

OUTLINE OF ISSUE

Agenda Title: Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Alberta: Report of the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE)

Motion: THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) forward to the GFC Academic Planning Committee (APC) their endorsement of the CLE Subcommittee Report on Evaluation and Teaching at the University of Alberta, and the recommendations contained therein, that was before them on the occasion of their January 7, 2009 meeting.

Item

Action Requested	<input type="checkbox"/> Approval <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion/Advice <input type="checkbox"/> Information
Proposed by	The CLE Teaching Evaluation Subcommittee (proposed at the CLE meeting of December 5, 2007)
Presenter	Heather Kanuka, Director, University Teaching Services, and Paula Marentette, Associate Dean (Teaching and Research), Augustana Campus, Subcommittee Co-chairs.
Subject	CLE Teaching Evaluation Subcommittee Report 2008

Details

Responsibility	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	"The creation of this task force arose out of a need to better understand teaching evaluations. This need was identified by the members of the Committee of the Learning Environment. The Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) is responsible for making recommendations concerning policy matters and action matters. The overarching purposes of this task force are to (1) examine alternative teaching evaluation instruments, (2) review existing policies for teaching evaluations at the UofA, as well as at other universities, and (3) provide recommendations for improving teaching evaluations."
The Impact of the Proposal is	See purpose.
Replaces/Revises (eg, policies, resolutions)	N/A
Timeline/Implementation Date	N/A
Estimated Cost	N/A
Sources of Funding	N/A
Notes	N/A

Alignment/Compliance

Alignment with Guiding Documents	<p>Dare to Discover Values (1-4): 1. Excellence in teaching that promotes learning, outstanding research and creative activity that fuel discovery and advance knowledge, and enlightened service that builds citizenship; 2. The centrality of our students and our responsibility to provide an intellectually superior educational environment; 3. Integrity, fairness, and principles of ethical conduct built on the foundation of academic freedom, open inquiry, and the pursuit of truth; 4. A diverse, yet inclusive, dynamic collegial community that welcomes change and seizes opportunity with passion and creativity.</p> <p>Dare To Deliver Areas of Commitment: Discovery learning, incubating scholarship, community engagement near and far, and building the</p>
----------------------------------	---

	transformative organization.
<p>Compliance with Legislation, Policy and/or Procedure Relevant to the Proposal (please <u>quote</u> legislation and include identifying section numbers)</p>	<p>The Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA), Section 26(1), gives General Faculties Council (GFC) responsibility, subject to the authority of the Board of Governors, over "academic affairs." GFC has thus established a Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE).</p> <p>CLE Terms of Reference: Section 3 (<i>Mandate of the Committee</i>): "The Committee on the Learning Environment is a standing committee of the General Faculties Council that promotes an optimal learning environment in alignment with guiding documents of the University of Alberta.</p> <p>The Committee on the Learning Environment is responsible for making recommendations concerning policy matters and action matters with respect to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) To review and monitor the implementation of the University Academic Plan with regard to teaching and learning. b) To review and, as necessary, <u>recommend to the GFC Academic Planning Committee and GFC Executive Committee as relates to the development and implementation of policies on teaching, learning, teaching evaluation, and recognition for teaching that promote the University Academic Plan.</u> c) To <u>develop policies that promote ongoing assessment of teaching and learning through all Faculties and units.</u> d) To nurture the development of innovative and creative teaching practices. e) To encourage the sharing and discussion of evidence about effective teaching and learning. f) To promote critical reflection on the impact of broad societal changes in teaching and learning. g) To promote projects with relevant internal and external bodies that offer unique teaching and learning opportunities that would benefit the university community. h) To consider any matter deemed by the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment to be within the purview of its general responsibility. <p>Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the terms of reference above, the General Faculties Council has delegated to the Committee on the Learning Environment the following powers and authority:</p> <p>To recommend to the GFC Academic Planning Committee and to the GFC Executive Committee broad policy directions for excellence in teaching and learning."</p>

Routing (Include meeting dates)

Consultative Route (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)	GFC Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) (the Subcommittee regularly reported to CLE on its progress throughout 2008, presenting its final report and recommendations at the December 3, 2008 CLE meeting). Vice-Provosts' Meeting – for information and advice (January 5, 2009)
---	---

	AASUA Executive – for information and advice (date to be determined)
Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)	GFC Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) – January 7, 2009 GFC Academic Planning Committee (APC) (date to be determined)
Final Approver	To be determined

Attachments

1. Attachment 1 CLE Teaching Evaluation Subcommittee Report 2008 (pages 1 – 31)
2. Attachment 2 Appendix C (pages 1 - 55)
3. Attachment 3 Appendix C (pages 1 -17)

Prepared by: Cindy Watt, University Governance, cindy.watt@ualberta.ca

EVALUATION OF TEACHING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT (CLE)

November 26, 2008

Members of the Sub-Committee

Heather Kanuka and Paula Marentette (co-chairs)
John Braga
Katy Campbell
Steve Harvey
Robert Holte
John Nychka
Dan Precht
Daphne Read
Chris Skappak
Connie Varnhagen

Purpose of the task force

The creation of this task force arose out of a need to better understand teaching evaluations. This need was identified by the members of the Committee of the Learning Environment. The Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) is responsible for making recommendations concerning policy matters and action matters. The overarching purposes of this task force are to (1) examine alternative teaching evaluation instruments, (2) review existing policies for teaching evaluations at the UofA, as well as at other universities, and (3) provide recommendations for improving teaching evaluations to the CLE committee members.

The Teaching Evaluation subcommittee focused on the following:

- Review existing research on university teaching evaluations
- Review existing instruments on university teaching evaluations at other (similar) Universities (e.g., North America, Australia, UK)
- Review existing teaching evaluation policies at other (similar) Universities (e.g., North America, Australia, UK)
- Building on the information gathered on policies, instruments and the literature, develop recommendations for improving teaching evaluations at the UofA
- Disseminate findings and recommendations to the CLE committee

This subcommittee is advisory to the CLE committee members.

The report that follows is comprised of:

- **Part 1:** a review of the research literature on teaching evaluations instruments and policies
- **Part 2:** a description of the policy context for research evaluation at the University of Alberta
- **Part 3:** a series of recommendations
- **Appendix A:** Evaluating teaching at FEC
- **Appendix B:** History of student rating systems at the University of Alberta,
- **Appendix C:** A review of existing instruments on university teaching evaluations and policies in North America
- **Appendix D:** A review of existing instruments on university teaching evaluations and policies in Australia and United Kingdom

Review of the Research Literature, Teaching Evaluation Instruments, and Policies

*Faculty Evaluation: Fast, Fair, Cheap—pick any two
(Arreola, 2007)*

A subtle but significant shift over the last decade has occurred in the social and economic paradigm within which institutions of higher education must operate (Arreola, 2007). There is a greater demand for accountability for what is being taught by the public and what is being learned by the accreditation bodies, increasing diversity of the student population, changing student attitudes and expectations, and a growing expectation by the governments that universities will assume greater responsibility for funding their own operations. Perhaps more importantly, the value of a university degree has been questioned (see, for example, “*Declining by Degrees*” online at <http://www.decliningbydegrees.org/>).

At the root of these changes is a shift from evaluating university processes to evaluating outcomes. The question universities must be able to respond to has changed from “What resources do you have and what are you doing with them?” to “How much have your students learned and what can they actually do as a result of the experience?” (National Centre for Higher Education Management Systems, online at <http://www.nchems.org/>). This shift has also impacted how universities treat their students. Specifically, the traditional practice of “filtering” students is changing from a preferred function of the university (where only the most persistent, talented and brightest survive) to an instructional/teaching function whereby universities must provide accountability for their completion rates *and* their graduates must be at a specified level of employable competence. The latter part of this expectation is of particular importance, as it requires universities to have graduates that are not only knowledgeable within their field of study, but also capable practitioners. This requires stepping up the learning transactions from simple “transmitters of information” to include learning activities that require the students actually *do* something with this information, and to do it with competence.

These shifts have led to a need for the University of Alberta to create a taskforce to function as an advisory body that will provide recommendations about whether the current teaching evaluation process (the USRI instrument and associated teaching policy for FEC) is sufficiently rigorous and whether the USRI instrument is measuring what it should be measuring. Also important is to provide recommendations on whether the USRI instrument is consistent with what the Academic Plan purports as effective teaching and learning.

Part 1: Review of the Research Literature

Scope of the Literature Review

Students' evaluation of teaching is not a new phenomenon. Students' feedback on instruction has been collected since the 1920s (Arreola, 2007; Doyle, 1983 as cited by d'Apollonia & Abrami, 1997). More recently, student evaluations of teaching have become much more common. McDaniel (2006) notes there has been an increase from 29% to 86% of postsecondary institutions using student evaluations over the last decade in the United States. With the increasing frequency of evaluations, the body of research on this topic grows. It is "probably...the most thoroughly studied of all forms of personnel evaluation, and one of the best in terms of being supported by empirical research" (Marsh, 1984, p. 749 as cited by Gump, 2007, p. 55). Similarly, Cashin (1998) states that by 1988 over 1,300 articles and books had been published on this topic (as cited by Ory, 2001), and Centra (2003) points out that the ERIC clearinghouse lists over 2,000 studies on this topic.

In preparing this literature review, over 125 articles from academic journals in one database (Academic Search Complete), which had been published since 2000 using the search subject "student evaluation of teachers" were found. A second database (Education Fulltext) search produced another 105 items. For this review 35 articles, published since 2000 were used. This literature review is by no means an exhaustive study of the research; however, it is sufficiently deep enough to identify key issues in the literature.

Identifying Themes

A number of recurring themes can be found in the literature about student evaluations of teaching, which is also known as SET, student rating of instruction (SRI), or student instructional ratings. Wachtel (1998) identified five areas of research: "(1) characteristics related to the administration of evaluations (e.g., anonymity of ratings, timing of evaluations, presence of the instructor during evaluation); (2) course characteristics (e.g., class size, selectivity); (3) instructor characteristics (e.g., gender, reputation); (4) student characteristics (e.g., age, expectations, prior subject interest); and (5) reaction to the use of evaluations (e.g. by faculty or students)" (as cited by Gump, 2007). Ali and Sell (1998) identified 14 questions in their literature review on student ratings of instruction (see Table 1). In this literature review, the following themes were examined:

- Validity of results
- Bias in evaluations
- Can students effectively measure quality of teaching?
- Need for effective tools
- Correlation between higher grades and higher ratings
- Impact on quality of teaching
- Evaluating faculty for tenure and promotion

Table 1: Commonly Expressed Questions Regarding Student Ratings of Instruction (Ali & Sell, 1998)

1. Are student rating forms reliable and valid?
2. Are student rating schemes only a popularity contest?
3. Are [those faculty] with excellent publication records and expertise the only persons qualified to teach and to evaluate their peers' instruction?
4. Do grades or marks students receive in the course affect ratings of the course and the instructor?
5. Does the immaturity and level of experience of students preclude their being able to make consistent judgments about the instructor and instruction?
6. Are students able to make accurate judgments prior to having been away from the course, and possibly the university, for several years?
7. Does class size affect student ratings?
8. Does gender of the student and/or instructor affect student ratings?
9. Does the level of the course (1st year, 2nd year, etc.) affect student ratings?
10. Does the rank of the instructor (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor) affect student ratings?
11. Does student workload affect student ratings?
12. Can student ratings be used meaningfully to improve instruction?
13. Does the ideology or value system of the instructor affect student ratings?
14. What impact does the publication of student ratings have on course selection, quality of instruction or instructors?

Validity of Results

The question of whether student evaluations of teaching produce valid results has been considered by numerous researchers. Greenwald's (1997) four different validity concerns highlight some of the issues they have raised:

1. Conceptual structures: Are ratings conceptually unidimensional or multidimensional?
2. Convergent validity: How well are ratings measures correlated with other indicators of effective teaching?
3. Discriminant validity: Are ratings influenced by variables unrelated to effective teaching?
4. Consequential validity: Are ratings results used in a fashion that is beneficial to the educational system? (p. 1185)

In response to these types of concerns, Ory (2001) identified five types of research that have been conducted to evaluate the validity of student evaluations of teaching: “multisection, multitrait-multimethod, bias, laboratory designs, and dimensionality” (p. 8). He concludes, based on these various types of research, that evaluations can be valid. Greenwald (1997) agrees that based on examining historical literature from the past 25-year period “more publications favored validity than invalidity” (p. 1182). d’Apollonia and Abrami (1997) further affirm that “across different students, courses, and settings, student ratings are consistently valid” (p. 1203). Marsh and Roche (1997) conclude that “SETs are significantly and consistently related to ratings by former students, students' achievement in multisection validity studies, teachers' self-evaluations, and extensive observations of trained observers on specific processes such as teachers' clarity. This pattern of results supports their construct validity” (p. 1188).

Of course, other researchers have presented different perspectives. Pounder (2007), for example, identifies three types of factors that influence SET ratings: (1) student related factors (gender, academic level and maturity, punishing teachers for low grades), (2) course related factors (grading, class size, course content), and (3) teacher related factors (gender, age, experience and rank, teachers' influencing tactics, teachers' behavioural traits). Merritt (2008) also disagrees about the validity of assessments: “evaluations collected from students after no more than five minutes exposure to a professor accurately predict assessments gathered at semester's end” (p. 239).

And, finally, some researchers remain undecided. Gump (2007), for example, examined the literature related to the leniency hypothesis. He concludes that: “there is little consensus on the validity of SETs, the perceptions of this validity (or lack thereof), and the ways in which SETs should (or should not) be used by the various constituents involved” (p. 65).

Bias in Evaluations

“Bias exists when a student, teacher, or course characteristic affects the evaluations made, either positively or negatively, but is unrelated to any criteria of good teaching, such as increased student learning” (Centra & Gaubatz, 2000 as cited by Centra, 2003, p. 498). The question of bias continues to be a persistent issue as multiple studies support each side. Tables 2 and 3 provide examples of some of the factors researched in relation to student evaluations of teaching.

Some research has provided evidence that bias can arise from characteristics of the student, the course and the teacher (e.g., Pounder, 2007). Typically, these studies focus on characteristics of the instructor including the English-language training see (Üstünlüoglu, 2007), the amount of physical touch demonstrated by the instructor (Lannutti, Laliker, & Hale, 2001), the amount of self-disclosure shared by the instructor (Lannutti & Strauman, 2006), the age and experience of instructors (Blackhart, Peruche, DeWall, & Joiner, 2006; Davidovitch & Soen, 2006), nonverbal mannerism which reflects gender, race, and cultural background (Merritt, 2008), and gender (Laube, Massoni, Sprague, & Ferber, 2007). Likewise, using data from an unendorsed online evaluation site (ratemyprofessors.com), researchers found that there are “strong positive correlations between Quality and Easiness and between Quality and Hotness” (Felton, Koper, Mitchell, & Stinson, 2008, p. 54) suggesting that the same factors may influence scores on officially sanctioned teaching evaluations.

Alternatively, some research explored other factors that can introduce bias. For example, McPherson (2003) uses a statistical model based on data collected over 18 semesters from almost a thousand courses in a department of economics. He concludes the characteristics of the course influence evaluation scores: “level of the class, time at which the class meets, the level of experience of the instructors, and the class size are all found to be significant determinants of SET scores” (p. 1). Pounder, Youmans and Jee (2007) found that evaluation results can be influenced by outside factors related to the administration of the evaluation. In this case, they found that offering students chocolate before they completed their evaluation resulted in higher ratings. d’Apollonia and Abrami (1997) echo the need to have clear procedures which are consistently applied in administering evaluations. From this perspective, Pounder’s (2007) literature review concludes,

most studies have called into question the value of the SET system. It seems that there are so many variables unrelated to the actual execution of teaching influencing SET scores that they tend to obscure accurate assessment of teaching performance. Equally, SET research has generally failed to demonstrate that there is a concrete relationship between teaching performance and student achievement. (p. 186)

Alternatively, some studies find that there is little or no bias in evaluations. For example, Ali and Sell (1998) conclude their literature review by stating, “the literature clearly demonstrates that student rating forms that are psychometrically sound, are reliable, valid, relatively free from bias, and useful in improving teaching” (1998, Concluding comments section, ¶ 2). Similarly, Smith, Yoo, Farr, Salmon, and Miller (2007) studied whether the sex of instructors and students influenced student evaluation scores. While they found that female teachers scored significantly higher on all areas of the teaching evaluation, a factor analysis found that less than one percent of the variance was explained by gender.

Table 2: Summary of Published Research Findings: Factors Determining Instructor Evaluation Scores (Chonko et al., 2002, p. 272)

<i>Authors and year</i>	<i>Factors considered in instructor evaluations scores</i>
Painter & Granzin, 1972	Communication skills
Tauber, 1973	Perception of fair grading
Kerin, Peterson, & Martin, 1975	Enthusiasm and subject knowledge
Ross, 1977	Personality
Aleamoni, 1981	Class size, grades, grade expectations
Glass, McGaw, & Smith, 1981	Class size
Homan & Kremer, 1983	Student attitudes
Marsh, 1984	Class size, grades, grade expectations
Cardy & Dobbins, 1986	Instructor traits: Warmth, supportiveness, and personality
Miller, 1987	Test frequency
Scherr & Scherr, 1990	Expected grade
Goldberg & Callahan, 1991	Class standing
Langbein, 1994	Faculty traits, overall GPA, hours spent on class, times met with instructor
Tatro, 1995	Grade expectations
Greenwald, 1997	Class size, grades, grade expectations

McKeachie, 1997	Class size, grades, grade expectations
Williams & Ceci, 1997	Instructor traits: warmth, supportiveness, and personality
Bergman & Dobie, 1999	Accessibility
Clayson, 1999	Instructor traits: warmth, supportiveness, and personality

However, there are also some factors that influence results that may be directly linked to the quality of teaching, which would mean they are not biasing factors. For example, Cohen (2005) conducted a principal component analysis and a smallest space analysis, and found that the following factors influence ratings: the course, the instructor, and the interaction between the course or instructor and students. Similarly Remedios and Lieberman (2008) explain,

students' ratings of courses are largely determined by the degree to which they feel involved, as measured by the extent to which they find their courses stimulating, interesting and useful. In turn, this sense of involvement largely depends on how well students thought a course was organized and taught. Factors such as grades and course difficulty seemed to play at most a very small role. (p. 110)

Similarly, Dziuban, Wang and Cook (n.d.) found that facilitation and communication skills, and the ability to make students feel supported are the most important predictors of ratings. Schrot et al. (2008) found that power relationships in the classroom impact student evaluations of teaching. These researchers found that:

When college instructors discuss current theory and research in the classroom, deliver clearly organized lectures, and demonstrate an advanced knowledge in the content area of the course, such behaviors positively predict higher teaching evaluations. At the same time, instructors who use expert power simultaneously sharing personal stories with students, relating to them in ways that are open and approachable, and generally identifying with students' perspectives are even more likely to reap the benefits of such behaviors by receiving higher evaluations. (p. 195)

While these behaviours are examples of using referent and expert power, they also demonstrate characteristics of effective teaching.

Table 3: Overview of Relationships Found Between Students’ Ratings and Background Characteristics

<i>Background characteristic</i>	<i>Summary of findings</i>
Prior subject interest	Classes with higher interest rate classes more favourably, although it is not always clear if interest existed before the start of the course or was generated by the course or the instructor.
Expected grade – actual grade	Class-average grades are correlated with class-average students’ evaluations of teaching, but the interpretation depends on whether higher grades represent grading leniency, superior learning, or pre-existing differences.
Reason for taking a course	Elective courses and those with a higher percentage of students taking the course for general interest tend to be rated higher.
Workload-difficulty	Harder, more difficult courses requiring more effort and time are rated somewhat more favourably.
Class size	Mixed finders but most studies show smaller classes are rated somewhat more favourably although some find curvilinear relationships where large classes also are rated favourably.
Level of course or year in school	Graduate-level courses are rated somewhat more favourably; weak, inconsistent findings suggest upper division courses are rated higher than lower division courses.
Instructor’s rank	Mixed findings but little or no effect.
Sex of instructor or student	Mixed findings but little or no effect.
Academic discipline	Weak tendency for higher ratings in humanities and lower ratings in sciences, but too few studies to be clear.
Purpose of ratings	Somewhat higher ratings if ratings are known to be used for tenure-promotion decisions.
Administrative conditions	Somewhat higher if ratings are not anonymous and the instructor is present when ratings are being completed.
Students’ personality	Mixed findings but apparently little effect, particularly because different “personality types” may appear in somewhat similar numbers in different classes.
Note: Particularly for the more widely studied characteristics, some studies have found little or no relation or even results opposite to those reported here. The size, or even the direction, of relations may vary considerably, depending on the particular component of students’ ratings that is being considered. Few studies have found any of these characteristics to be correlated more than .30 with class-average students’ ratings, and most relations are much smaller.	

Can Students Effectively Measure Quality of Teaching?

Another important issue is whether or not students have the skills and knowledge to measure the quality of teaching they receive. There seems to be general agreement that students are capable evaluators since their ratings correlate with those of peer evaluators and trained evaluators (Marsh & Roche, 1997). Similarly, Dolmans, Janssen-Noordman and Wolfhagen (2006) studied students' evaluation of tutors in problem-based learning tutorials. They found that students "are not only able to distinguish between poorly and excellently performing tutors, but are also able to distinguish between tutors with different deficiencies" (p. 159).

However, the research in this area has conflicting results. Chonko, Tanner and Davis (2002), for example, surveyed freshmen in their eighth week of introduction to business course in their first semester of college. These researchers found that the students' expectations of a good instructor did not necessarily reflect all of the qualities of good instruction. They conclude that students' evaluations may be more focused on qualities that make a course appealing than on qualities that will ensure students are learning skills that will benefit them in the long term. These authors fear that a customer service model of education is detrimental for students and the quality of instruction they receive.

A related question asks whether students should be involved in evaluating instructors. The large percentage of universities that incorporate some form of student evaluation appears to signal agreement on this issue. For example Greenwald and Gillmore (1997) state that, despite questions about validity, student ratings of teaching are the most readily available and least expensive form of evaluation, and therefore, should continue to be used. A recent study affirms that students also agree they should have a role in evaluating instruction. In their study of student, faculty and administrators' perceptions of student evaluations, Campbell and Bozeman (2008) identified three conclusions about students' beliefs about their role in this process: "The large majority of community college students strongly believe that students should complete formal evaluations of their instructors;" ... "administrators should inform faculty about the ratings;" and "a summary of the results should be available online" (pp. 18-19). In addition, "participants believe that students, in general, take the process of evaluating their instructors seriously, that student surveys are a valuable method of evaluating instructors, that students provide fair evaluations of their instructors, and that students know the qualities of effective teachers" (p. 19). The same study found that most students believe their ratings do not have a significant effect on "a teacher's grading system, dismissal or promotion status, or salary increases" (p. 20).

