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Executive Summary

As part of the University at Buffalo’s commitment to academic excellence and a primary objective of Realizing UB 2020, we seek to share a collective focus on improvement by instilling a pervasive culture of assessment, (Realizing UB 2020: Achieving Academic Excellence Oct 7, 2013). Building on the resolution approved by the Faculty Senate more than 30 years ago, UB’s course evaluation system ought to evolve to meet the changing standards for teaching effectiveness measured by specific learning outcomes as well as the key student traits we expect to develop in students reflecting the core institutional values inherent in a UB education.

The development and implementation of the university-wide course-evaluation system is phase one in an ongoing process that includes: revisions to the item set; strategies to bolster student response rates and reliability; and technical adjustments to maintain/improve accuracy and ease of data entry, access, and reporting.

Further, the course evaluation system is one piece of a multifaceted strategy of course and instructor evaluation. Foremost, course evaluations should serve as a complement to (a) the ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes (via exams, papers, discussion, etc.) and (b) surveys and questionnaires of course design and pedagogy administered by instructors. Likewise, peer- and/or department chair observation of teaching and assessment of course design, among other processes, is recommended. While the university-wide system serves an administrative role, the overarching aim is to improve the educational experiences and learning outcomes of students.

A university-wide course evaluation system serves a variety of purposes and constituencies. The structure, delivery, analysis, and reporting of campus-wide evaluations need to reflect this multiplicity, while minimizing redundancy. Likewise, the proposed structure seeks to balance the need for flexibility across units/departments/course with the goal of university-wide, cross-course comparisons. As such, the following structure, which builds upon higher education research (particularly that of Herbert Marsh and the SEEQ) is put to forth.

Committee Charge

With the support of Provost Charles F. Zukoski and Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Scott Weber, the Faculty Senate has formed in spring semester 2012 the Committee for University Wide Course Evaluations, to (1) investigate methods and opportunities for a university-wide course evaluation system and (2) creating a computerized campus evaluation system and (3) to implement it across UB’s twelve schools. Currently, there are at least five different electronic and three written platforms used across our twelve schools. These diverse methods present numerous challenges by:

- Causing confusion among students, especially undergraduates, who are often using multiple course evaluation platforms throughout a single semester;
- Inhibiting collection of consistent institutional data for university wide assessment of instruction and learning outcomes;
- Providing no common data set for evaluating instructional effectiveness at promotion;
- And preventing efficiencies from both an administrative and cost perspective.

The benefits of adopting a university wide course evaluation system include:

- Uniformity in administration leading to greater efficiency and more reliable results
- Greater transparency for students and one-stop evaluations may encourage greater response rates
- Availability of data and reports for assessment purposes:
  - Faculty review and development
  - Program review
  - Accreditation Reporting
- Electronic platform that is mobile-ready improves accessibility and usability for students

Under the leadership of Professor Peter Biehl, Chair of Anthropology, the Committee for University Wide Course Evaluations is comprised of two subcommittees with faculty and staff membership. The first is the Course Evaluation
Subcommittee which includes the development of the course evaluation content including the types of questions to be asked and how to appropriately structure the instrument. The second subcommittee is the Implementation Subcommittee, whose charge is to develop recommendations regarding the infrastructure needed to effectively administer university wide course evaluations. A complete list of membership can be found in Appendix A.

**Research Literature and Peer Practices:**
In reviewing the research literature related to student evaluations of teaching, course evaluations tend to serve three primary purposes: (a) formative, providing feedback to faculty for instructional and course improvement; (b) summative, providing an evaluation for purposes such as promotion/tenure decisions and annual performance review; (c) informative, assisting students in selecting future courses (Nevo et al, 2009).

The committee’s research revealed success factors and common experiences from institutions as they transitioned from paper to online course evaluations. The success factors for online evaluations from students’ point of view are identified in one study as:

- Anonymity
- Ease of use (survey and system)
- Accessibility
- Publication of results
- Subsequent adjustments to the course
- Survey redesign
- System reliability
- Incentives
- Reminders
- Conveying the importance of the course evaluations to students

When transitioning from a paper to online course evaluation system, schools consistently reported a lower response rate, however, students tend to submit more (and often more useful) comments on online evaluations compared to paper evaluations (particularly on short-answer questions). In addition, student and faculty generally view online evaluations more positively than paper evaluations (Anderson et al, 2005; Donovan et al, 2006; Kasiar et al, 2002).

