589)	6.44	833
How important is this questionnaire item?	1.0% (8)	0.7% (6)	0.2% (2)	4.3% (36)	6.7% (56)	19.8% (165)	67.2% (559)	6.43	832
answered question									836
skipped question									99

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	57
answered question	57
skipped question	878

3. "The instructor returned student work in a reasonable amount of time."

[Create Chart](#)

[Download](#)

	not at all			somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.2% (10)	1.3% (11)	1.8% (15)	6.7% (56)	8.9% (74)	17.0% (141)	63.1% (524)	6.24	831
How important is this questionnaire item?	1.0% (8)	1.2% (10)	1.4% (12)	9.3% (77)	9.0% (75)	19.6% (163)	58.5% (486)	6.17	831
								answered question	835
								skipped question	100

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	77
answered question	77
skipped question	858

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The instructor provided helpful feedback on student work."

[Create Chart](#)

[Download](#)

	not at all			somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.3% (11)	0.5% (4)	0.9% (7)	6.1% (50)	8.0% (65)	18.1% (148)	65.1% (532)	6.34	817
How important is this questionnaire item?	0.5% (4)	0.5% (4)	0.9% (7)	5.0% (41)	8.7% (71)	23.5% (191)	60.9% (496)	6.35	814
								answered question	818
								skipped question	117

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	31
answered question	31
skipped question	904

3. "The methods of evaluating my work were fair."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count	
How clear is this questionnaire item?	2.4% (20)	2.1% (17)	3.1% (25)	13.2% (108)	13.6% (111)	16.9% (138)	48.8% (399)	5.79	818
How important is this questionnaire item?	1.7% (14)	1.6% (13)	2.1% (17)	10.0% (82)	10.8% (88)	18.1% (148)	55.7% (455)	6.04	817
answered question								820	
skipped question								115	

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	67
answered question	67
skipped question	868

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The instructor treated students fairly."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count	
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.4% (11)	1.1% (9)	1.6% (13)	8.2% (66)	8.9% (72)	14.8% (120)	64.0% (518)	6.23	809
How important is this questionnaire item?	1.5% (12)	1.2% (10)	1.4% (11)	7.4% (60)	9.3% (75)	16.9% (136)	62.3% (503)	6.22	807
answered question								810	
skipped question								125	

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	46
answered question	46
skipped question	889

3. "The class was well-organized."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count	
How clear is this questionnaire item?	0.5% (4)	0.9% (7)	1.7% (14)	7.7% (62)	7.5% (61)	17.9% (145)	63.8% (516)	6.30	809
answered question								812	
skipped question								123	

3. "The class was well-organized."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

How important is this questionnaire item?	0.6% (5)	0.7% (6)	1.5% (12)	8.8% (71)	11.0% (89)	22.0% (178)	55.3% (447)	6.16	808
								answered question	812
								skipped question	123

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	
answered question	33
skipped question	902

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The instructor was prepared for class."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat		very	Rating Average	Response Count		
How clear is this questionnaire item?	0.4% (3)	0.3% (2)	0.5% (4)	3.4% (27)	5.8% (46)	15.8% (126)	73.9% (590)	6.57	798
How important is this questionnaire item?	0.6% (5)	0.8% (6)	1.3% (10)	4.9% (39)	8.4% (67)	20.1% (160)	63.9% (508)	6.36	795
								answered question	800
								skipped question	135

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	
answered question	20
skipped question	915

3. "The instructor was responsive to student questions."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat		very	Rating Average	Response Count		
How clear is this questionnaire item?	0.6% (5)	0.4% (3)	0.9% (7)	6.3% (50)	6.9% (55)	17.4% (139)	67.6% (540)	6.41	799
How important is this questionnaire item?	0.6% (5)	0.0% (0)	0.9% (7)	5.2% (41)	7.9% (63)	18.1% (144)	67.3% (534)	6.43	794
								answered question	800
								skipped question	135

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

		Response Count
Show replies		36
answered question		36
skipped question		899

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The instructor created a supportive learning environment."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count	
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.4% (11)	1.1% (9)	3.3% (26)	12.4% (98)	12.0% (95)	19.3% (153)	50.6% (401)	5.93	793
How important is this questionnaire item?	1.7% (13)	1.1% (9)	2.5% (20)	13.1% (103)	14.9% (117)	21.7% (171)	45.0% (354)	5.83	787
answered question								794	
skipped question								141	

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

		Response Count
Show replies		28
answered question		28
skipped question		907

3. "The instructor cleared up points of confusion."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count	
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.0% (8)	1.0% (8)	2.6% (21)	7.1% (56)	8.2% (65)	18.9% (150)	61.2% (485)	6.22	793
How important is this questionnaire item?	0.5% (4)	1.1% (9)	1.5% (12)	8.1% (64)	9.1% (72)	19.0% (150)	60.6% (479)	6.24	790
answered question								794	
skipped question								141	

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

		Response Count
Show replies		24
answered question		24
skipped question		911

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The instructor explained difficult material clearly."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all			somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count
How clear is this questionnaire item?	0.6% (5)	0.9% (7)	1.4% (11)	4.3% (34)	7.1% (56)	19.5% (154)	66.2% (522)	6.40	789
How important is this questionnaire item?	0.4% (3)	0.4% (3)	1.3% (10)	5.2% (41)	7.5% (59)	20.7% (162)	64.5% (505)	6.39	783
								answered question	790
								skipped question	145