Need for Effective Tools

In order for students to effectively evaluate instruction, they need effective tools. Some current evaluation tools have been criticized for focusing on the negative aspects of teaching. Zimmerman (2008), for example, points out that evaluation questionnaires tend to "manipulate students into providing negative responses, we encourage them to cast about for some negative remark, *any negative remark*" (2008 ¶ 7). He also questions that students submit anonymous feedback so they do not have to be accountable for their comments. Moreover, popular evaluation tools tend to focus on specific aspects of teaching. Kolitch and Dean (1999), for

example, found that “the majority of items emphasized an information transmission model for teaching, leaving them to conclude most instruments narrowly define an ‘effective’ course” (as cited by Dziuban et al., n.d., p. 2). Marsh and Roche (1997) also argue that many “homemade” (p. 1188) evaluation tools do not address the multidimensionality of teaching, so they do not effectively measure the quality of instruction or provide helpful feedback for instructors. Their recommendation is that all evaluation tools should be subject to “rigorous psychometric evaluation” (p. 1188).

In an ongoing debate, Marsh and Roche (1997) and d'Apollonia and Abrami (1997) present opposing sides of the multi-dimensional vs. global evaluation debate. On one hand, Marsh and Roche contend that more attention needs to be paid to “the importance of recognizing the multidimensionality of teaching and SETs in understanding research evidence in relation to the validity, perceived bias, and usefulness of SETs” (p. 1187). They argue that an effective evaluation tool will consider nine different factors: “Learning/Value, Instructor Enthusiasm, Organization/Clarity, Group Interaction, Individual Rapport, Breadth of Coverage, Examinations/Grading, Assignments/Readings, and Workload/Difficulty” (p. 1187). D'Apollonia and Abrami, on the other hand, identify three aspects of teaching that are measured by evaluations: “delivering instruction, facilitating interactions, and evaluating student learning” (p. 1198). They argue that global evaluation ratings are sufficient for making personnel decisions.

Students also need to be motivated to complete evaluations. Chen and Hoshower (2003) found that undergraduate students are most motivated to complete evaluations when the results were used to improve the quality of teaching. Their second motivation was to improve the quality of the course. They were less motivated to participate if their results were used for personnel decisions or to help students choose courses. The authors recommend that evaluations should clearly describe how the results will be used and that students should be made aware of how their results have had an impact.

More recently, many institutions have begun implementing online student evaluation systems. Donovan, Mader and Shinsky (2007) surveyed education students at a college offering both online and traditional, paper-based evaluations. They found that the large majority of students in all categories (undergraduate and graduate, male and female) preferred completing the evaluations online, with 88.4% of respondents indicating they preferred the online evaluation. The majority of students also preferred completing the surveys on their own time rather than going to the computer lab as a class. Students indicated the following reasons for preferring the online evaluations, from most (87.2%) to least common (48.2%) responses: convenience, anonymity, privacy, more time to reflect, able to write more comments, and not taking class time (p. 167). However, students also expressed concern with security and anonymity on the online system and remembering to complete the evaluations on their own time during the busy weeks at the end of term. These authors also found that students' preference for completing evaluations online increased as they completed more using the online evaluations, but that graduate students, in particular, had fewer opportunities to complete the online evaluations. If online evaluations are used, students need to be given time to complete the evaluations; they need to receive reminders to complete the evaluations; and they need extra support to complete the evaluations the first few times until they become familiar with the format. More information about online

evaluations can be found in volume 96 of *New Directions for Teaching & Learning* (Ballantyne, 2003; Bothell & Henderson, 2003; Bullock, 2003; Hardy, 2003; Hoffman, 2003; Jonhson, 2003; Lleywellyn, 2003; McGhee & Lowell, 2003; Sorenson & Reiner, 2003; Tucker, Jones, Straker, & Cole, 2003).

Correlation between Higher Grades and Higher Ratings

Numerous studies seem to agree there is a correlation between grades and evaluation scores (see, for example, Guinn & Vincent, 2006; Blackhart et al., 2006); however, whether that means that giving students higher marks causes them to rate instructors higher, or students who get higher marks have learned more so they rate their instructor's teaching better (Centra, 2003), or students who do better than they expected are more satisfied with the course, is unclear (Remedios & Lieberman, 2008).

Greenwall and Gillmore (1997) identify five possible theories to explain this correlation: “1. Teaching effectiveness influences both grades and ratings” ... “2. Students’ general academic motivation influences both grades and ratings” ... “3. Students’ course-specific motivation influences both grades and ratings” ... “4. Students infer course quality and own ability from received grades” and “5. Students give high ratings in appreciation for lenient grading” (pp. 1210-1211). Though it is also noted by Maurer (2006) that another explanation might be cognitive dissonance (i.e. students expect to get a low mark, and in order to justify it to themselves, they blame it on poor instruction).

One theory that has been frequently studied is the leniency hypothesis, which claims that when instructors are more lenient in their marking, students’ evaluation scores are higher. SET scores are higher in social sciences where there is more flexibility in grading, proving the connection between grade inflation and higher evaluation scores according to Johnson (2003) (as cited in Felton et al., 2008). However, this theory has been rejected by Marsh and Roche (1997), who identified numerous methodological problems with these studies before concluding, “Whereas a grading-lenient effect may produce some bias in SETs, support for this suggestion is weak, and the size of such an effect is likely to be unsubstantial” (p. 1193). Likewise, McPherson (2003) determined that “instructors cannot ‘buy’ higher SET scores by awarding higher grades” (p. 1). Similarly Gump (2007) finds that there are many contradictory studies on this hypothesis, reflecting problems with researchers’ bias, limited information about sample size, and nonexperimental research methodologies. In fact, there is ambiguity in the research about whether instructors perceive the leniency hypothesis as valid, and how that perception might influence their teaching.

Centra (2003) also rejects the leniency hypothesis. He analyzed results from over 50,000 college courses offered over a 5-year period, examining the relationships between expected grades and level of difficulty/workload, and course evaluation ratings. He found a smaller correlation between expected grade and rating than has been reported in other studies. He concluded that students give the highest ratings to courses that they label as “just right” in terms of level of difficulty/workload, which he claims affirms the fact that instructors who are aware of their students’ skill levels will be rated as most effective.

Impact on Quality of Teaching

In a recent editorial, Zimmerman (2008) questions whether evaluations provide instructors with any useful information. He points out that evaluation questionnaires tend to “manipulate students into providing negative responses, we encourage them to cast about for some negative remark, *any negative remark*” (¶ 7). Other studies confirm that faculty members question the effectiveness of these evaluations. For example, Campbell and Bozeman (2008) found that faculty members did not feel that evaluations had a significant impact on their teaching. Similarly, administrators believed that student valuations only “were marginally effective” in improving teaching (pp. 21-22). The faculty members interviewed felt that institutional systems were not in place to help them use these results effectively, while the administrators felt that faculty members, especially fulltime ones, need to use self-reflection to improve their teaching. Other studies confirm that very few instructors (2.5 to 10.3%) made changes in their teaching as a result of the evaluations (Nasser and Fresko, 2002) and that those who attended academic development workshops do not receive significantly higher scores (Davidovitch & Soen, 2006).

Swain (2006) points out that all teaching evaluation programs need to have a plan in place for using teaching evaluation feedback. It should include details on the analysis, what to do with results, who takes action, keeping students informed of what has happened, letting students know their comments make a difference and showing them the impact of their comments. Likewise, instructors who receive evaluation reports plus other interventions (i.e. resources, consultation) receive higher ratings on subsequent reports than instructors who receive only their results (Marsh & Roche, 1997). Marsh and Roche also recommend providing targeted intervention to address specific dimensions identified in the evaluation.

One example of a resource developed to assist instructors is the strategy and resources guide developed at Brigham Young University. It is a thorough list of resources and strategies for faculty members to improve their teaching. The information is organized to address each item in the teaching evaluation. For each item, the following information is provided: the evaluation item is explained in more detail, a list of strategies and resources are provided, and each strategy is examined in detail with specific advice and referrals to related resources (Clark, Johnson, Sorenson, Birch, & Bradley, 2007).

Evaluating Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

Student evaluations of teaching are often used in making decisions about tenure and promotion: “Seldin (1993) noted an 86 per cent use of the student evaluation of teaching (SET) as a central feature of personnel decisions in US higher education” (Pounder, 2007, p. 178). Interestingly, some research finds that institutions that value teaching the most tend to make less use of student evaluations:

Read, Rama, and Raghunandan (2001) surveyed a large number of accounting departments to clarify the importance placed on teaching effectiveness and the reliance on student ratings when making promotion and tenure decisions. They discovered an inverse relationship. Institutions that de-emphasized teaching importance gave more

credence to student ratings than institutions that emphasized the importance of teaching. (Dziuban et al., n.d., p. 5)

The use of student evaluations “has been a source of contention since the practice was introduced” (Felton, Mitchell, & Stinson, 2004, p. 46). Many faculty members express concerns about validity and bias in the evaluations, about who has access to results and how they are used, and whether students are qualified to evaluate teaching (Cutler, 2007; Gray & Bergmann, 2003; Gump, 2007; McDaniel, 2006; Ory, 2001). In an editorial, McDaniel (2006) poses a number of questions shared by other instructors:

- are students qualified to judge the quality of a professor’s pedagogy and academic expertise?
- are students evaluating teaching effectiveness – or something else?
- are faculty rights to academic freedom compromised by the pressures to secure favorable student evaluations?
- are administrators using student evaluations to intrude on the privacy of the classroom and to manipulate faculty behavior?

The opposing perspectives of students and faculty on this issue cause further complications. While students favour publishing teaching evaluation results to improve accountability, faculty felt publishing them would lower standards (Howell & Symabluk, 2001 as cited by Dziuban et al., n.d.).

While administrators believe that teaching evaluations are only “marginally effective” in improving the quality of teaching, these evaluations are still important tools in making decisions about employment (Campbell & Bozeman, 2008, pp. 21-22). Similarly, D’Apollonia and Abrami (1997) state, “student ratings should be used to make only crude judgments of instructional effectiveness (exceptional, adequate, and unacceptable)”(p. 1205), a statement with which and McKeachie (1997) agrees.

Researchers also disagree about which results should be used and how they should be analyzed. D’Apollonia and Abrami (1997) argue that a global rating “or a single score representing a weighted average of the specific ratings” should be used (p. 1203) while Marsh and Roche (1997) argue that a multidimensional approach should be used, though they also note a weighted average could achieve the same results (d’Apollonia & Abrami, 1997). In response to critiques, McPherson (2003) suggests that adjusting scores to account for variables outside of the instructors control like time of day, class size and class level might be an alternate way of looking at results. Considering the issue from another perspective, McKeachie (1997) argues that the problems associated with student evaluations of teachings are not reflective of problems with the evaluations but of problems with the interpretation and application of their results. He identifies two different problems: (1) personnel committees do not believe student evaluations are credible, so they are not given enough attention; (2) personnel committees try to compare instructors using evaluation data without considering factors which legitimately influence evaluations, for example, “differences in goals, teaching methods, content, and a myriad of other

variables” (p. 1222). However, there has been little research done on how committees use results in their decision-making processes.

Summary of Results

The literature on student ratings is immense, and this committee’s review of the research shows inconsistency exists in all areas of teaching evaluation. One reason is that each study is trying to answer a different question. Where one is measuring how a single factor, like expected grades, influences evaluation scores for a single instructor over a few terms (Maurer, 2006), another study is examining the relationship between multiple factors in the students, instructors and course with a sample of over 50,000 graduate and undergraduate courses offered over a five-year period (Centra, 2003). Likewise, one study uses multiple regression analysis (Blackhart et al., 2006) while another uses decision trees (Dziuban et al., n.d.) to arrive at their conclusions. Different studies also use different instruments, each asking slightly different questions (Centra, 2003), which also makes comparing results difficult. This being said and acknowledged, within the educational research community, conclusions have been made. The most consistent conclusion is that “properly constructed, appropriately administered, and correctly interpreted student rating can be valid and reliable measures indicating the quality of teaching” (Arreola, 2007, p. 98).

Among educational researchers, there is some consensus that when USRI instruments have undergone rigorous psychometric and statistical procedures result in valid and reliable ratings. Specifically, when ‘homemade’ faculty evaluation tools are not included in literature reviews, there is a fairly strong consensus in the following questions (Arreola, 2007, pp. 100-104):

- Are student ratings a popularity contest?
 - No—not if the institution is using a student rating form that has been constructed using professional psychometric procedures and has demonstrated reliability and validity. Well-designed student rating forms carefully measure many different aspects of faculty performance. Alternatively, student rating forms that have not been constructed to professional psychometric standards may be unreliable and, in turn, run the risk of having such factors as popularity, temperature of the classroom, instructor gender, etc., influencing student ratings.
- Aren’t student rating forms just plain unreliable and invalid?
 - Yes and No. Yes—if the student rating form in use has *not* undergone rigorous psychometric and statistical procedures. Alternatively, well-developed instruments have been shown to be reliable and valid.
- Aren’t students too immature, inexperienced and capricious to make any consistent judgments about the instructor and instruction?
 - No—an extensive body of research (going back to the 1920s) shows this commonly held belief is not true.

- Isn't it true that I can buy good student ratings by just giving easy grades?
 - No—and there has been more research conducted on this one question than almost any other in the field of student ratings and faculty evaluation. The reason for the numerous studies is not that the question is so difficult to answer, it's that faculty generally don't like the answer the research provides. The answer is that there is no consistent correlation between the grades a faculty member gives and the rating he or she receives *when a well-designed student rating form is administered.*
- Isn't it generally easier to get good rating in higher level courses?
 - Yes—the research has shown that first and second year students tend to rate a course more harshly than third or fourth year students.
- Isn't there a gender bias in student ratings? (Don't female faculty tend to get lower ratings than male faculty?)
 - No—there is a fairly consistent body of research showing gender bias does not exist in student rating forms.
- Isn't it true that students who are required to take a course tend to rate the course more harshly than those taking it as an elective?
 - Yes—the literature shows that students who are required to take a course tend to rate it lower than students who elect to take it.
- Isn't it more difficult for math and science faculty to get good ratings?
 - Yes—research has shown that courses in the math and sciences tend to get lower ratings than in the humanities.
- Don't students have to be away from the course, and possibly the institution, for several years before they are able to make accurate judgments about the instructor and instruction?
 - No—collecting data on this issue is difficult to obtain. What limited research on this topic is available, leads to the conclusion that this belief is not generally true.
- Isn't it true that class size affects student ratings?
 - No—the literature does not show a consistent relationship between class size and student ratings.
- Does the time of the day the course is taught affect student ratings?

- No—there is not much research is available in this area, but what has been conducted does not show the time of day has any influence on student ratings.
- Do majors in a course rate it differently than non-majors?
- ○ No—all research conducted in this area show there is no significant relationships between students ratings and whether students were majors or non-majors.
- Does the rank of the instructor affect student ratings?
 - No—while there are a few conflicting studies on this issue, in general, the research does not support the idea that faculty of higher professorial rank get higher student ratings.
- Do student ratings improve instruction?
 - Yes—under the right conditions (e.g. support and resources are provided, including personal consultations by qualified educators).

While not specific to the USRI instrument at the UofA, these findings discredit many myths that are held about the effectiveness of a student rating system.

Conclusions

Acknowledging the limitations of generalizing to the UofA, it seems reasonable to conclude that a professionally developed instrument with appropriately established metrics can result in valid and reliable teaching evaluation.

Although originally based on an evaluation system imported from the University of Michigan, the validity and reliability of the USRI currently in use at the University of Alberta needs to be revisited. This committee put forward the three possibilities for dealing with the UofA USRIs:

- Keep the current instrument
- Modify the current instrument
- Discontinue the use of the current instrument

The committee recognizes that USRIs are not the only means of evaluating teaching and must be assessed as one of many methods. The next section provides a larger context for the evaluation of teaching at the University of Alberta.

Part 2: Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Alberta

According to GFC policy on teaching evaluation, (Section 111.2, Teaching Evaluation):

1. Evaluation of teaching at the University of Alberta serves two purposes:
 - a. Summative - Evaluation provides a review and overview of an instructor's teaching that is an essential element in promotion and tenure decisions. In its summative form, teaching evaluation forms a basis for rewarding excellence, as well as the basis for withholding reward. (GFC 24 NOV 1997)
 - b. Formative - Evaluation provides helpful feedback to teachers by identifying teaching strengths and weaknesses and, in so doing, giving guidance for the improvement or refinement of teaching skills. (GFC 24 NOV 1997)
2. Evaluation of teaching shall be multifaceted. Multifaceted evaluation shall include the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction set out in Section 111.3 and other methods of assessing teaching designed within the individual Faculties to respond to the particular conditions of that Faculty. Such assessments shall include one or more of the following: input from administrators, peers, self, undergraduate and graduate students, and alumni. (GFC 09 JUN 1995) (GFC 24 NOV 1997)
3. Recognizing that the evaluation of teaching at the University shall be multifaceted, Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) decisions concerning tenure, promotion or unsatisfactory teaching performance must be based on more than one indicator of the adequacy of teaching. (GFC 24 NOV 1997)
4. Assessment of teaching involving input from administrators, peers, self, alumni, or undergraduate and graduate students in addition to the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction should occur annually prior to tenure. For continuing faculty (ie, Categories A1.1, A1.5 and A1.6), such assessment will occur at least triennially. (GFC 24 NOV 1997)
5. The University shall continue to support University Teaching Services in its education programming which is focused on the development and improvement of teaching and learning and its efforts to enhance research in university teaching. (GFC 28 APR 1980) (GFC 26 SEP 1988) (GFC 12 OCT 1993) (GFC 24 NOV 1997)

Two points can be made about these policy statements. First, these policy guidelines require that teaching be evaluated in a multi-faceted manner, although the particular methods of assessment are left to individual faculties. How to assess teaching is not obvious. Indeed, in GFC Section 111.1 Teaching and Learning it says “nowhere, in any document, is there a clear and concise statement of what constitutes excellent teaching. It is taken for granted that we all know.” Although this statement is followed by an attempt to describe the attributes of good teaching, it is not accompanied by assessment methods for each attribute. From her meetings with the Chairs of

each department at the University, Heather Kanuka, Director of UTS learned that Chairs struggle with this mandate (see summary of Chairs' comments in Appendix A).

Second, these statements on teaching evaluation have not been considered by GFC for more than ten years. This means that the present policy and assessment tools, the USRI in particular, were developed before both the Dare to Discover and Dare to Deliver documents. The values articulated in these documents should be reflected in how we assess teaching at this institution.

The evaluation of teaching involves a process of interpreting data through the lens of a set of values to determine whether the data indicate a desirable or undesirable set of conditions. In spite of GFC's policy that "Small differences in evaluation should not be considered meaningful" (111.3, section I), in fact they are because at present we do not have an effective means of conducting multifaceted evaluation. If the teaching evaluation process at the University of Alberta is to be perceived as fair, it is necessary to begin by gaining agreement of the values to be used in the evaluation process. Of necessity, this requires tying the University of Alberta's Academic Plan to the teaching evaluation process, as well as GFC policy on teaching and learning.

The teaching evaluation instrument exists in "recognition of the University's commitment to teaching" (111.3); that is, to ensure quality teaching. Improving teaching therefore becomes the priority. Also from GFC policy, we recognize that since evaluation of teaching was left to individual faculties, the responsibility for improving teaching lies with the faculties.

However, support from administration is essential to the improvement of teaching, as well as support services offered by UTS. Suggestions offered by Aerreola (2007) based on data collected from administration and teaching service units to help Faculties and Departments are as follows:

Integrate faculty evaluation and professional enrichment programs. For every element of the faculty evaluation program there needs to be corresponding professional enrichment resources offered. This will ensure that teaching staff have institutionally supported recourse when the evaluation system detects performance weaknesses.

Use a variety of sources in the evaluation system. The faculty evaluation system needs to use input from a variety of sources including peers, self, administration, as well as students. It is also important to articulate the impact that each of these sources of information has on the total evaluation.

Ensure that the faculty evaluation program is functionally valid. The areas of faculty performance that are being evaluated need to be in agreement with what the faculty and the administration believe ought to be evaluated. The extent to which faculty are either unsure of or disagree with the assumed value structure of the faculty evaluation program, they will consider the program not to be valid and will resist it. Equally important is that the faculty evaluation program is tied to the Academic Plan.

Provide detailed and confidential faculty evaluation information to each instructor. The faculty evaluation must be provided as confidential resources for faculty to use in improving and

documenting the quality of their performance. The unit providing the professional development (e.g., UTS) cannot come to be seen as a ‘watchdog’ agency for the administration.

Establish a facilitative reward structure. Policies need to be established that treat documented professional growth and enrichment efforts in a manner similar to those of publication and research efforts.

Hire an external consultant with expertise in faculty evaluation. Bringing in an outside expert can be invaluable in ensuring that an evaluation program initiative for the University of Alberta will effectively meet the needs of both faculty and administration, and in a manner that is tied to our Academic Plan. There are researchers who have expertise in faculty evaluation and we are recommending that we bring in one of these experts to provide consultation services to review our institutional needs.

Part 3: Recommendations

The subcommittee struggled with broader yet relevant questions such as the following:

Why do we evaluate teaching? And why do we use USRIs to evaluate the quality of teaching? Is it to improve teaching at the University of Alberta? Is it to provide data for evaluating teaching for FEC? Does the institution need it to provide evidence to the public that we are doing well at teaching our students? Should anyone be accountable for helping faculty improve their teaching? And if so, who should be accountable for helping faculty improve their teaching?

This committee has deliberated thoughtfully and extensively on how to provide productive recommendations to the Committee on the Learning Environment. Our recommendations fall into three distinct categories: (1) the USRI instrument, (2) multi-faceted evaluation and, (3) GFC Policy.

1. USRI instrument

- a) The use of the USRI (or equivalent instrument) needs be considered in a broader context. Specifically, a teaching evaluation instrument (with proper metrics) should be used in a broader context within course and program evaluation (for examples, see Appendix D from Australia and the UK).
- b) If a decision is made to continue with the administration of teaching evaluation instruments (i.e., the USRI), based on our review of the literature we recommend that a professionally developed instrument be created by an expert in this area to ensure validity and reliability.