**Hierarchy Structure for Online Course Evaluation System**
An item bank approach was recommended in the design of the online course evaluation system for two primary reasons. First, by having an item bank of vetted and approved questions, we can ensure comparability of ratings across departments, courses and instructors. Second, a multidimensional system promotes the greatest flexibility possible for units in selecting questions. By doing so, a hierarchy structure was designed at the university, school, department, program, and faculty levels. Additionally, the system will allow up to three unique questions (quantitative or qualitative) to be added to each course evaluation by the instructor.

In shaping the content for the university core questions, the committee recommended the Students’ Evaluation of Education Quality (SEEQ); an instrument developed by Dr. Herbert Marsh, University of Western Sydney in 1982. SEEQ comprises items grouped into nine dimensions of teaching (learning, enthusiasm, organization, group interaction, individual rapport, breadth, examinations, assignments, and overall) allowing faculty to pin-point specific areas of teaching quality. SEEQ has been extensively tested and used in more than 50,000 courses with over one million students at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, showing that SEEQ is both valid and reliable (1, 2). Since the SEEQ instrument is a public instrument, it is free of charge. Permission to use the SEEQ item set was granted by the developer.

The UB item catalog (item bank) is comprised of select questions from Purdue’s “PICES” item catalog and remaining SEEQ items. After a thorough review of the existing UB course evaluation question sets from across UB, we identified and selected the PICES equivalent for each question to ensure reliability – as these items have been tested and validated. UB has received permission to use Purdue’s PICES set free of charge with proper attribution. See Appendix C for the complete Marsh SEEQ and Purdue PICES item sets.
The university core questions incorporate overall assessment of the course and instructor by addressing 8 of the 9 categories put forth by Marsh’s SEEQ evaluation. We have rationalized that group interaction may not be an applicable category for all courses at the University at Buffalo and therefore, should not be part of the mandated item set.

1) Learning/Value
2) Enthusiasm
3) Organization
4) Individual Rapport
5) Group Interaction (not included in our question set)
6) Breadth of Coverage
7) Grading
8) Assignments/Readings
9) Workload and Difficulty

University Core Questions:
Based on the research, the committee elected to use a 4-point Likert scale scored as 1=disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=agree, to mitigate the likelihood of diminishing returns in terms of reliability from using a 5-point Likert scale. Studies have stated that a midpoint position can lower the mean for an instructor that receives a high score and adds no compensation for an instructor who receives a low score. It is said that nothing can be gained from a neutral response. Berk states in 2006, “For rating scales used to measure teaching effectiveness, it is recommended that the midpoint position be omitted and an even-numbered scale be used such as 4 or 6 points.”

In addition, a qualitative section was included to allow the student to give additional feedback about any of the specific categories or give general comments about the course and instructor. As additional schools/colleges add their custom question sets, they may decide to forgo adding additional comment questions as the CORE will already accommodate this option. The committee recommends the following set of 14 questions mandatory across UB:

1. The course was well organized. (Organization)
2. The course was intellectually challenging and stimulating. (Difficulty)
3. The work load in the course was reasonable and appropriate. (Workload)
4. Methods of evaluating student work were fair and appropriate. (Grading)
5. Overall, this was an excellent course. (Overall Course).
6. Please comment on the elements of the course you found particularly effective. (Qualitative)
7. Please comment on course improvements you would suggest. (Qualitative)
8. The instructor clearly presented what students should learn (the expected learning outcomes) for the course. (Breadth of Coverage)
9. The course content (assignments, readings, lectures, etc.) helped me meet the learning expectations set forth by the instructor. (Learning/Value, Assignments/Readings)
10. The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the course. (Enthusiasm)
11. The instructor made students feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class. (Individual Rapport)
12. The instructor presented material clearly. (Clarity, Communication, Learning)
13. Overall, this was an excellent instructor. (Overall Instructor)
14. Please comment on how effective the instructor was in teaching this course. (Qualitative)
Cost
As indicated below, UB’s decentralized approach to administering course evaluations has led to six different course evaluation systems and a recurring annual OTPS costs exceeding $47,218; this does not include costs of staff time. In some departments, preparation of evaluation forms is cumbersome, the questions varied and antiquated, making it near impossible to draw comparisons between departments when analyzing results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Installed</th>
<th>Recurring Annual OTPS Cost</th>
<th>2010 Fall Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Planning</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>ConnectEdu</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$7,986</td>
<td>189,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Medicine</td>
<td>ConnectEdu</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>8,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>Paper Scantron Excel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>In-House System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>SmartEvals - Hosted</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>32,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>InHouse – UBMobileMed</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>26,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>ConnectEdu</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$3,328</td>
<td>6,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy (Clinical)</td>
<td>e*Value - Hosted</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
<td>7,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>IDEA Center</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>ConnectEdu</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$3,630</td>
<td>16,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>SmartEvals - Hosted</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>5,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>ConnectEdu</td>
<td>2010 – Hosted Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$51,444</td>
<td>367,734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vendor Solution
In December 2013, three vendors were invited to campus to present their course evaluation solution to the committee. Campus Labs’ Course Evaluation Software proved to be superior when considering these criteria: usability by faculty and students, automated reporting, system flexibility, and cost.

