

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

CSUSB Faculty Senate records

Arthur E. Nelson University Archives

2020

Report of the SOTE Instrumentation Committee (2020)

CSUSB Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate>

Recommended Citation

CSUSB Faculty Senate, "Report of the SOTE Instrumentation Committee (2020)" (2020). *CSUSB Faculty Senate records*. 299.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate/299>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Arthur E. Nelson University Archives at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in CSUSB Faculty Senate records by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

Report of the SOTE Instrumentation Committee

June 2020 (final revision, August 2020; note: all links were working as of August 18, 2020)

This report describes the work of the committee and makes recommendations for a revised student rating instrument. We offer recommendations for use of the revised instrument and for improving instruction through a developmental feedback process largely separated from the RPT process.

Links to contents of the report (click on blue link to be taken to that section of the report):

[Executive Summary](#)

[Introduction to the Report of the SOTE Instrumentation Committee](#)

[Summary of Research and Collected Data](#)

[Development of a New Form, Student Perceptions of Teaching \(SPT\)](#)

[Item review using a meta analytic review of instruction variables](#)

[Think alouds with students and faculty interviews](#)

[A Proposed New Form](#)

[6 closed ended items](#)

[Format: Strongly Agree/Strongly Disagree, reporting percentages](#)

[One open ended comment requesting feedback](#)

[Items assessing student contributions to their learning](#)

[Recommended Changes to RPT Process with Emphasis on Feedback](#)

[Administer one form early \(for feedback\) and one later \(for RPT\)](#)

[Separate feedback data from the RPT process](#)

[The important role of peer classroom visitations and observations in our system](#)

[Other issues discussed and other recommendations](#)

[Next Steps](#)

[Committee Membership](#)

[References \(Research Cited\)](#)

[Acknowledgements](#)

[Appendix A. Committee Work and Processes](#)

[Prior to F2018](#)

[Review of meta analyses and original dimensions proposed](#)

[2016 student survey](#)

[2016 survey of faculty](#)

[2006 Ullman analysis](#)

[AY 2018-19](#)

[Re-review of research literature and newer meta analyses](#)

[Survey of faculty](#)

[AY 2019-20](#)

[Additional research reviewed: First impression effects](#)

[Review of other widely available reports](#)

[Analysis of data from a survey of students regarding current SOTE](#)

[Appendix B. Collective Bargaining Agreement Section Referencing Student Evaluations](#)

[Appendix C. Originally Proposed Dimensions for Developing a New Instrument \(AY2016-17\)](#)

[Appendix D. Survey and Results of Faculty Use of SOTE Data](#)

[Brief Overview of the Numeric \(Quantitative\) Data from the Faculty Survey](#)

[Instructor Data](#)

[From Those Who had been on Evaluation Committees or Evaluated as Department Chair](#)

[Summary of the Qualitatively Coded Data, SOTE Faculty Survey, S2019](#)

[Instructors](#)

[Turning to Those on Evaluation Committees and their Responses](#)

[Appendix E. Student Data from S2019 Psychology Course](#)

[Emergent Themes from Current SOTE Form Questions of Overall Quality, Specific Contribution](#)

[Appendix F. Items Reviewed, Created, Finalized](#)

[Table 1. Initial Items Derived from Schneider and Preckel \(2017\)](#)

[Table 2. Reduced Subset of Items after Student Think Alouds and Committee Discussion](#)

[Table 3. Proposed Final Items](#)

[Appendix G. Items Assessing Student Contributions to Their Learning](#)

[Appendix H. Proposed Form: Student Perceptions of Teaching \(SPT\)](#)

[Appendix I. Figure 1 -- Flow Chart of Separated Use of Feedback and RPT Process](#)

[Appendix J. Brief Biographical Sketches of Faculty Members of the AY2019-20 Committee](#)

Executive Summary

Key Take Away Points

- We propose a new format and a new process for the use of student-generated data:

- The committee reviewed multiple meta-analyses that associated instructor behaviors to college student learning, reviewed other widely available reports of student ratings of instructors, reviewed prior surveys of CSUSB students and faculty, conducted a survey of instructors and those who evaluate faculty in the RPT process using SOTE data, and conducted think alouds, a method employed to solicit input on survey questions, with students and interviews with faculty.
- Through an interactive process of committee discussion, student think alouds, and faculty interviews, we distilled a list of 45 possible items to 6.
- In addition to a change in the form, we propose a change to the use of these data in formal processes. A feedback form should be administered early in the term with the results available only to the instructor. If the instructor chooses, these data can be made available to a teaching mentor and placed into the WPAF. A second administration for RPT purposes will be done later in the term. Data from this second administration will be placed in the WPAF, as is done now.

Introduction to the Report of the SOTE Instrumentation Committee

This report describes the work of the committee and makes recommendations for a revised student rating instrument. We offer recommendations for use of the revised instrument and for improving instruction through a developmental feedback process largely separated from the RPT process.

In the interest of brevity, we have placed the details of the committee process in an appendix (see [Appendix A. Committee Work and Processes](#)). Here, we provide a short overview of the summary of information from which we drew our conclusions that drove our decision making.

Summary of Research and Collected Data

- Based on the extant research
 - There is considerable contention about whether student ratings of instructors measure teaching effectiveness (as measured by student learning and achievement).
 - At best, the relationship of instructor behaviors to student learning or achievement appears modest.
 - First impressions of instructors linger long into a term. Even though first impressions can be combated with quality teaching, the data that show that early-in-the-term ratings are replicated at the end of the term urge caution in interpretation of student generated data for evaluative purposes.

- Student ratings of instructors may unfairly penalize women, people of color, LGBTQI, or other members of marginalized groups in society.
- Despite issues with student rating instruments, they can provide instructors with useful feedback.
- Based on CSUSB student survey data
 - From a small 2016 sample, students wanted more categories to evaluate and wanted to add items on specific dimensions.
 - From 2019 data asking what students thought of when responding to the current SOTE, student responses reflected course dimensions that are often found in rating instruments that have more specific categories (e.g., availability of instructor, desire for feedback, structure of course).
- Based on CSUSB faculty survey data
 - By strong majorities, neither instructors nor evaluators believe the SOTE is an adequate indicator of teaching effectiveness. With that said, many instructors indicated that they use the feedback to make changes to courses. In addition, evaluators consider both the numbers¹ and the comments of students in reviewing WPAFs. Common comments from evaluators were that they wished the form had more specific categories.

Development of a New Form, Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPT)

Item review using a meta analytic review of instruction variables

- We identified a 2017 systematic meta-analytic review of the variables that lead to student achievement (Schneider & Preckel, 2017). This paper purports to contain fewer of the flaws that mar earlier meta-analyses. (See: [Schneider and Preckel - 2017 - Variables associated with achievement in higher ed.pdf](#))
 - This review included both instructional and student factors related to student learning.
 - Not surprisingly, some large effects for student learning and achievement can be attributed to student factors, such as student motivation, class attendance, HS GPA upon entry, admission test scores, and student effort.
 - We identified instruction variables with effect sizes equal to or greater than Cohen's $d = .46$. Cohen's d of .46 was selected because it was the median of all effect sizes listed in the article (and nearly achieves the status of a moderate effect size²). This criterion resulted in 48 possible variables for inclusion. These served as our starting point.

¹The CBA requires that students evaluate instructors. The form of this evaluation can be quantitative or quantitative and open ended. See [Appendix B](#) for CBA wording.

