Report of Student Evaluation of Teaching Committee

September 15, 2005

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluation of Teaching was created by the Faculty Senate to consider issues with respect to course evaluation and feedback and to develop a draft course/instructor instrument over the summer of 2005.

The vision for the teacher evaluation process at The College of New Jersey is that we will equip our teaching and learning community with both an evaluative and diagnostic tool that improves the feedback process within the curriculum and encourages shared responsibility for fostering a culture of continuous improvement.

The committee believes that the guiding principles of student evaluation include:

Principle 1: A carefully constructed, appropriately administered instructor/course feedback form can provide valid information about student outcomes from a course.

Principle 2: The developed course evaluation instrument should provide both evaluative and diagnostic information.

Principle 3: Assessment of teaching effectiveness can not, and should not, be accomplished by one single instrument or method.

Principle 4: The revised evaluation instrument should support and advance curriculum transformation, both through the selection of items and through the ways in which the results are used.

The committee recommends a standardized teaching evaluation instrument that contains both closed-end and open-end questions. The closed-end items on the form should tap multiple dimensions of instructional activities, focusing students' responses on both the instructor and the course. It is recommended that both closed-end and open-end questions be used, in conjunction with other appropriate assessment tools, for diagnostic and evaluative purposes in the spirit of continuous improvement.

The committee further recommends that the draft instrument be evaluated during a test period, using standard psychometric procedures, to assure that it is a valid and reliable measurement tool.

I. BACKGROUND

The Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluation of Teaching was created by the Faculty Senate to consider issues with respect to course evaluation and feedback and to develop a draft course/instructor instrument over the summer of 2005.

The Ad Hoc Committee met weekly through the summer of 2005. The Committee reviewed relevant literature, discussed important issues related to student evaluations, and developed a draft instrument.

A. Historical Background of Student Feedback of Instruction at TSC/TCNJ

Although many faculty members had made it a practice of soliciting student feedback from their classes, there was no requirement that this be done at The College of New Jersey, *the College*, prior to the fall of 1996. On November 27, 1996, the College and The College of New Jersey Federation of Teachers, Local 2364, AFT, *the Union*, signed a memorandum of agreement agreeing to procedures to be utilized in collection student feedback on teaching. This MOA, # 38, was developed in order to implement a uniform student feedback system across the campus for the collection and analysis of this information. The information was recognized as being the property of the instructor only to be shared when she/he felt it was appropriate to do so.

The actual student feedback form, which all faculty were required to use, was developed by a faculty committee, although some departments and faculty chose to include additional items in the materials they distributed to students.

Over the years since that MOA was implemented, a number of instances have arisen where departments or programs undergoing accreditation reviews have requested that student feedback on teaching information be shared in order to demonstrate that the level of instruction met accreditation agency standards. In those instances, it was done to the satisfaction of all parties.

The standard questionnaire was frequently criticized for a variety of reasons and, as far as is known, no reliability or validity studies were ever done using the data collected.

Given the increased interest in the quality of instruction at TCNJ over the ensuing years, the administration initiated discussions with the Union on this subject and indicated their interest in having student feedback of instruction information routinely included along with other materials considered when assessing the quality of instruction at the College.

During the period of a few years when the College and Union were negotiating a tuition waiver program for dependents of AFT bargaining unit employees, the College requested that MOA # 38 covering student feedback of instruction also be reviewed.

Ultimately, agreement was reached to use the student feedback data not only for the evaluation of probationary (untenured) faculty and those applying for promotion but also for the purpose of considering the effectiveness of teaching on the TCNJ campus. The underlying principle and goal is the continuous improvement of instruction for our students. With that as a primary goal, it was decided to review and revise where necessary the standard student feedback form. In the spring of 2005 the Faculty Senate formed the Student Evaluation of Teaching committee in the spring of 2005 to undertake that task.

MOA #64, *http://www.tcnj.edu/~aft/tr/moa64.doc* , was the result of negotiations conducted concurrently with the tuition waiver for dependents program negotiations. Both that MOA, # 65, *http://www.tcnj.edu/~aft/tr/moa65.doc* , and MOA # 64 were adopted by the TCNJ Board of Trustees on 30 June 2005.

The provisions of MOA # 64 reflect information gathered over the 9 years that MOA # 38 was in effect. In recognition of the critical importance of all aspects of the evaluation process employed for faculty reappointment, tenure, and range adjustment decisions, each step of MOA #64 was designed to ensure that the entire process is applied both uniformly and as consistently as possible.

B. Committee Members

The members of the committee were:

Raymond Barclay, Office of Institutional Research & Assessment
Ralph Edelbach, Technological Studies
Janet Gray, Women's and Gender Studies
Judit Kardos, Mathematics
John McCarty, School of Business, Committee Chair
Jacqueline Norris, EASE
Daria Silvestro, Student

II. VISION, MISSION, AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF THE COMMITTEE

We recognize that a teacher evaluation instrument and related process should be viewed as just one important aspect of an overarching continuous improvement and assessment strategy. As such, the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Subcommittee for Teacher Evaluation set forth the following vision, mission, and guiding principles:

A. Vision Statement

The vision for the teacher evaluation process at The College of New Jersey is that we will equip our teaching and learning community with both an evaluative and diagnostic tool that improves the feedback process within the curriculum and encourages shared responsibility for fostering a culture of continuous improvement.

