

# Report of the Task Force on Student Evaluation of Teaching:

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill April 5, 1999

## Section I: Prologue

The Carolina Course Review (CCR, hereafter) has been used at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill since the 1970s. During the 1997-1998 academic year, members of Faculty Council raised a large number of concerns about the CCR. These concerns

focused on: the use of the CCR in renewal, promotion and tenure decisions, the effects of extraneous variables on the CCR; the interpretability of statistical analyses of the CCR;

and possible violations of privacy that might arise from Web publication of the CCR. As a result of these concerns, the Faculty Council passed a resolution prohibiting the use of the CCR as an instrument for official personnel evaluation at the school or departmental

level.

In response to this resolution and the above concerns, Provost Richardson charged a Task Force, chaired by Professor Douglas Kelly, to respond to these issues during the summer

of 1998. This Task Force issued short term and long term recommendations. In the short term, it recommended use of the CCR for an interim year, with the proviso that statistical analyses be limited. In the long term, the Task Force recommended that a new system be designed that would simultaneously serve the purposes of: 1) evaluation of faculty

members for renewal, promotion and tenure; 2) provision of feedback to faculty members for the improvement of teaching; and 3) provision of information to students to guide

The Task Force met five times in the Spring Semester of 1999. Two sub-committees (the instrument evaluation sub-committee and the report drafting sub-committee) also met throughout the semester, providing information and analyses to the Task Force. The instrument evaluation sub-committee (members: Adler, Hirschman, Miles, Neal, Wolf Johnson) reviewed instruments used at peer institutions and suggested items and formats for the task force to consider. The report drafting sub-committee (members: Hirschman, McPhail, Panter, Ware, White) suggested positions on the use and interpretation of

## Section II: Description of Process

issues.

section compares the proposed instrument to the CCR and discusses implementation recommendations on the appropriate use and interpretation of the instrument. A final the Task Force's process, present the instrument the Task Force created, and offer Technology (T. Lewis) and Student Government (L. McPhail). In this report, we describe Affairs (C. Wolf Johnson), the Center for Teaching and Learning (E. Neal), Academic (R. Adler), Education (W. Ware), Medicine (G. White), Nursing (M. Miles), Student representatives from Arts and Sciences (E. Hirschman (Chair), A. Panter), Business instrument for use across the university. The committee was constituted with recommendations and charged by Provost Richardson to design a student evaluation The current Task Force was constituted in January of 1999 in response to these course evaluation system currently in use at the University of Michigan.

students' course selection. Further they recommended review and consideration of a

student evaluations for the Task Force and compiled the current report. The Task Force provided multiple opportunities for students, faculty and administrators to provide input during its deliberations. A public forum was held during February and a circular from the Provost solicited input from faculty members and students. In addition, the chair of the Task Force and the student representative (L. McPhail) met with members of the student government cabinet, while the chair of the Task Force and Professor Panter met with members of the executive and educational policy committees of Faculty Council.

During the Task Force's first meeting, prior campus events and the research literature on student evaluations of teaching were reviewed. Between the first and second meetings of the Task Force, the instrument evaluation subcommittee reviewed instruments used at peer institutions and identified a range of different approaches. At the second Task Force meeting, members of the instrument evaluation subcommittee presented these instruments to the Task Force. A consensus emerged that the system currently used by the University of Michigan possessed the structure and the flexibility necessary to meet the many purposes of student evaluations of teaching. At the conclusion of the second meeting, the instrument evaluation subcommittee was charged with identifying questions that could serve the purposes of evaluation of faculty, provision of feedback to faculty, and provision of information to students within the Michigan system.

The third Task Force meeting was a public forum in which input from students, faculty, and administrators was solicited. A strong sentiment emerging from this forum, as well as from input received by electronic mail, was that the student evaluation instrument must provide extensive opportunities for written comments. Following the third Task Force meeting, the report drafting sub-committee was charged with identifying consensus

positions on the use and interpretation of student evaluations, including issues related to

statistical norming, web publication, and the effects of extraneous variables.

The fourth meeting of the Task Force featured presentations of proposed items by the

instrument evaluation sub-committee and presentation of consensus positions on the use

and interpretation of student evaluations by the report drafting sub-committee. Following

discussion of these issues, the drafting sub-committee revised the proposed instrument

and the consensus positions, and compiled the current report. This report was presented,

discussed and revised at the fifth meeting of the Task Force. Following revision the

report was submitted to the Chancellor's Advisory Committee and Provost Richardson.

### **Section III: The Instrument and its Properties**

The recommended instrument is presented in Appendix A. As discussed above, and

recommended by the prior Task Force, it is modeled on the system currently in use at the

University of Michigan. The instrument attempts to meet the purposes of evaluating

faculty, improving teaching, and providing information to students, while permitting

departmental and faculty users substantial flexibility.

The instrument consists of a two-page required section and a larger optional section.

#### *A. Description of Required Section*

The required section consists of four components. The first component is a set of three

summary questions measuring students' overall judgments of teaching and course quality.