²Cohen's d is in standard deviation units and represents the difference between two distributions; thus a d of 1 represents one standard deviation difference in the means of two distributions. Cohen's d is usually interpreted as follows: $d = 0.2$ is a 'small' effect size, 0.5 is a 'medium' effect size, and 0.8 is a 'large' effect size.

- The committee systematically reviewed each item for its possible use on a subsequent student rating form. Three of the 48 variables were deemed not feasible to be measured through student ratings (student peer-assessment, student self-assessment, small-group learning; each of these requires specific conditions for implementation in a course).
- We also reviewed the items for their use as touchpoints for peer observation.
- We generated a list of 45 possible items for use on a subsequent student rating form. See [Table 1](#) in Appendix F.

Think alouds with students and faculty interviews

- Our next step in vetting items was to conduct think alouds with students in COE, JHBC, and CSBS³
 - Several members of the committee and three MSIOP students conducted focus groups with students in three colleges⁴ (CSBS, JHB, COE). All 45 items (or in the case of the CSBS, subsets of ten items) were presented to students. Students were asked what they thought of when they read/heard the item. These comments were captured, summarized, and subsequently reviewed by the committee. Items that were confusing or unclear to students were either revised or eliminated.
 - This process led to a reduced subset of 13 items (see [Table 2](#) in Appendix F).
 - Using this shortened set of items, interviews were conducted with faculty from CAL and CNS
 - Several faculty from CNS and CAL were contacted to ask about specific, unique issues relevant to lab classes and courses in the performing arts. Face-to-face (Zoom) interviews were held. The feedback from these faculty prompted revisions to several items so the items would better represent the needs of instructors of lab and performing arts (e.g., studio) classes.
 - These conversations also elicited additional concerns about how instructors who “push” students outside of their comfort zones (e.g., theatre or dance) as a matter of course objectives may be disadvantaged in the subsequent student ratings. Ironically, challenging students to think about complex material, to reflect on their learning, or to perform beyond their expectations are hallmarks of a college education.

A Proposed New Form

We propose a standard form of 6 closed-end items, each with the potential for comments, and 1 open

³Students in a large ($n=72$) undergraduate psychology course were surveyed asking the same question as in the think alouds. These data supplemented the face-to-face think alouds.

⁴We had intended to conduct think alouds with students from these two colleges, but the COVID 19 lockdown intervened at this stage of our process. The students from the 3 colleges that did participate yielded comparable findings. In addition, we solicited faculty input on those questions and found similar results.

ended item. See [Table 3. Proposed Final Items](#) in Appendix F. We also propose the use of a Strongly Agree/Strongly Disagree format in which percentages--not means or medians--of student responses would be reported. In addition, we propose 4 student responsibility items be introduced on this form (see [Appendix G. Items Assessing Student Contributions to Their Learning](#)). In the next section, we will discuss our proposal for the implementation of this form. Here we describe the justifications for these recommendations.

Justifications:

1. 6 closed ended items
 - a. On the faculty survey, there was considerable support from evaluators for a new form that included more specific questions than the current form. Comments are solicited from a student for each of the closed ended items. Having a small number of items with the possibility of open-ended responses for each will have several benefits:
 - i. It will allow for more focused comments by the students.
 - ii. It should ease somewhat the workload of those who read these for preparing RPT reports as the comments will be categorized by the construct being assessed.
 1. As it is now, evaluators need to perform the equivalent of a content analysis of student comments for every class an instructor has taught. With that said, evaluators reported that they find the comments to be useful as they review SOTEs (and so do instructors).
 - iii. Our approach balances the sheer number of elements to be evaluated from the student responses to the open-ended questions about specific contribution and quality of instruction. The items selected represent instructor dimensions that have substantive effect sizes in meta-analytic research. We recognize this could be a point of contention, considering the extant, but conflicting, literature on the relationship of student learning to instructor behavior. The systematic meta-analysis that we selected as our referent suffered fewer of the issues with prior analysis--further, it reviewed both student and instruction factors related to student learning, representing a more balanced presentation. It is notable that many of the variables found in the meta-analytic review were similar to those that were found in the earlier meta-analyses.
 - b. When asked what they thought of when they completed the two questions on the current SOTE, students who participated in the think-alouds identified all of the dimensions represented in these items. Further, the students did not differentiate in their responses to the two questions (many evaluators and instructors alike have seen the "see above" in student responses to the second question about specific contributions).
 - c. Finally, we also offer items that can be framed as reflective reactions of the student (i.e., instead of "The instructor provided informative feedback," the student would respond to the following item: "I received informative feedback on my course work." We do not recommend one form over the other, but offer these for consideration.

2. Format: Strongly Agree/Strongly Disagree, reporting percentages
 - a. One of the perennial concerns with the use of the current SOTE (or any rating instrument that is Likert style) is in the use of the summary statistics reported. Some argue that too much emphasis is placed on the numbers. From a statistical standpoint, the data that result from the Likert-style scales on the current SOTE are not normally distributed, nor would we expect them to be. Thus, which statistic to present has always been troublesome and lends itself to (unintentional) misuse.
 - b. After considerable discussion, the committee settled on a 5-point scale anchored with Strongly Agree/Strongly Disagree. Students would be given an opportunity to explain their ratings in a follow-up, open ended question. This strategy would give both instructors and evaluators a more focused approach to review student feedback.
 - c. Please note that we have not assigned numbered anchors to the example form (see [Appendix H. Proposed Form: Student Perceptions of Teaching](#)). We strongly encourage that when these data are tabulated, they be presented as percentages, rather than as means or medians.
 - i. Strongly Agree and Agree percentages could be combined into one category as could Strongly Disagree and Disagree be combined into one category for generating output. Because we know that these kinds of data are not normally distributed, we strongly discourage any comparisons of individual faculty data with departmental, college, or university percentages.
 - d. Our primary goal for the use of these data is to inform instructors about their teaching. Our secondary objective is to provide quality data for the purposes of evaluation. These are the reasons that we selected items that are related to student learning.
3. One open ended comment requesting feedback
 - a. We are not recommending an overall rating, but believe it advisable to give students an opportunity to provide any constructive feedback they see fit.
 - i. This question is: Is there anything else you would like the instructor to know?
4. Items assessing student contributions to their learning
 - a. Learning is a team process that involves both student and instructor. We recommend the form include several items that ask students if they have regularly attended and prepared for class, as well as have made efforts to reach out for help when it was needed. Our current SOTE includes a few of these kinds of items (e.g., how many classes did you attend?). The 4 items we propose frame the responsibilities of and partnership of student and instructor.
 - b. In our proposed implementation (see next section), these items also serve as feedback to the instructor in the early administration proposed. If, for example, many students are coming to class unprepared, the instructor can consider how to create the conditions that will encourage students to attend.

See [Appendix G. Items Assessing Student Contributions to Their Learning](#).

Recommended Changes to RPT Process with Emphasis on Feedback

We propose a new system, one that we believe would lead to improved instruction on campus, and one in which student feedback is incentivized to be used without the worry of negative evaluation outcomes. Our system parallels the notions of formative and summative assessment.

Before we lay out this new system, we outline our assumptions for proposing a change in how student ratings are solicited and used.

- Faculty want to be good instructors
- Faculty want meaningful feedback
- Faculty can change their behavior in response to constructive feedback

There are two aspects to our system proposal.

