

Information on the Proposed Course Evaluation Form

Why was a committee appointed to review and revise the current form?

- Faculty attending sessions at the Center for Teaching Excellence in Fall 2006 and participants in the Academic Leadership Workshop in May 2007 expressed dissatisfaction with the current form. This led to the Committee's appointment by the Faculty Senate to review and revise the form.
- The Committee began its work in the Fall 2007 and proceeded with the following three goals in mind: (1) draft a form that would be appropriate for all forms of teaching; (2) make sure that items on the form followed guidelines for survey design; (3) base the construction of the form on current research on the most important dimensions of teaching that students are capable of assessing.

What is wrong with the current form?

- Several rating items on the current form privilege lecture style teaching and disadvantage performance classes, service learning pedagogies, discussion, etc.
- Current form is seen as an impediment to increasing academic rigor
- Current form is seen as an impediment to teaching innovation and experimentation
- Several items on current form fail criteria for survey construction (Berk, 2006)
- Current form fails to address important dimensions of teaching that are associated with student learning (Feldman, 2007)

How does the proposed form address these concerns?

- Proposed form is pedagogically neutral
- Proposed form has items that address all of the top six dimensions of effective teaching associated with student learning (Feldman, 2007)
- All items meet criteria for survey construction (Berk, 2006)
- Includes an item related to academic rigor
- Includes a demographic item regarding the student's initial interest in taking the course as one perspective for interpreting the data
- Allows instructors or departments to add two additional items of their own choosing

How has the proposed form been tested?

Versions of the form were piloted 3 times (Fall 2007, Spring 2008, and Fall 2008) in 63 classes (23 lower division/27 upper division/13 grad) taught by 37 different instructors in all 6 Schools and Colleges, including 7 faculty who were affiliated with the Committee with a total return of 1060 forms.

- Faculty piloters not on the Committee were surveyed: 63% preferred the proposed form, 31% expressed no preference, and only 6 % preferred the current form.
- Students who used both the proposed form and the current form were asked to make a comparison of the two forms: 60% preferred the proposed form, 26% expressed no preference, and only 14 % preferred the current form.
- Students who preferred the proposed form most frequently stated that the questions had better content and allowed them to better express their opinions.

Statistical analysis showed:

- The proposed pedagogically-neutral form still captures the instructional dimensions that are more explicit on the current form (such as organization and clarity).
- The proposed form has a high degree of internal consistency.

What happens next?

On February 26, 2009 the Faculty Senate endorsed the proposed form and recommended implementation in Fall 2009. At the end of March there will be a vote by tenured and tenure-track faculty on whether or not to recommend the adoption of the new form in Fall 2009.

I have more questions about this proposed form; where can I get more information?

Copies of the current and proposed forms, the Committee's full report, an executive summary and a podcast from the Fall 2008 listening sessions can be found at <http://www.lmu.edu/Page47426.aspx>. The current membership of the Committee is: James Roe (chair), Paul Humphreys, Jennifer Pate, Kala Seal, with Jackie Dewar and Margaret Kasimatis serving as Resource Persons to the Committee. Other faculty who have served on the committee are: Sonny Espinosa, Linda Leon and Michael Miranda.