BGSU®

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

University-wide Evaluation of Teaching and Learning
Instrumentation Construction Work Group Final Report
Spring 2016

Executive Summary

Faculty Senate and Academic Affairs were charged with collaborating to explore the development and utilization of a student evaluation of teaching and learning at BGSU that includes a set of common University questions and provides flexibility for colleges and departments to add specific questions.

A Working Group engaged in a yearlong process to collect existing course evaluations currently in use at BGSU, solicit faculty and student feedback in a variety of ways (open forums, surveys, etc.), and through the collection and analysis of data.

Action Steps:
- Collected more than 60 course, program/department and collect course evaluation instruments currently in use.
- Conducted a content analysis of items currently in use on course evaluations.
- Shared content analysis at two open forums for faculty and students.
- Developed a survey containing 33 course evaluation statements that was sent to faculty, including part-time, and graduate students (Survey 1).
- Reduced number of course evaluation statements for the pilot (fall 2016) using data obtained from the survey (Survey 1).
- Shared potential pilot statements at open forums for faculty and students.
- Administered the pilot (fall 2016) to 69 faculty participants who taught 2,862 students (may be duplicated if students were enrolled in multiple sections) in 117 course sections (Survey 2).
- Collected and analyzed pilot data to identify final items for the student evaluation of teaching and learning.

Final Items for the Student Evaluation of Teaching and Learning at BGSU:
1. The instructor clearly explains course objectives and requirements.
2. The instructor sets high standards for learning.
3. The instructor offers helpful feedback throughout the semester
4. The instructor provides opportunities and/or information to help students succeed (for example, tutoring resources, office hours, mentoring, research projects, etc.)
5. The instructor encourages student participation (for example, by inviting questions, having discussions, asking students to express their opinions, or other activities)
6. The instructor creates an environment of respect.

Additionally, the process has begun to investigate systems to aggregate and distribute course evaluations electronically.

Working Group Members:
- Rachelle Hippler, Faculty Senate Chair (Co-Chair)
- Julie Matuga, Associate Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness (Co-Chair)
- I-Fen Lin, BGSU-Faculty Association Representative
- Hannah Stanberry, Undergraduate Student Representative (Spring 2016 Only)
- Soha Youssef, Graduate Student Representative (Spring 2016 Only)
- Man Zhang, Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Affairs Representative
- Matthew Lavery, Assistant Professor, School of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Policy (Started Fall 2016)
- Jessica Turos, Associate Director, Office of Academic Assessment (Started Fall 2016)

BGSU.

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

University-wide Evaluation of Teaching and Learning
Instrumentation Construction Work Group Final Report
Spring 2016

Charge

Faculty Senate and Academic Affairs were charged with collaborating to explore the development and utilization of a student evaluation of teaching and learning at BGSU that includes a set of common University questions and provides flexibility for colleges and departments to add specific questions.

Method

A Working Group, with representation from Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA), BGSU-Faculty Association (FA), Academic Affairs, graduate and undergraduate students, met in Spring 2016 and finalized a working plan. They requested college, department, and school course evaluations from A-Deans and received more than 60 evaluation instruments with representation from every college. The Working Group performed a content analysis of the questions from the collected evaluation instruments and categorized the questions by categories and themes.

Working Group Members:
- Rachelle Hippler, Faculty Senate Chair (Co-Chair)
- Julie Matuga, Associate Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness (Co-Chair)
- I-Fen Lin, BGSU-Faculty Association Representative
- Hannah Stanberry, Undergraduate Student Representative (Spring 2016 Only)
- Soha Youssef, Graduate Student Representative (Spring 2016 Only)
- Man Zhang, Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Affairs Representative
- Matthew Lavery, Assistant Professor, School of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Policy (Started Fall 2016)
- Jessica Turos, Associate Director, Office of Academic Assessment (Started Fall 2016)

Eight categories were derived from an analysis of all questions on course evaluations analyzed: feedback and assessment; instructor availability; engagement in learning and connections; instructor effectiveness and environment; instructor communication; assignments; expectations; and course organization and clarity. Duplicative questions, questions that were content specific, and those questions that committee members felt were not pertinent to teaching were eliminated. A total of 33 questions representative of the eight categories remained.