1. Administer an (optional) feedback form early in the term and a form for RPT later in the term
2. Separate the feedback data from the data submitted to the RPT process

Administer one form early (for feedback) and one later (for RPT)

1. *Early administration (optional)*. For data to improve teaching, the feedback needs to come early enough in the term so that the instructor can make adjustments to tailor teaching to the needs of the students in the course. We propose the feedback items be administered immediately after census (end of fourth week up to the sixth week). Working with or without a mentor, faculty could use this formative assessment to make the changes they deem appropriate for the course and class. Though we think all instructors could benefit from this administration, we propose that this early administration be made optional (later we comment on why we think there would be sufficient incentive for instructors to wish to opt in). Ideally, faculty would have a 'semester course dashboard' in which they access the controls for administering the feedback form.
2. *Later (RPT) administration*. Similar to what is done now, the form would be administered from the 8th to the 10th week in the term. By the 8th week, students will have formed their opinions of instruction. Instructors who used the proposed feedback form at census will have had time to implement any changes to that feedback they deemed appropriate. The results of this second administration would go into the WPAF, as they do now.
 - a. Based on the meta analysis, we have selected four of the six items that should be administered for the purposes of RPT.

Separate feedback data from the RPT process

As with formative assessment on student work that is intended to provide input to develop knowledge and skills, so too should faculty have access to appropriate feedback. As faculty ultimately assess the final student products of coursework to assign grades, the student rating data that go into the WPAF are

summative. One of the greatest difficulties with the current system is that instructors get one attempt (i.e., one SOTE) in a class “to get it right.” It is hard to imagine that we would be satisfied if students had one test or assignment in a class that formed the sole basis for the final grade. Thus, we propose that we have a formalized system whereby faculty obtain feedback from their classes without penalty to their retention, tenure, or promotion prospects.

The early administration form (feedback) would not automatically be placed into the WPAF, but could be included if the instructor chose to do so. There are good reasons for an instructor to deposit these feedback data into the WPAF--these data could be used to show improvement over the term, for example.

See [Appendix I. Figure 1 -- Flow Chart of Separated Use of Feedback and RPT Process.](#)

The important role of peer classroom visitations and observations in our system

We believe peers are best situated to evaluate discipline specific competence, appropriate assessment, and structure of a course. This makes classroom visitations (CV) and peer observations an important element to the feedback and evaluation processes.

Both faculty evaluators and administrators frequently comment that the classroom visitations (CV) do not provide much information about instruction. We believe this can be attributed to the evaluative nature of the CV. Faculty visitors may be hesitant to put potentially damaging comments on the CV. Yet, this information may be very important for instructors to use as feedback.

As with the separation of the student ratings into feedback and RPT purposes, we recommend that CVs also be revised to accommodate this strategy. In this process, faculty who are noted to be good instructors would serve as mentors for other faculty and conduct observations of faculty to complement the student feedback. Though this may be most beneficial for untenured faculty, there is good reason for tenured faculty and lecturers to work with teaching mentors, especially if they wish to experiment with innovative techniques or pedagogies in their classes.

Ideally, this mentoring system would be integrated with existing offices on campus, such as the FCE or TRC and the university mentoring network. We propose that CVs be continued but that fewer be placed in the WPAF. More specifically, we propose an equivalent **total** number of mentor observations and classroom visitations but fewer CVs would be placed in the WPAF (e.g., if 4 classroom visitations are required for an untenured assistant professor at the three year mark, 2 would be developmental, and shared with a teaching mentor--not placed into the WPAF, unless the faculty member so chooses--and 2 would be required to be placed in to the WPAF⁵).

CV form. The committee discussed restructuring the existing classroom visitation form. A copy of the current form can be found in Appendix 9 of the RPT manual (see footnote 5 below for link to RPT

⁵Because we are transitioning to a semester system, it is unclear how many classroom visitations will be required in the semester system versus the quarter system. Based on the most recent RPT Manual, the *Procedures and Criteria for Performance Review and Periodic Evaluation of Instructional Faculty* (see Appendix 12 of <https://www.csusb.edu/sites/default/files/RPTbooklet2019-20.pdf>), 6 classroom visitations are expected for untenured faculty who apply for promotion in the normal probationary period. In our proposed system, 3 of these would be observations shared with a mentor and 3 would be placed in the WPAF.

manual). We think this form could be significantly simplified. For example, the prompt, “are the materials appropriate for the course?” could be simplified with a Yes/No response format--a “No” check would lead to a space for a follow up explanation.

CV visitors. As part of its deliberations, the committee also discussed how visitors might be selected. Ideally, those who conduct CVs have knowledge of the discipline and are adept at recognizing good instruction. We had a number of discussions about how to select peers for classroom observations. As noted earlier, we think that identifying a pool of highly qualified instructors who would do the bulk of CVs would be a good step in supporting classroom teaching and serving our students. One possible strategy for the development of the pool is to integrate formally the willing volunteers into an existing mentoring program. Mentoring done well takes time and commitment. Thus, we suggest these mentors be compensated beyond the normal, expected contractual service.

Other issues discussed and other recommendations

Through the conversations with faculty, we identified other issues worth mentioning.

Student rating data for small classes. As is done now, classes of fewer than five are not SOTEd. As a result, instructors of these courses may be missing valuable feedback. No doubt this is to protect student anonymity. Studio classes in Music, for example, often have less than five students and are not SOTEd. One strategy for providing feedback would be to aggregate these types of classes over a full year. We reference the earlier idea of faculty having a dashboard for which they can initiate the feedback form in their classes. For small classes of the same modality, (e.g., studio), these feedback results would be aggregated, withheld for a year, and assuming a sufficient number to protect anonymity, would then be released to the faculty member.

Departmental or discipline specific student rating forms. When we considered the possibly unique nature of courses in the performing arts, we revisited the idea of Department specific feedback forms. Although it has always been an option for faculty to select⁶ (or create⁷) their own SOTE items from the TRC website, it is apparent that virtually no faculty do so. In the 2019 survey of faculty, 70% did not know the existence of this option.

The value of a department-level or discipline-specific feedback form lies not so much in the form itself, but the process that would be used to develop such a form. Conversations among Department faculty about what feedback might be useful beyond that of the omnibus form recommended here would be valuable. We are not recommending these separate Department level forms be used for evaluative purposes, but obviously, this would need to be taken up by the relevant faculty Senate committees.

Online courses. We did not address the matter of online courses. Nearly all of our work preceded the COVID-19 motivated move to virtual in S2020. With the wide-scale movement to online and virtual teaching, we see the need to attend to these modalities. With that said, there are already existing standards for the online teaching environment. We are not endorsing any specific standard but are aware that the CSU has made the QLT the *ipso facto* standard for quality online teaching. The checklist

⁶Approved supplemental items: <https://www.csusb.edu/trc/resources/sote-supplemental-questions>

⁷Creating instructor specific items: https://www.csusb.edu/sites/default/files/SOTE_%20Form%20C.pdf

for this standard, for example, has points associated with the recommended elements⁸. We invite a future committee to explore this issue.

Administration of the student rating form. Based on our discussions with faculty, it came to our attention that though there is a precaution against it, students sometimes have side discussions while the SOTE is being administered. To address this possibility, it may be prudent to add a checkbox on the instruction set that asks the SOTE administrator if any discussion took place while the form was being completed by students. If student administration is continued, the student would leave contact information (beyond what is done now) for follow up. Depending on the information from the follow up, the evaluations may be flagged in the faculty member's file.

Further, some discussion centered on the potential that some students may feel inequitably treated if they are NOT asked to administer the form or ARE asked to administer the form. This could be a more serious possibility in larger classes. Administration by someone other than students from the class would reduce these perceptions of favoritism and inequity. Ideally, there would be a designated staff person who would administer the form--we recognize that this may be impractical, but we wanted to point out the message that would be sent if there were designated staff to administer these evaluations: these administrations are important elements for feedback and evaluation.