Interpreted in the context of a range of other information (see Section IV below), the

responses to these questions provide useful information for evaluating faculty. While the

responses to these summary questions are likely to be correlated, three questions are used to allow the instrument to tap slightly different aspects of overall teaching performance. Consistent with the input we received during the public forum, each summary question presents students with an opportunity for written comments.

The second required component consists of thirteen questions, with each question being designed to capture an element identified by prior research as a constituent of effective teaching (Appendix B presents descriptions of the elements of teaching these questions attempt to measure with relevant citations to research literature). We refer to these as formative questions to denote that their primary purpose is to help faculty members improve their teaching.

The third required component consists of seven questions designed by student government representatives. These questions provide information to students that may help guide course selection. They focus exclusively on issues deemed by students to be relevant to course selection (e.g., workload). As discussed below, the design process suggests responses to these questions should not be used to evaluate faculty performance. The final component of this section is a single question soliciting input regarding teaching awards. The purpose of this question is to supplement other criteria for teaching awards by providing broader student input to appropriate awards committees.

### *B. Description of Optional Section*

The optional section of the instrument will vary depending on department decisions. Departments, in consultation with faculty, will be able to choose among approximately two hundred and fifty questions designed by researchers at the UNC-CH Center for Teaching and Learning. These questions cover almost all aspects of teaching and are

external indicators of teaching excellence (e.g., teaching awards). These multiple sources student evaluations, peer evaluations, self-evaluations, teaching portfolios, and other Evaluations of teaching performance should consider multiple perspectives, including exclusively in the renewal, promotion, tenure and performance evaluation processes. motivations for assessing the merits of a course. Consequently, they should not be used are reports provided at one point in time by a set of individuals with particular goals and Student evaluations reflect a single type of information about teaching performance; they

*and Performance Evaluation*

*A. Recommendations on the Role of Student Evaluations in Renewal, Promotion, Tenure*

**of Teaching**

**Section IV: Recommendations on the Use and Interpretation of Student Evaluations**

supervision.

C provides additional discussion of issues associated with the evaluation of research members to address the special needs of graduate and professional education. Appendix practice and research supervision. These questions were designed by Task Force attention to the sections of optional questions focusing on graduate education, clinical In the context of UNC Chapel Hill's role as a research university, we wish to draw special questions focusing on this area.

particular teaching initiative (e.g., in information technology), it might include optional reasons for these ratings. Similarly, if a department were attempting to implement a as poor might choose to include additional questions probing this area to help diagnose these questions might be used, a faculty member whose performance in an area was rated available for use by faculty members and/or departments. To give an example of how

of information should also be considered over time to provide a broader and more complete understanding of a person's teaching history and progress.

In this context, we recommend administrators receive student ratings from three sections of the proposed instrument to facilitate judgments on renewal, promotion, tenure and performance evaluation. (Faculty members, of course, will have access to all responses.) Administrators should receive: 1) responses from the three summary questions; 2) responses from the core formative questions; and 3) a listing of the written open-ended comments (or where appropriate, a summary thereof). They should not generally receive responses from the seven student questions, the optional questions, or the question about whether the professor is deserving of a teaching award--- unless the professor being evaluated believes these questions are particularly diagnostic of their teaching performance.

The decision regarding which responses administrators should receive is based on the fact that consistent performance on the former set of three measures (either good or bad) provides important information on teaching quality. In contrast, because of considerations influencing their design and purpose, the latter set of measures will not necessarily provide information on overall quality of teaching. For example, questions designed by students for use in course selection (e.g., does a course use information technology?) may not necessarily measure elements of effective teaching. Similarly, questions designed to solicit student opinions of those who merit teaching awards do not necessarily distinguish good, but not outstanding, teachers from very poor teachers. Neither the good or the very poor teachers would necessarily receive a large number of nominations. Finally, many of the optional questions are designed to measure specific

pedagogical techniques and, consequently, are not appropriate for overall evaluations of teaching quality.

To enhance the ability of administrators to interpret these measures, we recommend that supplementary information be presented to administrators including definitions for measures of central tendency (e.g., mean) and general guidelines for interpreting distributions of responses. Factors identified from the educational literature that may affect student ratings of teaching (e.g., class size, content area) should also be carefully described. Last, the materials should very clearly note that student course evaluations reflect only a limited type of information about teaching performance and that these data must be interpreted in combination with other indicators and perspectives (peer, self, course information, external indicators).

#### *B. Recommendations on Information to be Provided to Students*

The Task Force recognizes the importance of providing course evaluation results to students to help guide their course selection. We believe responses from the three summary questions, the core formative questions, and the seven student questions will be sufficient to accomplish this purpose. Distribution of written comments and responses to the optional and teaching award questions do not provide sufficient additional information to justify widespread distribution, especially as the responses for a single course in these latter categories can sometimes represent limited, and potentially misleading, information.

