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Executive Summary

The Course Evaluation of Instruction Committee (CEIC), consistent with recommendations by the Faculty Senate, conducted an analysis to evaluate the feasibility of implementing ETS’s SIR II instrument to replace UMBC’s current Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire (SCEQ). As a result of that investigation CEIC recommends that UMBC consider alternative survey instruments and delivery systems prior to replacing the current SCEQ process.

The evaluation focused on the administration of the survey, not on the efficacy of the instrument itself, since the choice of instrument was the result of recommendations by the 2011-2012 Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) and approved by the Faculty Senate. The evaluation included two pilots; a paper based version of the survey administered in the spring of 2013, and an online version administered in the summer of 2013. Both pilots uncovered problems with administering the survey.

The format in which the paper surveys were provided to UMBC required instructors to fill in cover sheets, students to copy arbitrary codes onto bubble sheets, collectors to track any mistakes as well as the physical orientation of the sorted surveys, and made the process arduous and error prone.

The online version, because it allows greater flexibility about when the student can fill it out, requires rules be in place to ensure students cannot fill out the survey after they have taken their final exam and/or received their final grade.

In both pilots, there were problems working with ETS from a customer service standpoint. ETS had little flexibility when it came to customizing the paper product (e.g., pre-printing course-specific codes, adding or modifying extra open-ended questions—to modify the standard questions would invalidate the measurement model), they were unable to address concerns in a timely manner (as when the sales rep was on vacation); and their billing system was overly complicated.

Despite no negative feedback from any participant regarding the survey instrument itself, administrative concerns were sufficient enough to conclude that proceeding with a paper version of the SIR II is not feasible. Further, although online delivery of the survey showed promise, the overall experience of the pilot suggested that ETS may not be a reliable or effective supplier in meeting the online needs of the broader University going forward. Because ETS requires that all SIR II users rely on its proprietary distribution system, the CEIC feels there are sufficient impediments to warrant exploring other options.
This report documents the historical development of the teaching evaluation survey at UMBC with a focus on the decision making process leading to the Faculty Senate recommendation to implement SIR II. It concludes with CEIC’s recommendation, following two pilots and an evaluation of implementation of SIR II, of an alternative approach for moving forward with teaching evaluations at UMBC.

Origin of the SCEQ at UMBC

Formal procedures for student evaluation of teaching were established by the UMBC Senate, May 4, 1971. During the 1970-71 academic year, a faculty-student Teaching Evaluation Committee chaired by Dr. William Rothstein reviewed available course evaluation instruments and developed and field tested a 39-item questionnaire for use at UMBC (Wang and Schumann 1980).

Although the original instrument was revised after many faculty members expressed dissatisfaction with its length, the first motion passed by the Senate establishing the evaluation of teaching, outlining the four principles of faculty rights in teaching evaluation, remains in effect. They are:

- A faculty member must have the right to petition that a given method of evaluation is not applicable to his or her situation and, if the petition is recognized as valid, he or she must have the right to propose an alternative method of evaluation.
- A faculty member must have the right to see and respond in writing to all formal teaching evaluations.
- Whenever possible, evaluations of a faculty member’s teaching should not be used for promotion, tenure, or contract decisions until the instructor has had the opportunity to alter his or her teaching in the same course.
- The faculty member has the right to expect that the questionnaire will be administered so as to minimize the possibilities of respondent bias.

Current Version of the SCEQ

A revised version of the SCEQ has been in use University-wide since the fall of 1977. It is composed of two parts. The first is a Likert-scale questionnaire consisting of seven sets of items. One set contains questions which are quite general and which should be applicable to almost all courses. The remaining sets are designed for lectures, discussions, mathematics and science laboratories, seminar, field experience and self-paced courses. Six questions permit separate evaluation of as many as four instructors. The instructor has the option of administering whichever set of questions are applicable (current instrument is attached). This portion of the Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire is UMBC’s official instrument for measuring student opinion of teaching effectiveness. The second portion of the evaluation consists of five open-ended questions that are designed for feedback directly to the instructor and are considered (as
stated in the 1971 senate motions establishing the SCEQ) a confidential communication between
the student and the instructor. They have come to be known as the ‘blue sheets’ and are also
attached (adapted from Wang and Schumann 1980).