B. Mission

The mission of The College of New Jersey's teacher evaluation process is to provide individual faculty members and decision-makers with valid information about the effectiveness of the instructional activities and courses to inform the promotion and tenure processes, encourage professional development activities, and increase student learning.

C. Guiding Principles for Student Evaluation

Principle 1: A carefully constructed, appropriately administered instructor/course feedback form can provide valid information about student outcomes from a course.

Over several decades, a number of studies have been conducted to determine the validity of student evaluations of teaching. Although there has been some disagreement about the validity of teacher evaluations, several authors have concluded that such instruments can provide meaningful and valid information about students' learning and experiences in a course. The noted University of Michigan psychologist Wilbert McKeachie (1997) concludes that "student ratings are the single most valid source of data on teaching effectiveness" (p. 1219). Cashin (1995) notes that studies have shown that student evaluations of teaching tend to correlate with other measures of performance, including: measures of student learning, instructors' self-ratings, and ratings by others (e.g., colleagues, administrators, trained observers).

Researchers have also investigated potential bias in student evaluations of teaching. These studies have investigated the relationship of ratings with: students' expected grade and GPA, instructor's gender, age and race, class size, workload and difficulty, among other variables. Although some relationships have been found, it has generally been concluded that the magnitude of these effects is small. As Marsh and Roche (1997) conclude, "perhaps the best summary is McKeachie's (1979) conclusion that a wide variety of variables that could

potentially influence SETs [Student Evaluation of Teaching] apparently have little effect" (p. 1193).[1]

Therefore, it is generally recognized that a student evaluation of teaching instrument can provide valid information that is generally free from biases. However, the validity of an instrument should not be confused with its completeness or its importance relative to other information. As Cashin (1995) states in his summary of the research on student evaluation instruments,

> There are probably more studies of student ratings than of all of the other data used to evaluate college teaching combined. Although one can find individual studies that support almost any conclusion, for a number of variables there are enough studies to discern trends. In general, student ratings tend to be statistically reliable, valid, and relatively free from bias or the need for control; probably more so than any other data used for evaluation. Nevertheless, student ratings are only one source of data about teaching and must be used in combination with multiple sources of data if one wishes to make a judgment about all of the components of college teaching. Further, student ratings are data that must be interpreted. We should not confuse a source of data with the evaluators who use student rating data – in combination with other kinds of data – to make their judgments about an instructor's teaching effectiveness. (p. 6)

The committee recognizes that the validity of a developed instrument for student evaluations of teaching depends on the careful construction and evaluation of the instrument. As Marsh and Roche (1997) state,

> Many SET [Student Evaluation of Teaching] instruments fail to provide a comprehensive evaluation of theoretically sound, multiple dimensions of teaching quality, thus undermining their usefulness, particularly for diagnostic feedback. "Homemade" SET surveys constructed by lecturers or committees are rarely evaluated in relation to rigorous psychometric considerations and revised accordingly. . . SET instruments should be designed to measure separate components of teaching effectiveness, and support for the construct validity of the multiple dimensions should be evaluated. (p. 1188)

The committee concludes that a valid instrument can be developed for use at TCNJ. However, the committee emphasizes the need for a testing period where the instrument can be evaluated and revised as necessary to achieve the desired level of validity.

---

[1] Some variables have been shown to have relationships with student ratings, although the effects are small or can be controlled. Faculty rank has been shown to be related to ratings, however, this might be expected as more senior instructors would be expected to be better teachers. The reasons for evaluations have been shown to be related to ratings in that ratings tend to be higher if students believe the ratings will be used for promotion decisions rather than just for self improvement. Ratings have been shown to be higher if the instructor is present during evaluations. These potential biases can be controlled by a standard set of instructions and a standard protocol for administration. Course difficulty has shown low to modest relationships with ratings, although in the opposite direction than most people think; although the effect sizes are generally low, more difficult courses tend to receive higher ratings than easier courses (Cashin, 1995).

Principle 2: The developed course evaluation instrument should provide both evaluative and diagnostic information.

The committee recognizes that one purpose of a teaching effectiveness instrument is to provide evaluative information for promotion and retention decisions, as well as other contexts in which the evaluation of an instructor is relevant. A second purpose, which is consistent with the principle of continuous improvement of teaching, is that the instrument should provide diagnostic information for an instructor. Thus, it is not enough for an instrument to indicate areas where improvement may be necessary; rather, the instrument should assist the instructor in understanding how he/she can develop towards excellence.

The diagnostic information of the student evaluation of teaching should provide the basis of a dialogue between the instructor and his/her supervisor with respect to potential problem areas and ways of improving. Furthermore, research has shown that a process whereby a faculty member may discuss his/her student feedback over a period of time with a "consultant" (a professional who is not associated with promotion decisions of the faculty member) can significantly improve teaching (Wilson, 1986).

Principle 3: Assessment of teaching effectiveness can not, and should not, be accomplished by one single instrument or method.

Although an instrument assessing students' evaluation of teaching effectiveness is important for evaluation of instructor performance and may provide diagnostic information to the instructor, the committee recognizes that assessment should be a multi-method endeavor. Faculty are encouraged to address the demands of the curricula with a repertoire of assessment strategies that monitor students' understanding and progress, and enable the professor to adjust instruction to meet their needs. Observations, interviews, analytic and diagnostic reviews of student journals, self-assessments and quick response essays are just a few of the many ways that we can gauge our effectiveness in the classroom. Faculty should also regularly invite their peers to observe and evaluate their classes. Peer evaluations are not only critical components of promotion and retention portfolios; they can also stimulate productive conversations about effective teaching strategies.