1. Usability by faculty and students
   a. Mobile-friendly platform allows students to complete evaluations anywhere
   b. Students are currently using similar interface with the Campus Lab Baseline survey tool
   c. Integrates with UB Learns in Blackboard
   d. Provides real-time response rates for faculty
   e. Ability for faculty to add unique questions to evaluations by course and section

2. Report generation
   a. Provides individual summary reports for faculty
   b. Provides segment comparison reports
   c. Automated email to faculty with reports attached (individual course and summary reports)
   d. Faculty summary reports available for administrators/Chairs
   e. Question Over Mean Analysis
   f. Customizable permissions for reporting

3. System flexibility
   a. Ability to customize evaluations to include items on granular level (university, school, department, program, faculty)
b. Ability to customize evaluations to accommodate all types of courses with varying instructor types (TA’s, team taught courses, labs, etc.)
c. Ability to add branching questions, matrix style, single select, and drop-down, quantitative or qualitative

4. Cost and Implementation
   a. Annual License for 2014 is $43,264 + implementation fee $6,490 for a total of $49,754
   b. Implementation provides hours specified for train-the-trainer and IT
   c. Existing Shibboleth authentication
   d. Pending approval by the Faculty Senate, a project timeline can be found in Appendix B.

Appendices
Appendix A: University Wide Course Evaluations Committee Membership
Appendix B: Timeline for Online Course Evaluation Project
Appendix C: Marsh SEEQ and Purdue PICES item sets.
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APPENDIX B: Timeline for University-Wide Course Evaluation Implementation

Course Evaluation System Project Timeline:

- Faculty Senate Executive Committee presentation and request for approval - March 12, 2014
- March – Complete student focus groups and finalize item bank
- April – Enter contract with vendor; begin system setup and testing with Campus Labs in preparation for Pilot in Summer 2014
- May – Testing and departmental training
- June – Pilot during first summer session with College of Arts & Sciences, Graduate School of Education, and School of Nursing.
- July/August: Make any necessary adjustments to system from pilot, campus-wide training and promotion.
- Fall 2014: University wide rollout to include Dental Medicine and SMBS as indicated above.
| LEARNING                                                                                           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| **You find the course intellectually challenging and stimulating.**                             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| **You have learned something which you consider valuable.**                                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| **Your interest in the subject has increased as a consequence of this course.**                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| **You have learned and understood the subject materials in this course.**                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| **ENTHUSIASM                                                                                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Instructor is enthusiastic about teaching the course.**                                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| **Instructor is dynamic and energetic in conducting the course.**                                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| **Instructor enhances presentations with the use of humor.**                                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| **Instructor's style of presentation holds your interest during class.**                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
ORGANIZATION
Instructor's explanations are clear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course materials are well prepared and carefully explained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed objectives agree with those actually taught so you know where the course is going.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor gives lectures that facilitate taking notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUP INTERACTION
Students are encouraged to participate in class discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students are invited to share their ideas and knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students are encouraged to ask questions and are given meaningful answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students are encouraged to express their own ideas and/or question the instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDIVIDUAL RAPPORT
Instructor is friendly towards individual students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor makes students feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructor has a genuine interest in individual students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor is adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BREADTH**

Instructor contrasts the implications of various theories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor presents the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor presents points of view other than his/her own when appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor adequately discusses current developments in field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMINATIONS**