2. Multi-faceted Evaluation

The USRI is designed to be a part of a broader teaching evaluation. Chairs, Deans, Supervisors and Faculty continue to struggle with this in FEC (see Appendix A). As per GFC policy, we need an accompanying set of possibilities and/or examples to be used as a guide for facilitating effective multi-faceted evaluation.

3. GFC Policy

Quite simply, existing policy is in need of updating.

Underpinning these recommendations is the assumption that if the University of Alberta is going to evaluate teaching it has a responsibility to support faculty to improve their teaching development.

References

- Arreola, R. A. (2007). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. A guide to designing, building, and operating large-scale faculty evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Anker Publishing.
- Ali, D. L., & Sell, Y. (1998). *Issues regarding the reliability, validity and utility of student ratings of instruction: A survey of research findings*. Retrieved from University of Calgary: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/vpa/USRI/appendix4.html>
- Ballantyne, C. (2003). Online evaluations of teaching: An examination of current practice and considerations for the future. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (96), 103-112. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=11744624&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Blackhart, G. C., Peruche, B. M., DeWall, C. N., & Joiner, T. E., Jr. (2006). Faculty forum: Factors influencing teaching evaluations in higher education. *Teaching of Psychology*, 33(1), 37-39. doi:[10.1207/s15328023top3301_9](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top3301_9)
- Bothell, T. W., & Henderson, T. (2003). Do online ratings of instruction make \$ense? *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (96), 69-79. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=11744627&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Bullock, C. D. (2003). Online collection of midterm student feedback. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (96), 95-102. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=11744625&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Campbell, J. P., & Bozeman, W. C. (2008). The value of student ratings: Perceptions of students, teachers, and administrators. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 32(1), 13-24. doi:[10.1080/10668920600864137](https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920600864137)
- Centra, J. A. (2003). Will teachers receive higher student evaluations by giving higher grades and less course work? *Research in Higher Education*, 44(5), 495-518. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=10691989&loginpage=login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Chen, Y., & Hoshower, L. B. (2003). Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness: An assessment of student perception and motivation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(1), 71-88. doi:[10.1080/0260293032000033071](https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293032000033071)
- Chonko, L. B., Tanner, J. F., & Davis, R. (2002). What are they thinking? Students' expectations and self-assessments. *Journal of Education for Business*, 77(5), 271-281. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=7214031&loginpage=login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Clark, S. J., Johnson, T., Sorenson, L., Birch, J., & Bradley, B. (2007). *Teaching improvement strategies and resources related to student rating items*. Retrieved from Center for Teaching & Learning, Brigham Young University: http://ctl.byu.edu/?page_id=661
- Cohen, E. (2005). Student evaluations of course and teacher: Factor analysis and SSA approaches. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(2), 123-136. doi:[10.1080/0260293042000264235](https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293042000264235)
- Cutler, A. (2007). A night at the circus. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 36, 6-7. Retrieved from

- <http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=25497742&loginpage=login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- d'Apollonia, S., & Abrami, P. C. (1997). Navigating student ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1198-1208. Retrieved from
<http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/spb/ovidweb.cgi>
- Davidovitch, N., & Soen, D. (2006). Using students' assessments to improve instructors' quality of teaching. *Journal of Further & Higher Education*, 30(4), 351-376.
doi:10.1080/03098770600965375
- Dolmans, D. H. J. M., Janssen-Noordman, A., & Wolfhagen, H. A. P. (2006). Can students differentiate between PBL tutors with different tutoring deficiencies? *Medical Teacher*, 28(6), 156-161. doi:10.1080/01421590600776545
- Donovan, J., Mader, C., & Shinsky, J. (2007). Online vs. Traditional course evaluation formats: Student perceptions. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 6(3), 158-180. Retrieved from
<http://www.ncolr.org.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/jiol/issues/showissue.cfm?volid=6&IssueID=21>
- Dziuban, C. D., Wang, M. C., & Cook, I. J. (n.d.). *Dr. Fox rocks: Student perceptions of excellent and poor college teaching [working draft]*. Retrieved from
<http://www.sc.edu/cte/docs/dr.FoxRocks.pdf>
- Felton, J., Koper, P. T., Mitchell, J., & Stinson, M. (2008). Attractiveness, easiness and other issues: Student evaluations of professors on ratemyprofessors.Com. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(1), 45-61. doi:10.1080/02602930601122803
- Felton, J., Mitchell, J., & Stinson, M. (2004). Web-based student evaluations of professors: The relations between perceived quality, easiness and sexiness. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(1), 91-108. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=12511352&loginpage=login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Ginns, P., Prosser, M., & Barrie, S. (2007). Students' perceptions of teaching quality in higher education: The perspective of currently enrolled students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(5), 603-615. doi:10.1080/03075070701573773
- Gray, M., & Bergmann, B. R. (2003). Student teaching evaluations. *Academe*, 89(5), 44-46. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=10928004&loginpage=login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Greenwald, A. G. (1997). Validity concerns and usefulness of student ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1182-1186.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Gillmore, G. M. (1997). Grading leniency is a removable contaminant of student ratings. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1209-1217. Retrieved from
<http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/spb/ovidweb.cgi>
- Guinn, B., & Vincent, V. (2006). The influence of grades on teaching effectiveness ratings at a Hispanic-serving institution. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 5(4), 313-321.
doi:10.1177/1538192706291138
- Gump, S. E. (2007). Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness and the leniency hypothesis: A literature review. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 55-68. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=24293912&loginpage=login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

- Hardy, N. (2003). Online ratings: Fact and fiction. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (96), 31-38. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=11744631&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Hoffman, K. M. (2003). Online course evaluation and reporting in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (96), 25-29. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=11744632&loginpage=login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Jonhson, T. D. (2003). Online student ratings: Will students respond? *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (96), 49-59. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=11744629&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Lannutti, P. J., Laliker, M., & Hale, J. L. (2001). Violations of expectations and social-sexual communication in student/professor interactions. *Communication Education*, 50(1), 69-82. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=4100573&loginpage=login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Lannutti, P. J., & Strauman, E. C. (2006). Classroom communication: The influence of instructor self-disclosure on student evaluations. *Communication Quarterly*, 54(1), 89-99.
doi:[10.1080/01463370500270496](https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370500270496)
- Laube, H., Massoni, K., Sprague, J., & Ferber, A. L. (2007). The impact of gender on the evaluation of teaching: What we know and what we can do. *NWSA Journal*, 19(3), 87-104. Retrieved from
http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/hww/jumpstart.jhtml?re_cid=0bc05f7a67b1790ec5a25dd95312f21932b15374917fd048cc5242add570a3d4c4e10f5ea26d892f&fmt=P
- Lleywellyn, D. C. (2003). Online reporting of results for online student ratings. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (96), 61-68. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=11744628&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making students' evaluation of teaching effectiveness effective: The critical issues of validity, bias, and utility. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1187-1197. Retrieved from
<http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/spb/ovidweb.cgi>
- Maurer, T. W. (2006). Cognitive dissonance or revenge? Student grades and course evaluations. *Teaching of Psychology*, 33(3), 176-179. doi:[10.1207/s15328023top3303_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top3303_4)
- McDaniel, T. R. (2006). Student evaluations of instructors: A good thing? *Academic Leader*, 22(8), 8. Retrieved from
http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/hww/jumpstart.jhtml?re_cid=0bc05f7a67b1790ec5a25dd95312f2193252051c0ad769747e92fb02395981490ed29155bf3ecff&fmt=H
- McGhee, D. E., & Lowell, N. (2003). Psychometric properties of student ratings of instruction in online and on-campus courses. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (96), 39-48. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=11744630&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

- McKeachie, W. J. (1997). Student ratings: The validity of use. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1218-1225. Retrieved from
http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/spb/ovidweb.cgi?&S=GHDIFPGOIDDDALJNCILJAPLDAPPAA00&Full+Text+Link=S.sh.15.16.18%7c6%7csl_10%7c80%7c2&WebLinkReturn=Full+Text%3dL%7cS.sh.15.16.18.42%7c0%7c00000487-199711000-00005
- McPherson, M. A. (2003). *Revisiting the determinants of student evaluation of teachers scores*. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=410934>
- Merritt, D. J. (2008). Bias, the brain, and student evaluations of teaching. *St. John's Law Review*, 82(1), 235-287. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=28324297&loginpage=login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Nasser, F., & Fresko, B. (2002). Faculty views of student evaluation of college teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(2), 187-198.
doi:[10.1080/02602930220128751](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930220128751)
- Ory, J. C. (2001). Faculty thoughts and concerns about student ratings. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (87), 3-15. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=9179128&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Pounder, J. S. (2007). Is student evaluation of teaching worthwhile?: An analytical framework for answering the question. *Quality Assurance in Education: An International Perspective*, 15(2), 178-191. Retrieved from
<http://www.emeraldinsight.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/Insight/viewContentItem.do;jsessionid=95F40DE105182093429C22368CA811DE?contentType=Article&contentId=1602895>
- Remedios, R., & Lieberman, D. A. (2008). I liked your course because you taught me well: The influence of grades, workload, expectations and goals on students' evaluations of teaching. *British Educational Research Journal*, 34(1), 91-115. doi:
[10.1080/01411920701492043](https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701492043)
- Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., Myers, S. A., Turman, P. D., Barton, M. H., & Jernberg, K. A. (2008). Learner empowerment and teacher evaluations as functions of teacher power use in the college classroom. *Communication Education*, 57(2), 180-200.
doi:[10.1080/03634520701840303](https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520701840303)
- Smith, S. W., Yoo, J. H., Farr, A. C., Salmon, C. T., & Miller, V. D. (2007). The influence of student sex and instructor sex on student ratings of instructors: Results from a college of communication. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 30(1), 64-77. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=25547189&loginpage=login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Sorenson, L., & Reiner, C. (2003). Charting the uncharted seas of online student ratings of instruction. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (96), 1-24. Retrieved from
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=11744633&loginpage=login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Tucker, B., Jones, S., Straker, L., & Cole, J. (2003). Course evaluation on the web: Facilitating student and teacher reflection to improve learning. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (96), 81-93. Retrieved from

- <http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=11744626&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Üstünlüoglu, E. (2007). University students' perceptions of native and non-native teachers. *Teachers & Teaching*, 13(1), 63-79. doi:[10.1080/13540600601106096](https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600601106096)
- Youmans, R. J., & Jee, B. D. (2007). Fudging the numbers: Distributing chocolate influences student evaluations of an undergraduate course. *Teaching of Psychology*, 34(4), 245-247.
- Zimmerman, B. (2008). Course evaluations - students' revenge? *University Affairs*. Retrieved from http://www.universityaffairs.ca/issues/2008/february/opinion_01.html

Appendix A
Evaluating Teaching at FEC

Chairs require information and strategies on how to conduct broad-based and fair evaluation. Many Chairs specifically noted they need help on how to evaluate teaching for FEC; they need information on what to look for in terms of assessing and evaluating good teaching and how to reward accordingly. While some Departments and Faculties use additional measures to evaluate teaching, the majority rely entirely on USRI scores for FEC. Most chairs are aware that (1) USRIs are not a sufficient measure for evaluating teaching for FEC and (2) teaching continues to be undervalued as compared to research productivity. Many chairs also expressed a desire to receive information on other ways to evaluate teaching effectiveness for FEC (e.g., peer observation).

Evaluating Teaching at FEC

- With respect to FEC and the evaluation of teaching: We need help on how to evaluate teaching.
- I have no training in this. Knowing how to look and what to look for would be helpful.
- In our department, we really need to find a balance between punishing and improving.
- Biggest problem with teaching: not enough rewards to recognize great teaching.
- With respect to annual reports: my dean says “more publications – not better teaching.”
- There is no information available on what—and how—we should be observing with ‘guided observations’. I need help with multi-faceted evaluation.
- The problem with FEC in our faculty is that there is no critical reflection and feedback, and no requirement for faculty to get to know their teaching philosophy.
- A critical problem with FEC is the absence of distinction between ‘courses’ and ‘instructors’.
- Importance given to teaching by FEC at tenure and how it is weighted and evaluated varies across campus. There needs to be consistency through policy.
- In our faculty, merit increments are awarded annually. Department chairs and FEC evaluate service, research, teaching vigorously and teaching research are evaluated symmetrically. We have to have balance. Letters are sent to those faculty members who need to improve.
- Our faculty takes teaching seriously. There is no tolerance for bad teaching and faculty members will lose increments for a track record of bad teaching.
- There is a lack of balance between teaching and research at FEC. A faculty member will never get tenure because he/she is a fabulous teacher. This needs to be addressed.
- Bottom line (while teaching is important) people recognize effort needs to go toward research. I’d say 70% of their time is spent on research efforts. Competition for grants is fierce.
- We do peer evaluations in which we are required to look at course outline, tests, etc. Faculty have a range of responses to this.
- When evaluating their teaching, Faculty are required to respond to written comments and provide contextualization. Simply thinking about their teaching makes all of the difference. Reflection is important. Students need to reflect on their learning as well. We also need to accommodate different styles of teaching.
- In our department, faculty teaching evaluations are color coded, signifying to the Dean and Chair who is having difficulty.
- We don’t value teaching as much as we should. We need better metrics on evaluation. We have no good indices

- There has been a shift in FEC to value teaching more, and in theory this is good, but we don't know how to evaluate teaching other than with the IDQs. So now IDQ scores are even more important. I'm not convinced there is a relationship between IDQ scores and good teaching.
- At FEC, there is limited room for growth if your research is not balanced with good teaching.
- We examine USRI comments from the students and look for patterns over time. We also have faculty submit syllabus, teaching materials, and there are group critiques of student work. There is a peer evaluation of untenured faculty in which senior faculty observe and report back. Depending on the Unit within the department, Faculty do guided observation. I prefer giving narrative feedback spanning over several classes. If there are problems, we ask the faculty member to do a self-assessment.
- The FEC process needs to reflect and value the educational process. We need a way of quantifying educational achievement and teaching. Knowing what individual departments do to assess teaching would be useful.
- Our experience with UTS hasn't been altogether positive. It is not a big plus for faculty to do UTS workshops with respect to FEC.

Questions asked related to FEC:

- For those instructors who are in trouble – how do I assess them?
- How do I do peer observation?
- How do I do a peer consultation within the department?
- How do I build on people's strengths?
- How do I tell a tenured professor that gets brutal reviews that they need an intervention?
- Where do I access services that provide effective support for faculty in trouble?
- As chair, how do I delegate this? (I have no time to do this myself).

Comments related specifically to USRIs

- According to the results on the USRI we are doing just fine in our teaching. But the USRIs present a double edged sword – people begin teaching to USRIs.
- There is a presumption that teaching and education is the same thing. There is the assessment of learning versus the assessment of teaching and we are not separating and assessing them the way we should be.
- There is a push to student centeredness rather than learning centeredness. Administration has to address this fundamental issue.
- The institution needs to clarify what it wants students to achieve by the time they leave. There needs to be quality control on assessment. There needs to be a clear sign on educational achievement rather than on things that are mechanistic, e.g. teaching to USRIs
- New instructors bring their USRI scores to me and say what does this score mean? I don't know, so a handout to support USRI would be helpful.
- Faculty do try to respond to feedback given in USRI to try to improve. The IDQ is relevant. Comments and scores speak to when there is a need for improvement within the classroom. We have an additional form that is used to evaluate teaching in smaller classes (4-9 students). I try to support faculty and get involved. The process works well.
- Co-teaching not captured in the way we evaluate. The way we evaluate is not useful.
- USRIs are one of the largest issues I have at FEC time. We don't know what is working and how to measure it. The problems I see are the full-tenured faculty who are teaching well, but are getting nailed because they require students to think critically and to do work. With newer

faculty there is a real shift in how much content is covered. Content is dumbed down to get higher scores on USRIs.

- On the USRI, most student evaluations are over 4, but everyone on the U of A website is over 4. You have to be really bad at teaching to get nailed.
- If we wind up getting grades that are too high, we take a look to see what's happening in the class. We've made a policy decision to increase difficulty level of examinations. The USRI is tough to criticize. We need to be tactful. It's touchy subject.
- Feedback given on USRI gives students the opportunity to give the department a clear signal early on if there is something not working. I do go through the USRIs. Where there are poor evaluations, I read all of the comments. This year, I met with two instructors who had done poorly. With one instructor, I mentored her. With the other individual, I recommended peer consulting. This individual had difficulty with English and had presentation problems (e.g. lacked eye contact, etc.). I also encouraged this faculty member to sit in on other instructors who are doing well.
- I recommend people who are having trouble with their teaching go to UTS. But, to be fair, Faculty are trapped between scoring well on the USRIs verses ensuring the rigor of their courses. There is no correlation between USRI and what people have learned. Faculty have to navigate tension between rigor and having students like them. Do you want to improve USRIs or improve teaching? How do faculty do things in an effective way to improve teaching? Our time needs to be focussed on the teaching not on satisfying students.
- Students can't tell a good instructor from a good course. What is the teaching rating versus the course rating and how do they compare? They need a teaching measure.
- We have a young department and have had a new turn over. New faculty are eager to read USRI results. Academics (like anyone else) are easily trained to increase USRI scores and there is an element of this. On the whole however, we are doing well.
- I have concerns about faculty teaching to the USRI. Faculty USRI scores are tracked and color coded by my Dean. You do not want to be red.

*Appendix B
History of Student Rating of Instruction
at the University of Alberta*

- Prior to 1978: students' ratings collected by the Students' Union, 20,000 forms completed in 1977
- 1978 - 1985: questionnaires individually designed and used in many departments; Faculty of Education had a common form
- 1985: IDQ (Instructor Designed Questionnaire) system acquired from the University of Michigan to support individualized questionnaires from a common catalog of items
- 1985 - 1994: IDQ system promoted by CITL (Committee for Improvement of Teaching and Learning); 107,524 forms completed in 1993/94
- 1987: Students' Union proposes to publish a "Course Evaluation Guide"; seeks administrative approval to access classes to administer questionnaires (didn't happen but indicative of some of the campus politics)
- 1994: USRI (Universal Student Ratings of Instruction) proposed by TLC (GFC's Teaching and Learning Committee); approved by GFC; funded by VP (Academic); common set of questions for comparison across campus; all instructors to be rated in all classes; printed reports to be made available to Students' Union.
1. This course was 1=A requirement 2=An elective 3=Other
 2. My university year is 1=First 2=Second 3=Third 4=Fourth 5=Post-Degree
 3. Overall, this was an excellent course
 4. Overall, the instructor was effective
 5. The course was well organized
 6. The objectives of the course were achieved
 7. The instructor presented the material in an interesting and helpful manner
 8. The instructor seemed to enjoy teaching
 9. The instructor treated students with respect
 10. The instructor was helpful in answering questions
 11. The instructor was reasonably accessible outside of class
 12. The workload for this course was appropriate
 13. The type of assigned work was appropriate to the goals of the course
 14. The instructor assessed my work fairly
- 1995: Committee struck by Dr. Owram with representation from CITL, AASUA, Chairs, Sociology to revise questionnaire
1. My university year is 1=First 2=Second 3=Third 4=Fourth 5=Post-Degree
 - 6=Unclassified/Other
 2. This course was 1=A requirement 2=An elective 3=Other
 3. The instructor spoke audibly and clearly
 4. The instructor was accessible outside of class SD to SA plus "Never Tried/Not Applicable"
 5. The instructor treated students with respect
 6. Overall, the instructor was 1=Poor 2=Fair 3=Acceptable 4=Very Good 5=Excellent
 7. Overall, this course was 1=Poor 2=Fair 3=Acceptable 4=Very Good 5=Excellent
- 1998: Results for "Universal" questions published on the Web (FOIPP-approved at the Provincial level at request of Anne Marie Decore)

- 1998: Committee struck by TLC to revise questionnaire
- literature review
 - pilot proposed forms (2 versions: random, matched samples)
 - psychometric analysis of results
- 1999: 3rd Edition of USRI implemented; policy set to not collect ratings from classes with enrollments less than 10
1. The goals and objectives of the course were clear.
 2. In-class time was used effectively.
 3. I am motivated to learn more about these subject areas.
 4. I increased my knowledge of the subject areas in this course.
 5. Overall, the quality of the course content was excellent.
 6. The instructor spoke clearly.
 7. The instructor was well prepared.
 8. The instructor treated the students with respect.
 9. The instructor provided constructive feedback throughout this course.
 10. Overall, this instructor was excellent.
- 1999: TLC struck a subcommittee to examine evaluation methods for alternative delivery courses. After lengthy discussion, the Committee agreed that 'alternative delivery courses' should be defined quite broadly, encompassing (but not limited to) web-based courses, courses with many instructors, distance-delivery courses, 'context-based learning' courses (such as those used in the Faculties of Nursing and Medicine and Dentistry), and courses with other non-traditional teaching and learning modes.
- 2001: A report from the above committee was submitted to TLC by Carolin Kreber. The committee had attempted to address the above by deriving parallel questions for various methods of delivery using a framework based on Boyer's *Scholarship of Teaching*. Recommendations from this report were not pursued; due, at least in part, to the turn-over of members on TLC and the departure of Dr. Decore
- 2003: Online USRI surveys administered to online classes
- 2008: There are now 7 variations of the 1999 USRI questions to accommodate
- problem based learning
 - on-line classes
 - lab tutors
 - small group facilitators
 - seminar facilitators
 - teaching assistants
 - tutors
- 2008: app. 250,000 questionnaires in 75 departments have been completed in each of the past 6 years
55 departments use more than the 10 USRI questions; some as high as 32 questions
data collected from 85 classes using the Remark Web Survey system

Item 11 Attachment 2
APPENDIX C (55 Pages)

University of Alberta http://www.ualberta.ca/CNS/TSQS/USRI.html	
Key Elements of Policy	Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (2002) - which courses are evaluated by which methods, description of the evaluation instrument, ensuring anonymity while protecting rights of instructors, details about the questionnaire, administration of the questionnaire, content of reports, distribution of results, cautionary statement about results, instructor's option to collect other feedback, and funding this process.
Evaluation Instrument	Universal Student Ratings of Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 10 required questions supplement by additional questions and space for comments
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Instructors are advised that "These factors include class size, class level, Faculty, time of class, required versus optional course, grade expectations, student GPA, gender, race, ethnicity, age of both students and instructors."
Resources for instructors	
Information for students	
Publication of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Information is made available to students' associations to be shared through a secure website.• These groups are not allowed to conduct further analysis of the results.
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The only institution with a section about concerns about the safety of faculty members.• The institutions with the most details about the statistical information provide, and how and why that information is offered.