Survey 1

A survey to evaluate the helpfulness in terms of teaching of the identified statements was created and distributed to 843 full-time faculty at BGSU. The survey contained 33 questions, from pre-existing course evaluations used at BGSU, by category and asked faculty to identifying which questions they felt would improve teaching the most (1=Not Helpful at All; 5=Extremely Helpful). The survey also asked participants to rank order the eight categories as to which they felt was most helpful to least helpful and the data obtained were used to generate an overall ranking for each category.

An announcement was made at Faculty Senate (October 4, 2016) and was placed in Campus Update to notify faculty that the survey was being deployed. The survey was sent on Monday, October 17, 2016 and reminders were sent periodically (October 19th, 24th and 26th) until the survey closed on Friday, October 29, 2016 at midnight. A total of 330 faculty responded to the survey (response rate 39%) and 307 faculty completed the survey (completion rate 36%). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations were calculated for each question. Correlations were conducted for statements within each category (correlations for each category were found to be statistically significant at the .01 level).

Reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) for the survey was .96. See Appendix A for a data summary of Survey 1.

Review of Survey 1 Data

The Working Group met on November 1, 2016 to review the data and discuss possible statements for discussion and consideration for the pilot. The group reviewed all feedback sent to group members. The Working Group discussed statements and made adjustments to wording, for example, they unpacked double-barreled questions. They also examined questions from various perspectives including career (undergraduate and graduate), domain/subject area (the arts, sciences, etc.), course format (online and face-to-face), and instructional method (lecture, studio, labs, etc.). After the Working Group identified potential questions, they examined them in their totality for goodness of fit with the goal of the project, represented highly ranked questions/categories, and were associated with expectations for teaching outlined in the collective bargaining agreement (Article 25, Section 2.4.2; Article 9, Section 2.6) and the four pillars to support student success at BGSU.

Below are the six draft statements that emerged from Survey 1 to be included in the pilot.

Course Expectations
1.   **Clearly explains course objectives and requirements. (Q28, #17)**
2.   **Sets high standards for student learning (Q26, #10)**

Feedback and Assessment
1.   **Offers helpful feedback throughout the semester. (Q1, #4)**

Support for Student Success
1.   **Provides opportunities and/or information to help students succeed (for example, tutoring resources, office hours, mentoring, research projects, etc.) (Derived from Q6, #8; Q20, #12)**

Engagement
1.   **Encourages student participation by inviting questions. (Q8, #2)**

Teaching/Subject Matter Expertise/Faculty Communication
1.   **Communicates the subject matter effectively. (Q14, #1)**

The Working Group held open forums in November 2016 for faculty to review the data and the draft statements. Based on feedback received an additional statement, "The instructor creates an environment of respect." was added to the pilot evaluation. The Working Group met on December 2, 2016 to finalize the questions for the pilot.

Survey 2: University-Wide Course Evaluation Pilot

On November 17, 2016, 190 faculty were emailed who on Survey 1 indicated interest in participating in the December pilot of the questions for the University-wide evaluation of teaching and learning. A total of 69 faculty teaching 117 sections committed to participating in the pilot. The pilot course evaluations were sent to all students in the participating 117 sections (2,862) on December 5, 2016, with reminder emails sent on December 8th, 13th, 15th, and 16th. The pilot University-wide course evaluation closed on December 16, 2016. It included the seven statements identified from the Survey 1 and campus forums. After each statement, there was an opportunity for students to share additional comments/feedback. There also were two questions to gain student insight: "From a student's perspective were these items easy to understand?" and "Did you have difficulty rating your instructor on any of the items?", with an opportunity for students to indicate why or why not. Students were reminded that the pilot course

evaluation did not replace the regular course evaluations they receive from their instructors and colleges. A total of 1,186 students participated in the pilot for a response rate of 41%.

Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations were calculated for each question. Inter-item correlations were conducted for the statements. Reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) for the survey was .92. See Appendix B for a summary of the data by question.

Final Questions

Feedback from faculty and students (campus forums, qualitative items on the course evaluation pilot, and Working Group discussions) raised concern about one item having a negative impact on the evaluation of non-native English speaking faculty: "The instructor communicates the subject matter effectively." Furthermore, the removal of this item was support by the inter-item correlations derived from the pilot between "The instructor communicates the subject matter effectively." and "The instructor clearly explains course objectives and requirement." (.74) and "The instructor offers helpful feedback throughout the semester." (.73). These also happened to be the highest inter-item correlations amongst all of the items. After committee discussion of these factors, the Working Group was unanimous in recommending the removal of this item ("The instructor communicates the subject matter effectively."). By removing this item from the overall instrument, the overall reliability remained considerably high at for the survey was .91 (Cronbach's Alpha).

University-Wide Course Evaluation Items:
1. The instructor clearly explains course objectives and requirements.
2. The instructor sets high standards for learning.
3. The instructor offers helpful feedback throughout the semester
4. The instructor provides opportunities and/or information to help students succeed (for example, tutoring resources, office hours, mentoring, research projects, etc.)
5. The instructor encourages student participation (for example, by inviting questions, having discussions, asking students to express their opinions, or other activities)
6. The instructor creates an environment of respect.

Next Steps

An Implementation Phase, which will include various committees, will move forward with the investigation of potential course evaluation software options. The goal of the course evaluation software is to give faculty their data back quickly, integrate with Canvas, be easy for students to use, provide some measure of storage for faculty course evaluation information, and offer aggregated data at different levels of the institution that will guide intuitional professional development activities.

Please note. If have any feedback about this report, please contact Rachelle Hippler, Faculty Senate Chair at rkristo@bgsu.edu or Julie Matuga, Associate Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness at jmatuga@bgsu.edu

BGSU.

Appendix A: Survey 1 Data Summary

Category 1: Feedback & Assessment (n=317)

The instructor…
Q1. Provides clear, helpful feedback throughout the semester (#4[1])
Q2. Delivers feedback in a timely manner
Q3. Welcomes questions (#3)
Q4. Is fair and conscientious in grading and testing

Question	Not Helpful at All – 1	2	3	4	Extremely Helpful – 5	$\overline{X}$	SD
Q1.	**21**	**10**	**35**	**108**	**143**	**4.08**	**1.13**
Q2.	26	29	61	93	108	3.72	1.25
Q3.	**16**	**10**	**35**	**111**	**145**	**4.13**	**1.07**
Q4.	40	24	50	92	111	3.66	1.36

Question	Q1.	Q2.	Q3.	Q4.
Q1.				
Q2.	.55			
Q3.	**.61**	.56		
Q4.	.49	.47	.53	

Category 2: Instructor Availability (n=316)

The instructor…
Q5. Is available for students outside of class
Q6. Is accessible and approachable (#8)
Q7. Is readily available for consultations with students

Question	Not Helpful at All – 1	2	3	4	Extremely Helpful – 5	$\overline{X}$	SD
Q5.	31	32	71	90	92	3.57	1.27
Q6.	**22**	**15**	**48**	**91**	**140**	**3.99**	**1.19**
Q7.	29	41	64	107	75	3.50	1.24

Question	Q5.	Q6.	Q7.
Q5.			
Q6.	.56		
Q7.	.55	.53	

The bolded items indicate the rank order of the means. See page 10.