Feedback on examinations/graded materials is valuable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods of evaluating student work are fair and appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examinations/graded materials test course content as emphasized by instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSIGNMENTS**

Required readings /texts are valuable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Readings, homeworks, etc., contribute to appreciation and understanding of the subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERALL
How does this course compare with other courses you have had at Mount Allison?
Very Poor   Poor    Moderate    Good   Very Good   N/A
1  2  3  4  5

How does this instructor compare with other instructors you have had at Mount Allison?
Very Poor   Poor    Moderate    Good   Very Good   N/A
1  2  3  4  5

Do you have any comments to add about your OVERALL EVALUATION of the course especially with respect to items not mentioned in the above questions?

STUDENT AND COURSE CHARACTERISTICS
Please circle your answer to each question.

Course difficulty, relative to other courses, is:
very easy    easy    medium    hard    very hard

Course workload, relative to other courses, is:
very light    light    medium    heavy    very heavy

Course pace, relative to other courses, is:
too slow    slow    about right    fast    too fast

Hours per week required outside of class:
0 to 2 hours    3 to 5 hours    6 to 8 hours    9 to 11 hours    over 11 hours

Your level of interest in the subject prior to this course:
very low    low    medium    high    very high

Your overall grade point average at MtA:
below 2.5    2.5 - 2.9    3.0 - 3.4    3.5 - 3.7    above 3.7

Your expected grade in the course:
A    B    C    D    F

Your reason for taking the course:
Required    distribution credit    elective    personal interest

Your year in school:
1  2  3  4
PICES Item Catalog

Listed on the following pages are the two University-wide core items plus an additional 646 items that departments or instructors may choose from when designing their PICES questionnaires. The core items are pre-printed on all PICES questionnaires. Users do not have to select them. Up to 36 additional items may be selected from the catalog, although specific departments may require the use of particular items. This catalog includes most of the items from the CAFETERIA Item Catalog. For those who want to continue using those items, a conversion chart is available that shows both old and new item numbers.

University Core

C01 Overall, I would rate this course as: Excellent - Good - Fair - Poor - Very Poor.
C02 Overall, I would rate this instructor as: Excellent - Good - Fair - Poor - Very Poor.

Course Structure, Goals, and Objectives

001 I understand what is expected of me in this course.
002 This course has clearly stated objectives.
003 The objectives of this course were clearly explained to me.
004 My instructor makes the objective of each class session clear.
005 It is clear what my instructor considers important.
006 My instructor identifies major or important points in the course.
007 Course objectives are helpful in organizing my studying.
008 The syllabus is an accurate guide to course requirements.
009 The course objectives allow me to know when I am making progress.
010 I am able to set and achieve some of my own goals.
011 I have an opportunity to help determine course objectives.
012 The objectives of this course are appropriate.
013 Announced course objectives agree with what is taught.
014 The stated goals of this course are consistently pursued.
015 Course objectives represent outcomes which I can achieve in the time allotted.
016 Lectures are consistent with the subject matter in the course outline.
017 Lecture information is highly relevant to course objectives.
018 The course content is consistent with my prior expectations.
019 The content of this course is consistent with the objectives of the course.
020 Required course activities are consistent with course objectives.
021 Course requirements are clear.
022 I understand the course requirements and grading scale.
023 Course procedures and deadlines are clearly explained.

Teaching/Learning of Relationships and Concepts

024 My instructor emphasizes relationships between and among topics.
025 Relationships among course topics are clearly explained.
026 My instructor explains new ideas by relating them to familiar concepts.
027 My instructor emphasizes conceptual understanding of material.
028 This course builds understanding of concepts and principles.
029 Concepts are presented in a manner that helps me learn.
030 My instructor effectively blends facts with theory.
031 My instructor clarifies topics with developments in other fields.
032 My instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations.
033 Important points are clarified with good examples.
034 My instructor makes good use of analogies, illustrations, and/or case studies.
035 My instructor’s examples/demonstrations are clear and concise.
036 My instructor presents sufficient and relevant examples.
037 My instructor indicates relationship of course content to recent developments.
038 My instructor demonstrates how to apply concepts and methodologies.
039 My instructor helps me apply theory to solve problems.
040 Practical applications of course material are discussed.
041 Course projects increase my understanding of concepts and principles.