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
 Show replies	25
answered question	25
skipped question	910

3. "The in-class activities were useful in helping me learn."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all			somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count
How clear is this questionnaire item?	0.6% (5)	0.9% (7)	1.0% (8)	5.7% (45)	7.6% (60)	16.5% (130)	67.7% (534)	6.39	789
How important is this questionnaire item?	1.1% (9)	1.0% (8)	2.7% (21)	9.1% (72)	11.1% (87)	22.0% (173)	53.0% (417)	6.06	787
								answered question	790
								skipped question	145

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
 Show replies	34
answered question	34
skipped question	901

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The instructor used helpful teaching techniques."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all			somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.1% (9)	1.5% (12)	2.7% (21)	9.8% (77)	13.6% (107)	18.8% (147)	52.4% (411)	5.99	784
								answered question	785
								skipped question	150

1. "The instructor used helpful teaching techniques."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

How important is this questionnaire item?	0.9% (7)	1.5% (12)	1.7% (13)	12.1% (94)	14.8% (115)	22.3% (173)	46.6% (361)	5.92	775
								answered question	785
								skipped question	150

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
 Show replies	31
answered question	31
skipped question	904


3. "The instructor used teaching strategies that enhanced my understanding of course content."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all	somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count		
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.0% (8)	2.7% (21)	2.6% (20)	10.6% (83)	10.1% (79)	19.8% (155)	53.2% (416)	5.98	782
How important is this questionnaire item?	1.0% (8)	2.0% (16)	2.2% (17)	9.3% (73)	12.9% (101)	23.5% (184)	49.0% (384)	5.98	783
								answered question	787
								skipped question	148

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
 Show replies	44
answered question	44
skipped question	891

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The requirements of the course enhanced my learning."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all	somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count		
How clear is this questionnaire item?	4.2% (33)	2.8% (22)	4.0% (31)	16.2% (127)	13.1% (103)	18.5% (145)	41.2% (323)	5.52	784
How important is this questionnaire item?	2.6% (20)	4.4% (34)	5.0% (39)	15.6% (121)	14.3% (111)	18.8% (146)	39.3% (305)	5.48	776
								answered question	785
								skipped question	150

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	37
answered question	37
skipped question	898

3. "The activities/assignments were useful in helping me learn."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat		very	Rating Average	Response Count		
How clear is this questionnaire item?	0.5% (4)	0.6% (5)	1.1% (9)	6.8% (53)	8.4% (66)	22.0% (172)	60.5% (474)	6.30	783
How important is this questionnaire item?	0.6% (5)	0.5% (4)	1.4% (11)	8.0% (62)	13.0% (101)	22.6% (176)	53.9% (420)	6.16	779
								answered question	786
								skipped question	149

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	24
answered question	24
skipped question	911

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The activities/assignments supported my understanding of the course content."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat		very	Rating Average	Response Count		
How clear is this questionnaire item?	1.5% (12)	1.5% (12)	2.9% (23)	9.6% (75)	11.8% (92)	22.6% (176)	50.0% (390)	5.96	780
How important is this questionnaire item?	0.9% (7)	1.2% (9)	2.5% (19)	10.8% (83)	13.7% (106)	25.3% (195)	45.7% (353)	5.94	772
								answered question	781
								skipped question	154

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
Show replies	28
answered question	28
skipped question	907

3. "The instructor was effective."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count	
How clear is this questionnaire item?	5.9% (46)	4.6% (36)	4.0% (31)	14.2% (111)	11.0% (86)	15.2% (119)	45.2% (354)	5.46	783
How important is this questionnaire item?	2.7% (21)	1.5% (12)	2.6% (20)	10.7% (83)	10.9% (85)	18.0% (140)	53.7% (418)	5.94	779
								answered question	784
								skipped question	151

4. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
 Show replies	72
answered question	72
skipped question	863

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. "The course was effective."

[Create Chart](#) [Download](#)

	not at all		somewhat			very	Rating Average	Response Count	
How clear is this questionnaire item?	6.4% (50)	4.7% (37)	5.5% (43)	16.0% (125)	12.2% (95)	14.2% (111)	41.0% (320)	5.29	781
How important is this questionnaire item?	3.8% (29)	1.6% (12)	4.5% (35)	11.0% (85)	10.0% (77)	18.8% (145)	50.4% (389)	5.80	772
								answered question	783
								skipped question	152

2. Any comments?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
 Show replies	80
answered question	80
skipped question	855

Show this Page Only

PAGE:

1. Do you have any comments about how student evaluation of teaching questionnaires should be written?

[Download](#)

	Response Count
answered question	162
skipped question	773

1. Do you have any comments about how student evaluation of teaching questionnaires should be written? [Download](#)

 Show replies	162
answered question	162
skipped question	773

2. Do you have any comments about how student evaluation of teaching questionnaires should be administered? [Download](#)

	Response Count
 Show replies	211
answered question	211
skipped question	724