Category 3: Engagement in Learning & Connections (n=313)

The instructor…
Q8. Encourages student participation by welcoming questions and discussion (#2)
Q9. Is open to student viewpoints
Q10. Encourages students to think independently (#9)
Q11. Helps student relate new knowledge and skills to other courses and learning experiences

Question	Not Helpful at All – 1	2	3	4	Extremely Helpful – 5	$\bar{X}$	SD
Q8.	**16**	**3**	**42**	**107**	**145**	**4.16**	**1.04**
Q9.	23	23	59	106	102	3.77	1.19
Q10.	**25**	**10**	**47**	**91**	**140**	**3.99**	**1.20**
Q11.	25	19	65	95	109	3.78	1.21

Question	Q8.	Q9.	Q10.	Q11.
Q8.				
Q9.	.60			
Q10.	**.56**	.64		
Q11.	.52	.50	.67	

Category 4: Instructor Effectiveness & Environment (n=312)

The instructor…
Q12. Applies tools and resources to enhance student learning in this class
Q13. Uses effective teaching methods
Q14. Communicates the subject matter effectively and explains new concepts clearly (#1)
Q15. Delivers course content in ways that stimulated student interest/enthusiasm in the subject
Q16. Creates opportunities for students to contribute through class activities and participation (#13)

Question	Not Helpful at All – 1	2	3	4	Extremely Helpful – 5	$\bar{X}$	SD
Q12.	56	40	81	86	49	3.10	1.32
Q13.	53	25	63	90	81	3.39	1.40
Q14.	**17**	**7**	**37**	**95**	**156**	**4.17**	**1.08**
Q15.	24	21	66	110	91	3.71	1.18
Q16.	**16**	**18**	**53**	**118**	**107**	**3.90**	**1.10**

Question	Q12.	Q13.	Q14.	Q15.	Q16.
Q12.					
Q13.	.57				
Q14.	.40	.44			
Q15.	.43	.52	.53		
Q16.	.45	.46	**.45**	.61	

Category 5: Instructor Communication (n=312)

The instructor…
Q17. Explains materials clearly (#6)
Q18. Respects students (#11)
Q19. Maintains good rapport with students
Q20. Seems genuinely concerned about students (#12)
Q21. Acts in a professional manner (#16)

Question	Not Helpful at All – 1	2	3	4	Extremely Helpful – 5	$\overline{X}$	SD
Q17.	**20**	**11**	**41**	**101**	**139**	**4.05**	**1.14**
Q18.	**20**	**16**	**53**	**86**	**137**	**3.97**	**1.18**
Q19.	24	22	84	104	78	3.61	1.16
Q20.	**19**	**14**	**55**	**105**	**119**	**3.93**	**1.34**
Q21.	**21**	**27**	**54**	**83**	**127**	**3.86**	**1.23**

Question	Q17.	Q18.	Q19.	Q20.	Q21.
Q17.					
Q18.	**.67**				
Q19.	.48	.64			
Q20.	**.45**	**.59**	.67		
Q21.	.54	.60	.54	.51	

Category 6: Assignments (n=308)

The instructor…
Q22. Creates examinations/assignments that help student learn
Q23. Designs course materials and assignments that are effective in achieving course goals
Q24. Develops assignments (including tests) that reflect the content and learning objectives of the course
Q25. Gives challenging and stimulating assignments

Question	Not Helpful at All – 1	2	3	4	Extremely Helpful – 5	$\overline{X}$	SD
Q22.	28	21	75	102	82	3.61	1.21
Q23.	30	24	58	95	101	3.69	1.27
Q24.	25	22	55	99	107	3.78	1.23
Q25.	27	15	57	111	98	3.77	1.20

Question	Q22.	Q23.	Q24.	Q25.
Q22.				
Q23.	.64			
Q24.	.60	.70		
Q25.	.61	.63	.56	

Category 7: Expectations (n=308)

