

Draft

Course Evaluation Revision Task Force Report

Members: Anne Marie Flatekval (TAS), Tae Yang Kwak (HGS), Lysandra Perez Strumolo, Chair (SSHS), Wilson Rose (ASB), Joel Weissman (CA)

Charge of the Task Force

This semester, the default delivery of the Student Course Evaluation (SCE) is online with the "opt out" option of using paper evaluations. This is a great opportunity to reassess and revise the Student Course Evaluation.

The SCE Revision Task Force (2007-2008) is charged with the task of reviewing the current SCE and developing a proposal for its revision. The Task Force will meet regularly to discuss the current SCE and to develop a proposal for its revision. The Task Force will also be responsible for the implementation of the revised SCE.

completely rewrite the SCE and submit the proposal to FA.

Task Force met regularly to accomplish the following tasks:

- Articulated the uses of the Course and Instructor Evaluation Forms at Ramapo
- Reviewed current form, identifying areas that may require revision
- Examined course evaluation forms from other NJ Public Colleges
- Reviewed literature on best practices
- Reviewed literature on bias in evaluations of teaching
- Examined Standardized Measures designed for course and instructor evaluation
- Reviewed AAC&U's LEAP (Liberal Education and America's Promise) essential learning outcomes
- Developed draft of revised "Student Evaluation of Instructor and Course"

Background

The Student Evaluation of Instructor and Course has been in use for some time now at Ramapo. The primary concerns with this form at the present time are the double barreled qualitative questions at the end of the form and the potential for biases to influence student's ratings, a problem that is not unique to this form but inherent to the process of student ratings and other similar evaluations.

The potential for biases to influence ratings has been an ongoing concern at Ramapo. In an effort to address these issues, an Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations was formed in 2001 and presented their report to the Faculty Assembly in 2002. At that time, the Ad Hoc committee argued that the "collection and analysis of

process is consistent with best practices for the purpose of evaluating teaching effectiveness (See Appendix A for more information about assessment of teaching effectiveness at Ramapo).

Student Ratings at other NJ Public Institutions

With the help of our AFT Union representatives, our Task Force examined the processes used by some of the other NJ Public Colleges for collecting student evaluation data. NJ Public Colleges rely on student surveys for collecting this information. Some use home grown forms such as our form, which afford flexibility and allow for questions that address specific teaching philosophies. A substantial number of NJ Public Institutions have adopted standardized forms for collecting student evaluation data. These forms have established validity and reliability and allow for more robust comparisons and data analyses.

Kean & Rowan:

an adequate sample of students, (c) analyze responses systematically to produce meaningful results, and (d) incorporate the results into professional development efforts known to improve teaching (p. 274).

Online methods for administering Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs) are plagued by low response rates and related to lower ratings (Nowell, Gale & Handley, 2010). The difference in response rates across delivery methods renders invalid any comparisons of evaluations gathered online to those gathered in class. Moreover, low response rates increase measurement error, which can result in limitations to our ability to use the data.

However, online methods are not thought to inherently render the evaluations invalid. Instead, it is recommended that colleges use a single mode of delivery for all courses (Nowell, Gale and Handley, 2010).

In a study conducted by Dommeyer et al. (2004) taking no action to encourage completion of online evaluations led to a response rate of 29%, demonstration of the Website in class led to a rate of 53%, and a small grade incentive of one quarter of 1% of the total course grade led to a response rate of 87% (Boysen, p.278). More research on incentives has followed and a summary of recommendations for improving response rates are included below

Improving Online SET Response Rates (Suggestions are integrated from: Boysen, 2016; Dommeyer et al., 2004; Goodman, Anson & Belcheir, 2015; Nulty, 2008; Stanny & Arruda, 2017)

The greater the number of measures taken (method, time, location, etc.) the higher the response rate (Boysen, 2016)

Home Grown versus Standardized Student Evaluations of Teaching

Several NJ Public institutions rely on standardized SETs. While making recommendations about standardized forms is outside the scope of our Task Force's charge, we agreed it was important to share what we learned about these methods.