Student response rate. As is noted in the Stark and Freishtat (2014) report, response rates matter. In the face to face environment, this may not be a significant issue, especially if our suggestion that the forms be administered in the 8th to 10th week of the term and that there is a representative of the university (i.e., a staff member) administering it. We discourage, however, offering incentives in either the FTF environment or online. Much as we want to increase response rates, offering incentives such as raffles may have unintended consequences, introducing biases into the process. These data that are collected from students are used to make employment decisions so we want them to be as unbiased as possible. To increase response rate, the most important elements are creating an environment in which students want to respond and know how their data will be used.

Next Steps

Ideally, the proposed form will be piloted by faculty members volunteering their courses. The collected data would NOT be used in the RPT process. Using these data and the feedback from faculty, the form would be refined as needed and the acceptability of the two-administration process evaluated.

We recommend the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate review our recommendations and consider how best to proceed.

⁸Online QLT: <http://courseredesign.csuprojects.org/wp/qualityassurance/qlt-informal-review/>

Committee Membership

Committee AY2018-19: Jo Anna Grant, CAL; Kathryn Howard, COE; Yasha Karant, CNS, Kathie Pelletier, JHB-CBPA, Becky Sumbera, COE; Julie Yang, ASI Rep; Seval Yildirim, Admin Rep

Committee AY2019-20: Jo Anna Grant, CAL; Cherie Ward, COE; Kathie Pelletier, JHB-CBPA; Becky Sumbera, COE (Lecturer rep); Seval Yildirim, Admin Rep

Please note that the committee met nearly weekly for two academic years without any release time.

See [Appendix J. Brief Biographical Sketches of Faculty Members of the AY2019-20 Committee](#).

References (Research Cited)

- Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1993). Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of nonverbal behavior and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(3), 431–441. <https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.csusb.edu/10.1037/0022-3514.64.3.431>
- Buchert, S., Laws, E. L., Apperson, J. M. & Bregman, N. J. (2008). First impressions and professor reputation: Influence on student evaluations of instruction. *Social Psychology of Education*, 11, 397-408. doi: 10.1007/s11218-008-9055-1
- Clayson, D. E. (2018). Student evaluation of teaching and matters of reliability. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(4), 666–681. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1393495>
- Cohen, P. A. (1981). Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multisection validity studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(3), 281–309. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543051003281>
- Feldman, K. A. (1989). The association between student ratings of specific instructional dimensions and student achievement: Refining and extending the synthesis of data from multisection validity studies. *Research in Higher Education*, 30(6), 583–645. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992392>
- Laws, E. L., Apperson, J. M., Buchert, S., & Bregman, N. J. (2010). Student evaluations of instruction: When are enduring first impressions formed? *North American Journal of Psychology*, 12(1), 81-92.
- Schneider, M., & Preckel, F. (2017). Variables associated with achievement in higher education: A

systematic review of meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(6), 565–600.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000098>

Samudra, P. G., Min, I., Cortina, K. S., & Miller, K. F. (2016). No second chance to make a first impression: The “thin-slice” effect on instructor ratings and learning outcomes in higher education: first impressions and instruction quality. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 53(3), 313–331. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jedm.12116>

Spooren, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2013). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(4), 598–642.

<https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313496870>

Stark, P., & Freishtat, R. (2014). An Evaluation of Course Evaluations: “F.” *ScienceOpen Research*.

<https://doi.org/10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AOFRQA.v1>

Ullman, J. B. (2006). *Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) Pilot Test Report*. See: [Ullman 2006 SotePilotReportFinal.pdf](#)

Uttl, B., White, C. A., & Gonzalez, D. W. (2017). Meta-analysis of faculty’s teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 54, 22–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.08.007>

Acknowledgements

The committee thanks Leslie Bryan, Theatre Arts, and Todd Johnson, Music, for providing feedback on the use of items in classes in the performing arts.

The committee thanks Sally McGill (Geology), Associate Dean, CNS, and Carol Hood, Physics, for providing feedback on the use of items in laboratory courses.

The committee thanks Concepcion (Connie) Rodriguez, MSIO Graduate Student, Jessica Carrera-Mendoza, MSIO Graduate Student, Alexa Massiquet, MSIO Graduate Student, who conducted think alouds with the students in the W2020 Psyc 355 Industrial Psychology course, as well as developed themes from the data that had been collected from students in a Psyc 357 course in S2019.

We also thank the students who participated in the think alouds from these courses: EDSP 686, MGMT 655, PSYC 355.

Finally, we thank the former chairs of this committee, Dorothy Chen Maynard and Andy Bodman.

Appendix A. Committee Work and Processes

Prior to F2018

Review of meta analyses and original dimensions proposed

We reviewed several meta analyses and summaries of research literature, which guided the discussions about which instructor behaviors were related to student learning (Cohen, 1981; Feldman, 1989; Spooen, Brockx, & Morelmans, 2013). Of these, the most compelling was by Feldman, 1989, who reviewed studies of multi section courses with common final exams that could be compared by ratings of instructors. In this analysis, dimensions of instruction such as course structure and clarity correlated moderately to strongly ($r_s = .40s$ and $.50s$) with student learning. The Feldman meta analysis was used initially to identify dimensions that were intended to form the basis for a new student rating form of instructors. See [Appendix C. Originally Proposed Dimensions for Developing a New Instrument \(AY2016-17\)](#).

2016 student survey

In January 2016, students were invited to respond to a short survey about the current SOTE. Only 26 students responded. When asked what they liked about the current form, students said the current form is simple, short, easy to complete, and provides an opportunity to give feedback to instructors. Their criticism of the current form was that it does not have enough categories or detail for the responses and a concern as to whether the data are useful feedback for professors. When asked what items they would add, these included availability outside of class, instructor teaching style, instructor interest in the class, feedback on assignments, more open-ended questions, like and dislike of class assignments, what was learned in the class, and whether the instructor should teach the course again. See [01_13_2016_students.pdf](#) for the responses of this sample.

2016 survey of faculty

In addition to the survey administered to students in January 2016, faculty were invited to respond to a short survey asking about the SOTE instrument. As with the student sample, the number of respondents was relatively small ($n = 48$). When asked if the SOTE instrument "captures the most important dimensions of teaching quality," 72% said no. When asked if the instrument was an "effective tool for receiving feedback from students," 53% said "no" and 13% said "not sure." With regard to the SOTE "providing useful data to make RPT decisions, 47% said "no" and 34% said "not sure." In addition, 72% of this sample said "yes" to modifying the current instrument. See the output here: [1_13_2016_fac_survey_responses.pdf](#)

2006 Ullman analysis

We also reviewed the 2006 analysis that Dr. Jodie Ullman conducted on SETE and SOTE data. Her study

demonstrated that most variability in student ratings of instructors could be attributed to students, not courses (nor instructors). Specifically, when student ratings were partitioned into variance attributed to differences in classes, which includes instructors, and differences among students, the overwhelming amount of variance--76 to 84%--can be attributed to differences among students. As Ullman noted in her report, this finding suggests that student evaluations be reviewed cautiously for any summative evaluation of faculty.

AY 2018-19

(Kottke became committee chair in F2018)

Re-review of research literature and newer meta analyses

The committee reviewed more meta analytic results (Clayson, 2018) as well as a critique (Uttl, White, & Gonzalez, 2017) of the meta analyses referenced earlier in this report (Cohen, 1981; Feldman, 1989). We also reviewed a summary article on student evaluations (Spooren, Brockx, & Mortelmans, 2013).