The instructor…
Q26. Sets high standards for student learning (#10)
Q27. Expects student to be engaged learners (#14)
Q28. Clearly explains course objectives and requirements in the syllabus (#17)
Q29. Clarifies course expectations appropriately

Question	Not Helpful at All – 1	2	3	4	Extremely Helpful – 5	$\bar{X}$	SD
Q26.	**18**	**8**	**53**	**114**	**115**	**3.97**	**1.09**
Q27.	**25**	**18**	**38**	**110**	**117**	**3.90**	**1.21**
Q28.	**23**	**14**	**56**	**108**	**107**	**3.85**	**1.17**
Q29.	24	19	66	101	98	3.75	1.19

Question	Q26.	Q27.	Q28.	Q29.
Q26.				
Q27.	**.70**			
Q28.	**.52**	**.52**		
Q29.	.54	.57	.64	

Category 8: Course Organization & Clarity (n=307)

The instructor…
Q30. Is well prepared for each class (#5)
Q31. Makes good use of class time (#15)
Q32. Presents material in an organized manner (#7)
Q33. Conducts class regularly and as scheduled

Question	Not Helpful at All – 1	2	3	4	Extremely Helpful – 5	$\bar{X}$	SD
Q30.	**17**	**14**	**27**	**124**	**125**	**4.06**	**1.08**
Q31.	**23**	**15**	**51**	**102**	**116**	**3.89**	**1.19**
Q32.	**20**	**9**	**37**	**113**	**128**	**4.04**	**1.12**
Q33.	45	28	47	71	116	3.60	1.44

Question	Q30.	Q31.	Q32.	Q33.
Q30.				
Q31.	**.79**			
Q32.	**.60**	**.61**		
Q33.	.57	.52	.48	

BGSU®
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

Category Rankings

Category 1: Feedback & Assessment (#3)

Ranking	Count	Percentage
1	42	12.8
2	42	12.8
3	**57**	**17.3**
4	**49**	**14.9**
5	40	12.2
6	39	11.9
7	21	6.4
8	15	4.6

Category 4: Instructor Effectiveness & Environment (#1)

Ranking	Count	Percentage
1	**87**	**26.4**
2	**59**	**17.9**
3	34	10.3
4	41	12.5
5	28	8.5
6	25	7.6
7	20	6.1
8	11	3.3

Category 2: Instructor Availability (#7)

Ranking	Count	Percentage
1	9	2.7
2	13	4.0
3	22	6.7
4	28	8.5
5	44	13.4
6	48	14.6
7	**52**	**15.8**
8	**89**	**27.1**

Category 5: Instructor Communication (#5-Tied)

Ranking	Count	Percentage
1	19	5.8
2	25	7.6
3	**51**	**15.5**
4	37	11.2
5	**52**	**15.8**
6	46	14.0
7	**62**	**18.8**
8	13	4.0

Category 3: Engagement in Learning & Connections (#2)

Ranking	Count	Percentage
1	**62**	**18.8**
2	**57**	**17.3**
3	41	12.5
4	40	12.2
5	32	9.7
6	31	9.4
7	21	6.4
8	21	6.4

Category 6: Assignments (#6)

Ranking	Count	Percentage
1	10	3.0
2	16	4.9
3	25	7.6
4	46	14.0
5	36	10.9
6	**54**	**16.4**
7	**58**	**17.6**
8	**60**	**18.2**

Category 7: Expectations (#5-Tied)

Ranking	Count	Percentage
1	25	7.6
2	42	12.8
3	38	11.6
4	36	10.9
5	37	11.2
6	34	10.3
7	51	15.5
8	42	12.8

Category 8: Course Organization & Clarity (#4)

Ranking	Count	Percentage
1	51	15.5
2	51	15.5
3	37	11.2
4	28	8.5
5	36	10.9
6	28	8.5
7	20	6.1
8	54	16.4

Question Means (Items above Grand Mean of 3.82)