111.3 Universal Student Ratings of Instruction

In recognition of the University's commitment to teaching, the General Faculties Council endorses a system of Universal Student Ratings of Instruction. This system, however, is only one part of the multi-faceted approach described in Section 111.2. (GFC 09 JUN 1995) (GFC 24 NOV 1997) (EXEC 29 MAR 1999)

The Universal Student Ratings of Instruction are designed to provide a minimal university-wide base of information on student ratings to the parties listed in this Section. With this purpose in mind, the General Faculties Council adopts the following policies: (GFC 24 NOV 1997)

A. All Faculties shall ensure that evaluation of all instructors and courses shall take place each time a course is offered. The term 'instructors' is meant to include tenured professors, tenure-track professors, sessional instructors, clinical instructors, field supervisors and graduate teaching assistants with responsibilities for courses. The term 'course' is meant to include undergraduate and graduate courses, laboratory courses, non-degree courses, seminars, clinical supervision courses, and reading or directed study courses. With the exceptions noted in Section 111.3.B, the assessment shall include the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction as set out below.

B. The Universal Student Ratings of Instruction shall be modified in the following circumstances:

i. courses with between four and nine registered students shall use a department or Faculty developed questionnaire with non-scored questions, such as:

- a) comments on the quality of this course;
- b) suggestions for improving this course;
- c) comments on the quality of instruction in this course;
- d) suggestions for improving the instruction in this course. (EXEC 29 MAR 1999)

ii. courses with multiple instructors shall use a modified Universal Student Ratings of Instruction questionnaire that will include one set of course-related questions for the entire course and one set of instructor-related questions for each instructor who has taught the equivalent of twenty percent or more of the course. If no instructor is responsible for at least twenty percent of the course, only course-related questions should be used on the questionnaire. (EXEC 29 MAR 1999)

iii. in courses with fewer than four registered students or courses such as alternate delivery style courses, the Chair, Director or Dean shall arrange for an alternate method of obtaining student feedback. Such methods could include student course or program exit interviews with the Chair, Director or Dean; or other appropriate means. (EXEC 29 MAR 1999)

C. The Universal Student Ratings of Instruction shall take the form of a questionnaire. The following statement of purpose shall be included at the beginning of the questionnaire:

The University of Alberta would appreciate your careful completion of this questionnaire. The results help instructors and departments or faculties to initiate constructive change in curriculum and instruction. In addition, the results are one important factor in decisions affecting the career of your instructor. The numerical summaries for the ten questions listed below are available through the Students' Union and the Graduate Students' Association.

To protect the anonymity of students, their responses written comments will be typed where the Chair, Director or Dean

deems it advisable. Students who are concerned about the anonymity of their responses should submit their typewritten comments within five working days of the assessment done in class to the Chair, Director or Dean , making sure to note the course number, section and name of the instructor. (GFC 24 NOV 1997)

Questions about this questionnaire should be addressed to your Chair, Director or Dean.

D. The anonymity of student responses to the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction is of fundamental importance in maintaining student confidentiality and encouraging the free expression of views. Under normal circumstances, the anonymity of students shall be protected. Universal Student Ratings of Instruction offer an avenue of feedback, including feedback critical of instructors. It is understood that it is a normal feature of criticism that it may be regarded as offensive and/or unjustified, and that such characteristics would not justify a departure from the normal rules pertaining to confidentiality and anonymity. (GFC 28 FEB 2000)

However, the University has a parallel duty to protect the safety (physical or mental) of members of the University community. If a Department Chair has concerns for the safety of faculty, staff or students, arising from statements that are part of a Universal Student Rating of Instruction, the Chair shall consult with the Dean of the Faculty. If the Dean believes that there is a valid concern for safety, he or she may recommend to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) that the identity of the author of the statements be sought out and disclosed to the appropriate University officials. At any time during this process, the Chair or Dean may invoke the Protocol for Urgent Cases of Disruptive, Threatening or Violent Conduct (Section 91.3, GFC Policy Manual). (GFC 28 FEB 2000)

On receiving such a request from a Dean, the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) will follow the terms of the Protocol for Urgent Cases of Disruptive, Threatening or violent conduct in determining whether there is

- i. reasonable cause to believe that the safety or security (including significant psychological harm) of persons may be threatened and
- ii. that under existing University policies, the statements are grounds for disciplinary action and hence whether confidentiality of USRI should be breached and the provisions in Section 91.3.2 and/or 91.3.3 of the Protocol invoked. (GFC 28 FEB 2000)

If the identity of the author is disclosed, the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) shall notify the author of the statements. The Provost and Vice-President (Academic) shall also notify any individuals mentioned in the statements. (GFC 28 FEB 2000)

E. The Universal Student Ratings of Instruction questionnaire shall use the rating scale

Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree (EXEC 29 MAR 1999)

to gather responses to the following questions:

1. The goals and objectives of the course were clear.
2. In-class time was used effectively.
3. I am motivated to learn more about these subject areas.
4. I increased my knowledge of the subject areas in this course.
5. Overall the quality of the course content was excellent.
6. The instructor spoke clearly.
7. The instructor was well prepared.
8. The instructor treated the students with respect.
9. The instructor provided constructive feedback throughout this course.
10. Overall, this instructor was excellent. (EXEC 29 MAR 1999)

These constitute the ten required Universal Student Ratings of Instruction questions. Instructors, departments, and faculties are encouraged to supplement the set of universal questions.

The questionnaire shall allow space for comments.

F. Certain policies are necessary in order to ensure that the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction Questionnaire is administered in as consistent a fashion as possible. These are:

- i. The Universal Student Ratings of Instruction questions and additional instructor, department or Faculty selected questions shall normally be rated in the same class period.
- ii. Questionnaires shall be administered and completed at the beginning of the class period.
- iii. Universal Student Ratings of Instruction shall normally be administered toward the end of the course but not during the last week of classes.
- iv. The instructor shall not distribute the questionnaires; shall not be present in the room when the questionnaires are being completed; and shall not collect the questionnaires. Departments or Faculties shall create policies to ensure that other individuals (eg, other instructors, students within the class, teaching assistants) are available to administer the questionnaires.
- v. The questionnaires shall be taken directly from the class by the person responsible for administration of the questionnaire to the Chair, Director or delegate (or, in the case of non-departmentalized Faculties, to the Dean or delegate). The Chair or delegate shall then transmit the questionnaires for optical scanning and be responsible for transmission of scanned results and comments to the instructor under the conditions set out in Section G.

G. The numerical summaries for the ten Universal Student Ratings of Instruction questions shall be reported to the instructor, the Chair, Director or Dean and students.

- i. the number of students responding in each category;
- ii. the median score to one decimal point for the question; and
- iii. numerical values from Tukey's boxplot statistics will be provided to describe the distribution of scores in the Faculty/Department:
 - a. lower cut-off for outlier scores
 - b. lower hinge (25th percentile)
 - c. median
 - d. upper hinge (75th percentile)
 - e. it is expected that the upper cut-off will always be 5.0 and, therefore, unnecessary to report. (EXEC 29 MAR 1999)

Note: Statistics from Tukey's box-and-whisker plot analysis (John W. Tukey, Exploratory Data Analysis, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. 1977) have been selected to describe the distribution of USRI data. These statistics are chosen to achieve two main objectives: (i) summarizing skewed data and (ii) identifying outliers from the general population if they exist.

The median (middle of a ranked set of numbers) is generally preferred rather than the mean in defining the centre of a skewed data set.

The 25th and 75th percentiles provide information about the spread of individual scores around the median. By definition, half of the scores in a distribution are below the median and 25 percent of the scores are below the 25th percentile. Since this occurs "by definition", these values should not be used to determine whether a particular score is "good" or "bad".

The lower whisker or cut-off, which is 1.5 box lengths below the 25th percentile (box length is the distance from the 25th to the 75th percentile), defines a reasonable limit beyond which any score can be considered an outlier. Outliers are scores that identify ratings of instruction falling outside the usual distribution of the scores for the population being tabulated.

Given the nature of the USRI data, the upper whisker or cut-off (1.5 box lengths above the 75th percentile) will usually be above 5.0, and so need not be reported.

H. Parties having access to numerical summaries of the ten Universal Student Ratings of Instruction questions and student comments shall be the instructor the Chair, Director or Dean; members of Tenure Committees; and members of Faculty Evaluation Committees.

For questions selected by an instructor, only the instructor shall receive the results. For questions initiated or mandated by a department or Faculty, the results will be reported to the instructor and the Chair, Director or Dean.

Normally, instructors shall receive the results from the student ratings of instruction within twenty working days after the course is complete and the grade sheet has been signed by the Chair, Director or Dean. (EXEC 29 MAR 1999)

Numerical summaries for the ten Universal Student Ratings of Instruction questions shall be given to the Students' Union and the Graduate Students' Association. Results of additional selected questions and student comments shall not be made available to the Students' Union or the Graduate Students' Association.

The Students' Union and Graduate Students' Association acknowledge that the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction are intended only for use by University of Alberta students and shall not be made available to other parties. Neither the Students' Union nor the Graduate Students' Association shall undertake further analysis of the data. The results will be made available to students in paper and/or electronic form. The results will not be released in electronic form for at least ten days following the provision of the results to the instructor.

I. All results given out to students, Chairs, Directors and Deans shall have the following cautionary preface:

Student questionnaires form an important part of evaluating teaching effectiveness but cannot be taken alone as a complete assessment of an instructor or course. Factors other than an instructor's teaching ability may influence ratings. These factors include class size, class level, Faculty, time of class, required versus optional course, grade expectations, student GPA, gender, race, ethnicity, age of both students and instructors.

Small differences in evaluation should not be considered meaningful.

J. Nothing in this section shall prevent instructors from seeking other means of feedback from students during the term.

K. The central administration of the University shall undertake the financing of the universal set of questions in support of the University's commitment to teaching.

111.4 Graduate Student Teaching Awards

Graduate Student Teaching Awards recognize annually the outstanding graduate teaching assistant(s) in each Faculty who meet(s) the eligibility conditions and adjudication criteria described below.

Graduate Student Teaching Awards will be administered by the University Teaching Services*. Award recipients will receive a framable certificate and a letter suitable for their teaching dossier, signed by the University President and the Education Director, University Teaching Services. Names of Graduate Student Teaching Award recipients will be published in the Gateway and Folio. (EXEC 13 DEC 1993)

* In October 1992, University Teaching Services assumed responsibility from the Committee for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning (CITL) for the administration of the Graduate Student Teaching Awards.

Procedure

Each Faculty Dean will receive a letter inviting the nomination(s) of graduate student(s) from the Faculty for the Graduate Student Teaching Award. The Dean will be asked to consult appropriate staff and students in making the selection and no award should be made if an outstanding candidate cannot be identified. Selections should be received by University Teaching Services in February/March of each year as specified in the letter to Deans, in order to allow sufficient time to have certificates printed, letters prepared and the Gateway and Folio articles ready for the end of April. University Teaching Services will send the letter and certificate to the Dean of the Faculty in which the student teaches; that Dean will be responsible for presenting the Award.

Eligibility

To be eligible for the Graduate Student Teaching Awards, students must be in good academic standing and must be making good progress in their degree program, as decided by their department. Awards should only be made to students who are considered outstanding teachers. Students whose teaching duties are outside their home unit shall be considered, for the purpose of adjudication, to be from the unit in which the teaching duties are assigned. Students who

function as part-time sessionals should also be considered as eligible for the award. Graduate students must be nominated within one year of completing their term as graduate teaching assistants. The awardees must have taught as graduate teaching assistants for a minimum of two academic (four month) terms, which may include the term in which the nomination is made. Faculties will determine what duties qualify a graduate student as a graduate teaching assistant.

Adjudication Criteria

The adjudication criteria for the graduate student teaching awards are listed below. Deans who choose to have their units participate in this Awards program will determine how the competition will be conducted in their individual Faculties. Circumstances in individual Faculties may require modification of the criteria by the Faculty.

1. Exhibits a consistently superior command of the subject matter being taught and attempts to provide students with a comprehensive, coherent understanding of the subject matter.
2. Is prepared, organized and able to explain the subject clearly.
3. Is respected and trusted by students. Instills in students interest and enthusiasm for the subject.
4. Is willing to spend time with students and is available and approachable outside the classroom or laboratory.
5. Presents the subject matter at a level appropriate to students.
6. Takes care and is prompt in marking assignments; gives feedback and direction and promotes self-assessment by students.

Number of Graduate Student Teaching Awards by Faculty

The number of awards available are calculated on the Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) of graduate students teaching in each faculty. One award can be awarded for every 20 FTE* [or as a portion thereof] graduate students and, normally, no individual unit or department beneath the Faculty level can receive more than three awards in any competition. (GFC 25 JUN 1990) (EXEC 10 DEC 1990) (EXEC 04 FEB 1991)

* editorial change, University Secretariat, 1992

GFC Executive approved the following:

1. That the Graduate Student Teaching Awards continue in their present form. (EXEC 28 OCT 1991)
2. That the awards be reviewed again with respect to purpose and procedures at the end of the 1992-93 academic year. (EXEC 28 OCT 1991)

(GFC 29 JUN 1981)	(EXEC 06 MAY 1991)
(GFC 01 MAR 1982)	(GFC 09 JUN 1995)
(EXEC 03 MAY 1982)	(EXEC 29 MAR 1999)
(EXEC 26 JUL 1982)	(GFC 15 MAR 1999)
(EXEC 06 MAY 1985)	(EXEC 01 DEC 1999)
(EXEC 04 NOV 1985)	(EXEC 11 SEPT 2000)
(EXEC 05 JUN 1987)	(EXEC 05 NOV 2001)
(EXEC 14 NOV 1988)	(EXEC 06 MAY 2002)
(EXEC 11 SEP 1989)	

Also see UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING AWARDS COMMITTEE, Section 118.

University of British Columbia http://www.senate.ubc.ca/vancouver/download/policy_on_student_evaluation_of_teaching.pdf	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (May 2007) - background, goals, guiding principles, implementation, access to results, dissemination of results, and assignment of responsibilities.
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 standard questions
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the results cover sheet, instructors are given referral to the Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth for debriefing.
Recommended Resources for instructors	
Information for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The academic centre's has information for students about completing evaluations.
Publication of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A modular system is used to share different data with different stakeholders. • Instructors have to give consent to have their results made public.
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UBC's faculty association challenged the introduction of this policy, but their request for arbitration was denied.



A POLICY ON STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Approved by Senate on May 16, 2007 upon recommendation of the Teaching and Learning Committee. This policy is meant to replace all earlier Senate Policies on Student Evaluation.

BACKGROUND

In May 2006, as part of a larger strategy to support and foster quality teaching and learning at UBC, Senate approved in principle recommendations related to student evaluations of teaching. These recommendations focused on supporting a modular evaluation process that enables the key stakeholders who influence the quality of the learning environment at UBC to ask relevant questions of students at appropriate times (concurrent and end of term, as appropriate) and then readily collect, analyze and interpret and share those data.

Guiding principles embedded in the recommendations were that evaluation of teaching should be student-focused, and that the products of evaluations be used to inform teachers on how they can continuously improve their practice and to support the university efforts to monitor and nurture its teaching and learning environments. The Senate charged the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee and the Office of the Provost with developing an implementation strategy for the recommendations. A joint committee (SEOT) was struck to address this charge.

The SEOT committee has reviewed recommendations, guidelines, and policies established by Senate over the past few decades on student evaluation of teaching at the University, and is of the opinion that a new policy on student evaluation of teaching would be of benefit. It should be noted that this proposed policy does not specify the means of data collection and should be applied to all current and future means of obtaining student evaluations of teaching evaluation. However, the SEOT Committee is of the view that a centrally supported, yet locally managed web-based system for student evaluations of teaching would greatly facilitate the uniform application of this policy. Evaluation of a potential system continues. This policy is meant to replace all earlier Senate Policies on Student Evaluation.

INTRODUCTION, APPLICATION, AND GOALS

This policy derives from recommendations approved by Senate in 1978, 1991, 1996, 1999, 2000, and 2006, and is in alignment with the conditions for appointment for faculty, sessional, and part-time faculty members. The policy also applies to teaching assistants when they take on substantial responsibility for student learning experience in a course. It applies to all undergraduate, graduate and continuing studies courses offered at UBC.

Student evaluation of teaching has four major goals:

- 1) To provide data that will be used to continuously improve the student's learning experience.
- 2) To provide students, departments, faculties and the University with a source of data about the overall quality of teaching.
- 3) To provide teachers with information on their teaching performance and to assist with the further development of their teaching.
- 4) To provide the University with data on the quality of teaching to be used for operational purposes, including but not limited to assessment of faculty for merit and/or performance adjustment salary awards, promotion, tenure and institutional recognition.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

- 1) Student evaluations should be considered as part of an overall teaching evaluation system that includes regular peer review, faculty self-assessment, and other forms of assessment, as appropriate.
- 2) Educational programs and incentives should be developed to ensure a high rate of participation in the evaluation of teaching.
- 3) Evaluations of teaching shall ensure students' confidentiality, e.g., the students will not be required to provide their name and/or student number.
- 4) Student evaluation of teaching should be student-centred (i.e., ultimately improving the learning experience) and it must provide a mechanism for receiving reliable and valid data from students on a range of topics related to their learning experiences.

- 5) Student Evaluations of Teaching should be administered in every course section at UBC every time it is offered including those offered to undergraduate, graduate and continuing studies students. Exceptions to this requirement are courses of an individual/independent nature (e.g., independent study courses, special research projects, thesis, music studios, etc.) or sections with very small enrollments as defined by each faculty, where other means of obtaining student feedback may be more appropriate.
- 6) A rating scale (when used) of 1–5 should be adopted for all evaluation questions, with 5 being the most positive response.
- 7) In addition to the formal summative evaluations by students, faculty members are strongly encouraged to seek formative feedback during the course, using methods of their own choice.
- 8) Carefully planned dissemination, feedback, and response strategies are needed, so that the data can be used to improve the learning environment.
- 9) Different stakeholder constituencies of the University require different information in order to assess the quality of teaching and provide appropriate support structures that encourage teaching excellence.

IMPLEMENTATION

- 1) A modular, multi-perspective design endorsed in principle by the Senate at its May 2006 meeting shall be adopted to take into account the multiple stakeholders in need of Student Evaluations of Teaching data (students, teachers, departments, faculties, and the University).
- 2) Data can be collected through mechanisms as diverse as traditional paper forms and a centrally administered web-based evaluation platform. Regardless of delivery mechanism, Faculties are responsible for providing certain data to the University on a timely basis for reporting.
- 3) In addition to modules contributed by departments, Faculties and the Provost Office, individual teachers may elect to include a personal module for which the data collected will be confidential to that teacher.
- 4) The instruments used to obtain student evaluations shall carry a copy of this statement:

The University recognizes the importance of high quality teaching for the academic preparation of its students and accordingly requires that teachers be annually evaluated by procedures which include provision for assessments by students. Students are advised that submissions containing malicious or otherwise inappropriate comments will be discarded.

Except for confidential questions used solely for the benefit of an individual teacher, the University will use data from student evaluations of teaching to improve the learning environment of the University. In addition the University will use this data for operational purposes, including but not limited to assessment of faculty for promotion, tenure and institutional recognition.

- 5) Paper forms shall carry an additional statement that:

Students may wish to print their comments to avoid recognition of their handwriting.

ACCESS TO RESULTS OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

The Modular approach is intended to provide a means for collecting data in alignment with the needs of stakeholder constituencies. Table 1 depicts who will have access to the data in each module. Note that the teacher of a course will have access to all of the data collected related to his or her teaching during the evaluation whereas the University designate will have direct access only to the University Module results. If there is more than one instructor teaching a course, that individual will have access to his or her own results, but not necessarily those of co-teachers.

Table 1. Representation of who has access to which modules, where the X indicates access to the results of a particular module. See footnotes for details.

Stakeholder Representative					
	Individual Teacher	Department Head or Designate	Dean/Head of School or Designate	University Designate	Students/AMS
University Module	X	X	X	X	X ¹
Faculty/School Module	X	X	X		
Department Module	X	X	X		
Confidential Teacher Module	X				

1. In compliance with the privacy laws, results for individual instructors will be released only with their consent.

DISSEMINATION OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

Student evaluations of teaching shall be disseminated according to the following guidelines:

1. Faculties shall make the University module data available to the Provost Office on an annual basis.
2. Deans, Heads or Directors or their equivalents will have access to all information contained in student evaluations of teaching except for the confidential questions collected at the specific request of individual teachers.
3. Individual teachers participating in a course taught by more than one individual will receive 1) a summary of the course evaluations, 2) numerical rating(s) of their own teaching performance together with any written comments and 3) the average numerical rating of the teaching performance of all other contributors to the course (given for the benefit of peer comparison).¹
4. Teaching assistants will receive: a) numerical rating(s) of their own teaching performance together with any written comments and (b) the average numerical rating of the teaching performance of all other contributors to the course (given for the benefit of peer comparison).
5. Results will not be given to instructors until after they have submitted final marks for the course or courses in which they are being evaluated.
6. Results of the University Module will be made available to students (AMS). Release of results in any public format must comply with privacy regulations stipulated by the Office of University Counsel. Accordingly, no results that can be attributed to an individual teacher will be released without the consent of that instructor.
7. Each Faculty/School will annually provide students with a summary report of the general quality of teaching in their programs.
8. In special circumstances, the University's designate in consultation with the Dean of the relevant Faculty, may choose not to release part or all of the summary data from teaching evaluations to the AMS or other authorized student organization. Examples of what might be withheld include evaluation summaries for:
 - A. faculty in their first year of teaching
 - B. classes with very small numbers of students
 - C. evaluations with very low response rates
 - D. first-time courses given on an experimental basis

Note: In the case of B above, alternate methods of involving students in the evaluation of teaching will have to be used.

ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Student's Responsibilities

The University has repeatedly affirmed the importance of and necessity for students to be able to provide confidential and timely feedback to faculty members regarding their teaching. This feedback comprises part of the information which is used to assess faculty performance, and is considered in reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions. As such, UBC believes that participating in teaching evaluation is a student responsibility which should be approached with due seriousness.

University Administration Responsibilities

The Vice President Academic and Provost shall report annually to Senate on teaching quality, effectiveness, and evaluation, and on the extent to which the university is reaching its learning goals.