- What do these say?
 - Multiple dimensions of instructor behavior are often used in student evaluation instruments. Individual studies and meta analyses of the correlation between student ratings of instructor behaviors and student achievement range considerably ($r = .10$ to $.47$ with Clayson's more recent (2008) meta analysis finding of $r = .13$).
 - Uttl et al. (2017) re-analyzed often cited prior meta analyses (i.e., Cohen, Feldman) and concluded that they were flawed, Specifically, they argued that the results were predicated on small sample sizes and publication bias. Thus, they suggest that the best case relationship of instructor behaviors with student achievement is $r = .17$.
 - The conclusions of these more recent meta analytic data were disappointing with regard to developing a new instrument. Nonetheless, a student rating instrument of instructors is required as part of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
 - See Article 15.17 ([Collective Bargaining Agreement \(Contract\) 2014-2017](#))

Survey of faculty

- Because we believe that the recipients and end users of the data are key constituents in our considerations, we conducted a survey of faculty who have evaluated other faculty (e.g., chairs, faculty on RPT committees) as well as instructors who use SOTE data for feedback. One hundred ninety (190) faculty responded to this survey.
- What were the key takeaways from these data?
 - The majority (60%) of respondents said "No" when asked if the SOTE is an effective measure of teaching quality.
 - Instructors were about equally divided in their satisfaction and dissatisfaction with SOTEs for RPT purposes.
 - Instructors viewed SOTE feedback as slightly more useful than not and 75% indicated that they had made course changes as a result of SOTE data.

- Most instructors review their SOTE results as soon as they are available.
- A large majority (82%) of evaluators who have used SOTE data for RPT purposes found the numeric ratings to be important (54%) or very important (28%).
- An even larger percentage of evaluators (94%) found the student comments to be important (32%) or very important (62%)
- However, 63% of these respondents were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the SOTE to evaluate teaching quality.
- When asked how much weight should be placed on SOTEs for purposes of RPT of tenure-track faculty, 64% indicated that it should be 50% or less.
- These findings parallel the 2016 survey results ($n = 48$).
- The full report of this study of faculty with links to the summarized data can be found in Appendix D ([Appendix D. Survey and Results of Faculty Use of SOTE Data](#)).

AY 2019-20

Additional research reviewed: First impression effects

- A rather (in)famous and often cited research article showed that the first impression of an instructor--on the first day of class-- lasted through to instructor ratings at the end of the term (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993). This effect has been replicated by Laws, Apperson, Buchert, and Bregman (2010). Comparably, Buchert, Laws, Apperson, and Bregman (2008) demonstrated that the results of student evaluations given two weeks into a term did not differ from those collected at the end of the term.
- More recently, Samudra, Min, Cortina, and Mille (2016) showed college students video clips in which quality of instruction and behavior that would elicit a negative or positive first impression were manipulated. They found that though there was an impact of first impressions, there was a larger impact for quality of instruction, indicating that a poor first impression may be overcome with good instruction. Caution is urged, however, in over interpreting these results as both quality and first impressions were manipulated at the same time (i.e., the method was cross sectional, not longitudinal).

Review of other widely available reports

- We reviewed IDEAedu.org's technical reports, its student rating of instructor form and process
 - The IDEA Center (ideaedu.org) markets the IDEA Student Ratings of Instructor (SRI) evaluation system. The SRI was developed through extensive iterations of instructor generated objectives that were then related to student ratings of their objectives. The system yields multiple ratings, including overall ratings of the instructor. While we were impressed that the process used to develop the items was a rich, deep consideration of what instructors do, the criteria used for the reported correlations were not objective student learning or achievement data, making these data different from meta analytic data already reported.
 - A notable feature of the SRI are the adjustments to instructor ratings on the basis of

personal variables believed to disadvantage instructors unfairly. Thus, student ratings are adjusted by factors such as the rigor of the course, subject matter, or demographics of the instructor (e.g., gender).

- Reviewed the Stark and Freishtat (2014) report
 - Recap of this report (authors are statisticians at UC Berkeley)
 - Student evaluations of teaching (SET) do not measure teaching effectiveness.
 - Controlled, randomized experiments find that SET ratings are negatively associated with direct measures of effectiveness. SETs seem to be influenced by the gender, ethnicity, and attractiveness of the instructor.
 - Summary items such as “overall effectiveness” seem most influenced by irrelevant factors.
 - Student comments contain valuable information about students’ experiences.
 - Survey response rates matter. Low response rates make it impossible to generalize reliably from the respondents to the whole class.
 - Teaching is unlikely to improve without serious, regular attention.
 - Recommendations
 - Drop omnibus items about “overall teaching effectiveness” and “value of the course” from teaching evaluations: They are misleading.
 - Do not average or compare averages of SET scores: Such averages do not make sense statistically. Instead, report the distribution of scores, the number of responders, and the response rate.
 - When response rates are low, extrapolating from responders to the whole class is unreliable.
 - Pay attention to student comments—but understand their limitations. Students typically are not well situated to evaluate pedagogy.
 - Avoid comparing teaching in courses of different types, levels, sizes, functions, or disciplines.
 - Use teaching portfolios as part of the review process.
 - Use classroom observation as part of milestone reviews.
 - To improve teaching and evaluate teaching fairly and honestly, spend more time observing the teaching and looking at teaching materials.

Analysis of data from a survey of students regarding current SOTE
Although this survey had been administered in S2019, the data from 64 students in an undergraduate psychology class had not been analyzed. For the purpose of this report, students were asked to describe the aspects of the course or instructor they thought about when they answered the two closed ended (numeric) questions about instruction and specific contributions (i.e., What aspects of the course or

instructor do you think about as you answer this question? Give at least two examples of the kind of responses you have given in the past. Three MS Industrial and Organizational Psychology (MSIOP) graduate students entered the data into Excel spreadsheets and identified themes from these questions. A table of these themes and representative statements can be found in [Appendix E](#). These themes include making the course relevant to students, accessibility of the instructor, individualized instructor feedback on assignments, structure and organization of the course, and teaching style. These themes mimic a number of the dimensions that were identified in the previously mentioned meta analyses.

Appendix B. Collective Bargaining Agreement Section Referencing Student Evaluations

From the CFA-CSU contract, Article 15, Evaluation:

15.17 a. Student evaluations collected as part of the regular student evaluation process shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section. The format of student evaluations shall be quantitative (e.g., "Scantron" form, etc.) or a combination of quantitative and qualitative (e.g., space provided on the quantitative form for student comments).

Source: <https://www.calfac.org/resource/collective-bargaining-agreement-contract-2014-2017>

Appendix C. Originally Proposed Dimensions for Developing a New Instrument (AY2016-17)

Dimensions agreed upon in AY2016-17 with thumbnail descriptions, based on Feldman, 1989

1*. Organization and expectations: *(effective use of time in class; course well-organized; expectations made clear)*

- Expectations and goals for the course made clear: does the student feel as though the course was well-organized with the promise met
- Preparation- preparation of/for class sessions or periods; time used wisely; how well-organized were class periods

2. Knowledge of subject matter: *(instructor's ability to convey their knowledge of the subject matter)*

- Can the instructor respond to questions clearly?

- Explain clearly the subject matter?
- Current knowledge of subject matter

3. **Nature of the assessment** (consistent with course expectations and goals; appropriate level of challenge)

- Assessments (i.e., exams, homework, assignments) reflect the content and scope of the course (directly related to course material?)
- Were the assessments aligned with the difficulty and expectations of the course?