Principle 4: The revised evaluation instrument should support and advance curriculum transformation, both through the selection of items and through the ways in which the results are used.

The new student feedback instrument should work as a component of TCNJ's transformed curriculum, encouraging students, instructors, and those making retention and promotion decisions to consider the quality of teaching in terms consistent with the Guiding Principles for Academic Work. The literature on teaching modes indicates that the following instructor activities best support the kind of "deep learning" described in the Guiding Principles for Student Work.[2]

[2] R. Barclay, "NJ-COS: The New Jersey Course Outcomes Survey: Theoretical and Empirical Background." Institutional Research, The College of New Jersey, April 23, 2004.

1. Presents clear goals, organization, and standards
2. Presents material with enthusiasm
3. Provides a challenging environment
4. Presents material with clarity
5. Displays authentic empathy toward student needs
6. Encourages student independence and promotes active, self-directed learning
7. Calibrates workload appropriately
8. Uses relevant assessment methods (including strategies for guiding students' further learning as well as ranking strategies)

III. ISSUES RELATED TO THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A COURSE FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT

The following presents issues related to the nature and implementation of a teaching effectiveness instrument. The committee's recommendations with respect to these issues are included.

A. Open-end and Closed-end questions

Both closed-end quantitative items and open-end qualitative questions are commonly used on student feedback forms. Each of these question formats has their advantages and disadvantages.

Close-end questions

A set of closed-end questions is typically presented with a common scale for all of the times (e.g., disagree – agree) or scales tailored for specific items. The scales are usually 5 or 6 point scales, allowing students to respond to each item along a dimension.

The advantages of closed-end questions include:

1. A set of closed-end items can cover a variety of issues; across a set, one can be assured that several areas of interest are covered. Furthermore, closed-end items elicit information about areas that students may not have considered had they not been specifically asked.

2. The psychometric (measurement) properties of many closed-end items are known. If not known, the measurement properties can be assessed using the proper statistical techniques.

3. Assuming that the closed-end items are written in a valid and unambiguous fashion, the responses on the items are easily interpreted.

4. Closed-end items can be compared relatively easily. A particular instructor's ratings can be compared across course sections in the same semester or across semesters. Data aggregated across instructors can provide normative information so that a point of comparison is provided for individual instructors to have a reference to evaluate their own ratings.

5. Closed-end items are relatively easy to administer and score

The disadvantages of close-end items include:

1. Closed-end items may point to problem areas; however, they do not provide any diagnostic information about the nature of the problem.

2. Since closed-end items are relatively easy to administer and students to complete, students can complete them without a great deal of thought. Thus, students may give a high or low score without having to articulate or justify their response.

Open-end Questions

One or more open-end questions are often provided as part or all of a student feedback form. Open-end items can be on the same form as closed-end items (i.e., on the back of the scan sheet) or on a separate sheet. Open-end questions can be broad (e.g., What did you like about the course?) or relatively specific to certain areas of the course/instructor. Some institutions include open-end comments in the student feedback provided to department heads, evaluation committees, etc.; however, other institutions provide open-end student comments only to the instructor.

The advantages of open-end questions include:

1. Open-end questions allow students to provide their feedback in their own words. They also allow students to focus on areas that they consider important.

2. Open-end questions can provide rich detail. Across responses from numerous students, open-end responses can provide information that is diagnostic with respect to a potential problem area.

3. Open-end questions are easy to administer.

The disadvantages of open-end questions include:

1. Although open-end questions can be standard across instructors and courses, the responses are not in a standard format. Therefore, there is typically no way to provide normative or comparative information.

2. Students may focus too much on one or two areas or issues. Even though questions may attempt to elicit responses with respect to a variety of areas, open-end questions cannot ensure that students will consider all important areas of concern.

3. Open-end questions are difficult to analyze compared to close-end questions. Although one can search for themes or commonalities across forms, such analysis involves potential bias and ambiguity.

Committee's Recommendation:

The committee recommends that the proposed instrument include both closed-end and open-end items. It further recommends that both of these types of items be included in the information available to supervisors and promotion and retention committees.

If this recommendation is accepted, we believe costs at this time will likely prohibit scanning hand-written comments (optical scanning of handwriting platforms exceeds $100,000). As a result, we recommend the open-ended forms be archived and available for diagnostic and evaluation activities. The committee is not making a recommendation about how each department should incorporate the open-ended information into its evaluation and assessment process.

Additionally, we are recommending that the computer center that scans the forms implement a strategy to code and convert these forms via a TIFF image file or in a portable document formats (pdf) and return this information (zipped file attachment via CD-rom or shared drive) to the instructor and department at the same time aggregated results from the closed-ended items are distributed.

B. Standard versus Tailored Forms

Student feedback forms can be standardized or tailored. A standard form would contain the same items for all courses and faculty. A tailored form would allow some or all of the items to be tailored for individual departments and/or instructors.