The survey is administered internally at UMBC. Oversight for its administration, though
originally housed in the Student Course Evaluation Center, is now the responsibility of the
Office of Institutional Research (OIR). OIR interacts with each academic department’s SCEQ
coordinator to determine which courses will be surveyed and how many questionnaires to
produce. The surveys are distributed to departments and are handed out in class during the last
two weeks of each fall and spring semester. The surveys are anonymous and are filled out
without the instructor in the classroom. A student volunteer returns the survey to the department
(or a designated drop-off location). The departments keep the blue sheets until after grades are
posted, and then they are provided to the instructor. The questionnaires are forwarded to OIR for
processing. Once the results are compiled, OIR publishes the results on their website
(http://oir.umbc.edu). OIR responds to queries concerning the results from instructors,
departments, administration or external constituents.

OIR works closely with other administrative offices in processing the SCEQs, especially the
Division of Informational Technology (DoIT). DoIT created the original computer programs that
produce the list of courses and enrollment counts for each semester. And, until recently, they
scanned the bubble sheet questionnaires that generated the database used for reporting results
(That function has since been outsourced to third-party vendor Scantron. The reason for this is
explained below). DoIT also wrote the program that created the report, including the statistical
comparisons listed below. OIR and the Registrar’s office collaborate to investigate data integrity
issues that arise from this process and, when appropriate, correct errors in the transactional
system.

The SCEQ results posted on OIR’s website provide details of evaluations of each course/section.
It includes summary information about the section including the title of the course, the term, the
instructor(s), the number of students enrolled and the number of questionnaires returned. Each
row of the report provides the distribution of responses to each question. It also provides the
mean value of the responses to each question. Those means are then compared to other
instructors, other sections of the course, the department average, the level of the course and
overall mean response for that question for all course sections at UMBC. The rules used to
determine when these comparisons are made available are as follows:

- The body of the table gives evaluation data for each item. If less than 25% of the students
  respond to an item, then data for that item are suppressed. For each item printed out, the
distribution of response, the mean of the responses, and normative data are given.
- **Distribution of Responses.** Responses to each item are reported on a five-point scale,
  with a response of “1” being a low (negative) rating, and response of “5” being a high
Proposed changes to SCEQ: 2000-2009

There were attempts to change the SCEQ process at UMBC in the first decade of this century. There were two separate attempts to change the delivery mechanism from paper to online. However, the discussion of moving the survey online prompted discussion about the veracity of the instrument in evaluating teaching effectiveness. This is not surprising since moving the delivery mechanism without changing the survey could implicitly be taken as an endorsement as to the veracity of the current instrument. Moreover, changing the delivery mechanism could facilitate making changes to the survey. For example, online delivery of the survey could lower the cost of customizing it, such as allowing individual departments to add questions specific to
their discipline. On the other hand, online delivery might impinge on other aspect of the teaching evaluation process. For example, if the blue sheets were delivered online, how might that effect how students respond to those open ended questions? So it makes sense that the choice of survey instrument and delivery system be discussed together. Here we simply try to state what happened as a prologue to the Faculty Senate’s recommendation to implement, and the CEIC’s subsequent evaluation of, SIR II.

In an effort to reduce costs, increase access (especially for on-line courses), and bolster the integrity of survey results, UMBC piloted an online SCEQ project in the early 2000’s. As a first step, a feasibility study was conducted during the summer of 2001 with volunteer faculty members teaching summer session courses. Students completed evaluations during the final portion of the course by accessing the SCEQ questionnaire, including a blue sheet, through myUMBC. In spring 2002, a second phase of research was undertaken, with selected volunteer faculty members, to address issues of comparability of results obtained online with those obtained using the traditional method. Although response rates were quite low for the online evaluations, mean ratings on individual SCEQ items were comparable to those obtained by the same professors teaching the same courses in spring 2001. Mean ratings on General item #9 (the overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness) were plotted for 29 courses that were offered repeatedly from 1997 through 2002, and they showed no discernible effect attributable to the mode of SCEQ administration. The committee concluded that, “although there are advantages and disadvantages to online course evaluation, the merits of moving to online evaluation outweigh the disadvantages in terms of cost, protection of student anonymity, and accessibility to all enrolled students, especially those enrolled in online courses (Demorest 2003).