4*. **Promptness and value of feedback** (quality of feedback – was it constructive and useful; Amount/existence of feedback; Timeliness of feedback)

- Was the instructor feedback constructive?

5. **Stimulation of interest** (stimulates interest; promotes participation and engagement in course)

- Instructor was able to stimulate interest in the course content (“The instructor puts material across in an interesting way”)
- Instructor encouraged/motivated students to engage with the course material or
- Instructor encouraged/motivated students to participate actively in the course

6*. **Availability and helpfulness** (accessible, outside of class availability)

- Instructor was available outside of class time (e.g., office hours, email) to answer questions about course material
- Consistent with class size, instructor helped students who encountered difficulties with course content

7. **Impact of instruction** (instructor was instrumental in increasing knowledge of the course’s subject matter; ‘I learned the material well’, knowledge, tools & skills)

- Students report that instruction contributed significantly their learning of knowledge or skills in the course

8. **Overall evaluation of the instruction:**

- Global dimension; taking all aspects of the course instruction into account, the quality of the instruction provided in the course

*Dimension selected for final form that also appear in Schneider and Preckel (2017)

Appendix D. Survey and Results of Faculty Use of SOTE Data

[Faculty use of SOTE data SURVEY.docx](#) (Word doc created from Qualtrics)

Brief Overview of the Numeric (Quantitative) Data from the Faculty Survey

- 234 people entered the survey portal; 190 responded to the questions asked.
- Breakdown of respondents:
 - 39% lecturers, 17% assistant professors, 8% associate professors, 36% full professors
 - 42% had served on some form of an RPT committee (department, college, university) or was a chair

- College representation among the respondents: 26% CAL, 13% JHB-CBPA, 7% COE, 31% CNS, 23% SBS

Instructor Data

- Instructors viewed SOTE feedback and format as slightly more useful than not
 - “somewhat useful” and “somewhat helpful” achieved a plurality of responses (44% and 46%, respectively).
- Instructors review their SOTE results as soon as they are available
 - 75% indicated that they had made changes as a result of SOTE data.
- Instructors are divided in their satisfaction with the feedback provided from the SOTE, its structure, and its use for RPT purposes (40-47% are satisfied) .
 - A nearly equivalent proportion was dissatisfied (32-34%) or very dissatisfied (11-19%) with these elements of the SOTE.
- Although the majority (60%) agreed that the number of SOTE administrations (all courses) was about right, 71% suggested that the number be revisited in the CBA.
- Simple majorities (49-56%) responded that no exceptions should be made to reduce the number of administrations of the SOTE.
- The majority (60%) of respondents said “No” when asked if the SOTE is an effective measure of teaching quality.
- Most were unaware of the supplemental forms B and C.

From Those Who had been on Evaluation Committees or Evaluated as Department Chair

- A large majority (82%) found the numeric ratings to be important (54%) or very important (28%).
- An even larger majority (94%) found the student comments to be important (32%) or very important (62%)
- 48% of these respondents were dissatisfied with the SOTE to evaluate teaching quality; 15% were very dissatisfied (total=63%)
- When asked how much weight is and should be placed on SOTEs for purposes of RPT of tenure-track faculty, there is a difference in what is and what should be
 - 50% of the respondents marked that SOTEs are weighted 60% or more in the RPT process whereas 64% indicated that it should be 50% or less.

Link to the output of the quantitative data:

[SOTE Survey Data Frequencies.pdf](#)

Summary of the Qualitatively Coded Data, SOTE Faculty Survey, S2019

The responses to the qualitatively coded questions echoed the themes found in the numeric data and amplified some concerns about the use of the SOTE instrument.

Instructors

Useful about SOTE? (Q9). Instructors, when asked what is useful about the SOTE responded that they found the comments and feedback provided by the students on the form to be the most useful.

Not Useful about SOTE? (Q10). When asked which aspects are not useful, the 2 Likert items were most often referenced. Nearly as likely, instructors commented on the prompts not being specific enough to provide actionable feedback and a comparable number of respondents stated that the ratings that are achieved on the form are based on factors other than quality of teaching (e.g., students unhappy with grades or demanding courses).

Is SOTE an effective measure of teaching quality (Q19/20). More than 60 percent of instructors ticked “No” when asked if the SOTE is an effective measure of teaching quality. Coded comments indicated that many believe that other approaches and/or material is needed to address teaching quality, which cannot be done with a single rating instrument. A sizable number of respondents left comments indicating that the SOTE measure itself is flawed. Further, many instructors commented on the idea that students cannot evaluate the quality of instruction or use the instrument as a weapon against faculty who have high standards. In addition, concerns with the bias inherent in evaluating instructors who are women and minority were raised. Finally, there were respondents who noted that the instrument provides the student perspective and provides accountability.

What changes, if any, to SOTE to help evaluate own teaching? (Q25). Respondents overwhelmingly requested more specificity in the questions to be asked of students about teaching. A number described their dissatisfaction with the process, including requests for fewer SOTEs to be administered.

What other information would be helpful to evaluate faculty teaching? (Q47). Instructors frequently commented on a desire for enhanced classroom visitations (e.g., more frequent, with more feedback about teaching styles). A sizable number of respondents commented on improving the information that comes from students (e.g., specific questions offered) as well as the information that can be offered about instructors (e.g., teaching portfolio). Another relatively frequent comment type was that student outcomes should be assessed (e.g., administering a common test or assessing student career achievement).

Turning to Those on Evaluation Committees and their Responses

How do you use the SOTE data in evaluation? (Q38). Nearly equal numbers of evaluators looked for 1) patterns and trends in the data and 2) balanced the numeric with the comments. A sizable number made comments about the process of evaluating teaching (e.g., the value of the data provided by students for assessing instructor quality, preference for class visitations over SOTEs).

What other information is used by evaluation committees? (Q45). The largest number of responses referred to class visitations. Additional, frequent references were made to class materials (e.g., syllabi), faculty self statements (e.g., teaching philosophy in FAR), and evidence of professional development (attendance at teaching workshops).

What changes would be helpful in the SOTE for evaluation of other faculty? (Q36). Of those who use the SOTE for evaluating faculty, the most frequent call was for more specific questions, preferably behavioral and objective in nature.

Link to the tallies of the qualitative coding of responses:

[Summary of the qual codes SOTE.xlsx](#)

Link to the current student rating form, Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness.

[SOTEFomA.pdf](#)

Link to Form B, Faculty Supplemental Comment Form.

[FormB.pdf](#)

Supplemental questions from TRC

<https://www.csusb.edu/trc/resources/supplemental>

Appendix E. Student Data from S2019 Psychology Course

Students ($n = 64$) were asked to respond to the following questions.

Preamble. On the current SOTE form, there are two closed-ended (Likert style) questions on the existing rating form that are rated on a 6-point scale anchored from 6 = Excellent to 1 = Unsatisfactory. The first one of these Likert items reads: How would you rate the overall quality of instruction in this course?

The survey asked respondents: What aspects of the course or instructor do you think about as you

answer this question? Give at least two examples of the kind of responses you have given in the past.

The same question was asked about the second Likert item: How would you rate your professor’s specific contributions to your learning in this course?

Because the themes that emerged from the qualitative coding of the responses to both questions were virtually identical, only one table is presented below that provides the resulting themes.