Both standardized and tailored formats are used in colleges and universities in the U.S. With respect to tailored forms, the level of tailoring can vary. At some institutions, there are a core set of standard items, common to all instructors, and a number of items that can be selected by a unit (e.g., department) and/or by individual instructors. As an example, at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, only two common items are preprinted on the form. Other items can be selected by academic units or instructors from a catalog of items. These additional items are printed on the form using a printer (e.g., computer line printer). The catalog contains items related to different themes (e.g., grading; instructor communication skills), as well as items that are designed for specific instructional settings (e.g., laboratory sections of a course). Some academic units require a set of tailored items to be selected by faculty in the unit; others allow instructors to select all of the tailored items themselves.

The advantages of a tailored form include:

1. Tailored forms allow instructors or academic units to select items that are appropriate for the type of course (e.g., seminar, large lecture).

2. Tailored forms allow instructors to select items that will measure areas that are of greatest concern. For example, if a previous semester's feedback suggested that there may be problems related to course management, the instructor could select additional items that tap different dimensions of course management.

The disadvantages of a tailored form include:

1. The logistics related to managing tailored forms are more complex than with standard forms. Forms with individually selected questions have to be ordered and printed to specifications. Analysis is more complex in that the report form is not standard.

2. Instructors might not select items that cover what is deemed by others (e.g., promotion committee members) to be all of the appropriate areas.

3. Normative information would not be available for items that are peculiar to a particular instructor.

4. The validity, reliability, and psychometric properties of instructor developed items would be unknown.

Committee's Recommendation:

Although the committee recognizes the value of providing opportunities for tailored items on a student evaluation form, it recommends that the form be standard for all courses. This recommendation is made in light of a consideration of the benefits of a tailored form relative to the administrative costs. The committee feels that the potential benefits do not outweigh the additional logistical costs in providing for a tailored form.

This recommendation also acknowledges the limitations of any one assessment instrument. No one instrument or method can provide all of the information necessary for proper assessment. Therefore, units or individual instructors are encouraged to develop assessment tools that would cover special needs with respect to teaching effectiveness.

C. Vendor Supplied Student Feedback Instruments

There are vendors who develop and score teacher evaluations. In particular, Educational Testing Service's Student Instructional Report System (SRI-II) and Kansas University's Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) Center are two commonly used vendor instruments. Both systems would be adequate. In particular, IDEA's system has a focus on student learning and instructor self-appraisals that would be helpful at TCNJ. However, prices to participate for a school our size are very excessive since most pricing is done in bulk. All related materials can be found at the following link: http://ir.intrasun.tcnj.edu/teacher.html

As a ballpark example, ETS prices quote follows:

- $28.00 per package of 100 forms
- $ 0.48 per processed form
- combined 'course reports' to run department and college level report summaries ($0.60 per class).
- institutional data diskette per administration ($75.00)
- CR-rom, with item level responses per administration ($150.00)

Example Costs per term:

- 29,000 students per term on average in courses
- require approximately 290 packages ($8,120)

- Scanning = $13,920 (minus $695 for a 5% discount)
- Disk & CD rom ($225)
- $1500 is the estimate for organized section-level reports
- IT would still need to develop the reports for the department and college level analyses from the course data .

Term Average Cost = $22,000-$25,000
Fall / Spring Cost Average = $50,000; Summer term would increase this cost somewhat

Committee's Recommendation:

Because of the prohibitive costs, the Committee recommends TCNJ develop its own form that is contextually appropriate (considers pedagogical and expected learning outcomes of the newly transformed curriculum) and accounts for items that provide formative and summative feedback and information about the class and instructor. TCNJ should seriously explore a self-appraisal form in the future for the instructor that contextualizes the course experience by noting extraneous occurrences that may positively or negatively bias ratings and can cross-validate ratings.

D. Overall Evaluation Question

In general, student evaluations of teaching include one or two items that attempt to tap students' overall evaluations students of a course. Although typically used, qualitative and quantitative researchers have noted the difficulty in utilizing 'overall' experience questions.

Although several researchers (e.g., d'Apollonia and Abrami, 1997) have argued that global scores are appropriate and valid, many have stated that global measures fail to capture the many facets of teaching. As Marsh and Roche (1997) state, "Global or overall ratings cannot adequately represent the multidimensionality of teaching. They also may be more susceptible to context, mood, and other potential biases than are specific items that are more closely tied to actual teaching behaviors . . ." (p. 1188). Many authors believe asking participants (especially students) to take everything into account in making an informed judgment is unrealistic and incongruent with the narrowing mindset that most often accompanies the task of responding to evaluative questions (Eley, 2001). Although Marsh and colleagues have advocated a profile of scores on several dimensions, they have argued that an appropriate compromise would be a weighted average as a summary measure across the several dimensions of teaching (Marsh and Roche, 1997).

Although the validity issue of overall measures is not entirely settled, a potentially more serious consideration is that there is a tendency for promotion and retention committees to rely primarily or exclusively on an overall measure. We believe that this reliance on an overall or summary evaluation is not consistent with a culture of continuous improvement. Rather, the total information available from the student evaluation of teaching instrument, as well as other appropriate assessment tools, should be used to develop dialogues between instructors and appropriate others.

Committee's Recommendation:

The committee does not recommend that an "overall" item (or items) be included on the evaluation instrument. Instead, the committee made a determination that the 'overall' satisfaction question be replaced by a cluster of specific behavioral prompts that we believe are more indicative of a student's satisfaction with a class or instructor (e.g., would the student recommend the course or the instructor to a friend). Although these are similar to summary items, the committee believes that there is less likelihood that promotion and retention committees will rely on them to the point of omitting a multidimensional consideration of teaching quality.