Relevance of Content

042 This course material is pertinent to my professional training.
043 This course gives me skills and techniques directly applicable to my career.
044 My instructor attempts to relate my present learning to work in my future profession.
045 This course is worthwhile in terms of my career objectives.
046 This course contributes significantly to my professional growth.
047 I developed skills needed by professionals in my field.
048 I can apply the learning in this class to work in my future profession.
049 This course directly contributes to my vocational preparation.
050 My instructor presents an appropriate amount of technical information.
051 My instructor demonstrates the importance and significance of the subject matter.
052 My instructor makes course material relevant to me.
053 The content of this course is relevant to my needs.
054 The relationship of this course to my education is apparent.
055 I can apply information/skills learned in this course.
056 This course gives me an excellent background for further study.
057 This course is of practical benefit to me as a student.
058 The practical application of subject matter is apparent.
059 This course is up-to-date with developments in the field.
060 This course relates course materials to real life situations.
061 My instructor incorporates current developments in the field.
062 This course includes adequate information on career opportunity.
063 This course is a valid requirement for my major.

Organization and Clarity of Presentation

064 My instructor displays a clear understanding of course topics.
065 My instructor has an extensive knowledge of this field.
066 My instructor is knowledgeable about the course topic.
067 My instructor is knowledgeable about origins of concepts and ideas.
068 Course topics are dealt with in sufficient depth.
069 My instructor makes use of alternative explanations when needed.
070 My instructor responds when I indicate that I fail to comprehend.
071 My instructor recognizes when some students fail to comprehend.
072 My instructor checks on students’ understanding during presentations.
073 My instructor explains difficult material clearly.
074 My instructor is able to simplify difficult materials.
075 Difficult concepts are explained in a helpful way.
135 Field trips offer insights that lectures or readings cannot.
133 An appropriate number of outside lecturers are used.
131 Sufficient time is allowed for notetaking and writing.
127 Developing the term project is a good learning experience.
125 This course emphasizes problem-solving.
124 In this course, many methods are used to involve me in learning.
121 The teaching strategy used in this course is appropriate.
120 The teaching methods used in this course enable me to learn.

### Instructional Methods

119 Teaching methods used in this course are well chosen.
120 The teaching methods used in this course enable me to learn.
121 The teaching strategy used in this course is appropriate.
122 The format of this course is appropriate to course purposes.
123 My instructor uses various activities that involve me in learning.
124 In this course, many methods are used to involve me in learning.
125 This course emphasizes problem-solving.
126 This course includes a sufficient number of practical exercises.
127 Developing the term project is a good learning experience.
128 Lecture information is adequately supplemented by other work.
129 Class lectures contain information not covered in the textbook.
130 This course strikes a good balance between reading, discussion, and writing.
131 Sufficient time is allowed for notetaking.
132 The guest speakers contribute significantly to this course.
133 An appropriate number of outside lecturers are used.
134 The speakers who addressed us communicated effectively.
135 Field trips offer insights that lectures or readings cannot.
136 Field trips, relative to course objectives, are well planned.
137 Student presentations significantly contribute to this course.
138 Student presentations in class are interesting/stimulating.
139 Collaborative work is a valuable part of this course.
140 My instructor encourages group work for writing projects.
141 The course gives me the opportunity to communicate electronically.
142 My instructor encourages students to use the writing lab.

### Instructional Technology

171 Instructional technology is well coordinated with course materials.
172 My instructor's use of technology increases my overall learning in this course.
173 My instructor uses technology in ways that helped my learning of concepts and principles.
174 My instructor makes effective use of classroom technology.
175 My instructor uses Internet technology effectively.
176 My instructor uses e-mail effectively.
177 My instructor uses multi-media presentations effectively.
178 My instructor uses computer exercises effectively.
179 Computer presentations are a valuable part of this class.
180 Computer presentations are clear and easily understood.
181 Computer-assisted instruction increases my understanding of course content.
182 Computer assignments are a valuable part of this course.
238 I am given sufficient creative freedom in writing papers and reports.
239 My instructor explains the purpose of writing assignments.
240 My instructor provides sufficient tests or assignments.
241 Directions for course assignments are clear and specific.
242 My instructor returns papers quickly enough to benefit me.
243 Course assignments are returned quickly enough to benefit me.
244 Enough time is allotted for programming projects.
245 The documentation for computer assignments is clearly written.
246 Programming projects clarify material presented in class.
247 My instructor explains policies for late assignments.