#### *C. Recommendations on Statistical Analyses*

The Task Force is convinced that student evaluations of teaching are one important piece of information about the teaching performance of a faculty member, but is also well



aware of their limitations. For example, as mentioned previously, extraneous factors (e.g., class size, course type) may influence student ratings. Similarly, narrow response ranges may make it very difficult to interpret percentile rankings. In this context, we recommend that data summaries include the distribution of responses and the mean response on each of the summary and core formative questions. Further, because the Task Force believes it possible to compare ratings across similar courses within a department, we recommend that data summaries also show the first, second, and third quartile points on the questions identified above for each department. In the same vein, it may be possible to develop over time estimates of quartiles for individual courses by aggregating the ratings as faculty repeat the course and/or it is taught by other faculty. If possible, this information should also be presented with indication of the number of times the course has been taught. The Task Force does not believe it appropriate to make comparisons across the University or even within a large unit such as the College of Arts and Sciences. Extreme heterogeneity in content area, pedagogical style, course goals, and student characteristics make such comparisons extremely difficult to interpret. The concept of comparing ratings raises the question of how to accommodate the large body of research indicating that student evaluations of teaching may be affected by factors beyond the control of a faculty member. Such factors include class size, type of course (required versus elective), content area or discipline, and expected grade. While it might be possible to develop a mathematical model to "statistically" adjust evaluations to take these factors into account, the Task Force does not recommend doing so at this time. Such a statistical adjustment is predicated on many assumptions which would need to be investigated in great detail before a model might be developed. Further, statistical models

are generally designed for understanding aggregate or group data. Consequently, application to individual cases, as would be necessary in the current situation, may produce numerous misleading conclusions. As an alternative to a statistical model, and as discussed in Section IVA above, we recommend providing administrators with a general description of the different variables that have been identified in the literature and how these variables may affect ratings. This should help produce more valid judgments of teaching quality, while minimizing the misleading conclusions that might arise from the application of a statistical model to individual cases. A final recommendation is that continual quality monitoring be in place to evaluate the adequacy of the items, to understand better ways to present responses, and to assess the instrument in relation to external criteria.

### **Section V: Comparison of the Proposed Instrument to the Carolina Course Review and Implementation Details**

We view the proposed instrument as a descendant of the Carolina Course Review. Thus, we wish to acknowledge publicly the effort, hard work and creativity of those who developed and maintained the CCR over the last three decades. Further, we wish to emphasize that there is substantial overlap in the constructs that the current instrument and the CCR attempt to measure. (Appendix B presents a detailed comparison of the questions used in the current instrument and the CCR.)

In this context, we wish to mention five important differences between the current instrument and the CCR. First, we have separated questions specifically designed for student use from questions designed for summative and formative uses. This division

allows questions to be designed specifically for student purposes, while ensuring that the responses to such questions do not inappropriately influence the renewal, promotion, tenure and performance evaluation processes. Second, the inclusion of a substantial optional section gives the current instrument significantly more flexibility than the CCR. As discussed above, faculty members or departments can insert optional questions to help them more fully evaluate areas of special interest. Similarly, the newly created modules on graduate education, research supervision and clinical practice can be interchanged with the other formative questions to provide more appropriate evaluation in these areas. Third, the three summary questions are presented together with opportunities for written comments. We think the opportunity for open-ended responses will enhance the reliability of our core formative questions allows for a broad analysis of many elements of effective teaching, rather than multiple measurements of a limited number of aspects (see Appendix B). This broader measurement can play a critical role in improving teaching by helping faculty members identify and monitor problem areas. Fifth, our proposed statistical analyses are substantially more conservative than those used by the CCR. Specifically, there is no attempt to represent precise percentile rankings, nor do we recommend making comparisons outside a faculty member's department. Similarly, given the broad diagnostic orientation of our formative questions, we do not use factor analytic methods for summarizing measurements. We think this approach responds to many of the criticisms raised previously by members of Faculty Council, as well as to the input we received from faculty members during the current process.

We close this section with a brief discussion of implementation issues. We strongly recommend the creation of a campus unit to implement the current recommendations and maintain the university's system of course evaluation. We believe this unit should be located in the UNC-CH Center for Teaching and Learning so that they can benefit from a collegial environment in which the assessment and enhancement of teaching are central. In this context, we recommend that appropriate resources be allocated to the UNC-CH Center for Teaching and Learning for this purpose.

### **Section VI: Conclusion**

The evaluation of teaching is critical to the university's instructional mission. The proposed instrument is designed to serve the purposes of faculty evaluation, improvement of teaching, and guidance for students in a succinct and flexible format. We strongly recommend that all units of the university adopt the proposed instrument.

# Appendix A: Proposed Evaluation Form

## University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill: Teaching Effectiveness Form

These evaluations are extremely useful to instructors in planning future semesters and are taken very seriously by the department and the university. Please consider your responses carefully. Make sure to complete all sections.