The University will support a central repository of information about student evaluation of teaching that contains such things as policy, historical information, best practice guidelines, etc., to facilitate professional development, information gathering, and scholarly discourse as well as avoid duplication of effort.

Faculty & Department/Unit Shared Responsibilities

Deans, Directors and Department Heads will ensure that the Student Evaluations of Teaching are administered according to this policy.

Deans, Directors, Department Heads and members of relevant committees shall review the procedures and instruments for the evaluation of teaching in their units and ensure that they are consistent with the statements made in this policy document.

Each Faculty and Department shall establish clear, written criteria which will be used to assess unsatisfactory teaching performance. These criteria shall be made known to anyone who is working in a teaching capacity (including Teaching Assistants).

1 In case of sections of courses taught by a large number of instructors, alternative modes of assessment may be used to gather the data, as appropriate.

Deans, Directors and Department Heads shall take action in response to results which show less than satisfactory teaching performance, and a report of such action shall be submitted annually to the Vice President Academic and Provost in the case of Deans and to the Dean in the case of Directors and Heads.

All units shall give serious consideration to establishing a committee whose function is to monitor the processes whereby teaching is evaluated and whose membership includes student representation.

Faculty Level Responsibilities

Each Faculty shall ensure that there is a level of uniformity in the evaluation questionnaires used by individual teaching units to allow the Faculty to make available statistical summary data on overall teaching effectiveness in individual courses.

Each Faculty shall develop policies and procedures that ensure access for their Professors, Instructors and Teaching Assistants to peer-based teaching development programs.

Department Head's or Director's Responsibilities

Heads or Directors of teaching units, or their delegates, shall use the results of teaching evaluations as one component in assessing teaching performance when recommending annual merit/performance salary adjustment increases for faculty, and for the purposes of recommendations concerning tenure and/or promotion.

Heads or Directors of teaching units, or their delegates, shall ensure that all faculty whose teaching is being assessed by students are given the opportunity to provide or withhold consent to their Student Evaluations of Teaching data being released to the students, as stipulated by this policy. However, these data will be used by UBC employees designated with the authority for the assessment of faculty for merit and/or performance adjustment salary awards, promotion, tenure and institutional recognition.

Each unit head must be responsible for ensuring that the criteria are set high enough to motivate teachers to improve the effectiveness of their teaching.

Faculty Member's Responsibilities

Anyone teaching a course at UBC is responsible for familiarizing themselves with the policies and expectations related to student evaluation of teaching.

Anyone teaching a course at UBC is strongly urged to avail themselves of services offered through UBC teaching and scholarly service units (e.g., TAG, Institute for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning) in order to understand how they can use student evaluations of teaching to inform and improve their teaching practice.

University Module Items

Based on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = adequate, 4 = good and 5 = excellent, please rate your instructor on the following:

1. **The clarity of the instructor's expectations of learning.** Good practice indicates that instructors should set high learning expectations for their students and clearly communicate them. This question asks for your overall rating of how clearly your instructor communicated his or her expectations of you.
2. **The fairness of the instructor's assessment of learning (exams, essays, tests, etc)** Some courses are harder than others; you should not expect that every course will challenge you in exactly the same way. However, good teaching practice does mean that the instructor will outline reasonable standards by which you will be assessed. This question asks you to rate how fairly you believe the instructor assessed you based on the standards set for the course.
3. **The instructor's ability to communicate the course objectives and content.** At UBC, you will be exposed to a variety of teaching approaches and classroom situations. Regardless of whether your instructor is delivering a lecture, facilitating an online discussion or answering a question privately (face-to-face or via e-mail), your instructor needs to effectively communicate with you about course objectives, concepts and content. This question asks you to rate how well your instructor communicated with you in matters relevant to the course.
4. **The instructor's ability to inspire interest in the course material.** Good teaching practice encourages students to engage with the course material, activates students' curiosity and challenges them to learn more. This question asks you to rate your instructor's ability to inspire your interest in the course.
5. **The instructor's concern for students' learning.** Instructors demonstrate their concern for students' learning in a variety of ways, including their treatment of students in public and private situations, their responsiveness to student queries and the timeliness of returning student work. This question asks you to rate how well your instructor demonstrated his or her concern for students' learning.
6. **The instructor's overall quality of teaching.** High quality teaching is a sum of many characteristics that make up good teaching practice. This question asks you to reflect on your learning experience as a whole in the course with a particular instructor. How would you rate this instructor's overall quality of teaching?

University of Calgary http://www.ucalgary.ca/vpa/USRI/reference-info.htm	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal Student Ratings Of Instruction (1998) • This report details the history of student evaluations at the U of C. • It includes 33 recommendations for developing the instrument and process. • This report and the recommendations were accepted in 1998.
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal Student Ratings Of Instruction (USRI) • 12 standard questions
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is information for faculty members but it focuses on administrative details like adding comments or finding results rather than on using results to improve teaching
Recommended Resources for instructors	
Information for students	
Publication of results	
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are asked to provide their ID number in order to access demographic details • Legal ownership of evaluation forms and their content lies with the University rather than the Students' Union. • Online since Fall 2005.

Index:

[Introduction](#)
[Background](#)
[Implementation Task Force](#)
[Costs](#)
[Recommendations](#)
[Purpose and Expectations](#)
[Expectations](#)
[Form of the Instrument](#)
[Control](#)
[Administration](#)
[Reporting](#)
[Publication](#)
[Guidelines for Instructor](#)
[Feedback Other Use of the Data](#)
[Implementation](#)
[Future Testing](#)
[Archiving](#)
[Summary](#)

[Green Sheet](#)
Appendices:
[1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [4](#) [5](#) [6](#) [7](#) [8](#)
[9](#)

Universal Student Ratings Of Instruction Report and Recommendations

1998-05-06

Introduction

The history of discussions at General Faculties Council (GFC) regarding Student Ratings of Instruction is a lengthy one, going back at least to 1992 (see Chronology of GFC Decisions, Student Ratings of Instruction, 1997-04-24 in [Appendix #1](#)). This report will not attempt to provide all the details of that history. Rather, it will emphasize those decisions which are pertinent to the implementation of a Universal Student Ratings of Instruction Instrument (hereinafter referred to as the Ratings Instrument). In addition the report will also provide pertinent details of the work of the Academic Program Committee's (APC) Implementation Task Force and an estimate of costs for administering the Ratings Instrument annually.

([Top](#) / [Bottom](#) of Report)

Background

At its 369th meeting (1992-03-12) GFC approved student evaluations as "one factor on which the evaluation of teaching shall be based," and asserted that "student evaluations shall be required of all academic appointees." Subsequently, at its 389th meeting (1992-03-27) the GFC Executive Committee established the Task Force on Teaching Effectiveness, Evaluations and Procedures. Part of its mandate was to review logistical issues involved with student evaluation forms and departmental procedures on evaluation of teaching.

The report of the Task Force was presented to GFC at its 395th meeting (1994-06-16). GFC approved a set of both General Principles as well as Operating Principles. Two of the General Principles are of significance for this report: 1.) that there should be regular and systematic evaluation and 2.) that it is acknowledged that "students are an essential source of insight into the effectiveness of educators." The Operating Principles directed the VP(A) to work with Deans to develop a systematic set of procedures for administering student teaching evaluations and directed Deans to develop written plans for evaluating teaching in their Faculties. To facilitate this process the VP(A) sent a proposal to all Deans (August 24, 1994) describing a set of five principles upon which the process of evaluation would be based:

1. evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be multi-faceted;
2. evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be used to foster excellence in teaching;
3. the purpose of evaluation shall be to provide formative and summative evaluation for the improvement of teaching and learning;
4. the evaluation process will identify strengths and areas in need of improvement in instruction;
5. evaluation will be an essential element in promotion and tenure decisions.

The proposal also outlined a multi-faceted process consisting of three elements.

1. a mandatory universal set of questions to be administered every time a course is taught by all instructors;
2. the option available for each Faculty or department to include additional questions;
3. the inclusion from time to time of another method of evaluation chosen by the Faculty and approved by the VP(A).



Universal Student Ratings of Instruction Instrument

The information you provide on this rating instrument is intended for use by students to aid them in selecting courses, by Deans and Department Heads to assess instructors, by instructors to assist them in improving instruction, and by the University for administrative research purposes. Therefore it is essential that you answer the questions carefully. If you have concerns about the course or instruction that are not addressed by this instrument, please speak to the Department Head or Dean.

You are asked to provide your ID number so that the University can access relevant statistical data (e.g. major, year, gender, age). Your ID will NOT be revealed to the instructor(s) receiving the summary information from the responses on the instrument. Instruments which do not include an ID number that would indicate you are a student registered in the course or course component will not be considered.

Your participation in this evaluation process is gratefully acknowledged by the Students' Union, Instructors and Administration of the University.

RATING INSTRUCTIONS

- Please rate only the course/course component (lab, lecture, segment, etc.) as requested.
- Base your ratings on your expectations for courses of similar type and size (e.g. large lecture, small lecture, multi-instructor courses, practicum, labs, or distance education courses).
- Please rate each item independently of the others.

	Unacceptable	Very Poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A
1. The overall quality of instruction was:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
2. The course outline or other descriptive information provided enough detail about the course (e.g., goals, reading list, topics covered, assignments, exams, due dates, grade weightings).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. The course as delivered followed the outline and other course descriptive information.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The course material was presented in a well-organized manner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Student questions and comments were responded to appropriately.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. The course content was communicated with enthusiasm.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Opportunities for course assistance were available (e.g., instructor office hours, out-of-class appointments, e-mail, telephone, websites).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Students were treated respectfully.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. The evaluation methods used for determining the course grade were fair.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Students' work was graded in a reasonable amount of time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. I learned a lot in this course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. The support materials (e.g., readings, audio-visual materials, speakers, field trips, equipment, software, etc.) used in this course helped me to learn.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

side 2 of 2

Mark Refex® by NCS MM2168B3-3

6

ED08

sample

Dalhousie University	
http://learningandteaching.dal.ca/sri.html	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures for Collecting, Storing, and Reporting SRI Data I cannot find any specific policy, but there is information about the procedures related administering the survey, format of the survey, use of written comments, printed reports, storage of original forms, and sample forms.
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Ratings of Instruction (SRI) There are separate quantitative and qualitative (comment) forms.
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a form for summarizing and reporting results.
Recommended Resources for instructors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a list of resources about teaching evaluations rather than about improving teaching. This information is provided without any additional context or suggestions on how to use it.
Information for students	
Publication of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It doesn't appear that the information is published anywhere
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are clear rules about dealing with signed (can be used for evaluation but identity is not revealed) and unsigned (for use by instructor only) comments from students.

CLT HOME

ABOUT CLT

ACADEMIC STAFF

New Academic Staff Orientation

New Academic Staff Handbook

Professional Development

Teaching Excellence Awards

Teaching Dossiers/Portfolios

Workshops

Discussion Groups

Student Ratings of Instruction

Procedures

Directions

Forms

Resources

TEACHING ASSISTANTS

CERTIFICATE IN UNIVERSITY
TEACHING & LEARNING

CLT LIBRARY

INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA
SERVICES

DISTANCE & ONLINE
EDUCATION

CONTACT US

Award Winning Teachers

Grants & Fellowships

Online Journals

Focus Online

Online Resources

Publications

Educational Development

Centres

Events:

Year at a Glance

Event Photo Albums



Procedures for Collecting, Storing, and Reporting SRI Data

1. Schools and Departments designate a liaison person (usually support staff) who receives a preliminary list of the courses/professors to be rated and sends any corrections to Carol O'Neil, Associate Director (Technology), Centre for Learning and Teaching. This occurs shortly after the last add/drop date in each semester.
2. There are two different questionnaires: one for collecting quantitative data (a scannable "bubble" form) and another for collecting qualitative data (students' written comments). CLT prepares class envelopes containing questionnaires and delivers these to the department. There is one envelope for each professor/class combination (e.g., a class taught by two professors will have two envelopes). Each envelope contains sufficient questionnaires for each registered student.
3. There are strict requirements regarding the processing and distribution of students' written comments and a distinction is made between signed and unsigned comments.
 - *Unsigned comments* are seen by the professor ONLY, are not used by others for any purpose in performance evaluation and are not available to academic administrators.
 - *Signed comments* may be used for performance evaluation but in no case should students' identities be revealed to the instructor.
4. Decisions about Students' Written Comments
 - *Typed versus not typed.* To allay students' fears that an instructor may recognize their handwriting, some departments opt to type the comments. The department, not CLT, does this work. Different forms are provided by CLT for typed or untyped comments.
 - a. If unsigned comments are typed, comments are marked "unsigned" and provided to the instructor ONLY. The originals should be shredded. Untyped originals of unsigned comments may be given to the instructor if the students are advised this will happen.
 - b. If signed comments are typed, students' signatures are deleted and comments are marked "signed." Original forms with signatures are kept in a secure file (e.g., personal file) where students' identities will remain confidential from the instructor.
 - c. If signed comments are untyped, photocopies of the originals, with student names masked, may be given to the instructor. Original forms with signatures are kept in a secure file (e.g.,

personal file) where students' identities will remain confidential from the instructor.

5. *Department versus CLT comment forms.* Departmentally designed forms for students' comments must provide clear direction to students about:

- a. the purpose for which the comments will be used
- b. who will have access to them
- c. when the instructor will receive the comments (that is, not until after the final grades for the course have been submitted)
- d. how student identities will be kept confidential from the instructor

6. The questionnaires are administered any time during the 11th and 12th weeks of the semester; precise timing is up to the instructor. Professors pick up their envelopes from departmental staff, take the envelope to the class, read the instructions to the class, appoint a student volunteer to oversee the process, and leave the room. The instructor is not permitted to be present when the data are being collected. If the department prefers, administrative staff may oversee this process.

7. The student volunteers (or staff) distribute the questionnaires, collect and count the completed questionnaires, and put all completed and unused questionnaires back into the envelope. The envelopes are sealed, signed across the flap, and returned to the departmental office—not to the professor.

8. CLT staff pick up the completed questionnaires in person, then separate the scannable questionnaires from the "comments forms." Comments forms are hand-delivered back to the department/school for typing or photocopying.

9. The bubble questionnaires are scanned, results analyzed, and reports printed. Each professor will receive reports for his/her own classes. Each Director or Head will receive a report for each professor/class combination as well as a separate report that contains departmental means only. This latter department report will also be sent to the Dean.

Only two copies of the reports are printed. Printed reports are distributed in accordance with CLT policy. Additional copies will be generated only at the written request of the faculty member involved; his/her Director, Head, Chair, or Dean; the President; or the Vice-President Academic and Provost. In addition, access to the original computerized database is restricted and information is held in confidence by CLT.

10. The raw data and statistical analysis for each SRI annual cycle (September 1 to August 31) are electronically archived and can be accessed at a later date if necessary, in accordance with CLT policy. The original scannable questionnaires will be kept for 12 months after the August 31 end of the SRI annual cycle in which the forms were completed before they are shredded (e.g., forms completed in September 2005 to August 2006 will be shredded in September 2007).

11. Copies of the qualitative and quantitative questionnaires and a sample SRI report can be viewed at [Forms](#).

Please direct comments and suggestions to Carol O'Neil, Centre for Learning and Teaching,
Phone: 494-1895, Fax: 494-3767, Email: Carol.ONeil@dal.ca



Dalhousie University Student Rating of Instruction Questionnaire Comments

Department _____ Class _____ Section _____ Instructor _____
(one name only, please)

Read the following carefully before proceeding:

- Please sign the form if you want your comments to be used for tenure, promotion, re-appointment, or other personnel decisions.
- All comments will be typed without your signature before being given to the instructor.
- The original signed version will be kept in a confidential file and will not be seen by your instructor.
- If you choose not to sign, the typed version of your comments will be given only to your instructor.

Please feel free to comment on any aspect of the instruction. You may want to elaborate here on the reasons for your responses to questions 1 to 8 on the questionnaire.

1. What did your instructor do to facilitate your learning in this class or clinical setting?

2. What did your instructor do which hampered your learning in this class or clinical setting?

3. Additional comments:

(Use other side, if necessary)

Signature (Optional, see above)

Université Laval	
http://www.ulaval.ca/sg/reg/Politiques/encadrement.html	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POLITIQUE D'ENCADREMENT DE L'ÉVALUATION DES ACTIVITÉS D'ENSEIGNEMENT PAR LES ÉTUDIANTS AUX TROIS CYCLES (1997)
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEVE, EVE and EVEweb
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is information about support for instructors.
Recommended Resources for instructors	
Information for students	
Publication of results	
Other comments	

POLITIQUE D'ENCADREMENT DE L'ÉVALUATION DES ACTIVITÉS D'ENSEIGNEMENT PAR LES ÉTUDIANTS AUX TROIS CYCLES

Politique adoptée par le Conseil universitaire à sa séance du 1^{er} avril 1997 (CU-97-81).

La présente politique d'évaluation de l'enseignement s'inscrit dans l'ensemble des actions et des politiques de l'Université Laval qui soutiennent la qualité de la formation aux trois cycles. Il s'agit tantôt de critères de promotion valorisant la fonction enseignement, tantôt d'évaluation périodique des programmes, tantôt de politique d'évaluation des apprentissages, tantôt d'éléments structurants comme le Réseau de valorisation de l'enseignement et les budgets de soutien à la pédagogie.

Son objet est de fournir d'abord aux membres du personnel enseignant, mais aussi aux facultés, aux départements et aux comités de programme, des informations susceptibles d'avoir un impact positif sur la qualité de l'enseignement dont ils ont la responsabilité. Sa visée est d'encadrer le processus d'évaluation de l'enseignement par les étudiants des trois cycles.

La présente politique veut assurer la consolidation du travail déjà entrepris par plusieurs facultés et départements, en concertation avec leurs associations étudiantes; elle se veut aussi la marque d'un engagement collectif qui devrait être complété ultérieurement par une évaluation périodique de l'enseignement par les pairs.

PRINCIPES ET VALEURS

1. L'Université reconnaît sa responsabilité à l'égard de l'enseignement et, de ce fait, son obligation d'en évaluer les différents aspects.
2. Par enseignement, il faut entendre l'ensemble des activités pédagogiques qui contribuent à l'acquisition par les étudiants de connaissances, d'habiletés ou d'attitudes. En corollaire, un apprentissage réussi est fonction de l'engagement des étudiants.
3. L'acte d'enseigner requiert des compétences particulières qu'il est de la responsabilité de l'Université de reconnaître, et dont elle doit favoriser le développement; l'évaluation est une mesure en ce sens.
4. L'Université reconnaît le droit des étudiants de participer à l'évaluation de l'enseignement reçu et de participer à l'élaboration et à l'application de toute politique d'évaluation de l'enseignement.
5. Les responsabilités d'enseignement sont surtout assumées par les professeurs; d'autres catégories de personnel y contribuent, de façon toute particulière les chargés de cours, mais également les maîtres de langue, les responsables de formation pratique, les superviseurs de stage, les auxiliaires d'enseignement, les moniteurs de laboratoires, etc. Dans son esprit, la présente politique s'adresse à chacun d'eux.
6. L'évaluation de l'enseignement peut prendre diverses formes: autoévaluation, évaluation par les étudiants, évaluation par les pairs. Dans tous les cas, son objectif est d'enrichir la relation

professeur-étudiants et d'améliorer la qualité de l'enseignement.

7. Pour que l'évaluation de l'enseignement soit efficace, ses résultats doivent faire l'objet d'un suivi, tant de la part de l'enseignant que du responsable de l'évaluation.

8. Les résultats de l'évaluation sont diffusés dans le respect des règles et conventions en vigueur à l'intérieur comme à l'extérieur de l'Université. En particulier, cette diffusion sera conforme à la loi relative à la protection des renseignements personnels.

OBJETS D'ÉVALUATION

Pour les fins de la présente politique, les compétences en enseignement qui sont objets d'évaluation sont de trois ordres:

les compétences disciplinaires:

- connaissances théoriques et pratiques de la discipline et de l'évolution du domaine d'études
- capacité d'établir des liens entre le cours et les autres composantes du programme

les compétences pédagogiques:

- précision du plan de cours
- efficacité et dynamisme de la communication en classe
- qualité de la documentation écrite
- pertinence de l'évaluation des apprentissages
- disponibilité et qualité de l'encadrement pédagogique

les compétences personnelles:

- respect des personnes
- interaction avec les étudiants et avec les auxiliaires d'enseignement.

DEUX MOMENTS D'ÉVALUATION

Évaluation formative

Réalisée assez tôt dans le déroulement d'un cours ou de toute autre activité pédagogique, une évaluation dite formative vise à poser un premier diagnostic et à pointer des éléments susceptibles d'être améliorés, tant du point de vue du professeur que de celui des étudiants. Le plan de cours doit normalement en indiquer le moment.

L'évaluation formative est sous la responsabilité partagée du professeur ou du chargé de cours et des étudiants et elle peut prendre diverses formes; elle vise à assurer le meilleur déroulement possible de l'activité pédagogique en fonction notamment de ce que prévoit le plan de cours.

Évaluation sommative

Au terme du trimestre, un cours ou toute autre activité pédagogique peut être évalué par les étudiants à l'aide d'un questionnaire. La mise en place ainsi que le bon fonctionnement de cette évaluation sont sous l'autorité de la faculté. Celle-ci peut avoir recours à divers aménagements et en partager la responsabilité avec une de ses instances officiellement reconnues - direction de département, direction de programme ou comité de programme - dans le respect des prérogatives de chacune par rapport à la qualité des cours et des programmes.

Les résultats de l'évaluation sont considérés significatifs si au moins 60% des étudiants inscrits à l'activité ont rempli le questionnaire. Ils sont d'abord transmis par le responsable autorisé, doyen ou directeur du département, au professeur ou au chargé de cours concerné, dans le respect des règles en vigueur.

SUIVI DE L'ÉVALUATION

Il importe que les directeurs de départements et d'écoles, ainsi que les membres des comités de programme, aient accès aux résultats de l'évaluation par les étudiants afin qu'ils puissent en assurer le meilleur suivi possible. Ces personnes devront aller au-delà des résultats purement individuels afin que l'évaluation permette avant tout de considérer les phénomènes à l'échelle d'un programme ou d'un département.

On devra prévoir également la possibilité que soient accessibles à un public plus large des résultats globaux pour une période donnée. L'Université est imputable de la qualité de la formation qu'elle dispense et, lors de l'évaluation périodique de ses programmes, elle doit se donner les moyens d'attester de l'état de santé pédagogique de ceux-ci.