E. Course and Instructor Items

Evaluation instruments typically include items that relate specifically to the instructor (e.g., "The instructor was dynamic and enthusiastic."), as well as items that are related to the course (e.g., "I found the course intellectually challenging/stimulating."). Although an instructor is often responsible for the content and design of a course, it is clear that there are instances (e.g., multi-section courses) when there are others who share some responsibility for the course. It was felt that the instrument should distinguish between course and instructor items. In general, individual instructors and their units can determine the extent to which course items should be attributed to individuals or groups.

Committee's Recommendation:

The committee recommends that the evaluation instrument distinguish between course and instructor items. Relative use of the two types of items in promotion and retention decisions should be carefully considered on a case by case basis.

F. In-Class and On-line Evaluation Techniques

Traditionally, students complete evaluation forms during a portion of a class session at the end of the semester. Recently, there has been some experimentation with online, web-based evaluation methodologies.

On-line evaluation techniques can have some advantages over in-class techniques, including:

1. Students can complete their evaluation at their leisure, during some open period for evaluation at the end of the semester (e.g., a two week period).

2. Although there would be significant upfront costs for the software and hardware that would allow for on-line evaluations, the administration logistics (dissemination and collection of forms, scanning, etc) and related data coding and analysis for the evaluations would be significantly simplified. Furthermore, open-end student comments would be typed by the student into the on-line form.

3. On-line forms would not have length constraints that in-class forms have.

4. If the tailoring of a form is desired, it is easier to do so with an on-line format.

5. As TCNJ invests in technical infrastructure (Smart Classrooms, PDA distribution to students, etc.), it is likely that students will begin to expect to participate in activities such as electronically delivered teaching evaluations.

There are some potential disadvantages to on-line formats, including:

1. Unless procedures are implemented to encourage or require students to complete the on-line evaluation, the response rate may not be as high as with the in-class format. (A study by Dommeyer, Baum and Hanna (2002) comparing in-class and on-line surveys showed that the response rate for on-line format was lower than for in-class collection. In addition, committee members talked with another school that have experimented with on-line evaluations, Temple University, and were informed that response rates hover around 30%).

2. The Dommeyer, Baum and Hanna study showed that students had some concerns about the anonymity of their responses in the case of the on-line format.

3. The literature shows that requiring students to submit their teaching evaluations on-line by withholding grades or some other means will negatively bias ratings.

<u>*Committee's Recommendation*</u>:

The committee recommends that for the near future, the student evaluation of teaching be conducted with an in-class format. An on-line format should be seriously explored as a future possibility. It may be viable if there is a method to assure an adequate and representative response from students, and if the logistics of the process are developed in such a way to assure anonymity and confidentiality and to minimize or control for negative bias in ratings.

IV. RECOMMENDED STUDENT FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT

The committee developed the instrument after considering issues related to transformation, the issues described above, and relevant literature on student evaluations. In particular, the committee agrees with Marsh and Roche (1997) who stated that "teaching is a complex activity consisting of multiple dimensions (e.g., clarity, teachers' interactions with students, organization, enthusiasm) and that formative-diagnostic evaluations of teachers should reflect this multidimensionality (e.g., a teacher is organized but lacks enthusiasm)" (p. 1187). Although different researchers have found slightly different dimensions of instructor and course performance, the general nature of these dimensions is very similar across studies. The nine dimensions proposed by Herbert Marsh and his associates have received the most support (Marsh 1984). As noted by McKeachie (1997), "Renaud and Murray (1997) have shown that actual behaviors of teachers as coded by observers covary with student ratings of the same behaviors and fall into dimensions corresponding fairly well to those of Marsh (1984). Marsh's demonstration of the validity of these factors is impressive" (p. 1218).[3] The nine dimensions proposed by Marsh are:

1. Learning value (e.g., course was challenging/stimulating)
2. Instructor enthusiasm
3. Course organization (e.g., Course materials were prepared and clear)
4. Group interaction (e.g., class discussion was encouraged)
5. Individual rapport (e.g., assessible to individual students)
6. Breadth of coverage (e.g., gave different points of view)
7. Examination/grading (e.g., examination feedback valuable)
8. Assignments (e.g., reading/texts were valuable)
9. Workload/difficulty (e.g., course workload was light-heavy)

In developing the draft instrument, the committee considered these dimensions, as well as the principles of transformation as articulated in the Guiding Principles for Academic Work (http://academic.intrasun.tcnj.edu/work/guidingprinciples.doc). We strove to assure that the developed instrument measured each of the nine dimensions proposed by Marsh and his associates, as well as provided information important to transformation. The table on the next two pages presents Marsh's dimensions with the proposed closed-end items that correspond to each dimension. An example version of the proposed form is in Appendix I.

[3] At least two articles (d'Apollonia and Abrami, 1997; Greenwald and Gillmore, 1997) challenge the multidimensional nature of teaching evaluation instruments. d'Apollonia and Abrami argue that student ratings measure a large global component of general instructional skill that can be broken down into three highly correlated components: delivering instruction, facilitating interactions, and evaluation of students.