	Question	Mean	Std. Deviation	Category	Category Ranking[2]
#1	Q14	4.17	1.087	4	1
#2	Q8	4.16	1.038	3	2
#3	Q3	4.15	1.067	1	3
#4	Q1	4.09	1.141	1	3
#5	Q30	4.06	1.084	8	4
#6	Q17	4.05	1.142	5	5
#7	Q32	4.04	1.115	8	4
#8	Q6	3.99	1.196	2	7
#9	Q10	3.99	1.211	3	2
#10	Q26	3.98	1.086	7	5
#11	Q18	3.97	1.186	5	5
#12	Q20	3.93	1.138	5	5
#13	Q16	3.91	1.102	4	1
#14	Q27	3.90	1.211	7	5
#15	Q31	3.89	1.186	8	4
#16	Q21	3.86	1.233	5	5
#17	Q28	3.86	1.166	7	5

---

[2] We multiplied the number of people who ranked the category at each priority level by the priority level (i.e., 42 ranked as 1 = 42 points, plus 38 at 2 = 72 points, etc.) and summed them up for a total weighting per category.

Appendix B: Data Summary from University-Wide Course Evaluation Pilot (Survey 2)

Q1. The instructor clearly explains course objectives and requirements.

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Grand Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
AS	20	4.78%	16	3.83%	17	4.07%	157	37.56%	208	49.76%	418	100.00%
BGSU 1910	0	0.00%	3	16.67%	1	5.56%	4	22.22%	10	55.56%	18	100.00%
CBA	1	0.57%	9	5.17%	10	5.75%	83	47.70%	71	40.80%	174	100.00%
EDHD	1	0.70%	0	0.00%	5	3.52%	29	20.42%	107	75.35%	142	100.00%
FIRE	0	0.00%	4	5.00%	4	5.00%	19	23.75%	53	66.25%	80	100.00%
HHS	12	5.17%	12	5.17%	15	6.47%	96	41.38%	97	41.81%	232	100.00%
MUSIC	3	3.53%	2	2.35%	5	5.88%	29	34.12%	46	54.12%	85	100.00%
TECH	1	2.78%	3	8.33%	6	16.67%	13	36.11%	13	36.11%	36	100.00%
Grand Total	**38**	**3.21%**	**49**	**4.14%**	**63**	**5.32%**	**430**	**36.29%**	**605**	**51.05%**	**1185**	**100.00%**

Q2. The instructor sets high standards for student learning.

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Grand Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
AS	17	4.07%	6	1.44%	38	9.09%	177	42.34%	180	43.06%	418	100.00%
BGSU 1910	1	5.56%	0	0.00%	1	5.56%	7	38.89%	9	50.00%	18	100.00%
CBA	1	0.58%	2	1.16%	14	8.09%	97	56.07%	59	34.10%	173	100.00%
EDHD	0	0.00%	1	0.71%	6	4.26%	37	26.24%	97	68.79%	141	100.00%
FIRE	1	1.25%	1	1.25%	6	7.50%	20	25.00%	52	65.00%	80	100.00%
HHS	7	3.02%	5	2.16%	20	8.62%	92	39.66%	108	46.55%	232	100.00%
MUSIC	3	3.53%	0	0.00%	3	3.53%	28	32.94%	51	60.00%	85	100.00%
TECH	0	0.00%	2	5.56%	8	22.22%	15	41.67%	11	30.56%	36	100.00%
Grand Total	**30**	**2.54%**	**17**	**1.44%**	**96**	**8.11%**	**473**	**39.98%**	**567**	**47.93%**	**1183**	**100.00%**

Q3. The instructor offers helpful feedback throughout the semester.