CONTEXTE DES ÉVALUATIONS

Pour être utiles à l'institution, les résultats de l'évaluation de l'enseignement par les étudiants, que cette évaluation soit formative ou sommative, doivent être mis en contexte. Aussi y a-t-il lieu de prévoir la prise en compte de certains éléments susceptibles d'en modifier la perception, par exemple:

- l'expérience et la situation d'emploi de la personne responsable de l'activité pédagogique;
- la complexité ou la nouveauté de la matière à enseigner ou de l'activité pédagogique;
- la nouveauté de la formule pédagogique utilisée;
- la qualité du matériel ou de l'environnement physique disponibles;
- certaines caractéristiques du groupe d'étudiants;
- l'horaire du cours ou de l'activité;
- etc.

Le professeur ou le chargé de cours qui le juge opportun peut remettre au responsable de l'évaluation un document faisant état de l'un ou l'autre élément particulier du contexte.

ACTIVITÉS PÉDAGOGIQUES ÉVALUÉES ET FRÉQUENCE DE L'ÉVALUATION

Toutes les activités pédagogiques dont l'Université est responsable sont sujettes à évaluation, même si leur variété impose certains ajustements. Les comités de programmes et les départements sont invités à se préoccuper en priorité des situations pédagogiques les plus courantes et qui concernent le plus grand nombre d'étudiants, et à établir la périodicité de l'évaluation.

Cependant, sont évalués à chaque occurrence:

- tout nouveau cours ou tout cours existant donné selon une nouvelle formule pédagogique;
- tout cours donné pour la première fois par un professeur ou un chargé de cours;
- tout cours dont la dernière évaluation, de l'avis du responsable autorisé, a révélé des difficultés.

L'évaluation de certains cours ou de certaines activités pédagogiques, notamment aux deuxième et troisième cycles, peut se prêter moins bien au mode d'évaluation décrit ici. Des lignes directrices devront être arrêtées ultérieurement à cet égard, et progressivement implantées.

IMPLANTATION DE LA POLITIQUE

La présente politique prend effet au trimestre suivant son adoption par le Conseil universitaire. Conformément aux principes de gestion reconnus par l'Université, le respect de ses orientations est confié aux facultés. Ces dernières procéderont dans les meilleurs délais à l'identification du ou des responsables et à l'établissement de la périodicité des évaluations.

Au cours des trois années suivant l'adoption de la politique, un comité de suivi institutionnel en

supervisera l'implantation. Il sera composé de deux professeurs et d'un chargé de cours et de trois étudiants dont un de deuxième ou de troisième cycle, nommés par la Vice-rectrice aux études. Le comité fera rapport à la vice-rectrice aux études de l'avancement de l'implantation de la politique à la fin de l'automne 1998.

D'ici là, les unités qui font déjà l'évaluation de l'enseignement poursuivent leurs pratiques actuelles qu'elles ajusteront dès que possible, le cas échéant, aux orientations de la politique.

1997/09

McGill University http://www.mcgill.ca/tls/courseevaluations	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on official end-of-term course evaluations (Jan 2008) - policy, definitions, purpose, scope, content, timing, confidentiality, dissemination, oversight, depository, and required statements.
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students complete evaluations online. • There are 4 standard questions plus up to 21 additional questions selected by the department and/or instructor (up to 3 questions). • A pool of suggested questions is available.
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is advice for instructors on improving completion rates, interpreting results with information on factors that influence ratings (class size, subject area, level, elective or required), contextualizing results, using results to improve teaching and using results for personnel decisions
Recommended Resources for instructors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information about evaluations is provided on the Teaching and Learning Services web site; however, there are only brief references to the other services provided by this department.
Information for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is FAQ page with general information and information for students and faculty.
Publication of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are available to students, staff and faculty through a secure site if there is a high enough response rate and the instructor gives permission. • Written comments are for the instructor and dean only.
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructors are encouraged to give permission to publish results because it will increase student participation.

Policy on official end-of-term course evaluations

*Approved by Senate on 23rd January 2008
- to be reviewed in 2010*

Policy statement:

1. McGill University values the quality of the courses it offers its students. End-of-term course evaluations are one of the ways that McGill works towards maintaining and improving the quality of courses and the student's learning experience.
2. There shall be a university wide course evaluation system, administered through an agreed upon process, which is the official system for collecting course evaluation data from students for all courses subject to evaluation.

Definitions:

3. "Department" includes School, Institute and a Faculty without departments.
4. "Chair" includes Director and, where appropriate, Dean of a Faculty without departments.
5. "Course evaluations" refers to end-of-term course evaluations.

Purpose:

6. Course evaluations at McGill shall be used for three primary purposes:
 - a) to help instructors improve future offerings of courses;
 - b) to inform students about courses and instructors; and
 - c) as one indicator of teaching effectiveness, which for purposes of promotion and tenure must be interpreted within the larger context of the [Teaching Portfolio](#).
7. It is recommended that individual instructors reflect upon their course evaluations in their annual review and discuss these with a Chair, mentor, or a consultant from Teaching and Learning Services.

Scope:

8. All undergraduate and graduate courses with five (5) or more students shall be evaluated, including lectures, laboratory course teaching and seminars.

Content:

9. The course evaluation questionnaire for each course shall not exceed 25 questions.
10. All course evaluations shall begin with a limited set of core questions defined by the Academic Policy Committee:
 - i. Overall, this is an excellent course.
 - ii. Overall, I learned a great deal from this course.
 - iii. Overall, this instructor is an excellent teacher.
 - iv. Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor.
11. All questions shall be answered on a 1-5 scale where 1=Strongly disagree, 5=Strongly agree and 3=Neutral.
12. Each academic unit may select up to 21 additional questions. Units are encouraged to select these from the attached pool of recommended questions (Appendix A).

13. In multiple instructor courses, each instructor will be evaluated. Students should not have to respond to more than three (3) instructor specific questions for each instructor.
14. Teaching assistants (TAs) may be evaluated as part of the course evaluation process. Instructors shall share results of TA questions with TAs as one way to help them improve their teaching abilities. Students should not have to respond to more than three (3) TA specific questions for each teaching assistant.

Timing

15. Evaluations in regularly scheduled courses shall normally be completed before the start of the examination period. In some circumstances, the Faculty may adjust the evaluation dates. In all cases, course evaluations shall be completed before grades are submitted.
16. Results shall not be disclosed to the instructor before final grades in each course taught by the instructor have been submitted and processed.

Confidentiality

17. All submitted course evaluation results shall be anonymous.
18. Written evaluations in the form of comments shall be considered confidential to the instructor and the Chair of the department, or the Dean in the case of courses taught by a Chair or in Faculties without departments.

Dissemination

19. Numeric results of course evaluations shall be made available to the McGill community, provided two conditions are met:
 - a) the instructor has granted permission to allow access.
 - b) an adequate response rate has been received, as follows:

Class size	Response rate (%)
5-11	minimum 5 responses
12-30	at least 40%
31-100	at least 35%
101-200	at least 30%
201 or more	at least 25%

20. Students shall also have access to course evaluations from previous terms, provided the two conditions for dissemination have been met and no formal change in content or instructor has occurred.

Oversight

21. The Office of the Provost shall be responsible for ensuring that the principles in this policy are applied. Each Department is responsible for implementing the course evaluation procedure consistent with the University administrative practices.

Depository

22. There shall be a university wide depository for the course evaluation questionnaires used in each department. An agreed upon system will serve as the depository.

Required statements

23. The following statement concerning the purpose, uses, utility, and mode of accessibility of course evaluations shall be put at the top of every course evaluation questionnaire by the University:

"Subject to certain limitations, end-of-term course evaluation results are to be accessible to the McGill community. A statistical summary of responses will be used:

- a) to help instructors improve future offerings of courses;*
- b) to inform students about courses and instructors;*
- c) as one indicator of teaching effectiveness, which for purposes of promotion and tenure must be interpreted within the larger context of the [Teaching Portfolio](#).*

Any written comments will be used to provide useful information (e.g., suggested improvements) to the instructor and Chair/Director of the academic unit but will not be available to the McGill community.

Course evaluations are completely anonymous.

Moreover, summary results are not available to an instructor until the final grades for the course have been submitted and approved."

24. The following statement shall be put, by the University, at the top of course evaluation results that are disseminated to students:

"End-of-term course evaluations results are used:

- a) to help instructors improve future offerings of courses;*
- b) to inform students about courses and instructors; and*
- c) as one indicator of teaching effectiveness for purposes of promotion and tenure.*

Written comments are treated as confidential and are not made available to the McGill community."

<i>"Total number of completed evaluations</i>	<i>xx</i>
<i>Total enrolment in course</i>	<i>xx</i>
<i>Response rate</i>	<i>xx%"</i>



Recommended Pool of Questions

Respect for students

- The general climate in this course was good for learning.
- The course respected diverse ways of learning.
- The instructor demonstrated respect for individual differences (e.g. gender, race, religion etc.)
- The instructor related to students in ways that promoted mutual respect.

Communicating expectations

- The course objectives were clearly explained.
- In general, the level of difficulty in this course was appropriate.
- Expectations for learning in this course were clearly communicated.
- The instructor told us what we could expect to learn as a result of taking this course.
- The instructor set high but attainable expectations for this course.

Active engagement

- There was a collaborative atmosphere in this course.
- The assignments engaged me in learning.
- Students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge.
- The instructor encouraged students to actively participate.
- The instructor provided adequate opportunities for questions and discussion during class time.

Interaction with faculty members

- The instructor was helpful to students seeking advice.
- The instructor was available to students outside of class.
- The instructor had a genuine interest in individual students.
- Considering class size, the instructor was available for individual consultation.

Evaluation/Feedback to students

- The evaluation methods used in this course were fair and appropriate.
- Feedback on course assignments contributed to my learning.
- The instructor provided useful feedback on my progress in the course.
- The instructor graded student work promptly, considering the size of the class, and provided helpful comments and feedback where appropriate.

Cohesion

- The course content matched the course objectives.
- The learning activities were well integrated into the course.
- There was close agreement between the stated course objectives and what was actually covered.
- The assignments in the course were clearly related to the course goals.
- The evaluation methods reflected the important aspects of the course.

Enthusiasm / Interest

- In this course, I felt motivated to learn.
- As a result of this course, I have greater appreciation for this field of study.
- The instructor stimulated my interest in the course.
- The instructor's use of examples and illustrations helped to heighten my interest.

Organization

- Course materials were presented in an organized manner.
- The course outline was consistently followed.
- As the course progressed the instructor showed how each topic fit into the course as a whole.
- The instructor conducted class sessions in an organized manner.

Clarity

- Overall, the instructor's explanations were clear and understandable.
- The course objectives were clearly explained.
- The instructor explained concepts clearly and understandably.
- The requirements of the course (projects, papers, exams) were adequately explained.
- The instructor summarized material in a way that helped me remember.

Learning activities and resources

- The course materials (e.g., readings, lecture notes, in-class exercises) contributed to learning the subject matter.
- The physical facilities provided for this course were appropriate (e.g., classroom/lab space, structure, furnishings).
- The instructor used effective teaching aids.
- The instructor's use of teaching technology (e.g., WebCT, audio-visual presentations, PowerPoint presentations, email) was effective and appropriate.

Administrative/Context

- Approximately how often have you attended the classes in this course?
- Did you attend the section in which you were registered? If you changed section, please state your reason why.



Questionnaires & templates

Course evaluation questionnaires & templates

Each Faculty will determine whether a Faculty-wide questionnaire will be used. If yes, the Faculty liaison will submit the questionnaires with a message to that effect. If individual academic units set their own questionnaire, then each departmental liaison will send the default questionnaires to the [Mercury system administrator](#) for entry in Mercury. Note that there can be different default questionnaires for different course types, e.g., lectures and labs. The default questionnaire will be used as is for all the courses in the academic unit and cannot be edited by the Department/Faculty and instructor.

The course evaluation questionnaire for each course should not exceed 25 questions. The questionnaires are prepared on the basis of four sections:

1. Statement about the purpose, uses, utility, and mode of accessibility
2. Four core questions defined by the Academic Policy Committee
3. Additional questions (up to 21 questions)
4. Written comments (optional)

If authorised by the academic unit, individual instructors may customize their course evaluations by submitting additional questions which pertain directly to their course. A maximum of three (3) questions is allowed as long as the total does not exceed 25 questions. Instructors should send the additional questions to their designated [Mercury Department Liaison](#) to be inserted in the course evaluation questionnaire.

For questions on how to design questionnaires, please consult with the course evaluation administrators by sending an email to [Mercury Info](#).

The purpose, uses, utility, and mode of accessibility

"Subject to certain limitations, end-of-term course evaluation results are to be accessible to the McGill community. A statistical summary of responses will be used:

- a. to help instructors improve future offerings of courses;
- b. to inform students about courses and instructors;
- c. as one indicator of teaching effectiveness, which for purposes of promotion and tenure, must be interpreted within the larger context of the [Teaching Portfolio](#).

Any written comments will be used to provide useful information (e.g., suggested improvements) to the instructor and Chair/Director of the academic unit but will not be available to the McGill community.

Course evaluations are completely anonymous.

Moreover, summary results are not available to an instructor until the final grades for

the course have been submitted and approved."

Four Core questions

1. Overall, this is an excellent course.
2. Overall, I learned a great deal from this course.
3. Overall, this instructor is an excellent teacher.
4. Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor.

Additional questions (*up to 21 questions*)

It is suggested that each academic unit may select up to 21 additional questions from the [recommended pool of questions](#) when designing their course evaluations. Alternatively, each academic unit may choose to develop up to 21 questions of their own.

It is intended that the list of up to 21 questions address the 10 domains as equitably as possible, consistent with the priorities of each academic unit.

All questions should be answered on a 1-5 scale where 1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree and 3 = Neutral.

Written comments (*optional*)

Academic unit can ask for written comments from students. Any written comments that students choose to include will be used, as is, to provide useful information (e.g. suggested improvements) to the instructor and the Chair/Director of the academic unit and will not be available to other students.

Templates and Sample Questionnaires

Coming soon!

Teaching and Learning Services (TLS) [[Unit detail](#)]

Suite MS-12, McLennan Library Building, 3459 McTavish Street [[Map](#)]

Montreal, Quebec H3A 1Y1

Tel.: 514-398-6648 | Fax: 514-398-8465 | [[Email](#)]

Copyright © 2008

McGill University

Page last updated:

Apr. 7, 2008 at 10:32 AM

McMaster University	
http://www.mcmaster.ca/senate/academic/teachexc.htm	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The guidelines for student evaluations are part of the Policy for Teaching Excellence (1994), which includes information about rewards and recognition, peer evaluation, professional development and quality assurance. The section about teaching evaluation focuses on developing questionnaires, scope of evaluation, ensuring the instructor is not part of the process, and how results will be reported and used.
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each faculty develops its own standardized evaluation tool.
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A sample report is provided online.
Recommended Resources for instructors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a process in place for reviewing and refining courses where instructors can get feedback on a course and support from the Centre for Leadership and Learning.
Information for students	
Publication of results	
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results are used primarily for personnel decisions. There is no mention of using results to improve the quality of teaching or to help students select courses.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

Complete Policy Title: **POLICY ON THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE**

Policy Number (if applicable): **SPS 10**

Approved by: **Senate**

Date of Most Recent Approval: **February 9, 1994**

Revision Date(s): **November 10, 1993**

Position Responsible for Developing **University Secretariat**
and Maintaining the Policy:

Contact Department: **University Secretariat**

DISCLAIMER: *If there is a discrepancy between this electronic policy and the written copy held by the Policy owner, the written copy prevails.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preamble

- I. [Rewards and Recognition for Good Teaching](#)
 - II. [Guidelines for Student Evaluation](#)
 - III. [Guidelines for Peer Evaluation of Teaching](#)
 - IV. [Curriculum Development, Professional Development and Educational Research](#)
 - V. [Assurance of Educational Quality](#)
-

PREAMBLE

This document has evolved from and supersedes the 1980 "University Policy on the Encouragement of Teaching Excellence by Means of the Evaluation of Teaching". The procedures and guidelines contained in this document are also, in part, an implementation of the 1992 "McMaster University Revised Policy and Regulations with Respect to Academic Appointment, Tenure and Promotion". In addition, they incorporate much of the spirit and many of the recommendations of the 1992 report of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning entitled, "Recognition and Reward of Teaching at McMaster University" as well as parts of the 1993 report of the Senate Task Force on Quality Assurance.

I. Rewards and Recognition for Good Teaching

The University provides a number of incentives for good teaching, including promotion through the professorial ranks, the granting of tenure, salary increments based on merit, and University teaching awards (the President's Awards). In addition to providing incentives, these processes allow opportunities for the improvement of teaching through formal and informal feedback. Such feedback is particularly important for new faculty, at the beginning of their teaching careers, where it can and should provide a useful contribution to the development of teaching skills.

Assessment of teaching for salary review occurs throughout the career of all faculty, and assessment for promotion and tenure touches all faculty at the appropriate stages of their careers. The general expectations regarding teaching effectiveness and illustrations of how this can be evaluated are contained in Section III, clauses 4 to 8 of the "Policy and Regulations with Respect to Academic

Appointment, Tenure and Promotion". Procedures for such assessments are described below. In general, they involve two components, assessment by students and assessment by peers. The process of peer assessment is a cooperative one, involving the faculty member and the department chair and possibly other departmental colleagues and/or external assessors. In the following two sections, guidelines are presented for each of these two kinds of assessment.

II. Guidelines for Student Evaluations

Over the past decade, every department in the University has developed considerable experience in the formulation, administration and interpretation of student evaluation questionnaires. In recent years, some consensus has developed, at least within Faculties, regarding the form that such questionnaires should take. The following guidelines are intended to consolidate this consensus and to prescribe uniform procedures for the administration of student questionnaires. It is the responsibility of the Dean of each Faculty to ensure that these guidelines are followed.

1. Each Faculty shall develop and maintain a standard, Faculty-wide student evaluation questionnaire. If necessary, this questionnaire may be customized for individual departments, maintaining a common format.
2. All courses should be evaluated. Student evaluation by questionnaire shall be performed for every undergraduate course (including summer courses), toward the end of the course, every time the course is offered. Students should be informed at the beginning of each course that they will be expected to participate in these evaluations. The same evaluation procedure may be used for graduate courses, or the students may be interviewed by a representative of the department chair.
3. It should be made clear to the students that the instructor is not involved in the administration or the analysis of student questionnaires. Questionnaires should be distributed and collected during class time by someone other than the instructor. The instructor shall not be present during this procedure. Completed questionnaires should be returned by someone other than the instructor to the departmental office.
4. Information from the questionnaires will be consolidated by the department into a report, consisting of a tabulation of numerical data on the form containing the questions, together with an evaluative summary of written comments. A copy of this report will be used by the department as input for promotion, tenure, and/or salary reviews, and a copy will be given to the instructor after the final grades have been submitted.

III. Guidelines for Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation is done by the department chair or a delegate of the department chair by means of interviews with the instructor and, where appropriate, with students and colleagues. It may also involve attending one or more classes of the instructor under review. In addition, some departments may choose to make use of external reviewers. These formal reviews of teaching are part of the tenure and promotion process. However, they should also be performed periodically for purposes of salary review.

In order to be effective, peer review requires some degree of self-evaluation by the instructor as well as the collection by the instructor of relevant information and material. This information and material should be organized into a "teaching portfolio", which is primarily intended for use in the interview with the chair or the chair's representative. Alternatively, it should be possible, when appropriate, to organize this material into a package which could be sent out to an external reviewer. Advice about what kinds of material might usefully be incorporated into a teaching portfolio is available to instructors from the Instructional Development Centre. However, to a good approximation, this portfolio should contain whatever information is felt to be relevant to a review of the instructor's teaching accomplishments and effectiveness, such as course outlines, copies of examinations, etc. A departmental interviewer should insure that all material that the instructor feels is relevant is

discussed in the interview. Evaluation may also involve interviews by peers with undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or colleagues. Interviews with graduate students should address the question of the effectiveness of the instructor in graduate thesis supervision. Each department should develop a format for student interviews which is similar in spirit to the faculty's student questionnaire.

The result of the interviews with the instructor, students and colleagues and input, if any, from external reviewers, is a peer evaluation report which is used by the department as input to salary, promotion and tenure decisions and recommendations. This report should contain the names of students and colleagues interviewed, although particular comments should not, in general, be attributed to individuals. In the case of promotion and tenure, the peer evaluation report, together with the results of student questionnaires, form the basis of the teaching section of the departmental recommendation to the Faculty tenure and promotion committee. Under the 1992 tenure and promotion policy, the instructor is to be provided "...with an opportunity to comment on or make an explanation about any evaluation of the candidate's teaching which is part of the departmental submission".

The direct input of a candidate into the promotion and tenure case is through the candidate's *curriculum vitae*. Each *curriculum vitae* should contain a Teaching Section describing teaching duties performed, courses developed, graduate students supervised, innovations in teaching, research and/or publications on teaching and learning, and professional development activities related to teaching.

VIIICurriculum Development, Professional Development and Educational Research

Curriculum development, enhancement of teaching and supervisory skills, and educational research are all important components of a faculty member's job. Each of these activities requires time and resources which should be recognized and budgeted for by departments. In general, time and effort spent on the development of new teaching methods, courses and/or programmes should be consistent with a departmental strategy for the evolution of its educational offerings. In this context, assignments to develop new courses, labs etc. should be viewed in the same light as other educational activities, such as lecturing. Ultimately, of course, it is the responsibility of the department chair to assign teaching duties to faculty. Depending on its resources and priorities, a department may or may not wish to invest in new initiatives at any given time. However, the operative principle is that, when such initiatives are undertaken, the time spent on them should be recognized as part of the teaching contribution of the faculty members involved.

In some cases, a faculty member may wish to undertake educational research or professional educational development of potential value to the University as part or all of the project for a research leave. Such a proposal is eligible for consideration under the Research Leave Policy, provided that the faculty member meets all other criteria.

IX.Assurance of Educational Quality

The responsibility for ensuring and continually improving the quality of educational programmes is shared by departments, Faculty Deans and by the governing bodies of the University, the Senate and the Board of Governors. The following two paragraphs address methods for programme evaluation, (A) by departments and (B) by the Deans and governing bodies.

- A. In addition to monitoring the teaching performance of individual faculty members by the means described in Sections II and III above, each department or Faculty should have in place procedures for programme evaluation whereby graduating students, both undergraduate and graduate, are surveyed or interviewed regarding their overall

experience with and impressions of the effectiveness of the teaching programme. A record should be kept of these students' plans and career aspirations and of how they can be contacted in the future. These surveys or interviews should be followed up by a second survey, 3 to 5 years after graduation, of at least a sample of each graduating class. The results of these surveys and interviews should be used by the department or Faculty for programme evaluation and improvement, and they should be made available, in summary form, for use by internal university reviewers.