Marsh Dimensions of Teaching Effectiveness and Proposed Items
for TCNJ Teaching Evaluation Instrument

Dimension	Items
Learning value	The instructor encouraged and motivated me to do my best in this course
	I found the course intellectually challenging/stimulating
	I believe what I learned in this course is valuable
	I learned a great deal in this course
	I increased my ability to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments and points of view
Instructor enthusiasm	The instructor's teaching style contributed to learning material covered in the course
	The instructor was dynamic and enthusiastic
Course organization	The instructor was well organized and prepared for class
	The instructor clearly explained and pursued the learning goals and requirements of this course
	The course materials were well prepared and carefully explained
Group Interaction	The instructor promoted an atmosphere that was conducive to students sharing ideas and knowledge
	Assignments promoting collaboration among classmates added to my understanding (problem sets, presentations, performances, etc.)
Individual Rapport	The instructor was respectful of differing viewpoints
	I was made to feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class
	The instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours and after the class
	The instructor used student questions/feedback to help students understand course material
Breath of Coverage	The instructor presented the background or origin of ideas/concepts presented in class
	The instructor presented contrasting points of views on topics
	The instructor exhibited a significant depth of knowledge about the material covered in this course

continued . . .

Dimension	Items
Examinations/Grading	Feedback received from the instructor on assignments was valuable The examinations and/or written work in the course reflected the content and emphasis of the course Methods utilized for evaluating student work were fair and appropriate
Assignments	Required readings/texts were valuable and enriched my learning experience
Workload/Difficulty	The workload was appropriate for the level and credit value of the course Please note the hours per week you spent preparing for this course

There are also two items that reflect students' recommendations with respect to the course. These items were designed to tap the students' overall feel about the course. These items are:

I would recommend the current instructor to a friend.

I would recommend this course to a friend.

Open-End Items

The committee recommends four open-end items that should appear on the back of the instrument form. These four items are:

Please indicate the characteristics of this instructor or class that have been most valuable to your overall learning experience.

Please indicate the characteristics of this instructor or class that you feel are most important for him/her to improve (particularly aspects not covered by the rating items).

Please comment on experience(s) that facilitated your in-depth understanding of the course material.

Please use additional space to clarify any of your responses from the other side of this form and to make additional comments.

Testing and Validation

The committee believes it is important to conduct a pilot of the instrument over a two year period. We believe a pilot study will help TCNJ work out some of the procedural bugs by preliminarily testing the instrument. It will also assist in understanding item reliabilities and factor structure of the instrument. This pilot work may lead to changing some hypotheses about factors, dropping items, or developing new items. The pilot will also permits a thorough check of the planned statistical and analytical procedures to develop campus, school, program and course level averages and assess the usefulness of the data. Information Technology will need to provide The Office of Institutional Research and/or recommended faculty members from Faculty Senate in undertaking this pilot. The Faculty Senate should review the results following year 1 and year 2 analyses.

V. RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES FOR ADMINISTERING STUDENT FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT

The agreement between the Union and the College (MOA # 64, adopted on 30 June 2005) outlined the general procedures for collecting Student Feedback on Teaching; the following recommends procedures for a standard protocol for administering the instrument in classes.

1. We recommend that faculty members explain the purpose of collecting student feedback on teaching before the actual administration of the instrument. Students should know that their opinions and suggestions are taken seriously by the faculty member and by the administration. They should know that their feedback helps the instructor to improve the course and that the collected information is also used by the administration in promotion and retention decisions. Research has suggested that students' interest in the teaching evaluation process is related to the extent to which they believe that their input will matter (Chen and Hoshower, 1998). If the value and the sensitive nature of this information are made clear to the students, they will express their opinions more carefully, and they will provide more accurate and factual information. This explanation should be standardized and well known to students, since research has shown that ratings may vary as a function of the purpose of the evaluations (Cashin, 1995).

2. Students must be allowed sufficient time at the beginning of the class to fill out the forms. The fact that student evaluations are done in place of lecture time has special value to students, especially at the end of the semester. Time will ultimately influence how much consideration can be given to each question so it will determine the seriousness of the response as well.

3. Students should be assured that the information from their evaluations will be returned to the instructor after grades have been submitted to the registrar. They should be asked to print their responses to the open-ended questions in order to protect their anonymity. Anonymity of responses has been shown to be a concern that students have with evaluation forms (Dommeyer, Baum and Hanna, 2002).

4. The instructor must leave the room during the time students are completely the evaluation form. Research has shown (Cashin, 1995) that ratings can be positively biased if the instructor is present when the forms are being completed.

REFERENCES

Cashin, William E. (1995), Student Ratings of Teaching: the Research Revisited (IDEA Paper No. 32). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

Chen, Yining and Leon B. Hoshower (1998), "Assessing Student Motivation to Participate in Teaching Evaluations: An Application of Expectancy Theory," *Issues in Accounting Education*, 13 (August), pp. 531-549.

d'Apollonia, Sylvia and Philip C. Abrami (1997), "Navigating Student Ratings of Instruction," *American Psychologist*, 52 (November), pp. 1198-1208.

Dommeyer, Curt J., Paul Baum, and Robert W. Hanna (2002), "College Students' Attitudes Toward Methods of Collecting Teaching Evaluations: In-Class Versus On-Line," *Journal of Education for Business*, 78 (Sept/Oct), pp. 11–15.

Eley, M. G. (2001), "The Course Experience Questionnaire: Altering Question Format, and phrasing could improve the CEQ's effectiveness," *Higher Education Research and Development*, 1(3): pp. 293-212.