Department Code → 

--	--	--	--	--

Course Code → 

--	--	--	--	--

Section Code → 

--	--	--	--	--

Who is Your Instructor? → 

--	--	--	--	--

### Background Information

1. What is your year in school? <input type="radio"/> first year <input type="radio"/> senior <input type="radio"/> sophomore <input type="radio"/> graduate student <input type="radio"/> junior <input type="radio"/> other	2. What is your overall cumulative grade point average? <input type="radio"/> 1.99 or less <input type="radio"/> 3.00-3.49 <input type="radio"/> 2.00-2.49 <input type="radio"/> 3.50-4.00 <input type="radio"/> 2.50-2.99	3. To the best of your knowledge, what is your grade in this course? <input type="radio"/> F or D <input type="radio"/> B or B+ <input type="radio"/> C- or C <input type="radio"/> A- or A <input type="radio"/> C+ or B-	4. Is this a required course for you? <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
--	---	---	---

Instructions. Use the scale below to indicate your agreement with the statements on this page and the reverse side:

- (NA) Not applicable;
- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Disagree Nor Agree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

### A. Overall Course Assessment

1. Overall, considering its content, design, and structure, this course was excellent. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	← COMMENTS?
2. Overall, considering the possibilities of the subject matter, this instructor was an effective teacher. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	← COMMENTS?
3. Overall, considering the possibilities of the subject matter, I learned a great deal from this course. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	← COMMENTS?

### B. Course/Instructor Characteristics

1. This course challenged me to think deeply about the subject matter. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
2. The course was well organized. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3. It was clear what was expected of me in this class. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
4. I was able to get individual help when I needed it. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
5. The course materials (e.g., textbook) helped me better understand the subject matter. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
6. The course assignments helped me better understand the subject matter. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
7. Grades reflected a fair evaluation of my performance. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
8. The instructor seemed concerned about whether students learned the material. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
9. The instructor expressed ideas clearly. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
10. The instructor showed enthusiasm for the subject matter. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
11. The instructor treated all students with respect. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
12. The instructional techniques engaged me in the subject matter. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
13. The instructor provided me with helpful feedback on my performance. (NA)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Please be sure to complete the reverse side.

© Copyright, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1999.  
DRAFT VERSION developed by the Task Force on Student Evaluations, Spring 1999. Do not cite without permission from the Task Force.

- Ⓜ Does not apply
- ① Strongly Disagree
- ② Disagree
- ③ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ④ Agree
- ⑤ Strongly Agree

**C. Student Questions.** UNC student government representatives selected these questions to aid in course selection.

1. The instructor handled questions well.	Ⓜ	①	②	③	④	⑤
2. The instructor used examples that had relevance for me.	Ⓜ	①	②	③	④	⑤
3. The instructor used class time well.	Ⓜ	①	②	③	④	⑤
4. The instructor encouraged participation/interaction.	Ⓜ	①	②	③	④	⑤
5. The instructor used innovative forms of presentation.	Ⓜ	①	②	③	④	⑤
6. Information technology was used effectively in the course.	Ⓜ	①	②	③	④	⑤
7. The workload in the class was appropriate.	Ⓜ	①	②	③	④	⑤

**D. Teaching Award Question.** This question will be used to help university committees for teaching excellence identify talented and deserving instructors for teaching awards.

1. This instructor was one of the best I have had at UNC-CH, fully deserving of a teaching award.

Yes, this instructor is one of the best I have had at UNC.

**E. Additional Comments.** Written comments may help improve this course in the future. Please comment on Sections B and C, as well as answer the following: Would you recommend this course under this instructor? Why or why not? What were the best and worst parts? What could be improved?

Thank you for taking the time to give us your evaluation of this course and instructor. Appendix A (Continued): Optional Questions (Modules A Through X)

Questions from the following modules can help provide additional feedback about the course.

Module	Module Name	Number of Optional Items in Module
Module A	Students' Development	9
Module B	Instructor's Development	19
Module C	Instructor's Attitude Toward Students	8
Module D	Instructor's Organization and Preparation	8
Module E	Instructor's Communication Skills	8
Module F	Instructor's Interest in Teaching	3
Module G	Instructor's Presentational Style	5
Module H	Pace and Depth of Coverage	6
Module I	Instructor's Expectations and Objectives	5
Module J	Instructor's Accessibility	6
Module K	Use of Instructional Technology	9
Module L	Students' Attitude Toward the Course	4
Module M	Student Interaction	9
Module N	Course Relevance	4
Module O	Examinations	15
Module P	Assignments	15
Module Q	Grading	6
Module R	Laboratory Work	24
Module S	Clinical/Field Placement	21
Module T	Studio Work	8
Module U	Team Teaching	4
Module V	Guest Lectures	4
Module W	Field Trips	3
Module X	Graduate Seminar	15



## Module A: Students' Development

- A-1. This course was helpful in developing new skills.
- A-2. I learned more in this course than in similar courses.
- A-3. I generally understood the material presented in this course.
- A-4. I felt that this course challenged me intellectually.
- A-5. I have become more competent in this subject area during this course.
- A-6. I performed up to my potential in this course.
- A-7. My opinions about some topics changed because of this course.
- A-8. I learned more in this course than I expected to learn.
- A-9. The course made me think hard and carefully.