Providing Help as Needed

248 Everything possible is provided to help me learn.
249 My instructor helps me understand the material.
250 My instructor is friendly and accessible.
251 My instructor is actively helpful when students have problems.
252 My instructor provides adequate opportunity for individual assistance.
253 My instructor provides individual assistance when asked.
254 Conferences with my instructor have been valuable to me.
255 My instructor is readily available for consultation.
256 My instructor is reasonably available for consultation.
257 My instructor is available during office hours.
258 My instructor has enough office hours for individual conferences.
259 My instructor is available outside of class for extra help.
260 Students are encouraged to see the instructor if they are having difficulty.
261 My instructor gives advice on how to study for the course.
262 My instructor suggests references for added reading/research.

Adapting to Individual Differences

263 This course shows a sensitivity to individual interests/abilities.
264 My instructor adjusts to fit individual abilities and interests.
265 My instructor displays a personal interest in students and their learning.
266 The flexibility of this course helps all kinds of students learn.
267 My instructor tailors this course to help many kinds of students.
268 The design of this course lets me learn at my own pace.
269 Students proceed at their own pace in this course.
270 My instructor changes approaches when the occasion demands it.

Providing Feedback to Students

271 My instructor regularly checks and rewards progress in learning.
272 My instructor lets me know how well I am doing in this course.
273 My instructor recognizes and rewards success in this course.
274 My instructor gives appropriate/timely feedback on each student’s performance.
275 My instructor provides useful feedback throughout the semester.
276 Adequate feedback is provided to guide my progress in this course.
277 My instructor can gauge what I know and what I should do next.
278 My instructor suggests specific ways I can improve.
279 My instructor’s explanations and comments are always helpful.
280 My instructor comments usefully on my written work.
281 My instructor is sensitive to students’ responses when giving critiques.
282 Comments on my papers help me improve my writing.
283 Meaningful feedback on tests and other work is provided.
284 I receive appropriate and timely feedback on exams and projects.
337 I am free to express and explain my own views in class.