- B. The primary mechanism by which the quality of the educational programmes of departments is monitored is through periodic internal reviews conducted under the auspices of the Board-Senate Committee on Academic Planning. The following policies are intended to supplement the procedures which are currently in place for such reviews.
 1. The review process should be open and transparent. All participants should be asked to provide comments during the review and on the draft report before final recommendations are made. All those affected by the outcome of the review should participate, including faculty, staff, and undergraduate and graduate students.
 2. The review panel should study the reports on teaching by individual faculty members which are the subject of Sections II and III above. They should also refer to the results of interviews of graduating students and alumni, described above, and they should themselves interview some current students and alumni regarding the effectiveness of the overall teaching programme of the department.
 3. Based on the final report, the reviewing body and the Dean should agree on a set of recommendations to be implemented, and the agreed-upon set of recommendations should be made public. The Dean is responsible for the implementation of these recommendations and will report periodically on the progress of this implementation until it is agreed that the implementation is complete.
-

Université de Montréal	
http://www.cefes.umontreal.ca/evaluation_enseignement/eval_enseignement.html	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Politique relative à l'évaluation de l'enseignement (1974) • A more recent report (2001) provides further recommendations about making teaching evaluations more systematic.
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruments are developed by departments and reviewed every 5 years with faculty and students input. • Instruments are approved by the CEFES, so a member of that office should be involved in the review.
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructors are reminded that results should be considered in light of the goal of the study, which is improve teaching. • Information about interpreting results is provided, and a section about following through on results is forthcoming.
Recommended Resources for instructors	
Information for students	
Publication of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information is used for both improving teaching and making personnel decisions. It is not published.
Other comments	

Secrétariat général

PERSONNEL ENSEIGNANT

Numéro : 50.9

Page 1 de 4

POLITIQUE RELATIVE À
L'ÉVALUATION DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT

Adoption

Date :
1974-02-25

Délibération :
AU-501-1.2

Modifications

Date :

Délibération :

Article(s) :

Attendu que lors de l'évaluation des activités d'un professeur aux fins de promotion, l'on doit considérer que les critères de promotion sont complémentaires et,

Attendu qu'il y a lieu lors de cette évaluation de tenir compte non seulement des aspects mesurables de ces activités mais également des apports impondérables d'un professeur à sa tâche.

A. ÉVALUATION DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT

I. PRINCIPES

Recommandation 1

Que soit affirmée et reconnue la nécessité d'une évaluation, constante de l'enseignement universitaire.

Recommandation 2

Que l'évaluation de l'enseignement de chaque professeur se fasse suivant un processus continu et dynamique.

Recommandation 3

Que soit affirmé et respecté le but de cette évaluation, qui est d'améliorer l'enseignement et de favoriser chez l'étudiant un meilleur apprentissage.

II. APPLICATIONS

Recommandation 4

Que l'Université favorise et développe par divers moyens (v.g. séminaires, stages, rencontres, expériences), l'intérêt des professeurs pour l'amélioration de l'enseignement et assure l'assistance pédagogique aux nouveaux professeurs.

PERSONNEL ENSEIGNANT Numéro : 50.9 Page 2 de 4

**POLITIQUE RELATIVE À
L'ÉVALUATION DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT** Adoption Date : 1974-02-25 Délibération : AU-501-1.2

Modifications Date : Délibération : Article(s) :

Recommandation 5

Qu'il y ait dans l'Université, notamment à l'intérieur du Service d'aide à l'enseignement et à la disposition des départements et des professeurs, des conseillers spécialisés en pédagogie et en évaluation de l'enseignement.

Recommandation 6

Que l'Université définisse les objectifs de ses programmes et de ses cours d'autant plus que ces définitions sont utiles à l'évaluation de l'enseignement.

Recommandation 7

Que les professeurs d'un même département, assistés au besoin de conseillers spécialisés, adoptent des processus et des méthodes d'évaluation de l'enseignement à partir des objectifs définis et compte tenu des méthodes d'enseignement qui peuvent varier beaucoup, selon le cours, le professeur, l'année...

Recommandation 8

Que le doyen ou le directeur de département veille à ce que soit faite une mise à jour annuelle de l'évaluation de l'enseignement de chaque professeur et consigne au dossier de celui-ci les éléments pertinents de l'évaluation.

Recommandation 9

Que ce dossier puisse comprendre l'évaluation par les étudiants ainsi que d'autres rapports d'évaluation comme celui du professeur lui-même, celui des collègues, celui du directeur de département ou du doyen suivant ce qui aura été établi par les professeurs du département conformément à la recommandation 7.

Secrétariat général

PERSONNEL ENSEIGNANT

Numéro : 50.9

Page 3 de 4

**POLITIQUE RELATIVE À
L'ÉVALUATION DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT**

Adoption

Date :
1974-02-25

Délibération :
AU-501-1.2

Modifications

Date :

Délibération :

Article(s) :

Recommandation 10

Que les différents rapports d'évaluation fassent clairement état des dates et de la fréquence de l'évaluation et des circonstances particulières, s'il y a lieu, ainsi que des moyens employés, tant les moyens spécifiques à différents types d'enseignement que les moyens généraux applicables à tous, ceux-ci devant être clairement définis avant chaque période d'évaluation.

Recommandation 11

Que chaque professeur ait accès à son dossier d'évaluation, atteste annuellement qu'il en a pris connaissance et puisse y ajouter toutes pièces qu'il juge utiles.

Recommandation 12

Que, pour fins de promotion, l'évaluation de l'enseignement soit basée sur le dossier cumulatif du professeur depuis la dernière promotion et sur un rapport-synthèse préparé par un comité présidé par le doyen ou par le directeur de département et composé de trois membres nommés par l'assemblée de département ou de faculté.

Recommandation 13

Que le professeur qui est candidat à la promotion ait accès à ce dossier cumulatif et au rapport-synthèse et, qu'après y avoir ajouté ses commentaires, s'il le désire, il atteste en avoir pris connaissance.

PERSONNEL ENSEIGNANT Numéro : 50.9 Page 4 de 4

POLITIQUE RELATIVE À
L'ÉVALUATION DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT

Adoption

Date :
1974-02-25

Délibération :
AU-501-1.2

Modifications

Date : Délibération : Article(s) :

B. ÉVALUATION DE LA RECHERCHE

Recommandation 14

Que, dans le prolongement de ces travaux, soit confié au Comité du statut du corps professoral le soin de proposer des critères et des moyens qui permettraient au Comité des promotions d'évaluer de façon plus claire et plus précise la qualité des activités de recherche d'un professeur et le degré de son rayonnement intérieur et extérieur; que l'étude relative à l'évaluation de la qualité des activités de recherche se fasse en étroite collaboration avec le Comité de la recherche; que le Comité du statut du corps professoral présente ensuite un rapport global sur l'évaluation des activités des professeurs aux fins de promotion, lequel rapport devrait intégrer et harmoniser les différentes tendances du présent rapport.

University of Ottawa	
http://www.evaluation.uottawa.ca	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No policy statement. • The closest document is the Statement on Teaching and Learning (2007).
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructors can customize the survey with up to 10 questions from a bank of questions.
How instructors can use results	
Recommended Resources for instructors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructors are referred to the Centre for University Teaching for more resources.
Information for students	
Publication of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are numerous reports prepared, each with a different audience. One report is available to students and faculty members through a secure site.
Other comments	

Proposed revised version of the Statement on Teaching and Learning

At the University of Ottawa, student learning is our focus. Providing exceptional learning opportunities for every student is a duty. Therefore, the University is committed to supporting our educators – regular professors, part-time professors, teaching assistants, clinical and graduate supervisors and all others engaged in teaching and mentoring our students – in exploring and developing best practices in teaching, in supporting curriculum changes that focus on improving student learning and in nurturing a work environment where teaching and learning are discussed and valued. We recognize that excellence in this domain is demonstrated through many means, both inside and outside the university classroom.

The University commits itself to providing support for all teaching staff to acquire and apply best practices in instruction, and endeavors to recognize a comprehensive range of accomplishments related to teaching.

The University views teaching and learning as being of equal importance to all other job-related activities when making tenure and promotion decisions.

More specifically, to reach these goals, the University of Ottawa will:

- Actively support the creation of teaching and learning innovations in ways that enable their integration into our ongoing teaching practices;
- Facilitate and support curriculum transformation efforts that demonstrate a clear focus on student learning;
- Support new approaches to classroom instruction grounded in sound pedagogical approaches or theories;
- Nurture teaching communities in its academic disciplines;
- Integrate our part-time professors and teaching assistants as full participants in our teaching communities;
- Support professional development for the improvement of teaching at a scale that meets the needs of the teaching community;
- Provide the best possible physical, virtual and administrative environment to achieve more effective teaching and learning. This includes comfortable classrooms for educators and students, access to proper equipment, materials and other means to achieve excellence in teaching;
- Evaluate teaching and programs to foster a culture of continuous improvement in students' learning experience;
- Establish evaluation techniques to best identify various measures of exceptional teaching at all levels, including teaching assistants;
- Nurture a culture where research on university teaching and student learning is supported, valued, shared and recognized in the tenure and promotion process;
- Recognize a broad range of contributions and demonstrated excellence in teaching through awards, promotions and work load adjustments.

Revised - August 2007

Queen's University http://www.queensu.ca/registrar/usat	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The "policy" is section 29.3 of the Queen's University Faculty Association (QUFA) Collective Agreement (2005-2008). University Survey of Student Assessment of Teaching (USAT) - format of evaluation survey, students' anonymity, administration, reporting results, and explaining statistical terms used in reports.
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University Survey of Student Assessment of Teaching (USAT) - 4 university-wide evaluation items, up to 7 department-chosen items, and up to 10 instructor-chosen items from a bank of 200 questions
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the web site says results are used to improve teaching, the majority of the information provided describes how they are used for personnel decisions.
Recommended Resources for instructors	
Information for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a web page explain how students can "make their results count." Students are responsible for getting the packages and administering the surveys.
Publication of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results are available to students through a secure site. In 06/07 58% of instructors gave permission to share their results. Results for university and dept. questions are sent to dean, dept head and students' associations.
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A study was done to compare completion rates at different points in the term. Week 10 was the part of the term that produced the highest completion rates.

ARTICLE 29
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF TEACHING

- (e) Data from students including USAT per Article [29.3](#) and the Member's Course Survey per Article [29.4](#), letters and testimonials;
- (f) A record of the faculty Member's special contribution to teaching including teaching awards, publications and presentations, instructional development grants, participation in conferences and seminars on education/pedagogy, and other such evidence as the Member deems appropriate.

29.3 University Survey of Student Assessment of Teaching (USAT)

- 29.3.1 The current University Survey of Student Assessment of Teaching (USAT) shall be used by the University in the assessment of Members' teaching performance until replaced by a new/revised instrument(s) as approved by the Parties. A Committee created under the Memorandum of Agreement (Appendix [E](#)) shall conduct this review and make recommendations to the JCAA. Members may also submit results from any pilot test arising from the review of the USAT by the Committee. The USAT shall comprise a set of standard questions, and the Member shall also have an opportunity to add questions to the quantitative section of the survey. All questions in the USAT shall conform to the requirements of Article [9](#) and Article [14](#). The USAT shall also provide opportunity for signed written comments from students.
- 29.3.2 The USAT form, with the exception of any written comments, shall not be signed by the student.
- 29.3.3 The USAT shall be administered through the Office of the University Registrar, and in such a way as to afford all the students in a given course or class a reasonable chance to respond.
- 29.3.4 The USAT shall be conducted within the last three (3) weeks of the course and announced at least one (1) class in advance on a date determined by the faculty member responsible for the course in consultation with the students. In courses with multiple instructors, a separate USAT survey shall be conducted for each instructor responsible for a major block of time. Such surveys may be grouped at the end of the course or administered at the end of the block given by an instructor to be assessed, as appropriate. The USAT form shall be distributed and collected and returned by someone other than the Member, who shall leave the room during the surveying process. After the surveys have been completed, they shall be placed in a sealed

ARTICLE 29

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF TEACHING

envelope. This envelope shall not be opened until the final marks for the class have been submitted to the appropriate administrative office.

29.3.5 Quantitative responses to the questionnaires shall be sent to the Member, the Department Head (if applicable) and the appropriate Dean(s) after the data have been converted into a report and following the submission of final grades. The report shall contain aggregated responses to each quantitative question, with the mean, standard deviation, frequency and number of eligible respondents calculated. Student responses to the University's questionnaire shall be aggregated in such a way as to present a fair and accurate picture of the opinions of the respondents. The report shall be placed in the Member's Official File.

29.3.6 The University shall provide an explanatory note of the statistical terms used in Article [29.3.5](#) to individuals charged with assessment and evaluation of a Member's teaching.

29.3.7 Written comments shall be sent only to the Member, and the University will take the appropriate measures to ensure that only the Member receives such responses.

29.3.8 Data and statistical measures derived from surveys which conform to the provisions of Article [29.3.5](#), and which have been placed in the Member's Official File shall be used in the University's assessment of a Member's teaching performance.

29.4 Member's Course Survey

29.4.1 In order to improve course design and/or teaching effectiveness, a Member may conduct a written survey in her/his classes, provided that the students consent to participate and provided that the procedures of the survey protect student confidentiality and are carried out in a way which prevents confusion with the USAT evaluation.

29.4.2 Member's course surveys are not for the same purposes as the USAT and shall not be used in its stead, in whole or in part. Nonetheless, a Member may submit the Member's course survey as part of the material to be examined in the assessment and evaluation of the Member's teaching performance, provided that full details of the instrument and its administration are included.

University of Toronto	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can't find a specific policy on evaluation. The policy about promotion mentions that applicants need to provide results of their student evaluations in their teaching dossier.
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Recommended Resources for instructors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Information for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Publication of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Arts and Science Students' Union produces an “anti-calendar” with quantitative and qualitative information from course evaluations.
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

University of Waterloo	
http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy77.htm	
Key Elements of Policy	• Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members (2000) - affirms the need for student feedback on teaching
Evaluation Instrument	•
How instructors can use results	•
Recommended Resources for instructors	•
Information for students	•
Publication of results	•
Other comments	•

Policy 77 -- Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members

Established: June 6, 2000

Class: F

1. INTRODUCTION

Universities exist to develop society's intellectual resources and to preserve its intellectual traditions. Their primary functions are to preserve, evaluate, develop and transmit knowledge, intellectual skills and culture. The modern university is expected to provide intellectual leadership to society, to contribute in a major way to the coordination of knowledge and the development of artistic, philosophical, scientific and technological ideas, and to provide a fertile intellectual environment in which new knowledge and ideas can evolve. To achieve these goals, faculty members must be effective and committed teachers and scholars, constantly striving to expand and communicate their knowledge, ideas and understanding for the benefit of society.

Tenure. Tenure is meant to provide institutional support for academic freedom (see the Article on Academic Freedom in the Memorandum of Agreement between the University and the Faculty Association). The pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and the attainment of understanding through scholarship and teaching, which are essential functions of a university, occur best in an atmosphere in which free inquiry and discussion are fostered. Free inquiry may at times bring a faculty member into conflict with society, governments or the University itself. Tenure provides security of employment against pressures that might arise from such conflicts, in the belief that the University and society at large benefit from honest judgments and independent criticisms rendered by scholars who are free from fear of possible consequences that might arise from giving offense to powerful individuals or groups.

Tenure provides stability for both individual faculty members and the University. Tenure provides a faculty member with an environment conducive to long-term scholarly work. The University, for its part, is assured of a continuing group of teachers and scholars committed to the University, around which it can plan and from whom it can draw its academic leadership.

Professional Conduct. All faculty members are expected to conduct themselves in relations with colleagues, staff and students across the University in such a way as to promote the academic well-being of all concerned. Faculty members should avoid denigrating the character and professional competence of others, and should pass judgment on the work of colleagues only in the proper academic forums. Further, they should refrain from actions that prevent others from pursuing their legitimate activities and should strive to be helpful, readily contributing their time and expertise for the

overall benefit of the academic community.

2. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

The standards outlined here guide all decisions made at each stage of a regular faculty appointment, beginning with the original decision to hire. Because these standards are intended to apply university-wide to faculty members engaged in complex intellectual endeavours, they cannot be expressed in absolute quantitative terms. Nonetheless, they do provide a framework around which qualitative judgments can be made by academic administrators and by those serving on tenure and promotion committees.

The University expects all faculty members to maintain high standards in all aspects of their university work. To this end, the University exercises judgments on performance in the basic areas of a faculty member's academic responsibilities: teaching, scholarship and service. Such judgments must be made with the greatest possible care and fairness as they are reflected in decisions regarding salary, reappointment, tenure and promotion.

It is the responsibility of department Chairs to assess the performance of each regular faculty member annually, to provide a written performance review and to be available to discuss it upon request. Performance reviews are especially important in helping new faculty members gauge their progress towards meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure. Annual performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure and promotion considerations, together with reports from external referees and more extensive career reviews carried out by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (DTPC).

Teaching. The purpose of teaching is to facilitate learning. Thus, effective teaching draws the strands of a field together in a way that provides coherence and meaning, places what is known in context, lays the groundwork for future learning, and opens the way for connections between the known and the unknown. High-quality teaching is an important goal of the University. All regular faculty members are expected to contribute to undergraduate teaching and, where possible, to contribute to graduate teaching and to participate in project/thesis supervision.

University teaching encompasses a wide range of activities. It takes many different forms (e.g., undergraduate and graduate courses, graduate seminars, distance education, project and thesis supervision), has many different components (e.g., lectures, tutorials, setting and grading of assignments and examinations, interaction with students outside the classroom, curriculum development), and can occur in many different environments (e.g., large lecture theatres, small seminar rooms, off-campus short courses and workshops, clinics, laboratories, one-on-one supervision).

In all of their teaching activities, faculty members are expected to be fair in the evaluation of student work and constructive in their comments. They are expected to be available to students for interviews and consultations outside the classroom at reasonable times. They must always respect the integrity of their students and carefully avoid any exploitation of them for private advantage. They must maintain strict confidentiality with regard to students' personal lives and political and religious views. They must comment on academic progress and provide judgments on character only to appropriate persons and in appropriate circumstances, and must always be as fair and as objective as possible when making assessments and providing letters of reference.

Scholarship. University teaching is informed and enriched by the research and scholarship of the professoriate. The University expects its regular faculty members to be active participants in the evolution of their disciplines and professions, to keep academic programs and courses current with developments in their fields, and to communicate both their discoveries and their commitment to scholarship and research. Where feasible, faculty members are expected to seek external funding to support their scholarly work.

Scholarship may take several equally valuable forms. One is the discovery of new knowledge, which may differ from discipline to discipline, and includes the generation of new concepts, ideas, principles and theories. A second form involves the innovative coordination, synthesis or integration of knowledge. This type of scholarship seeks and promotes understanding in a broader context by organizing knowledge in a new and useful way, by illustrating new relationships between the parts and the whole, by relating the past in a new way to the present and future, or by demonstrating new and significant patterns of meaning. Scholarship may also be observed in new and useful applications. Indeed, significant new applications of knowledge to the problems of society represent important scholarly contributions. Novel applications may take many forms, such as creative writing, design, fine and performing arts, clinical practice, and the discovery, development and transfer of technology for societal benefit. Peer-reviewed research with respect to pedagogy and peer-reviewed research with respect to innovative teaching also constitute scholarly activity.

Although any of these scholarly activities may be carried out on a confidential basis, the expectation of the University is for communicated scholarship. In general, only work that is accessible for peer review or professional adjudication can be considered in assessing scholarship for performance reviews, tenure or promotion. Regardless of the discipline and type of scholarship, the key ingredients are the originality, quality and impact of the scholarly work.

Faculty members are expected to meet the ethical standards for scholarship in their particular fields of endeavour; to observe the University's guidelines and policies with respect to ethical conduct in research; and more generally, to act with integrity, truthfulness and honesty in the conduct and communication of their scholarly work.

Service. In addition to their primary duties of teaching and scholarship, regular faculty members have a responsibility to participate in the effective functioning of the University through service on committees, student advising, coordination of activities and in administrative positions. It is important that all faculty members be willing to assist with administrative duties when their help is needed. Many faculty members also provide valuable service to groups outside the University, such as disciplinary or professional organizations, conferences, journals and granting councils. Community service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities is normally considered as service to the University.

3. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

Peer assessment of teaching, scholarship and service forms the basis for determining the suitability of a faculty member for the granting of tenure or for promotion to Professor. Insofar as possible, tenure and promotion committees shall base their assessments on evidence that is first-hand and direct.

Assessment of Teaching. Teaching quality should be assessed broadly using evidence gathered from as many sources as practicable. Responsibility for providing documentary evidence on teaching rests with the candidate and, to a lesser degree, with the department Chair. A teaching dossier developed by the candidate may be the most effective way of assembling this information.

Classroom performance may be judged in terms of preparation, organization of subject matter, currency of course material, presentation skills, ability to stimulate student interest and scholarship, suitability of assignments and examinations, and willingness to provide individual feedback and help outside the classroom. Student course evaluations are an important source of information, but they should be supplemented with peer evaluation of teaching skills, course content and course materials.

University teaching involves much more than classroom performance and, hence, it is important to develop a fair assessment of competence and effectiveness across the candidate's full spectrum of teaching activities. Contributions to project and thesis supervision, graduate seminars, oral and thesis examinations, and curriculum development are all relevant in assessing overall teaching activity. The opinions of current and former students can be of value if solicited on a systematic basis.

Assessment of Scholarship. The University relies primarily on external referees and members of the DTPC to judge a candidate's scholarly record. Although the University looks for evidence of active continuing scholarship, the volume of scholarly output is less important than its quality, originality and impact.

A candidate for tenure or promotion must provide examples of her/his scholarly work for examination by referees and the DTPC. The candidate is responsible for documenting contributions made to team research and jointly authored work. Joint work with students supervised by the candidate should be identified. The candidate must also provide an overview of her/his scholarly work to date, information about work in progress and a general indication of future plans.

High quality contributions to the synthesis of knowledge (e.g., books, monographs, review articles) and to non-traditional forms of scholarship (e.g., artistic exhibitions and performances, innovative design) can provide direct evidence of effective scholarship. Consulting reports and planning documents that are accessible for peer review may also be submitted as evidence of a candidate's scholarly contributions.