Three well researched, multidimensional measures were examined by our Task Force: the Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment (IDEA; Cashin &

References

- Boysen, G. A. (2016). Using student evaluations to improve teaching: Evidence based recommendations. *Scholarship Of Teaching And Learning In Psychology, 2*(4), 273-284. doi:10.1037/stl0000069
- Boysen, G. A., Kelly, T. J., Raesly, H. N., & Casner, R. W. (2014). The (mis)interpretation of teaching evaluations by college faculty and administrators. *Assessment & Evaluation In Higher Education, 39*(6), 641-656. doi:10.1080/02602938.2013.860950
- Capa Aydin, Y. (2016). Student evaluation of instruction: Comparison between in class and online methods. *Assessment & Evaluation In Higher Education, 41*(1), 112-126. doi:10.1080/02602938.2014.987106
- Delucchi, M., & Pelowski, S. (2000). Liking or learning? The effect of instructor likeability and student perceptions of learning on overall ratings of teaching ability. *Radical Pedagogy, 2*(2),
- Dommeyer, C. J., Baum, P., Hanna, R. W., & Chapman, K. S. (2004). Gathering faculty teaching evaluations by in class and online surveys: Their effects on response rates and evaluations. *Assessment & Evaluation In Higher Education,*

Richmond, A. S., Boysen, G. A., Gurung, R. R., Tazeau, Y. N., Meyers, S. A., & Sciutto, M. J. (2014). Aspirational model teaching criteria for psychology. *Teaching of Psychology, 41*, 281–295.

Appendix A

Assessment of Teaching Excellence
From the

Appendix B

DRAFT
STUDENT RATINGS OF COURSE AND INSTRUCTION

Your responses to these questions provide useful information to your instructor for the purpose of professional development and course development. Please consider each question carefully and provide thoughtful responses.

Course materials (syllabus, assignment instructions, etc...) were clear

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Almost Never		Sometimes		Almost Always	

The course was well organized

The instructor provided meaningful feedback on students' academic work

The instructor explained course material clearly and effectively

The instructor made effective use of examples to enhance student learning

The instructor encouraged participation, discussion and/or questions during class

The instructor was sensitive to the diversity of students in the class (i.e. in terms of gender, race, age, and special physical or academic needs).

The instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours *and/or outside of class*

Indicate the degree of progress you have made as a result of this course in each of the following areas

(based on LEAP goals from AACU COPLAC):

Learning and understanding of the subject

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
No Progress		Some Progress		Much Progress	

The ability to apply knowledge effectively

Learning to analyze and evaluate material

Improving writing skills

Improving oral communication skills

Learning to analyze and interpret quantitative information

Learning to find and evaluate appropriate sources

The ability to work in teams

Developing ethical reasoning and action

(based on Ramapo Pillars):

Interdisciplinary: Learning to examine ideas from multiple, diverse perspectives

Experiential learning: Applying course content outside the classroom or engaging in applied activities

International: Developing a global awareness

Intercultural: Developing knowledge and/or understanding of other cultures

OPTIONAL QUESTIONS *(space for faculty members to add 1-5 optional questions specific to their course and/or program)*

Provide an overall estimate of your learning in the course

--

OVERALL RATINGS

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	

This course challenged me intellectually

Overall this instructor was excellent

Overall, this course was excellent

--

Qualitative Questions

Comment on what the Instructor has done especially well

Comment on what you believe were the best features of this course

Identify specific ways the course could be improved

--

(Student-Specific Questions)

Rate your level of interest in the subject matter PRIOR to the course

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Medium		High

Rate your level of interest in the subject matter AFTER taking the course

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Medium		High

In general, I tend to work harder than other students on my academic endeavors.

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	

Indicate the number of hours you spent on the course outside of class each week, on average:

0-3 4-7 8-11 12-15 16-19 20+

Please indicate your expected grade in this course:

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

Why did you take this course?

Options→

- It is a requirement of the major/minor
- It is a general education or school-specific requirement
- It is an elective

Appendix C

	Current Student Evaluation	Similar Question(s) in Proposed Evaluation	Deletion Reasoning
1	The goals, requirements, and grading policy of the course were		

16	Optional Question		
17	This course improved my (Fill in as many as apply) Analytical Reasoning Critical Thinking Creative Productivity Communication Skills Computational Skills Writing	*Various within the section based on LEAP goals progress.	
18	Why are you taking this course? It meets requirements for my major or minor It meets requirements for my school's core It meets general education requirements It is an elective The time and day were convenient The course or instructor were recommended	*Why *Why	