336 My instructor takes my views and comments seriously.

335 Students volunteer knowledge, opinions, or personal experience in class.

334 Each student is encouraged to contribute to class learning.

333 A student/teacher partnership in learning is encouraged.

332 My instructor creates an atmosphere where ideas can be exchanged freely and easily.

331 The climate of this class is conducive to learning.

330 Cheating is a problem on exams in this course.

329 Appropriate steps are taken to prevent cheating.

328 The contract grading method is used appropriately in this course.

327 I can score reasonably well on exams by just cramming.

326 My instructor returns papers/exams quickly enough to benefit me.

325 My instructor is prompt in returning tests and papers.

324 My instructor uses a variety of methods to evaluate student progress on course objectives.

323 My instructor evaluates often and provides help where needed.

322 My work is evaluated in ways that are helpful to my learning.

321 My instructor gives quizzes that accurately assess what I learned in this class.

320 My final grade will accurately reflect my overall performance.

319 My papers are graded fairly.

318 The grading system in this course allows me to calculate my grade at any time.

317 I understand the methods of evaluation used to grade my work.

316 Exams are announced ahead of time and are held as scheduled.

315 The grading system was clearly explained.

314 Grades are fair.

313 My instructor collects enough evidence for valid grading.

312 Grades are based on a fair weighting of the required course activities.

311 My instructor gives exams which accurately reflect the course material.

310 Exams cover material on which I expect to be tested.

309 Grading is clear and tied to key learning objectives.

308 My instructor has a realistic definition of good performance.

307 I know how I stand relative to others in the class on exams.

306 Exams require a synthesis of various parts of the course.

305 Exams require me to do more than recall facts.

304 Exams are free from ambiguity.

303 Exams are creative and require original thought.

302 Exams test my ability to apply knowledge in new situations.

301 Exams cover a reasonable amount of material.

300 Exams are used to help me find my strengths and weaknesses.

299 Exams are coordinated with major course objectives.

298 Exams stress important points of the lectures/text.

297 Adequate time is allowed for exams.

296 Exams are fair.

295 Exams cover an amount of material.

294 Exams are fair and impartial when dealing with students.

293 Exams stress my ability to apply knowledge in new situations.

292 Exams have instructional value.

291 My instructor gives quizzes that accurately assess what I learned in this class.

290 My instructor gives exams which accurately reflect the course material.

289 Exams accurately assess what I have learned in this course.

288 My instructor’s responses to assignments are beneficial to me.

287 Feedback on exams indicates clearly my standing in the course.

286 Test items are adequately explained after an exam.

285 Evaluation of my work is expressed in a constructive manner.

284 Course material is presented enthusiastically.

283 I believe my instructor wants everyone to succeed in this course.

282 My instructor seems concerned that students learn.

281 My instructor respects divergent viewpoints.

280 My instructor respects divergent thinking.

279 Differing viewpoints and dialogue are encouraged in class.

278 My instructor deals fairly and impartially with me.

277 My instructor is open to differences in perspective.

276 My instructor respects divergent viewpoints.

275 My instructor encourages divergent thinking.

274 My instructor maintains a positive rapport with the class.

273 My instructor relates to me as an individual.

272 My instructor has a good working relationship with students.

271 I feel that I am an important member of this class.

270 My instructor gives exams which accurately reflect the course.

269 My instructor gives quizzes that accurately assess what I learned in this class.

268 The class mixture of Fr., So., Jr., Sr., or Grad is appropriate.

267 I have easy access to equipment/tools required in this course.

266 The background is sufficient to enable me to use course material.

265 The facilities for this course are excellent.

264 The size of this class is appropriate to course objectives.

263 The workload is appropriate for the goals of this course.

262 The course material is presented enthusiastically.

261 I believe my instructor wants everyone to succeed in this course.

260 My instructor seems concerned that students learn.

259 My instructor respects divergent viewpoints.

258 My instructor encourages divergent thinking.

257 Differing viewpoints and dialogue are encouraged in class.

256 My instructor deals fairly and impartially with me.

255 My instructor is open to differences in perspective.

254 My instructor respects divergent viewpoints.

253 My instructor encourages divergent thinking.

252 My instructor maintains a positive rapport with the class.

251 My instructor relates to me as an individual.

250 My instructor has a good working relationship with students.

249 I feel that I am an important member of this class.

248 My instructor gives exams which accurately reflect the course.

247 My instructor gives quizzes that accurately assess what I learned in this class.

246 The class mixture of Fr., So., Jr., Sr., or Grad is appropriate.

245 My instructor respects divergent viewpoints.

244 My instructor encourages divergent thinking.

243 My instructor maintains a positive rapport with the class.

242 My instructor relates to me as an individual.

241 My instructor has a good working relationship with students.

240 I feel that I am an important member of this class.

239 My instructor gives exams which accurately reflect the course.

238 When I have a question or comment I know it will be respected.

237 I am free to express and explain my own views in class.

236 My instructor respects constructive criticism.

235 I feel free to challenge my instructor’s ideas in class.

234 My instructor creates an environment for mutual respect.

233 My instructor treats all students with respect.

232 My instructor shows respect for diverse groups of people.

231 My instructor shows respect for the various points of view represented in this class.

230 My instructor is concerned with whether I learn course content.

229 My instructor is interested in me as a person as well as a student.

228 My instructor is a good classroom leader.

227 This class provides a meaningful learning experience.

226 Overall, the instruction is effective.

225 Overall, this course is among the best I have taken.
In this course, I always felt challenged and motivated to learn.

My instructor challenges me to think.

I have been motivated to do work beyond the minimum requirements.

Successful performance in this course requires that I understand the material.

My instructor provides many challenging new viewpoints.

This course develops the creative ability of students.

This course helps me understand ways audiences affect my writing.

I gained experience writing for specific audiences and purposes.

I have reconsidered some former attitudes about women's issues.

This course improves my writing skills.

This course helps me clarify my ideas through writing.

This course helps me support a main idea (thesis, focus).

I have acquired skills in working with others as member of a team.

I have reconsidered many of my former attitudes.

I have developed awareness of societal problems in this course.

Broadening Student Outlook/Personal and Social Growth

Overall, this instructor is among the best teachers I have known.