Other evidence of activity and standing as a scholar includes supervision of student research, invitations to present "keynote" addresses, election to and awards received from professional and disciplinary societies, service as a referee for journals and granting councils, and membership on government or professional committees.

The primary assessment of quality, originality and impact is made by referees and DTPC members on the basis of examining examples of the candidate's work. Other less direct indicators include the rigor of the review processes for journals and conferences in which the candidate has published, the standards of publishing houses for books, and the extent to which other scholars have made reference to the work. In areas such as the fine and performing arts, similar information may be derived from the prestige of exhibitions and performances to which the candidate has contributed, professional reviews and the receipt of awards or prizes.

Item 11 Attachment 3
APPENDIX D (17 Pages)

Oxford	
http://ceq.oucs.ox.ac.uk/intro.cfm	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Educational Policy and Standards: Quality Assurance Processes and Practices• Students' feedback is gathered as part of the quality assurance process.
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oxford Student Course Experience Questionnaire - Research is done at the program level rather than the course level
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Information about how to interpret report results is provided with the reports.
Recommended Resources for instructors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are suggestions for evaluating teaching at the level of an individual course through the Oxford Learning Institute.
Information for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•
Publication of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Information is available to the public, online.
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Results are reported on a scale from -100 (strongly disagree) to +100 (strongly agree).



Quality Assurance at the University of Oxford

Educational Policy and Standards

Welcome to the website for quality assurance and academic policy matters at the [University of Oxford](#). This site is managed by the [Academic Policy Support Section](#) of the University Offices on behalf of the [Educational Policy and Standards Committee](#).

Follow the links to find out more about:

- ▶ [The Educational Policy and Standards Committee \(EPSC\)](#). The EPSC is the Council Committee with primary responsibility for academic quality assurance. It is one of the four main committees of Council established as part of the University's [governance reform](#) in 2000. See [recent proposals](#) for governance reform
- ▶ [More about EPSC](#)
- ▶ [Current work](#)
- ▶ Quality Assurance at Oxford University: a [summary](#) of the University's philosophy and practice
- ▶ EPSC Policy Guidance: EPSC's [policy guidance](#) is issued within the internal framework of the [University's Statutes and Regulations](#) and the external framework provided by the academic infrastructure of the [Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education \(QAA\)](#)
- ▶ Students' Views: Feedback from students about their experience at Oxford is collected through the [Oxford Student Course Experience Questionnaires](#) (OSCEQ). The undergraduate version of this questionnaire has been in use since 2001. Versions for graduate research and taught graduate students have been piloted and will be fully launched in 2007/08. See also the National Student Survey (NSS) results on the [Unistats](#) website.
- ▶ External examiners: An area of this site for [external examiners](#) is under development. Please check for new additions to the area during the academic year 2007/2008.



Student Course Experience Questionnaire

2007 Questionnaire	2007
--------------------	------

Beside each statement please tick the box that most accurately reflects your experience at Oxford	SD	D	N	A	SA
1. My course was intellectually stimulating	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. There was a lot of unwanted academic pressure on me as a student	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. My teachers normally gave me helpful feedback on my progress	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The workload was too heavy	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. The course has helped me develop my ability to work as part of a group	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. I have usually had a clear idea of where I was going and what was expected of me in this course	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. I have found the course motivating	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. The teachers in this course motivated me to do my best work	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. The course has helped sharpen my analytical skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Since being at Oxford, I feel more confident about tackling unfamiliar problems	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. My course has stimulated my enthusiasm for further learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. It was always easy to know the standard of tutorial work expected	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. There has been more assessment of what I have memorised than of what I have understood on this course	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. I have felt a part of a community of scholars who are committed to learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. I was generally given enough time to understand the things I had learnt	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. My teachers made a real effort to understand any difficulties I had	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. The course has stimulated my interest in the field of study	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. The course has improved my communication skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. My teachers were extremely good at explaining things	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Too many teachers asked me purely factual questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. The teachers worked hard to make their subjects interesting	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. The academic expectations of me on this course were too high	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. The course has helped me to develop the ability to plan my own work	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. The volume of work necessary to complete this course means that it cannot all be thoroughly comprehended	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. It was made clear right from the start what is expected from students	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26. To do well on this course all you really need is a good memory	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. My teachers put a lot of time into comments (orally and/or in writing) on my work	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28. It was often hard to discover what was expected of me on this course	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29. Intellectual standards at Oxford are set too high	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
30. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of this course	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
31. Tutorials were more about me showing tutors how much I had learned in the subject areas than about developing my understanding	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
32. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the support from my department	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
33. In my experience tutorials given by graduate students were a less valuable learning experience than tutorials given by other university staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	0%	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
34. The proportion of my tutorials given by graduate students was approximately...	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Back to top](#)

<p>Stanford</p> <p>http://registrar.stanford.edu/faculty/course_evaluations</p>	
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies on Student Evaluation of Teaching (1997) - 3 goals (improving teaching, helping students with course selection, and administrative review of quality), which courses are evaluated and which results are reported, elements of the evaluation instrument, informing instructors of process, ensuring high completion rates, confidentiality, reports of results, and releasing results.
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations are collected online by an external service to ensure instructors are not involved. • Part of the survey is designed by the students union to gather information for their student guide to courses.
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Recommended Resources for instructors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Information for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As an incentive, students can access their grades earlier if they have completed all of their course evaluations.
Publication of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Policies on Student Evaluation of Teaching

On This Page

[Downloads](#)

[Policy](#)

All Online Course Evaluation Pages

Policies on Student Evaluation of Teaching

[Axess Instructions for Faculty](#)

[FAQ](#)

[Evaluation Means](#)

Downloads

- [Axess for Faculty brochure \(pdf\)](#) with the instructions on page 7
- [Frequently Asked Questions about Online Course Evaluations \(pdf\)](#)
- [Sample Course Evaluation \(pdf\)](#) (i.e., what students see when they evaluate)
- [Sample Section Evaluation \(pdf\)](#)
- Evaluation means for 2006-07 are available online through the [Online Course Evaluation system](#).

[Top of page](#)

Policy

The following policies were developed by the Committee on Academic Appraisal and Achievement (C-AAA) and were approved by the Senate of the Academic Council on October 30, 1997, superseding Send#2526 dated May 12, 1983.

The evaluation of teaching has three major goals:

- Provide information to instructors about how effectively their teaching is encouraging student learning and to help them improve their teaching;
- Provide information to students to help them select courses wisely;
- Provide information about the overall quality of courses for administrative review (i.e., salary setting, promotion, curriculum development).

Evaluation of teaching should be carried out in a number of ways including evaluation by the instructors themselves, by peers, and by students. (See the Final Report of the C-AAA Subcommittee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching, April 1995). The present document specifies only the required features of the Senate-mandated student evaluation of teaching.

1. Each time it is offered, every course must undergo student evaluation of teaching done by faculty, other instructors, and teaching assistants (understood to include all section leaders).

Summary reports of such evaluations are sent to the evaluated faculty and teaching assistants. Exceptions to this requirement are:

- a. Courses of an individual/independent nature (e.g., independent study courses, special research projects, thesis, music studios, etc.);
 - b. Activity courses.
2. The relevant department chairs, program heads, and deans also receive the evaluation summaries with the exception of first-time courses given on an experimental basis (so designated by the faculty member on a check-off box attached to the forms — see 4.d below).
 3. The exact content and nature of any instrument used for course evaluation shall be determined by the Dean of each School in consultation with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and representative faculty from that school. The Dean may also consult with the Provost and the Advisory Board.
 4. In general, course evaluations should include:
 - a. Demographic information on students in the class (e.g., year, area of study) and their reasons for enrolling in the class;
 - b. Evaluative questions about the course and instruction addressing such topics as intellectual content, organization, motivation, interactions, procedures for assessing student work;
 - c. A student portion designed by the ASSU or other authorized student organization to enable that group to assemble a student course guide;
 - d. A form attached to the evaluations for faculty to check-off if a course is being taught on a first-time experimental basis.
 5. The Dean of the school is responsible for informing instructors about the methods of administration, the uses of the results of the evaluation, and the importance of the evaluation process.
 6. The uses to which the evaluations will be put should be stated clearly and simply on the evaluations themselves.
 7. Evaluations should be conducted in such a way as to encourage a high rate of return and thoughtful responses from students. The instructor should provide ample time (15 minutes in class is the suggested minimum) for students to complete the evaluation.
 8. The evaluations will be administered and collected in a manner that assures their confidentiality. They will be delivered in a timely fashion to the University or school office charged with tabulating them, where they will be summarized and presented in a manner that is easy to understand and interpret. The responses and evaluation summaries will be returned to their appropriate recipients (see 9 below) as quickly as possible, but certainly no later than two weeks after the start of the subsequent quarter.
 9. Responses shall be reported according to the following guidelines:
 - a. Faculty will receive (1) the original individual student responses to the evaluative questions, (2) evaluation summaries for their own courses, and (3) the evaluation summaries for the teaching assistants in those courses.
 - b. Teaching assistants will receive (1) the original individual student responses to evaluative questions concerning the teaching assistant's performance and (2) evaluation summaries of those questions.
 - c. Department chairs, program heads, and deans will receive only the evaluation summaries

for the courses they oversee.

- d. The ASSU or other authorized student groups will receive the student-designed portions of the course evaluations. For each school, unless the Dean decides otherwise (see 10 below), the authorized student group will also receive from the Dean the evaluation summaries for faculty instructors. The student-designed portions of the evaluations will be available to the instructor following the composition of the course guide.
10. The Dean of each school, in consultation with representative faculty, may choose not to release part or all of the summary data from the faculty evaluations to the ASSU or other authorized student organization. Examples of what might be withheld include evaluation summaries for faculty in their first year of teaching, for teachers teaching courses to which students are assigned, or for classes with very small numbers of students. Such policies are subject to review from time to time by the Provost and the Advisory Board.

[Top of page](#)

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Course and Section Evaluations



Students are an important source of information about the effectiveness of a course, its instructor, and its teaching assistants. Please respond candidly to the following questions. The top portion of these forms and a summary of numerical data will be given to the instructor and department chair following the end of the quarter. The results are used in setting salaries and preparing teaching award nominations. In addition, portions of this data, both written and numerical, will be published for general distribution to students. You are particularly encouraged to offer constructive suggestions that may help to improve both the course and the teaching of the instructor.

Your evaluation data will be lost if you do not save or submit your form before leaving this page. To save what you've done so far without exiting, click the 'Save' button. To review and submit your evaluation, click the 'Next Page' button.

Course Information

Course Title **Occam's Razor: Less is More**

Course # **100**

Section

Department of HISTORY

Year	Area of study	Reason(s) for taking this course	Attendance	Expected grade	Time spent on course work outside class
					% that was valuable
<input type="button" value="▼"/>	<input type="button" value="▼"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Major/minor <input type="checkbox"/> GER <input type="checkbox"/> Reputation <input type="checkbox"/> Interest <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="button" value="▼"/>	<input type="button" value="▼"/>	<input type="button" value="▼"/>

Instructor Ratings

Please consider each statement separately rather than letting your over-all feelings about the instructor determine your response.

Instructor Name

Roger Bacon

Overall Ratings

1. The quality of the course content
 2. The instructor's overall teaching

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	NA
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				

Instructor's Organization/Clarity

3. Set out and met clear objectives announced for

- the course
4. Displayed thorough knowledge of course material
 5. Explained concepts clearly
 6. Distinguished between more important and less important topics
 7. Presented material at an appropriate pace

<input type="radio"/>					
<input type="radio"/>					
<input type="radio"/>					
<input type="radio"/>					

Instructor's Ability to Engage and Challenge Students Intellectually

8. Emphasized conceptual understanding and/or critical thinking
9. Related course topics to one another

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	NA
<input type="radio"/>					
<input type="radio"/>					

Instructor's Interaction with Students

10. Demonstrated concern about whether students were learning
11. Inspired and motivated student interest in the course content
12. Was available for consultation outside of class

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	NA
<input type="radio"/>					
<input type="radio"/>					
<input type="radio"/>					

Course Organization, Content, and Evaluation

13. Selected course content that was valuable and worth learning
14. Organized course topics in a coherent fashion
15. Chose assignments that solidified understanding
16. Explained clearly how students would be evaluated
17. Designed and used fair grading procedures

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	NA
<input type="radio"/>					
<input type="radio"/>					
<input type="radio"/>					
<input type="radio"/>					
<input type="radio"/>					

Section/Lab Integration

18. Section or lab was well integrated into course structure

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	NA
<input type="radio"/>					

Specific Comments for Instructor(s)

1. Please comment on the individual instructors with regard to effectiveness and attitude toward students:

Strengths	Suggestions for Improvement
-----------	-----------------------------

--	--

2. Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses, if any, of the textbook(s) and reading(s). What materials were most and least valuable? Why?

Strengths	Suggestions for Improvement

3. Please comment on assignments and exams (difficulty, length, frequency, usefulness, and their success at testing conceptual understanding rather than recall):

Strengths	Suggestions for Improvement

4. Do you have any additional comments on the course over-all?

Strengths	Suggestions for Improvement

To save what you've done so far without exiting, click the 'Save' button. To review and submit your evaluation, click the 'Next Page' button.

After submitting this form, you will not be able to review your answers or make corrections. Please verify that you have evaluated the correct instructor before submitting.

If you are having problems with the online evaluation, please contact the Help Desk at help@applyweb.com.

University of Sydney	
	http://www.usyd.edu.au/learning/evaluating/student.shtml
Key Elements of Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of Teaching and Learning policy (2001)
Evaluation Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit of Study Evaluation • 8 standard items and 4 faculty designated items • Information is collected at the level of the course (i.e. all sections of a course are reported together) rather than the level of the instructor.
How instructors can use results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a template for combining survey feedback, peer feedback and self-reflection. • Results are not used for personnel decision making.
Recommended Resources for instructors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructors are encouraged to adopted a "student centred approach to teaching"
Information for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Publication of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students also complete the Student Course Experience Questionnaire which is also used at Oxford.



About the Unit of Study Evaluation System (USE)

The Institute for Teaching and Learning's **Unit of Study Evaluation (USE)** system is designed to support aspects of the University's policy on The Management and Evaluation of Teaching which was approved by Academic Board on 16 May, 2001.

Unit of Study coordinators, or the faculty coordinator for this survey process can [order a survey](#) using this website.

The USE survey has 12 items. There are 8 standard items and 4 faculty designated items. Faculty representatives on the Evaluation and Quality Assurance Working Group consult with staff in their respective faculties to determine the additional four items for inclusion on their faculty's forms. These items are set for at least twelve months and in some cases for the full term of the three year survey cycle.

In addition to feedback gathered using the student surveys, the USE system encourages Unit of Study Coordinators to consider information from self and peer review in evaluating units.

Information on Unit of Study Evaluation (USE)

You can use the answers to the following frequently asked questions to find specific information about the USE system, or you can scroll down this page and read through some background on the system. If you have any questions about the USE please contact Jennifer Ungaro on 9351 5810.

1. [What is the University's policy on evaluation of units of study?](#)
2. [What is the ITL's Unit of Study Evaluation System \(USE\) intended to do? Does it contribute to the University's Teaching Performance Indicators?](#)
3. [What does the USE survey look like?](#)
4. [How is the survey reported?](#)
5. [How can I 'USE' the Results?](#)
6. [What are the relationships between USE items, SCEQ scales, and Academic Board resolutions on teaching?](#)
7. [Who can I talk to about USE?](#)
8. [What is the timeline for USE ordering and reporting? - download pdf](#)

1. What is the University's policy on evaluation of units of study?

The minimum standards for Unit of Study Outlines as well as the requirements for evaluating units of study are set out in the Academic Board Resolution on The Management and Evaluation of Teaching. The policy also describes the characteristics of a '*student centred approach to teaching*' which Academic Board encourages teachers to adopt.

Student-centred teaching has many of the following qualities:

- a. lecturers are confident that students understand the integration of course/unit aims, curricula, teaching methods and assessment practice;
- b. students become responsible for their own learning, and receive adequate support to come to accept this responsibility;
- c. where appropriate, teaching methods encourage active student engagement with subject materials, in contexts that help students create meaning and insight;

- d. student evaluations of their experiences of courses and units are used to improve the learning experiences of future students;
- e. students are encouraged to participate in the development and review of courses and units, and more broadly in University governance;
- f. faculties and departments establish procedures for seeking regular feedback from students on all matters affecting them in their studies and for involving them, where appropriate, in decisions and discussion affecting their learning, as recommended in the [Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee's Guidelines for Effective University Teaching](#);
- g. faculties and departments regularly review procedures and processes involving students, to maximise benefits and minimise inconvenience, and to ensure that the unit's academic goals are pre-eminent.

(Academic Board Resolution *The Management and Evaluation of Teaching*, Part 4.1.2, page 11)

The policy requirements for Unit of study evaluation are:

- 1. Units of study will be evaluated at least once every three years, at faculty level.
- 2. Summaries of the results of student evaluations of units will be forwarded by heads of departments or faculty unit co-ordinators to deans for information and action if needed. Deans will refer non-confidential information on the evaluations to Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees and to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) for advice and comment. Unit of study evaluations may be used to inform the University's internal quality audit process, including the annual faculty reviews conducted by Academic Board.
- 3. Units of study may be evaluated by the standard survey form devised by the Institute for Teaching and Learning or another faculty-approved form. Co-ordinators, heads and deans must provide a summary of the results of the most recent student evaluation of units on a unit of study website or in handouts. This summary will refer to actions taken in response to student comments.

Academic Board Resolution *The Management and Evaluation of Teaching*, Part 5.2, page 13)

[top](#)

2. Purpose of the USE

The purpose of the **Unit of Study Evaluation (USE)** system is to provide information for unit of study coordinators seeking to assess the effectiveness of units of study in order to plan and implement teaching and learning improvements. The focus of the system is on the unit of study and not the individual or the faculty. The key outputs of the USE system are intended to be:

- Documentation of the quality of units of study and an indication of how units of study effectively contribute to the overall quality of students' learning experiences in a degree.
- Recommendations by unit of study co-ordinators in the form of documented strategies which will maintain, or further improve, the teaching and learning quality of individual units.

The data gathered by the Unit of Study Evaluation student feedback surveys is not used by the Planning Support Office in calculating the faculty's Teaching Performance Indicators.

In addition to students' numerical ratings of their teaching and learning experiences, the **Unit of Study Evaluation** system encourages unit of study coordinators to draw upon other data from students, academic colleagues and their own insights as teachers. In doing so it recognises that issues of teaching context must be considered in the evaluation of individual units of study. These include; class size, available resources, and the compulsory or elective nature of student enrolments, amongst others. The unit of study coordinator is ideally placed to integrate data on these factors. As such, information generated by the USE system (the statistical reports of the students' ratings and the surveys containing their explanations for these ratings) is returned initially to unit of study co-ordinators.



The University
of Sydney

UNIT OF STUDY EVALUATION

ITL
Institute
for Teaching
and Learning

Please help us to improve the teaching and learning experiences of students by filling in and submitting this survey. The University is committed to responding to student feedback and staff are encouraged to inform students of their responses to such feedback. This is a voluntary survey and your responses are anonymous. Please think carefully about your feedback and please write a comment explaining your rating for each item.

NAME OF
UNIT OF STUDY

CODE OF
UNIT OF STUDY

WHICH DEGREE ARE
YOU ENROLLED IN?

INSTRUCTIONS

- Use a blue/black biro or pencil, preferably 2B
- Do not use red pen or felt tip pen
- Erase mistakes fully
- Make no stray marks
- Please MARK LIKE THIS

For each item below, please indicate the extent to which you AGREE or DISAGREE with the statement, using the scale provided. Then use the space below each question to explain the reasons for your rating and provide suggestions for improvement.

1. The learning outcomes and expected standards of this unit of study were clear to me

STRONGLY
DISAGREE
 ① DISAGREE
 ② NEUTRAL
 ③ AGREE
 ④ STRONGLY
AGREE
 ⑤

Please explain the reasons for your rating.

2. The teaching in this unit of study helped me to learn effectively

STRONGLY
DISAGREE
 ① DISAGREE
 ② NEUTRAL
 ③ AGREE
 ④ STRONGLY
AGREE
 ⑤

Please explain the reasons for your rating.

3. This unit of study helped me develop valuable graduate attributes [eg. 1) Research & inquiry skills; 2) Communication skills; 3) Personal & intellectual autonomy; 4) Ethical, social and professional understandings; 5) Information literacy].

STRONGLY
DISAGREE
 ① DISAGREE
 ② NEUTRAL
 ③ AGREE
 ④ STRONGLY
AGREE
 ⑤

Please explain the reasons for your rating.

4. I was motivated to engage with the learning activities in this unit of study

STRONGLY
DISAGREE
 ① DISAGREE
 ② NEUTRAL
 ③ AGREE
 ④ STRONGLY
AGREE
 ⑤

Please explain the reasons for your rating.

5. The assessment in this unit of study allowed me to demonstrate what I had understood

STRONGLY
DISAGREE
 ① DISAGREE
 ② NEUTRAL
 ③ AGREE
 ④ STRONGLY
AGREE
 ⑤

Please explain the reasons for your rating.

6.	I can see the relevance of this unit of study to my degree	STRONGLY DISAGREE (1) (2) (3) (4) STRONGLY AGREE (5)
----	--	---

Please explain the reasons for your rating.

7.	It was clear to me that the staff in this unit of study were responsive to student feedback	STRONGLY DISAGREE (1) (2) (3) (4) STRONGLY AGREE (5)
----	---	---

Please explain the reasons for your rating.

8.		STRONGLY DISAGREE (1) (2) (3) (4) STRONGLY AGREE (5)
----	--	---

Please explain the reasons for your rating.

9.		STRONGLY DISAGREE (1) (2) (3) (4) STRONGLY AGREE (5)
----	--	---

Please explain the reasons for your rating.

10.		STRONGLY DISAGREE (1) (2) (3) (4) STRONGLY AGREE (5)
-----	--	---

Please explain the reasons for your rating.

11.		STRONGLY DISAGREE (1) (2) (3) (4) STRONGLY AGREE (5)
-----	--	---

Please explain the reasons for your rating.

12.	Overall I was satisfied with the quality of this unit of study	STRONGLY DISAGREE (1) (2) (3) (4) STRONGLY AGREE (5)
-----	--	---

Please explain the reasons for your rating and provide any other suggestions for improvement.