The Faculty Senate did not follow the committee’s recommendation to adopt online SCEQ University-wide, though it did, several years later, recommend online delivery of the SCEQ for online courses. Specifically in the spring of 2006, the Senate passed the following motion:

10. Motion Passed: Courses that are currently taught on-line shall be evaluated on-line (Hrabowski 2006).

This allowed the Information System department to continue to deliver online an adapted form of the SCEQ to evaluate their online master’s program. Over time, Information System expanded the online delivery of the SCEQ to include all courses.

At the same Faculty Senate meeting in the spring of 2006 that passed a motion allowing online delivery of the SCEQ for existing online courses, it passed two motions requesting a re-evaluation of the SCEQ. Specifically;

6. Motion Passed: A revised SCEQ instrument shall be developed with a concise number of questions which will be asked university-wide reflecting the gravity of the instrument’s intended purpose. Departments may add a limited number of additional questions specific to those departments. (Hrabowski 2006)
7. Motion Passed: An ad hoc committee with expertise in measurement shall be established to develop the set of university-wide questions. The committee will also provide recommendations for how the information gathered from the questions may be tabulated (e.g. composite scores or individual items, possible weighting of items, how data should be quantified, means, variance). (Hrabowski 2006)

To our knowledge no revised instrument was developed and the ad hoc committee was not set up at that time.

**People Soft Student Administration Implementation’s Effect on SCEQ**

Moving from UMBC’s legacy student administration module (i.e., HP3000) to PeopleSoft Student Administration required conversion of queries used to extract information from the old system so that they would perform within the new system. These queries included the program that tallied survey results, including comparative statistics. It was during this period that questions regarding the continued costs of maintaining scanning equipment (including the personnel to perform the scanning) to support the SCEQ were reconsidered and discussion about moving the SCEQ process online ensued.

In spring 2008, Provost Johnson tasked a working group comprised of faculty, students and administrators to recommend a solution to administering future SCEQs that would best fulfill the needs of faculty, departments, students, administrators, and other campus constituents. After careful consideration of the current process and its limitations; the costs associated with redesigning the current process to maintain in-class administration of the survey; and the future trends in technology and surveying, the working group proposed that UMBC move to an online administration of the SCEQ concurrent with the full implementation of SA PeopleSoft in the summer of 2009 (Dillon 2008).

The recommendation to move to an on-line version of the SCEQ was not approved by Faculty Senate. Subsequently, the university moved to outsource the processing for the paper version of the survey to Scantron after the implementation of PeopleSoft Student Administration. Administration of the survey is currently supervised by the Office of Institutional Research.

**Selection and Evaluation of the SIR II instrument (2010-present)**

In May 2010, the UFRC made the following recommendation to Provost Hirshman:

We recommend that a committee be constituted to examine measures for teaching assessment and effectiveness that can be used across Colleges, measures that DP&TCs and Deans can refer to in a more consistent way in retention and promotion procedures… there is almost universal agreement that the SCEQ survey is seriously flawed, yet substantial weight is given to SCEQ scores in promotion and tenure proceedings. The language in departmental reports and Deans’
letters makes statements about the significance of score differences that we feel cannot be supported on either statistical or legal grounds. (UMBC UFRC 2010)

Subsequently the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate charged a task force to investigate alternative course survey instruments. After careful review, the task force considered four instruments as potential alternatives to the SCEQ: Aleamoni Source-Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire (CIEQ); IDEA Student Rating of Instruction: SIR II (Student Instructional Report) and SEEQ (Student’s Evaluation of Educational Quality). All are normed and validated based on previous student data; all provide subscale statistics (through grouped questions) as well as individual question statistics (FAC 2011).

The task force recommended to the Faculty Affairs Committee that SIR II replace the SCEQ. The Faculty Affairs Committee forwarded the following recommendation to the Faculty Senate:

Our recommendation is that UMBC should adopt the SIR II survey created by the Educational Testing Services, and create an online administration mechanism for the survey (to be piloted in 2012-13 and made campus-wide in Fall 2013). This recommendation is based on a number of factors detailed in the report, including:

- The SIR II is a validated instrument, has been shown to be statistically reliable and provides nationally normed comparison data.
- The SIR II includes eight subscale statistics that are more reliable than individual questions, and that will help greatly in shifting the focus away from a single response (as with the SCEQ Question 9).
- Moving to an online system reduces distribution costs, increases the likelihood of students providing answers to open-ended questions, increases access to response data, has been shown to be preferred by students, and can maintain or even increase response rates with appropriate implementation.
- Suggested incentives for increasing response rate including restricting early access to grades to students who complete the evaluations, involving student organizations in publicizing and emphasizing the importance of the evaluations, and sharing information about how the evaluation results are used to improve instruction.