Student Participation and Effort

Student Outcomes

Laboratory Courses
Clinical Courses

533 The amount of clinical experience offered is adequate.
534 An adequate amount of observation and supervision is provided.
535 My instructor clearly demonstrates the clinical techniques I am expected to develop.
536 Both appropriate and inappropriate clinical behaviors are clearly identified.
537 My instructor helps me correct problems in my clinical technique.
538 My instructor explains the underlying rationale for particular techniques.
539 My instructor explains each step carefully when discussing processes/techniques.
540 The clinic time is adequate to perform the required procedures.
541 Client availability is adequate to achieve course objectives.
542 Clinical cases provide an adequate breadth of experience.
543 Clinical experiences illustrate guidelines for ethical and professional behavior.
544 Prior course work adequately prepared me to handle clinical tasks.
545 I have responsibility for patients commensurate with my abilities.
546 I have improved my ability to present and discuss case problems effectively and concisely.
547 Clinic/field projects are appropriate to the level of the course.
548 Performance exams allow me to sufficiently demonstrate my clinical competencies.
549 Prescribed criteria are used in evaluating my performance.
550 The amount of field experience is adequate.

Performing and Studio Arts Courses

551 My field experience is well coordinated with my course work.
552 I receive adequate supervision at the field site.
553 University and field site personnel work well together.
554 Group meetings are helpful in increasing my knowledge and skills.
555 I have good rapport with my clinical instructor.

Distance Learning Courses

556 This course has appropriate balance between artistic philosophy and craft.
557 The performance/art projects are extremely valuable.
558 The performance/art projects are appropriate to the level of the course.
559 I was exposed to a variety of performance/art techniques.
560 My instructor values my creativity and/or originality.
561 My instructor recognizes students’ problems in performing difficult material.
562 My instructor demonstrates his/her ability as an artist.
563 The conductor helps me feel confident in performing music new to me.
564 Directions given by the conductor in rehearsal are presented clearly.
565 My instructor’s demonstrations of techniques are clear and concise.
566 My instructor has a strong influence upon my work.
567 My instructor is instrumental in raising my artistic values.
568 My individual artistic gifts have developed because of this course.
569 My instructor makes me think about different ways to approach subjects.
570 Performance requirements represent outcomes achievable in the time allotted.
571 Performances provide an opportunity to demonstrate my learning.
572 Rehearsal experiences will be helpful to me in my future profession.
573 Rehearsal time is used effectively.
574 My instructor is able to diagnose technical problems.
575 My instructor is sensitive to students when giving critiques.
576 Evaluations of my performance/artistic products are constructive.
577 The practice room is well equipped.
578 I have sufficient opportunity to use practice room facilities.

Instructional materials are readily available to distant students.
Communication of information (course calendars, fliers) is timely.
Delivery of initial course materials is timely.
Delivery of course materials is timely.
Delivery of exams is timely.
My instructor promptly returns graded assignments to distant students.
Company registration process is efficient.
Registration process is convenient.

Instructor-Supplied Items

Instructor-supplied item 1
Instructor-supplied item 2
Instructor-supplied item 3
Instructor-supplied item 4
Instructor-supplied item 5
Instructor-supplied item 6
Instructor-supplied item 7
Instructor-supplied item 8
Instructor-supplied item 9
Instructor-supplied item 10
Instructor-supplied item 11
Instructor-supplied item 12
Instructor-supplied item 13
Instructor-supplied item 14
Instructor-supplied item 15
Instructor-supplied item 16
Instructor-supplied item 17
Instructor-supplied item 18
Instructor-supplied item 19
Instructor-supplied item 20
Instructor-supplied item 21
Instructor-supplied item 22
Instructor-supplied item 23
Instructor-supplied item 24
Instructor-supplied item 25

Service Learning Courses

Learning was more meaningful in this class than other classes I have taken.
I took more responsibility for my learning in this class than I typically do in other classes.
The community service was relevant to the academic course materials and content.
I was more motivated to learn in this class than in other classes I have taken.
I felt my contributions were appreciated by the community partner.
The instructor should use the community partner we worked with for future service-learning projects.
The instructor's expectations for the service-learning project were clear to me.
The community partner's expectations for the service-learning project were clear to me.
In this class I felt I made a worthwhile contribution to the community.
This class made me realize that it is very important that I help others throughout my lifetime.
I think all students should take a service-learning class while a student here at Purdue.
My instructor did a good job of monitoring the projects that students were doing in the community.
My instructor helped me work through difficulties I encountered while doing community service.
Sharing reflections helped me to clarify what I was learning in this class.
This service-learning course has made me more sensitive to diverse populations than ever before.
This service-learning course has increased my knowledge about the needs of diverse populations.
Working with diverse populations in this course expanded my learning of the course content.