## Module B: Instructor's Development

- B-1. The instructor inspired me to be critical of ideas and materials.
- B-2. The instructor's work in class built upon what I learned from the reading assignments.
- B-3. The instructor related the course to students' experiences and backgrounds.
- B-4. The instructor made me feel that the course material is worthwhile.
- B-5. The instructor helped me develop an interest in the material.
- B-6. I generally enjoyed going to classes.
- B-7. The instructor integrated the course material with what I had previously learned.
- B-8. The instructor presented divergent viewpoints when appropriate.
- B-9. The instructor made me aware of current problems in this field.
- B-10. The instructor related theories and concepts to practical issues.
- B-11. The instructor effectively used examples to get across key points.
- B-12. The instructor clarified complex sections of the text.
- B-13. The instructor presented diverse approaches to problems and their solutions.
- B-14. The instructor accepted viewpoints other than his/her own as valid.
- B-15. I learned more from this instructor than I could by independent study.
- B-16. The instructor incorporated material from other fields to help my understanding.
- B-17. The instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter of the course.
- B-18. The instructor used a scholarly approach in presenting content, such as referring to theory, research, and debates in the field.
- B-19. The instructor helped me synthesize the material.

## Module C: Instructor's Attitude Toward Students

- C-1. The instructor encouraged students to express their opinions.
- C-2. The instructor always seemed aware of the needs of students.
- C-3. The instructor seemed receptive to new ideas and others' viewpoints.
- C-4. I was comfortable asking questions in this course.
- C-5. The instructor knew the names of students.
- C-6. The instructor created a positive classroom environment.
- C-7. The instructor recognized individual differences in the abilities of students.
- C-8. The instructor showed interest in students.

## Module D: Instructor's Organization and Preparation

- D-1. The instructor's class presentations made for easy note taking.
- D-2. The instructor presented material in a clear manner.
- D-3. The course material was presented in logical units.
- D-4. There was continuity from one class meeting to the next.
- D-5. The class presentations were well organized.
- D-6. The instructor was prepared for class.
- D-7. The instructor rarely digressed from the subject matter.
- D-8. The instructor summarized key points.

## Module E: Instructor's Communication Skills

- E-1. The instructor's voice was clear and understandable.
- E-2. The instructor's vocabulary was appropriate for my level of understanding of the material.
- E-3. The instructor's lectures were at an appropriate level for me.
- E-4. The instructor defined new terms, concepts, and principles.
- E-5. The instructor spoke at an appropriate pace during lecture.
- E-6. The instructor gave examples, illustrations, or applications to clarify abstract concepts.
- E-7. The instructor slowed down when discussing complex and difficult topics.
- E-8. The instructor facilitated student involvement in the seminar.

## Module F: Instructor's Interest in Teaching

- F-1. The instructor was enthusiastic in presenting course material.
- F-2. The instructor seemed friendly and relaxed in front of the class.
- F-3. The instructor seemed genuinely interested in the course material.

## Module G: Instructor's Presentational Style

- G-1. The instructor varied activities over the course of the semester.
- G-2. The instructor made the subject matter interesting.
- G-3. The instructor's presentations were generally thought provoking.
- G-4. The instructor's classroom sessions stimulated my interest in the subject.
- G-5. I was generally attentive in class.

## Module H: Pace and Depth of Coverage

- H-1. The instructor covered about the right amount of material in this course.
- H-2. Prerequisites for this course adequately prepared me for taking it.
- H-3. Within the time limitations, the instructor covered the course content in sufficient depth.
- H-4. The instructor generally presented the material at an appropriate pace.
- H-5. The instructor made sure that students understood material before moving on to new topics.
- H-6. The course material provided sufficient depth of content in the area.

## Module I: Instructor's Expectations and Objectives

- I-1. The instructor clearly specified the course assignments.
- I-2. The instructor informed us of the direction the course was to take.
- I-3. The objectives of the course were adequately explained.
- I-4. The instructor took time to define my responsibilities in this course.
- I-5. The catalogue description of the course matched the way it was taught.

## Module J: Instructor's Accessibility

- J-1. Assistance from the instructor outside the class was readily available.
- J-2. Talking to the instructor during office hours was helpful.
- J-3. The office hours were scheduled at convenient times.
- J-4. The instructor was available for consultation with students.
- J-5. The instructor encouraged out-of-class consultations.
- J-6. The instructor was available during office hours.

## Module K: Use of Instructional Technology

- K-1. Audio/visual materials (or computers) were an asset to this course.
- K-2. AV materials (or computers) used in this course contributed significantly to my learning.
- K-3. AV materials (or computers) used in this course were well integrated with course topics.
- K-4. AV materials (or computers) used in this course were well chosen.
- K-5. Using the Discussion Board contributed to my learning in this course.
- K-6. Using email contributed to my learning in this course.
- K-7. Using the Listserv contributed to my learning in this course.
- K-8. The WWW course page was an effective tool in this course.
- K-9. Using the internet to discuss class material was valuable to me.

## Module L: Students' Attitude Toward the Course

- L-1. The time spent in the class was worthwhile.
- L-2. My attendance for this course has been better than for other courses.
- L-3. I would have taken this course even if it were not required.
- L-4. I looked forward to this class.

## Module M: Student Interaction

- M-1. The instructor stimulated class discussion.
- M-2. I had an opportunity to participate in discussions with the instructor.
- M-3. I participated in class discussion more in this course than in similar courses.
- M-4. The instructor devoted enough time to class discussion.
- M-5. The instructor allowed enough time for answering questions in class.
- M-6. My questions were answered satisfactorily by the instructor.
- M-7. The instructor provided a good mixture of lecture and discussion.
- M-8. The instructor asked questions to gauge whether students understood the material.
- M-9. The instructor noted and responded to students' puzzlement or boredom.