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Grand Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
AS	16	3.83%	18	4.31%	34	8.13%	154	36.84%	196	46.89%	418	100.00%
BGSU 1910	0	0.00%	3	16.67%	3	16.67%	6	33.33%	6	33.33%	18	100.00%
CBA	3	1.72%	14	8.05%	23	13.22%	75	43.10%	59	33.91%	174	100.00%
EDHD	0	0.00%	4	2.82%	4	2.82%	44	30.99%	90	63.38%	142	100.00%
FIRE	1	1.25%	3	3.75%	6	7.50%	23	28.75%	47	58.75%	80	100.00%
HHS	8	3.45%	19	8.19%	28	12.07%	82	35.34%	95	40.95%	232	100.00%
MUSIC	3	3.53%	6	7.06%	8	9.41%	31	36.47%	37	43.53%	85	100.00%
TECH	1	2.78%	4	11.11%	7	19.44%	12	33.33%	12	33.33%	36	100.00%
Grand Total	**32**	**2.70%**	**71**	**5.99%**	**113**	**9.54%**	**427**	**36.03%**	**542**	**45.74%**	**1185**	**100.00%**

Q4. The instructor provides opportunities and/or information to help students succeed (for example, tutoring resources, office hours, mentoring, research projects, etc.).

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Grand Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
AS	19	4.55%	13	3.11%	28	6.70%	132	31.58%	226	54.07%	418	100.00%
BGSU 1910	0	0.00%	1	5.56%	3	16.67%	10	55.56%	4	22.22%	18	100.00%
CBA	2	1.15%	5	2.87%	29	16.67%	83	47.70%	55	31.61%	174	100.00%
EDHD	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	7	4.93%	39	27.46%	96	67.61%	142	100.00%
FIRE	0	0.00%	3	3.75%	5	6.25%	20	25.00%	52	65.00%	80	100.00%
HHS	7	3.03%	3	1.30%	22	9.52%	64	27.71%	135	58.44%	231	100.00%
MUSIC	3	3.53%	2	2.35%	9	10.59%	36	42.35%	35	41.18%	85	100.00%
TECH	0	0.00%	1	2.78%	6	16.67%	17	47.22%	12	33.33%	36	100.00%
Grand Total	**31**	**2.62%**	**28**	**2.36%**	**109**	**9.21%**	**401**	**33.87%**	**615**	**51.94%**	**1184**	**100.00%**

Q5. The instructor encourages student participation (for example, by inviting questions, having discussions, asking students to express their opinions, or other activities).

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Grand Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
AS	19	4.55%	10	2.39%	21	5.02%	125	29.90%	243	58.13%	418	100.00%
BGSU 1910	0	0.00%	1	5.56%	0	0.00%	8	44.44%	9	50.00%	18	100.00%
CBA	1	0.57%	0	0.00%	13	7.47%	63	36.21%	97	55.75%	174	100.00%
EDHD	1	0.71%	2	1.42%	4	2.84%	21	14.89%	113	80.14%	141	100.00%
FIRE	0	0.00%	1	1.25%	4	5.00%	20	25.00%	55	68.75%	80	100.00%
HHS	5	2.16%	5	2.16%	11	4.74%	77	33.19%	134	57.76%	232	100.00%
MUSIC	4	4.71%	2	2.35%	2	2.35%	26	30.59%	51	60.00%	85	100.00%
TECH	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	13	36.11%	11	30.56%	12	33.33%	36	100.00%
Grand Total	**30**	**2.53%**	**21**	**1.77%**	**68**	**5.74%**	**351**	**29.65%**	**714**	**60.30%**	**1184**	**100.00%**

Q6. The instructor communicates the subject matter effectively.