Greenwald, Anthony G. and Gerald Gillmore (1997), "Grading Leniency is a Removable Contaminant of Student Ratings," *American Psychologist*, 52 (November), pp. 1209-1217.

Marsh, Herbert W. (1984), "Students' Evaluations of University Teaching: Dimensionality, Reliability, Validity, Potential Biases, and Utility," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76 (5), pp. 707–754.

Marsh, Herbert W. and Lawrence A. Roche (1997), "Making Students' Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness Effective: The Critical Issues of Validity, Bias, and Utility," *American Psychologist*, 52 (November), pp. 1187–1197.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. (1979), "Student Ratings of Faculty: A Reprise," *Academe*, 65, pp. 384-397. [cited in Marsh and Roche, 1997]

McKeachie, Wilbert J. (1997), "Student Ratings," *American Psychologist*, 52 (November), pp. 1218-1225.

Renaud, R. D. and H. G. Murray (1997), *Factorial Validity of Student Ratings of Instruction*. Paper presented at the 78th annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. [cited in McKeachie, 1997]

Wilson, Robert C. (1986), "Improving Faculty Teaching: Effective Use of Student Evaluations and Consultants," *Journal of Higher Education*, 57 (March/April), pp. 196-211.

APPENDIX A

DRAFT FORM

Draft

Department **Course**
Instructor Name **Section** **Year/Semester** **#of Students**
(Scantron elements)

TEACHER EVALUATION DRAFT

Please indicate your reason for taking this course:

O Liberal learning Requirement O General Elective
O Major Requirement O General Interest
O Major Elective O Other

Please note the hours per week you spent preparing for this course:

O Less than 1 O 1-3 O 4-6 O 7-9 O More than 9

Gender: O Male O Female

What is your expected grade for this course?

O A O A- O B+ O B O B- O C+ O C O C- O D+ O D O F

How does your expected grade align relative to how you thought you would do in this course?

O Above my Expectations O What I Expected O Below my Expectations

Level of interest in the subject matter prior to the course:

O Very Low O Low O Medium O High O Very High

Level of interest in the subject matter after taking the course:

O Very Low O Low O Medium O High O Very High

Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements by circling the corresponding number:

1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree; N = Not Applicable

Instructor Questions

	1	2	3	4	5	N
1. The instructor encouraged and motivated me to do my best in this course	O	O	O	O	O	O
2. The instructor's teaching style contributed to learning material covered in the course	O	O	O	O	O	O
3. The instructor clearly explained and pursued the learning goals and requirements of this course	O	O	O	O	O	O
4. The instructor presented the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class	O	O	O	O	O	O
5. The instructor presented contrasting points of view on topics	O	O	O	O	O	O
6. Feedback received from the instructor on assignments was valuable	O	O	O	O	O	O
7. The instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after the class	O	O	O	O	O	O
8. The instructor promoted an atmosphere that was conducive to students sharing ideas and knowledge	O	O	O	O	O	O
9. The instructor used student questions/feedback to help students understand course material	O	O	O	O	O	O
10. The instructor was well organized and prepared for class	O	O	O	O	O	O
11. The instructor was dynamic and enthusiastic	O	O	O	O	O	O
12. The instructor was respectful of differing viewpoints	O	O	O	O	O	O
13. I was made to feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class	O	O	O	O	O	O
14. The instructor exhibited a significant depth in knowledge about the material covered in this course	O	O	O	O	O	O
15. I would recommend the current instructor to a friend	O	O	O	O	O	O

Course Questions

16. The course materials were well prepared and carefully explained	O	O	O	O	O	O
17. Assignments promoting collaboration among classmates added to my understanding of the course (problem sets, presentations, performances, etc.)	O	O	O	O	O	O
18. Required readings/texts were valuable and enriched my learning experience	O	O	O	O	O	O
19. The examinations and/or written work in the course reflected the content and emphasis of the course	O	O	O	O	O	O
20. Methods utilized for evaluating student work were fair and appropriate	O	O	O	O	O	O
21. The workload was appropriate for the level and credit value of the course	O	O	O	O	O	O
22. I learned a great deal in this course	O	O	O	O	O	O
23. I found the course intellectually challenging/stimulating	O	O	O	O	O	O
24. I increased my ability to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments and points of view	O	O	O	O	O	O
25. I believe what I learned in this course is valuable	O	O	O	O	O	O
26. I would recommend this course to a friend	O	O	O	O	O	O

- PLEASE COMPLETE BACK OF PAGE -

Draft

Your written comments will be shared with your instructor. To protect anonymity, please print your comments and do not use any personal identifiers. Please answer the numbered questions in the corresponding numbered boxes below.

1. Please indicate the characteristics of this instructor or class that have been most valuable to your overall learning experience.
2. Please indicate the characteristics of this instructor or class that you feel are most important for him/her to improve (particularly aspects not covered by the rating items).
3. Please comment on experience(s) that facilitated your in-depth understanding of the course material.
4. Please use additional space to clarify any of your responses from the other side of this form and to make additional comments.

1.

2.

3.

4.

Thank you very much for your participation.