## Module N: Course Relevance

- N-1. I was interested in learning the course material.
- N-2. This course has given me an enduring interest in this area.
- N-3. This course has stimulated me to do outside reading on my own.
- N-4. I plan to take additional courses in this field.

## Module O: Examinations

- O-1. The instructor gave about the right number of examinations.
- O-2. The exams were clearly worded.
- O-3. The exams gave students an opportunity to demonstrate what they had learned.
- O-4. The exams gave the instructor a good picture of my understanding of the course material.
- O-5. The exams adequately covered the reading assignments.
- O-6. The exams adequately covered the lecture material.
- O-7. The exams concentrated on reasoning and applying concepts.
- O-8. The exams concentrated on factual material.
- O-9. The exams concentrated on the important aspects of the course.
- O-10. The exams were fair.
- O-11. The instructor took reasonable precautions to prevent cheating during tests.
- O-12. The exams reflected the objectives of the course.
- O-13. The answers to the exam questions were adequately explained after the exam.
- O-14. I had enough time during the examination periods.
- O-15. The type of examinations were appropriate to the course content.

## Module P: Assignments

- P-1. The assignments were challenging.
- P-2. The assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.
- P-3. The instructor made useful comments on the assignments I turned in.
- P-4. An appropriate amount of homework was required for this class.
- P-5. There was no "busy work" in this class.
- P-6. Assigned readings in this class were at an appropriate level.
- P-7. The reading assignments were interesting.
- P-8. Readings covered both sides of issues.
- P-9. Outside readings were relevant to the rest of the course.
- P-10. The course required a reasonable amount of outside reading.
- P-11. The text used in the course was helpful.
- P-12. The writing assignments were adequately explained.
- P-13. The criteria for grading the writing assignments were clear.
- P-14. The writing assignments were connected to the course material.
- P-15. The course required a reasonable amount of writing.

## Module Q: Grading

- Q-1. I had expected to get the grade in this course that I will receive.
- Q-2. My grades accurately represent my performance in the course.
- Q-3. I know my relative standing in the class.
- Q-4. The grading system was adequately explained.
- Q-5. The instructor was fair in assigning grades.
- Q-6. The instructor's grading system encouraged me to work harder.

## Module R: Laboratory Work

- R-1. The laboratory instructor was concerned with safety.
- R-2. I generally found the laboratory sessions valuable.
- R-3. The laboratory instructor clarified lecture material.
- R-4. The laboratory instructor presented material over and above the lecture material.
- R-5. The laboratory instructor provided adequate individual attention.
- R-6. The laboratory instructor helped me to find supplementary references.
- R-7. The laboratory instructor was available during office hours.
- R-8. The questions on the lab quizzes were a good sample of what I was expected to know.
- R-9. The lab increased my competence in using lab equipment and materials.
- R-10. The lab equipment was, on most occasions, effectively set up.
- R-11. The laboratory section appeared to be well integrated with the lecture.
- R-12. The use of laboratory equipment was adequately explained.
- R-13. Laboratory assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.
- R-14. The laboratories used for this course had adequate facilities.
- R-15. I had sufficient opportunity to use the laboratory facilities.
- R-16. The laboratory sessions were well organized.
- R-17. My laboratory instructor thoroughly understood the laboratory experiments and equipment.
- R-18. Directions for the laboratory assignments were clear.
- R-19. Laboratory assignments required a reasonable amount of time and effort.
- R-20. Laboratory assignments were interesting and stimulating.
- R-21. Laboratory assignments were reasonable in length and complexity.
- R-22. Assistance was available throughout laboratory sessions.
- R-23. Laboratory reports were graded fairly and impartially.
- R-24. Laboratory reports were returned promptly.

## Module S: Clinical/Field Placement

- S-1. We encountered a good variety of clinical problems.
- S-2. The instructor's clinical demonstrations were clear and concise.
- S-3. Clinical techniques were explained and discussed thoroughly.
- S-4. Sufficient observation and supervision were provided in clinical work.
- S-5. Prior course work adequately prepared me to handle the clinical tasks.
- S-6. The instructor satisfactorily answered my clinical questions.
- S-7. The instructor evaluated my clinical work consistently.
- S-8. The instructor was very helpful in my developing good clinical techniques.
- S-9. Appropriate and inappropriate clinical procedures were clearly identified.
- S-10. The instructor made reasonable demands of the students in clinical work.
- S-11. The (C/F/P) was valuable in my professional development.
- S-12. The (C/F/P) assignments stimulated my ability to critically apply information learned in other courses.
- S-13. The instructor clearly communicated expectations for (C/F/P).
- S-14. The instructor was very knowledgeable in regards the (C/F/P).
- S-15. The instructor was sufficiently available to me during the (C/F/P).
- S-16. The instructor encouraged critical thinking in regard to my (C/F/P).
- S-17. The instructor demonstrated an open and analytic approach to different points of view about issues related to the (C/F/P).
- S-18. The instructor facilitated my growth as a professional.
- S-19. The instructor provided timely and constructive feedback about my performance during the (C/F/P).
- S-20. The instructor was sensitive about and stimulated thinking related to cultural diversity encountered during the (C/F/P).
- S-21. The instructor helped me be aware of ethical aspects of my experiences.