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Grand Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
AS	22	5.25%	19	4.53%	21	5.01%	149	35.56%	208	49.64%	419	100.00%
BGSU 1910	0	0.00%	4	22.22%	1	5.56%	4	22.22%	9	50.00%	18	100.00%
CBA	4	2.31%	13	7.51%	14	8.09%	82	47.40%	60	34.68%	173	100.00%
EDHD	0	0.00%	1	0.70%	9	6.34%	30	21.13%	102	71.83%	142	100.00%
FIRE	1	1.27%	2	2.53%	5	6.33%	22	27.85%	49	62.03%	79	100.00%
HHS	8	3.45%	20	8.62%	27	11.64%	88	37.93%	89	38.36%	232	100.00%
MUSIC	3	3.53%	2	2.35%	5	5.88%	28	32.94%	47	55.29%	85	100.00%
TECH	1	2.78%	4	11.11%	6	16.67%	11	30.56%	14	38.89%	36	100.00%
Grand Total	**39**	**3.29%**	**65**	**5.49%**	**88**	**7.43%**	**414**	**34.97%**	**578**	**48.82%**	**1184**	**100.00%**

Q7. The instructor creates an environment of respect.

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Grand Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
AS	13	3.10%	7	1.67%	15	3.58%	131	31.26%	253	60.38%	419	100.00%
BGSU 1910	0	0.00%	1	5.56%	1	5.56%	6	33.33%	10	55.56%	18	100.00%
CBA	2	1.15%	5	2.87%	16	9.20%	74	42.53%	77	44.25%	174	100.00%
EDHD	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	2.11%	24	16.90%	115	80.99%	142	100.00%
FIRE	1	1.25%	2	2.50%	3	3.75%	16	20.00%	58	72.50%	80	100.00%
HHS	8	3.45%	7	3.02%	14	6.03%	95	40.95%	108	46.55%	232	100.00%
MUSIC	4	4.71%	0	0.00%	3	3.53%	25	29.41%	53	62.35%	85	100.00%
TECH	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	13.89%	17	47.22%	14	38.89%	36	100.00%
Grand Total	**28**	**2.36%**	**22**	**1.85%**	**60**	**5.06%**	**388**	**32.72%**	**688**	**58.01%**	**1186**	**100.00%**

	Q1. The instructor clearly explains course objectives and requirements.		Q2. The instructor sets high standards for student learning.		Q3. The instructor offers helpful feedback throughout the semester.		Q4. The instructor provides opportunities and/or information to help students succeed.		Q5. The instructor encourages student participation.		Q6. The instructor communicates the subject matter effectively.		Q7. The instructor creates an environment of respect.	
College	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD
AS	4.24	1.03	4.19	0.95	4.19	1.02	4.28	1.03	4.35	1.01	4.20	1.08	4.44	0.89
BGSU 1910	4.17	1.15	4.28	1.02	3.83	1.10	3.94	0.80	4.39	0.78	4.00	1.24	4.39	0.85
CBA	4.23	0.82	4.22	0.69	3.99	0.98	4.06	0.84	4.47	0.69	4.05	0.97	4.26	0.83
EDHD	4.70	0.61	4.63	0.60	4.55	0.69	4.63	0.58	4.72	0.66	4.64	0.63	4.79	0.46
FIRE	4.51	0.81	4.51	0.80	4.40	0.88	4.51	0.78	4.61	0.65	4.47	0.83	4.60	0.79
HHS	4.09	1.07	4.25	0.92	4.02	1.08	4.37	0.93	4.42	0.85	3.99	1.08	4.24	0.95
MUSIC	4.33	0.96	4.46	0.87	4.09	1.06	4.15	0.96	4.39	1.00	4.34	0.96	4.45	0.94
TECH	3.94	1.07	3.97	0.88	3.83	1.11	4.11	0.78	3.97	0.84	3.92	1.13	4.25	0.69
Grand Total	**4.28**	**0.97**	**4.29**	**0.87**	**4.16**	**1.01**	**4.30**	**0.92**	**4.43**	**0.88**	**4.21**	**1.02**	**4.42**	**0.86**

From a student's perspective were these items easy to understand?

Yes	1081	92.16%
No	92	7.84%
Grand Total	**1173**	**100.00%**

Did you have difficulty rating your instructor on any of the items?

Yes	89	7.61%
No	1081	92.39%
Grand Total	**1170**	**100.00%**