On February 14, 2012, the Senate passed the following motion:

1. Motion Passed: the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the Educational Testing Services’ SIR II survey be adopted in place of the SCEQ, effective fall 2012. A course evaluation steering committee shall be appointed to oversee this transition, composed of members of the Faculty Senate, Faculty Affairs Committee, SGA and GSA student representatives, and appropriated administrative offices.
During the March 13, 2012 meeting of the Faculty Senate, Dr. Marie des Jardins, in her report for the Faculty Affairs Committee, provided a revised version of the motion that addressed faculty concerns. It reads as follows:

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that an online version of UMBC’s course evaluation instrument be established. Implementation of the online version shall be piloted in 2012-13 by volunteering departments, and made campus-wide effective Fall 2013. The administration is requested to develop appropriate incentives to maximize the reliability and validity of responses.

After fall 2013, a policy shall be developed under which departments may choose either online or paper-based course evaluations, with an appropriate implementation plan to ensure that potential concerns about response rate, reliability, consistency, and cost are addressed.

The course evaluation steering committee shall oversee the implementation process of the online course evaluations and shall develop recommended policies for interpreting scores during the P&T review process. Specifically, these policies should indicate how scores should be interpreted for faculty who have been evaluated under both the SCEQ and SIR II, and how scores should be compared for courses that vary along with other relevant factors, including online v. paper survey administration, course size, course level, required/elective courses, and course discipline. OIR is requested to periodically report back to the Senate with relevant data, including response rates, score distributions and an analysis of factors that statistically affect scores, including those listed previously.

**CEIC Findings**

On May 24, 2012 the Faculty Affairs Committee provided a set of recommendations for the Course Evaluation Task Force in developing and overseeing the implementation plan for the adoption of the SIR II and the online SIR II pilot (FAC 2012).

In fall 2012 the task force, renamed the Course Evaluation of Instruction Committee (CEIC) met to discuss the Faculty Affairs Committee recommendation. The CEIC committee members are:

Matthew Baker, Associate Professor, Geography and Environmental Systems  
Kyana Beckles, Student Government Association  
Michael Dillon, Associate Vice Provost, Institutional Research, Analysis and Decision Support  
Linda Hodges, Director, Faculty Development Center  
Kaylesh Ramu, Graduate Student Association  
Kimberly Moffitt, Assistant Professor, American Studies  
Antonio Moreira, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs  
Barbara Morris, Coordinator, Special Events and Projects, Information Systems  
Denise Meringolo, Associate Professor, History  
Kalman Nanes, Lecturer, Mathematics and Statistics
Pilots

The committee agreed to pilot a paper version of the SIR II in the spring of 2013 followed by a larger online version in the summer of 2013. It agreed to solicit volunteers from tenured faculty to participate in the pilot, minimizing the risk to those instructors participating in the pilot. The evaluation focused on the administration of the survey, not on the efficacy of the instrument itself, since the choice of instrument was the result of recommendations by the 2011-2012 Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) and approved by the Faculty Senate. Initial communication with the Education Testing Services (ETS) revealed that SIR II had few customers of similar size and composition of UMBC. Most of its customers were smaller institutions, or were not used by the entire institution, but rather by a single department or school within the institution. As a result, the committee was specifically interested in whether ETS could handle the volume and complexity of providing the survey to UMBC.

Summary of the spring 2013 paper and pencil pilot

- 19 instructors volunteered to participate
- 23 courses were evaluated
- 963 surveys were distributed
- 609 surveys were returned (63%)

Evaluation:

Pros

- There was no negative feedback about the instrument from students or instructors.