Emergent Themes from Current SOTE Form Questions of Overall Quality, Specific Contribution

Theme	Definition	Example
Applicability	Real world application of course material; understanding why they are learning this material; the material is relevant and appropriate to their major or learning environment.	“The information learned from the course is relatable to the real world and useful” (JB9).
Availability	Is the instructor easy to get a hold of (e.g., prompt to respond to emails, attend office hours, available before/after class, etc.)	“I think about how flexible the professor is with their time, if they were willing to be helpful with rescheduling or setting up appointments outside of office hours. The communication, and being able to reach them in a timely manner when needed” (AE4).
Clarity	Instruction and information given to students (through any outlet, e.g., Face-to-face or Bb) is coherent.	“... How clearly the instructor elaborates on the lecture material or how in depth they get” (JB15).
Feedback	Instructor gives individual feedback (e.g., writing comments on individual students' assignments), not just general feedback (e.g., giving the mean, SD, and median of class grades).	“...the instructor provides feedback in order for me to better my work...” (CD58).
Instruction	How effectively the instructor communicated class content/ knowledge to the students. About the content students are learning, not HOW they are learning.	“Content difficulty... (AB3).
Knowledge	Instructor is competent and knowledgeable regarding course material (instructor is considered knowledgeable because she/he can effectively answer student questions).	“I think about how well the professor knows the information about the subject...” (CD48).

Overall	Student takes into account their overall experience.	"I evaluate my overall learning experience..." (AB13).
Personality	Instructor shows passion for the subject, the instructor has a positive attitude and they show they care about their students (e.g., they are approachable, they answer questions, receptive, funny, helpful, etc.); the instructor is engaging.	"... the instructor being kind and caring. I also notice the instructor's interest for their students" (CD65).
Reasonable	Instructor being sensible regarding homework load, learning objectives, etc.; class meeting student's expectations, is the course unreasonably difficult?	"I think about the level of expectation for a class that only meets once a week. The test (midterm) should take place far sooner in the quarter. (JB5).
Retention of Material	Does the student feel they learned something?	"I think about how much I remember about the information after class before reading & after exams and what has [stuck]. I have [written] that I was learning so much from the quality of the teacher I didn't have much stress during testing because [I remember so much]. I have said to keep teaching how they are, very useful!" (CD52).
Structure	How the teacher arranges the course; instructor provides lecture reinforcements (e.g., homework, class activities, etc.); how organized the course is; instructor gives point opportunities (e.g., attendance points, participation, homework assignments, etc.). There is a logical flow to the course.	"Order and organization caused delay and confusion on the fly. Made timeframe and converging of material more difficult than expected" (AE14).
Teaching Style	What tools do instructors use (e.g., PowerPoint); Presentation of course material; Student engagement (e.g., asking questions during lecture); giving specific examples; detailedness of professor; student feels that professor is influential and had an impact on their learning.	"I usually think about how an instructor answers questions and how the information was taught in class. I've given good rating on how instructors were willing to rephrase an answer to make it more concise..." (CB49).

Note.

Overall Quality: How would you rate the overall quality of instruction in this course? Specific

Contribution: How would you rate your professor's specific contributions to your learning in this course?

Themes are applicable to both Overall Quality and Specific Contribution.

Themes developed by Concepcion (Connie) Rodriguez, MSIOP Graduate Student, Jessica Carrera-Mendoza, MSIOP Graduate Student, Alexa Massiquet, MSIOP Graduate Student.

Letter and number combination in parentheses indicate specific case number from data.

Appendix F. Items Reviewed, Created, Finalized

Table 1. Initial Items Derived from Schneider and Preckel (2017)

Number	Item
1	Students were required to demonstrate their mastery of each topic before moving on to new material
2	The teacher gave useful feedback on graded material
3	Instructor comments on papers was helpful to students
4	Provided timely and frequent feedback on tests, reports, projects, and other assignments
5	The instructor has definite standards and is impartial in grading
6	Tests and assignments covered the most important points of the course
7	The exams reflect material emphasized in the course
8	The instructor was skilled in observing student reactions
9	The instructor was aware when students failed to keep up in class
10	The instructor explained material clearly
11	The instructor clearly explains concepts
12	The instructor interprets abstract ideas and theories clearly.
13	The instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations to get across difficult points
14	The instructor speaks distinctly, fluently, and without hesitation
15	The instructor varied the speech and tone of his or her voice
16	The instructor shows interest and enthusiasm in the subject
17	The instructor communicates a genuine desire to teach students

18	The instructor puts materials across in an interesting way
19	The instructor stimulated intellectual curiosity*
20	Students were expected to support their answers with material from the course
21	The instructor is available on an individual basis outside of class when I request
22	The instructor was willing to help students having difficulty
23	The instructor was accessible to students outside of class
24	The instructor shows respect and concern for students
25	The instructor was friendly toward all students
26	The instructor took students seriously
27	The instructor was concerned that the students learned the course material
28	The instructor appeared receptive to the viewpoint of others
29	The instructor encourages me to raise questions or make comments
30	Students felt free to ask questions
31	Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class (office visits, phone calls, e mail)
32	The instructor clearly defined student responsibilities in the course
33	The purpose and policies of the course were made clear to the student
34	Students were asked to apply course content to real life situations
35	Students were asked to apply course content to new problems
36	The instructor challenges me to think
37	This course challenged students intellectually
38	Gave projects, tests, or assignments that required original or creative thinking
39	The instructor raised challenging questions and problems
40	There were opportunities to work on class assignments in small groups
41	Instructor made an effort to relate course content to student experiences
42	Instructor personalized course material so that it was more meaningful for me
43	The instructor planned the activities of each class period in detail*
44	The instructor made effective use of class time

45	The instructor was well prepared for each day's lecture
----	---

Number of items: 45

Table 2. Reduced Subset of Items after Student Think Alouds and Committee Discussion

Original Item No.	Item
2	The instructor gave useful feedback on assignments
4	The instructor provided timely and frequent feedback.
5	The instructor has clear grading criteria.
7	The exams reflect material emphasized in the course
10	The instructor explained course material clearly
11	The instructor clearly explains concepts*
13	The instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations to get across difficult points
23	The instructor was available to students outside of class (office visits, phone calls, e mail)
24	The instructor shows respect and concern for students
32	Expectations of students were made clear
33	The policies of the course were clearly stated in the syllabus
44	The instructor made effective use of class time
45	The instructor was well prepared for each day's lecture

Number of items: 13

Table 3. Proposed Final Items

Item No.	Instructor focused Item	Item framed as a student reflection
2	The instructor gave useful feedback on assignments and projects.	I received useful feedback on assignments and projects.
4	The instructor provided informative feedback.	I received informative feedback on my course work.

5	The instructor has clear grading criteria/standards.	The grading criteria/standards were clear to me.
11	The instructor explains concepts clearly.*	
23	The instructor was available to students outside of class time (e.g., face-to-face, phone calls, Zoom, e mail).*	If I needed, I could meet with the instructor outside of class time.
44	The instructor made effective use of class time.*	
45	The instructor was well prepared for each class session.*	

Notes.

Because items 2 and 4 assess the same dimension (nature, quality, and frequency of feedback from the teacher to students), one item of these two is suggested. Item 4 may be more generalizable to courses across the curriculum.

Some items may provide better feedback if they are administered as student learning reflection items. See column 2 for these.

Number of items: 7

In addition to the above items, which we considered useful for peer observation, we propose the following items also be used by peers for considering effective instruction:

- The instructor was skilled in observing student reactions
- The instructor was aware when students failed to keep up in class
- The instructor shows respect and concern for students

Appendix G. Items Assessing Student Contributions to Their Learning

Goal 1 of CSUSB’s Strategic Plan is Student Success: *Provide learning experiences that promote student success, achievement, and academic excellence and prepare students to contribute to a dynamic society.*

As you complete this form, we want you to think of learning as a partnership between instructor and student. With this in mind, in addition to the expectations that faculty will demonstrate competency in their coursework, it is expected that students will contribute to their learning by coming to class, preparing for each class session, and reading the assigned material. To give you some idea how much preparation is expected for a college level class, for a 3 unit course, 6 hours of outside work is expected (the standard for college level work is 2 hours of work outside of class session, per course unit).