## Module T: Studio Work

- T-1. The studio projects were valuable in understanding the course.
- T-2. The studio facilities were adequate.
- T-3. The assigned studio projects were appropriate to the level of the course.
- T-4. The instructor required a reasonable amount of work to be done in studio class.
- T-5. The instructor's examples and demonstrations in studio class were clear and concise.
- T-6. The instructor carefully explained each step of new processes and techniques in studio class.
- T-7. The instructor explained the underlying rationale for techniques or styles in studio class.
- T-8. Desk critics were effective in studio class.

## Module U: Team Teaching

- U-1. Team-teaching was effectively used in this course.
- U-2. Instruction was well coordinated among the teachers.
- U-3. The teachers were compatible in this course.
- U-4. Course material was effectively presented with the team-teaching approach.

## Module V: Guest Lectures

- V-1. The guest lecturers were interesting and stimulating.
- V-2. The guest lecturers contributed significantly to this course.
- V-3. The guest lecturers addressed issues relevant to the course.
- V-4. The guest lecturers were effective speakers.

## Module W: Field Trips

- W-1. The field trips were useful learning experiences.
- W-2. The field trips were conducted with a high level of expertise.
- W-3. The logistics of the field trips were well planned.

## Module X: Graduate Seminar Module

- X-1. I felt that this course challenged me intellectually.
- X-2. The instructor inspired me to be critical of ideas and materials.
- X-3. The instructor presented divergent viewpoints when appropriate.
- X-4. The instructor accepted viewpoints other than his/her own as valid.
- X-5. The instructor used a scholarly approach in presenting content, such as referring to theory, research, and debates in the field.
- X-6. The instructor helped me synthesize the material.
- X-7. The instructor encouraged students to express their opinions.
- X-8. The instructor seemed receptive to new ideas and others' viewpoints.
- X-9. The instructor facilitated student involvement in the seminar.
- X-10. The course material provided sufficient depth of content in the area.
- X-11. The instructor was available for consultation with students.
- X-12. The instructor stimulated class discussion.

## Appendix B: Research References and Item Comparisons

### Appendix B, Part 1. Elements of Effective Teaching Supported by Research

1. Plans the course in such a way that students can easily follow its organization.
2. Develops course goals that emphasize higher-order learning.
3. Provides challenging and interesting assignments.
4. Clearly communicates expectations for student performance.
5. Varies the instructional strategies used in the course.
6. Uses classroom techniques that involve the students actively in the subject matter.
7. Shows enthusiasm for the subject matter and for teaching.
8. Insures that communication of the subject matter is clear.
9. Provides ways for students to receive individual help if they need it.
10. Gives prompt, constructive feedback to students on their performance.
11. Uses grading practices that insure fairness and impartiality.
12. Demonstrates caring about students and how well they are learning in course.

## References

- 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. (1989). Instructional effectiveness of college teachers as judged by teachers themselves, current and former students, colleagues, administrators, and external (neutral) observers. *Research in Higher Education, 30*, 137-194.
- Marsh, H. W. (1987). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Research findings, methodological issues, and directions for future research. *International Journal of Educational Research, 11*, 253-388.
- Sullivan, A. M. & Skanes, G. R. (1974). Validity of student evaluation of teaching and the characteristics of effective instructors. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 66*(4), 584-590.
- Wotruba, T. R. & Wright, P. L. (1975). How to develop teacher-rating instruments: A research approach. *Journal of Higher Education, 46*(6), 653-663.

# Appendix B, Part 2. Mapping of Current Summative and Formative Items to Carolina Course Review Items and to Effective Teaching Elements

Items on Proposed Form	Carolina Course Review Item	Corresponding Element
1. Overall, considering its content, design, and structure, this course was excellent.	No specific Carolina Course Review item	Captured by the set of Elements
2. Overall, considering the possibilities of the subject matter, this instructor was an effective teacher.	Overall, my instructor is an effective teacher. (CCR-10)	Captured by the set of Elements
3. Overall, considering the possibilities of the subject matter, I learned a great deal from this course.	Overall, this course was a valuable learning experience. (CCR-21)	Captured by the set of Elements