Cons

- Forms are not preprinted. Instructors need to fill in a cover sheet for each course and every student needs to fill in a 6-digit number linking each survey to the instructor cover sheet.
- Cover sheets and surveys must be kept together in order to have them reported correctly. There were cases where the cover sheet was not returned and a new cover sheet had to be replaced, including a new report number on both the cover sheet and each survey. This manual procedure could not be scaled effectively.
Overall, it was clear that the administration costs of using this method would be extremely labor intensive and prone to error.

Summary of the summer 2013 online pilot

- 39 instructors participated
- 66 courses were evaluated
- 1693 surveys were distributed
- 799 surveys were completed (47%)

Evaluation:

Pros

- There was no negative feedback about the instrument from students or instructors.
- Once logged on very few reported problems on filling out survey.
- There was positive feedback on accessing the survey using a variety of mobile devices.

Cons

- ETS was not prepared for multiple administrations of surveys over the summer. For example, they were not prepared to deal with two summer sessions beginning in the same month. This caused particular problems when sending summary reports to instructors because it was not possible to narrow the distribution to just the instructors in a particular session.
- Courses needed 50% response rates for surveys to be processed. There was no automated way to check courses that did not reach the specified response rate. It required constant manual intervention from an administrator (OIR’s Administrative Assistant) to determine which courses were at risk for not being compiled.
- Ordering surveys was cumbersome: for example, receipts needed to be requested by phone. Orders had to be placed online, printed, and then faxed to ETS.
- There was trouble getting assistance when needed. For example, when the sales rep was on vacation questions could not be answered until she returned.
- There were logistical issues about making sure students could not fill out the surveys after grades were posted. There would be significant setup required by departments to ensure that this would not occur.

Committee Recommendations

The CEIC met on October 13, 2013, to review the outcome of the two pilots. The committee concluded that both pilots uncovered serious and potentially intractable problems using ETS to
administer the survey. Given that ETS was unwilling to sell the rights to administer the survey without the delivery mechanism, the CEIC recommended that UMBC consider alternative survey instruments and delivery systems prior to replacing the current SCEQ process. The executive summary that appears at the top of this report was crafted and approved by the committee.

The committee met twice more in the fall of 2013. In the first it reviewed a demo from eXplorance, a software company that provides a platform for surveying students online. The committee agreed the product provides far greater functionality than the software provided by ETS. In the second meeting, after reviewing the price quote from eXplorance, the committee agreed they were a strong candidate for a third party vendor for delivering surveys online, but that further investigation is needed before recommending a particular delivery system. The committee also reviewed alternative survey instruments. It decided to meet early in the spring of 2014 to further continue that discussion.

The CEIC members met early in spring 2014 and agreed the committee needs to work towards being ready to recommend a course evaluation tool to the Faculty Senate early in the fall 2014 semester. A work group to include Jack Suess, Michael Dillon, Linda Hodges and Tony Moreira will be engaged during the remainder of the current spring semester and the summer to gather information on the University of Washington IA System as well as two other public domain tools. As information becomes available, it will be shared with all the members of the CEIC. The work group will prepare a package with evaluation of the tools examined and subsequent recommendations for discussion by the full CEIC committee in September of 2014. With approval of the CEIC committee, a recommendation will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate by October/November 2014.
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March 31, 2014
Prepared by Dr. Michael Dillon, Associate Vice Provost, IRADS
on behalf of the CEIC
### UMBC Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

**GENERAL**

1. **Did you gain new insights, skills, or knowledge as a result of this course?**
   - I learned very little
   - I learned a lot

2. **Did the instructor make it clear what skills, insights, or knowledge you were expected to acquire?**
   - Seldom
   - Very much

3. **Did the questions asked on exams reflect the knowledge, skills, and insights you were expected to acquire?**
   - There were no exams
   - Very much

4. **Did evaluations, other than exams (such as critiques, grading of papers, reports, or oral presentations) reflect the skills, knowledge, and insights you were expected to acquire?**
   - There were no such evaluations in this course
   - Very clearly

5. **Did assigned readings, including text(s), contribute to what you learned in this course?**
   - No assigned readings.
   - Very little

6. **Did written assignments, not including exams, contribute to what you learned in this course?**
   - No written assignments
   - Very little

7. **Was the grading system clearly explained?**
   - Seldom
   - Very much

8. **How many times was class canceled without substitution of some other learning experience, such as an assignment, film, field trip, or guest lecturer?**
   - I did not attend class often enough to judge
   - Never