APPENDIX B

The Committee worked with the Office of Institutional Research to set up a website as a clearinghouse for resources supporting our work. The website address is: http://ir.intrasun.tcnj.edu/teacher.html

The website contains the following documents:

General Documents

Teacher Evaluation Subcommittee Notes
Initial Item Pool
Current & Proposed TCNJ Teacher Evaluation Process & MOA
Proposed Survey Instrument
Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations

TCNJ Survey Scanning Tools

OpScan 10 Scanner (Scanner we use at TCNJ)
Features
Spec Sheet
Pre-Printed Standard or Blank Forms
Other Forms

ScanTools Plus Software (Optional - we could purchase and use)

TCNJ Survey Scanning Tool Features
Spec Sheet

Vendor Materials

Summary of Findings

IDEA Center - Kansas State University
Diagnostic Form
Short Form
Faculty Information Form
Group Summary Report - Sample
Short Summary Example
Fee Schedule

ETS
Student Instructional Report - Order Form
Processing Request Form

APPENDIX C

Student Feedback on Instruction New Process

Please note that the materials in Appendix C and Appendix D were developed to comply with the agreement between the Union and The College of New Jersey with respect to the procedures of how the evaluation forms would be handled and processed. These procedures were not within the scope of the committee's charge. These two appendices are provided for reference purposes and do not relate to the committee's work.

DRAFT

DRAFT - Student Feedback on Instruction New Process

The Dean of Academic Services will ensure that appropriate student feedback forms (SFF) for all regularly scheduled classes (whether taught by full-time or adjunct faculty) are ready for distribution to departments no later than the fourth week prior to the end of the semester.

All SFF for required for each section will be in an "official envelope" upon which is printed the tracking sheet (see two sample drafts attached).

As before, it is the responsibility of the department chairperson (or appropriate program coordinator) to maintain the integrity of the process for distributing, administering, collecting, and delivering SFF to the computer center for processing.

The SFF shall be completed anonymously and independently during the last two weeks of classes and prior to final exam week. The faculty member has the option of having the SFF administered either by a student volunteer in that class or by a faculty member designated by the appropriate personnel committee. Every officially enrolled student in a class present on the day the SFF is administered shall be given the opportunity of completing the form. Students must be allowed at least 15 minutes to complete the SFF. The instructor shall not be in the room while students are completing the SFF. The designated student or faculty volunteer will collect and return all SFF to the department chairperson or designee (as specified on the tracking sheet) in a sealed envelope. The person who administers the SFF must both print and sign her/his name over the envelope seal.

All the SFF envelopes will be held securely by each department until the final examination period ends and then delivered to the computer center with the appropriate requisition form for scanning.

It is the responsibility of the Dean of Academic Services to ensure that the SFF are processed and scored carefully, promptly and securely as specified in MOA # 64. The SFF are tabulated in the TCNJ computer center under the oversight of the Dean of Academic Services. Only designated personnel are to handle the materials. After an envelope is opened, the SFF are scored and then returned along with the tabulated data sheet to the original envelope and resealed with pre-printed tape as soon as possible. While in the computer center, the SFF are to be processed confidentially.

Completed and scored SFF are kept in the Office of Academic Services until after final grades are posted for the semester. At this time two additional copies of the tabulated data sheets are produced (one for the appropriate department chair and one for the appropriate school dean). After grades have been posted for the semester, the original SFF and tabulated data sheets are returned in their original envelopes to the department chairperson who is responsible for distributing them to the faculty. Copies of the tabulated data sheets for each department are sent directly by the Dean of Academic Services to the chairperson (or program director) with a copy to the appropriate school dean. These summary forms should normally be retained for a period of five-years.

It is the responsibility of the department chairperson (or appropriate program coordinator) to distribute tabulated results and original forms in a manner that is respectful and constructive and that leads to appropriate analysis and discussion within the department or program.

The chairperson shall also be responsible for preparing a concise review (analysis and discussion) of the quality of instruction in their department or program for their Dean on an annual basis. This review is meant to be formative, not summative, in nature and serve as the basis for the allocation of the support and resources necessary for the improvement of instruction. The overview should consider courses taught by adjunct faculty as well as full-time faculty.

APPENDIX D

Student Feedback Form Tracking Sheet

DRAFT

Student Feedback Form (SFF) Tracking Sheet

Note: This envelope must accompany the enclosed student feedback forms (SFF) throughout the entire process. All dates, signatures and initials must be completed as indicated.

Course Information {this likely will be replaced by a pre-printed label}

Course # {InsertCourse#} Course Title {InsertCourseTitle}

Instructor's Name {InsertInstructorName} Enrollment {InsertEnrollment}

Department: Please fill in the shaded space below indicating the person and room location to which completed forms (in signed, sealed envelopes) are to be returned prior to distributing envelopes with forms to instructors.

Department: Date envelope originally delivered to instructor_____

Returning the Student Feedback on Teaching Forms

Dear Student or Faculty member volunteering to administer SFF:

When SFF are completed, please return them in this envelope to _____ in room _____ after completing the following information:

Your Name _____ Today's Date _____

# of students in class today _____ # completed SFF in envelope _____

You must seal this envelope and both sign and print your name over the seal. Thank you very much for your assistance in this important process.

Department: Date sealed enveloped received with completed SFF_____

And name of individual receiving_____

Computer Center: Date sealed envelope arrived in Computer Center_____

Computer Center: Date of processing_____

And name of processor_____

Department: Date envelope received back from Academic Services with processed forms_____

And name of individual receiving_____

Form date: September 12, 2005