## Core Formative Items

1. This course challenged me to think deeply about the subject matter.	The course has challenged me to work at my full potential. (CCR-18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides challenging and interesting assignments (Element 3)</li> <li>Uses classroom techniques that involve the students actively in the subject matter (Element 6)</li> <li>Plans the course in such a way that students can easily follow its organization (Element 1)</li> </ul>
2. The course was well organized.	No specific Carolina Course Review item	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans the course in such a way that students can easily follow its organization (Element 1)</li> </ul>
3. It was clear what was expected of me in this class.	No specific Carolina Course Review item	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly communicates expectations for student performance (Element 4)</li> </ul>
4. The course materials (e.g., textbook) helped me better understand the subject matter.	No specific Carolina Course Review item	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides challenging and interesting assignments (Element 3)</li> </ul>
5. The course assignments helped me better understand the subject matter.	Course assignments are interesting and stimulating. (CCR-15)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides challenging and interesting assignments (Element 3)</li> </ul>
6. The instructor expressed ideas clearly.	My instructor presents difficult material clearly. (CCR-6) My instructor speaks audibly and clearly. (CCR-4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insures that communication of the subject matter is clear (Element 8)</li> </ul>
7. Instructional techniques engaged me in the subject matter	My instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations. (CCR-7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses classroom techniques that involve the students actively in the subject matter (Element 6)</li> </ul>
8. The instructor seemed concerned about whether students learned the material.	No specific Carolina Course Review item	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates caring about students and how well they are learning in the course (Element 12)</li> </ul>
9. The instructor showed enthusiasm for the subject matter.	My instructor displays enthusiasm when teaching. (CCR-2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows enthusiasm for the subject matter and for teaching (Element 7)</li> </ul>
10. The instructor treated all students with respect.	No specific Carolina Course Review item	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates caring about students and how well they are learning in the course (Element 12)</li> </ul>
11. The instructor provided me with helpful feedback on my performance	No specific Carolina Course Review item	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gives prompt, constructive feedback to students on their performance (Element 10)</li> </ul>
12. Grades reflected a fair evaluation of my performance.	Grades are assigned fairly and impartially. (CCR-14)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses grading practices that insure fairness and impartiality (Element 11)</li> </ul>
13. I was able to get individual help when I needed it.	My instructor is actively helpful when students have problems. (CCR-9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides ways for student to receive individual help if they need it (Element 9)</li> </ul>

### Appendix B, Part 3. Mapping of Carolina Course Review Items Not Associated with Required Items to Optional Items

Carolina Course Review Item	Corresponding Optional Item from Modules
1. My instructor identifies major or important points in the course. (CCR-1)	My instructor summarized key points. (D-8)
2. My instructor seems well-prepared for class. (CCR-3)	The instructor presented material in a clear manner. (D-2)
3. My instructor displays a clear understanding of course topics. (CCR-5)	The instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter of the course. (B-17)
4. Exams in this course have instructional value. (CCR-11)	The exams concentrated on important aspects of the course. (O-9)
5. My instructor returns exams and assignments quickly enough to benefit me. (CCR-12)	No specific optional question is available at this time.
6. Exams stress important points of the lectures/text. (CCR-13)	The exams adequately covered the reading assignments (O-5)
7. The assigned reading is well integrated into this course. (CCR-17)	Outside readings were relevant to the rest of the course. (P-9)
8. The amount of student effort required in this course is reasonable. (CCR-19)	An appropriate amount of homework was required for this course. (P-4)
9. My instructor has a realistic definition of good student performance. (CCR-21)	No specific optional question is available at this time.



## Appendix C: Evaluation of Research Supervision

Research supervision (honors projects, master's research, and dissertations) is a major role of a faculty member at a doctoral research university. Yet, faculty are seldom given credit for the time involved (workload), nor is there a requirement or consistent manner to evaluate this work. For some faculty, research supervision is an exceptional teaching strength, when teaching large classes may not be as strong. Thus, these evaluations are important. On the other hand, there are faculty with serious problems in research supervision that are never clearly evaluated or dealt with.

Because research supervision is a one person evaluation, there is a serious problem related to student confidentiality of their evaluations and, given the potential bias regarding whom faculty might give or not give evaluations forms to, an added question is who should request the evaluation. In addition, there are issues related to when and how often such evaluations should be completed.

Regarding confidentiality, it is recommended that someone other than the faculty member administer the evaluation forms; the procedure should be made part of a routine each semester so the process is not overlooked. Efforts should be made to get the completed form from all students to ensure that evaluations are based on all students and not just disgruntled students.

The completed evaluation should be placed in a sealed envelope and given to the Department Chair or similar person to be placed in the faculty members' confidential department file. When 10 (number could be debated) evaluations have accumulated, the data should be compiled by a third party and given to the faculty member and Chair.

Regarding frequency, such evaluations could be done every semester a student is enrolled in a research experience involving advisement or only the semester when the honors project, research project, or dissertation is completed. Because in some programs students are enrolled for research experiences other than for these types of final products, evaluating only at the end of these projects might be too limiting. On the other hand, having a faculty member evaluated by students each semester they take credits involving research advisement activities could mean that several of the 10 evaluations were completed by the same student. Thus, there is a need for discussion on these issues to better understand the issues and needs of different departments.

Recommendation for evaluation items:

- Was knowledgeable about the research process
- Demonstrated an open and analytical approach to different points of view about the problem being studied.
- Was sufficiently available to me.
- Stimulated my intellectual curiosity about the topic
- Facilitated my growth in research skills
- Served as sounding board for my research ideas and guided the development of my research
- Was knowledgeable about School and University research requirements.
- Provided timely feedback
- Provided helpful and appropriate feedback
- Was clear about accepted outcomes at each stage of the process.
- Encouraged critical thinking
- Taught me about scientific integrity in research
- Facilitated my understanding of ethical aspects of the research process
- Facilitated timely completion of my study

