

COURSE EVALUATION

Spring 2019 Pilot



THE UNIVERSITY OF
TOLEDO

COURSE EVALUATION AD-HOC COMMITTEE

Co-Chairs: Amy Thompson and Christine Fox

Faculty Advisors on Methodology and Analysis: Svetlana Beltyukova and Christine Fox

The charge of the Course Evaluation Ad-Hoc Committee was to review best practices and procedures for assessing student perceptions of faculty teaching and make recommendations for a standardized data collection process and standardized set of common core assessment questions.

SURVEY DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES

Reviewed published literature to assess best practices in course evaluation

Reviewed existing course evaluations from each of the UT colleges as well as some peer institutions

Conducted a thematic analysis to determine common constructs that reflected best teaching practices

Developed 12 core questions and 3 Open-ended questions

SURVEY PILOT PROCEDURES

Feedback and approval was sought from the ad-hoc committee and faculty governing bodies

Individual faculty members, department chairs, and college deans were contacted to solicit volunteers for the Spring 2019 pilot

The core questions were administered to participating courses/departments/colleges electronically via Blackboard

Each participating department and college was able to include additional questions that were tailored to their own unique needs

SURVEY PILOT RESULTS

The core questions were administered in Spring 2019 to almost 4,000 students (undergraduate and graduate) across 9 colleges

College	Program Level			Delivery Method				Total # students
	Merged U & G	Graduate	Under-graduate	DL	BL	F2F	Not Coded	
Arts & Letters		2	625	71		556		627
Business & Innovation				43	155	452		
Education		299	351					650
Engineering	52					52		52
Health & Human Services		182	876	11	394	653		1058
Honors								
Law		22				22		22
Medicine & Life Sciences								
Natural Sciences & Math		47	456	10	58	435		503
Nursing		231	750	2	206	497	276	981
Pharmacy								
University College								
TOTAL	52	783	3058	137	813	2667	276	3893



PSYCHOMETRIC ANALYSIS

Psychometric analyses:

- For the overall sample (n=3,893)
- By each college
- By course level (graduate & undergraduate)
- By method of delivery (DL & face-to-face)

Purposes:

- To determine if computing a composite course evaluation score was meaningful and justifiable
- To determine if any questions needed to be analyzed and reported separately
- To determine the extent to which the meaning of the composite score was stable across colleges, student levels, and methods of course delivery



1. A composite score based on 8 out of 9 questions would be meaningful and justifiable.
1. Question 1 (*I put forth my best effort in this course*) needs to be analyzed and reported separately as it does not fit both conceptually and statistically with the other questions.
1. The remaining 8 questions form 4 meaningful clusters/themes:
 - **Cluster 1:** Clear expectations and fair grading
 - **Cluster 2:** Climate
 - **Cluster 3:** Feedback
 - **Cluster 4:** Teaching strategies

Results of Psychometric Analysis



STEPS IN COURSE EVALUATION QUESTION REVISIONS

1. Think-aloud interviews with 27 graduate & undergraduate students (saturation was reached) representing the following colleges:

- Arts & Letter
- Education
- Engineering
- HHS
- Natural Sciences & Math
- Nursing
- Medicine

2. Review of the think-aloud data and question revision discussion by the survey committee members



COURSE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Original Questions	Revised Questions
1. I put forth my best effort in this course.	1. I put forth my best effort in this course.
2. The learning outcomes and expectations for performance were clearly communicated throughout the semester.	2. Expectations for performance were clearly communicated throughout the semester.
3. I felt encouraged and supported to do my best work.	3. In this course, I felt motivated to do my best work.
4. A variety of teaching approaches were used to meet the needs of all students.	4. The teaching approaches used supported my learning needs.
5. I felt comfortable expressing my views and ideas in this course	5. The course provided a comfortable environment for expressing views and ideas.
6. I received feedback on my work promptly and in time to adjust my performance in this class.	6. I received feedback on my work within a reasonable timeframe.
7. Feedback I received from the instructor was helpful in improving my performance in the course.	7. The quality of the feedback on my work helped my learning.
8. The grading in the course was fair.	8. The grading in the course fairly reflected the quality of my work.
9. I learned a lot in this course.	9. Overall, I had a good learning experience in this course.

10. Describe activities or assignments that were most beneficial to your learning.
11. Suggest way(s) in which the course could be improved (if any).
12. Briefly describe what you thought was the most important thing you learned in this course



With the original wording, students immediately thought about the syllabus and did not understand the term ‘learning outcomes.’ The intent of this question is to emphasize the importance of expectations for performance AND clear communication throughout the semester.

Original Q2: The learning outcomes and expectations for performance were clearly communicated throughout the semester.

Revised Q2: Expectations for performance were clearly communicated throughout the semester.

Students were interpreting “being encouraged and supported” differently. It needed to be clear that this was about the course, and motivation better captures the intent of encouragement and support because those result in motivation.

Original Q3: I felt encouraged and supported to do my best work.

Revised Q3: In this course, I felt motivated to do my best work.

First, the question is asking about two different things: about variety of approaches and needs of all students. Second, the students felt they could not speak for everyone's needs. Third, the question is not about the variety of approaches but about the nature of approaches to help students be successful in the course.

Original Q4: A variety of teaching approaches were used to meet the needs of all students.

Revised Q4: The teaching approaches used supported my learning needs.

The question should focus on learning environment, not on feeling comfortable. Given that some students don't feel comfortable speaking up, the original wording made it all about the student, not the course.

Original Q5: I felt comfortable expressing my views and ideas in this course.

Revised Q5: The course provided a comfortable environment for expressing views and ideas.

Students thought these questions were very similar as both related to adjusting performance and feedback. The suggestion was to make them shorter and focus on one component only – on feedback timeliness and quality.

Original Q6: I received feedback on my work promptly and in time to adjust my performance in this class.

Original Q7: Feedback I received from the instructor was helpful in improving my performance in the course.

Revised Q6: I received feedback on my work within a reasonable timeframe.

Revised Q7: The quality of the feedback on my work helped my learning.

Students were unclear if this question was about treating everybody the same or getting the grade they deserved or their understanding why they earned that grade. Subsequent discussion of this question with the committee made it clear that the intent of the question was about grading criteria and student understanding of the grade they earned.

Original Q8: The grading in the course was fair.

Revised Q8: The grading in the course fairly reflected the quality of my work.

Students felt that many required courses would “suffer” from this question as they would be required to take a course where they already know most of the material. Many also felt the question was vague and should be about engagement with the course material, relatedness of the course material, etc.

Original Q9: I learned a lot in this course.

Revised Q9: Overall, I had a good learning experience in this course.

Fall 2019 - 'soft launch' across the university using
Campus Labs Software

Spring 2020 – full implementation

Department and College questions can be added

Next Steps



THANK YOU



THE UNIVERSITY OF
TOLEDO