9. **How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?**
   - I did not feel qualified to judge the instructor's teaching effectiveness
   - One of the best instructors I've had

10. **Did the instructor's lectures contribute to what you studied?**
    - Seldom
    - Very much

11. **Were all students actively encouraged to participate in class discussions?**
    - Seldom
    - Very much

12. **Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion of diverse points of view?**
    - Seldom
    - Very much

13. **Did the instructor's use of audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding of or interest in course material?**
    - No special techniques were used
    - Very much

**LECTURE**

1. **Were the instructor's lectures well prepared?**
   - Seldom
   - Very little

2. **Did the instructor seem interested in the subject matter of the course?**
   - Not at all
   - Very much

3. **Was lecture material presented and explained clearly?**
   - Seldom
   - Always

4. **Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion of diverse points of view?**
   - Seldom
   - Always

5. **Did the instructor's lectures contribute to what you learned in this course?**
   - Seldom
   - Very much

6. **Were special techniques (such as seating arrangements, small group discussions, role playing, etc.) successful in producing relevant discussion?**
   - Seldom
   - Always
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LABORATORY: MATHEMATICS &amp; SCIENCE</th>
<th>SEMINAR</th>
<th>FIELD WORK</th>
<th>SELF-PACED PERSONALIZED INSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. 1. Did lab activities increase your understanding of material presented in the corresponding lecture course?</td>
<td>E. 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme of the seminar?</td>
<td>F. 1. Did your field experience contribute to what you learned in this course?</td>
<td>G. 1. Did this individualized, self-paced learning system contribute to your acquisition of skills or knowledge in this course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no corresponding lecture course.</td>
<td>Does not apply to this seminar.</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>Very little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information (such as lab lectures, texts, handouts, reference materials) to enable you to carry out assigned lab activities? | 2. Was the instructor available and willing to give individual attention to your research project(s) while they were in preparation? | 2. Did you understand clearly, at the beginning of your field experience, the criteria by which you would be evaluated? | 2. Did the study questions (unit objectives) make it clear what skills or knowledge you were expected to acquire? |
| Seldom | There were no research projects. | Criteria not clear | There were no study questions. |
| Always | Seldom | Criteria very clear | Seldom |
| Always | Very much | Always | Seldom |

| 3. Were necessary materials available for required lab activities? | 3. Did your research project(s) contribute to what you learned in this seminar? | 3. Was the instructor available for consultation during office hours or by pre-arranged appointments? | 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful in mastering course materials? |
| No materials were necessary for lab activities. | There were no research projects. | I did not seek consultation. | There were no contacts with the instructor. |
| Always | Very much | Seldom | Contacts not helpful |
| Seldom | Seldom | Contacts very helpful |
| Always | Always | Always | Always |

| 4. Did the laboratory instructor provide assistance by answering questions about procedures or by directing you to another source for answers? | 4. Did presentations and discussions contribute to what you learned in this seminar? | 4. To what degree did you have opportunity to discuss evaluations with your instructor or superior? | 4. Was the feedback/tutoring provided by proctors helpful in mastering course material? |
| I did not seek assistance from the lab instructor. | There were no presentations or discussions. | No evaluations have been made yet. | There were no proctors. |
| Always | Seldom | No opportunity | Seldom |
| Seldom | Always | Frequent opportunity | Seldom |
| Always | Always | Always | Always |

| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified in advance? | 5. Were criteria for grading of your classroom presentations or discussions made clear? | 5. Do you feel that conferences with your instructor helped you to carry out your field activities? | 5. Were there enough proctors to provide services for all of the students? |
| No lab reports were required. | There were no presentations or discussions. | There were no conferences with the instructor. | There were no proctors. |
| Always | Not clear at all | Seldom | Definitely not enough |
| Seldom | Always | Seldom | Definitely enough |
QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE GIVEN TO INSTRUCTOR
(This sheet will not be computer analyzed. Use the other side of the page if necessary.
Do not sign your name or social security number.) updated Fall 2009

1. What was the best part of the course and why?


2. What changes would you recommend in the course and why?


3. What classroom approaches or actions make this instructor an effective teacher?


4. Were there any classroom approaches or actions that hinder this instructor from being an effective teacher? If so, what?


5. Other Comments.