Number	Student Contributions to Their Learning Items
1	How many class sessions did you miss?*
2	Did you prepare before you came to class?
3	How many hours did you prepare for this course, outside of class, per week? This includes reading, practicing, studying.
4	Did you let the instructor know if you needed help?

Notes.

*Missing a class is more distinctive and lends itself to better recall than how many sessions were attended.

Appendix H. Proposed Form: Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPT)

[COVER SHEET]

After instructor leaves the room:

Instruction sets

(Instruction set for the form administered early in term, intended for feedback)

Your perceptions of your instructor’s teaching provide important feedback. Please fill out the form thoroughly, thoughtfully, and individually. Mark the responses that represent your observations of the instructor and where appropriate, make comments. Your responses will be provided to your instructor so they can make any needed adjustment in the course. If there are areas in which the instructor is contributing to your learning in a meaningful way, please state that as well.

Before you provide your feedback about the instructor, there are some questions about your preparation for this course. These questions help the instructor understand if the students in the class need additional help to be ready to learn in this course.

(Instruction set for the form administered late in term, used for RPT)

Your perceptions of your instructor’s teaching is an important element in the evaluation of Faculty.

University evaluation committees carefully consider your responses in making reappointment, retention, promotion, and tenure recommendations. Please fill out the form thoroughly, thoughtfully, and individually. Mark the responses that represent your observations of the instructor and where appropriate, make comments. Your responses are confidential and will not be made available to your instructor until after grades are recorded. Discussion of the instructor while completing this form is inappropriate, will be reported to the appropriate administrative office, and may result in invalidation of all student feedback for the class.

Before you provide your feedback about the instructor, there are some questions about your preparation for this course. These questions help the instructor and the evaluators to understand your feedback about the instructor.

Form begins here -----

Student learning is the premier objective of a university education. Learning is so important that Goal 1 of CSUSB's Strategic Plan is Student Success: *Provide learning experiences that promote student success, achievement, and academic excellence and prepare students to contribute to a dynamic society.*

As you complete this form, we want you to think of learning as a partnership between instructor and student. With this in mind, in addition to the expectations that faculty will demonstrate competency in their coursework, it is expected that students will contribute to their learning by coming to class, preparing for each class session, and reading the assigned material. To give you some idea how much preparation is expected for a college level class, for a 3 unit course, 6 hours of outside work is expected (i.e., the standard for college level work is 2 hours of work outside of class session, per course unit).

1. How many class sessions did you miss?⁹

1___

2___

3___

4___

5 or more___

2. Did you prepare before you came to class?

Most of the time___

Some of the time___

Rarely___

⁹Students are more likely to recall how many class sessions they missed as these are likely to be more distinctive relative to recalling how many sessions they attended.

Not applicable ___

Would you like to comment on your class preparation?(in electronic administration, a text box would automatically appear):

3. How many hours did you prepare for this course, outside of class, per week? This includes reading, practicing, rehearsing, studying.

1-2 hours per week ___

3-4 hours per week ___

5-6 hours per week ___

7-10 hours per week ___

10 hours or more ___

4. Did you let the instructor know if you needed help?

Yes ___ No ___ Not applicable ___

If you wish, please provide more explanation here:

Considering the class that is named above on this form, please complete the following items.

1. The instructor gave useful feedback on assignments and projects (OR The instructor provided informative feedback).

¹⁰Strongly Agree ___

Agree ___

Neither agree or disagree ___

Disagree ___

Strongly Disagree ___

Not applicable ___

If you wish to give more detail, feel free to explain here:

2. The instructor has clear grading criteria/standards.

Strongly Agree ___

Agree ___

¹⁰We recommend percentages of endorsement be reported, e.g., for one item, the students' responses may break out: 40% Strongly Agree, 35% Agree, 10% Neither agree or disagree, 5% Disagree, 5% Strongly Disagree, and 5% Not applicable. Combining the Strongly Agree and Agree options would indicate 75% agreement with the item and combining the Strongly Disagree and Disagree options would indicate 10% disagreement with the item. Using percentages is consistent with the Stark and Freishtat (2014) recommendation to report distributions.

Neither agree or disagree ___

Disagree ___

Strongly Disagree ___

Not applicable ___

If you wish to give more detail, feel free to explain here:

3. The instructor explains concepts clearly.*

Strongly Agree ___

Agree ___

Neither agree or disagree ___

Disagree ___

Strongly Disagree ___

Not applicable ___

If you wish to give more detail, feel free to explain here:

4. The instructor was available to students outside of class time (e.g., face-to-face, phone calls, Zoom, e mail).*

Strongly Agree ___

Agree ___

Neither agree or disagree ___

Disagree ___

Strongly Disagree ___

Not applicable ___

If you wish to give more detail, feel free to explain here:

5. The instructor made effective use of class time.*

Strongly Agree ___

Agree ___

Neither agree or disagree ___

Disagree ___

Strongly Disagree ___

Not applicable ___

If you wish to give more detail, feel free to explain here:

6. The instructor was well prepared for each class session.*

Strongly Agree ___

Agree ___

Neither agree or disagree ___

Disagree ___

Strongly Disagree ___

Not applicable ___

If you wish to give more detail, feel free to explain here:

7. Is there anything else you would like the instructor to know?

Notes.

*Results from these four items will be placed within the instructor's WPAF from the last administration at the end of the term. For the first administration during the semester, all feedback will be provided to the instructor only.

Alternative items phrased as student reflective:

2. I received useful feedback on assignments and projects.
4. I received informative feedback on my course work.
5. The grading criteria/standards were clear to me.
23. If I needed, I could meet with the instructor outside of class time.

Appendix I. Figure 1 -- Flow Chart of Separated Use of Feedback and RPT Process

Appendix J. Brief Biographical Sketches of Faculty Members of the AY2019-20 Committee

Jan Kottke, Chair, is Professor of Psychology and founder of the nationally recognized master of science program in industrial psychology (MSIOP) at CSUSB. In 2019, she was made a Fellow of the American Psychological Association, Division 2, Society for the Teaching of Psychology. In 2020, she was the recipient of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Distinguished Teaching Contributions Award. Her typical teaching assignments include graduate applied measurement, graduate applied practicum, and teaching of psychology. She has supervised over 80 master's theses, manages a thriving research lab, the Leadership Think Tank, of undergraduates and graduates, and has published multiple scales. During her CSUSB career, she has served at all levels of campus service: department, college, and university.

Jo Anna Grant is the Director of the Teaching Resource Center, Co-Director of the Faculty Center for

Excellence, and Professor of Communication Studies. She holds credentials from Quality Matters and Quality Learning and Teaching for online course design, and the American Council on Education/Association of Colleges and Universities (ACE/ACUE)-endorsed Certificate in Effective College Teaching Practice. She is a graduate of the Professional and Organizational Network's (PODnetwork's) Summer Institute for New Faculty Developers, and is a 2019 alumna of the Higher Education Resource Center (HERS) Leadership Institute. She regularly attends various meetings on effective teaching and student success including HIPS in the States, AAC&U Diversity Conference, WASC Quality Matters, the Lilly Conference, and the CSU Summer Academy on Diversity and Inclusion. She teaches graduate instructional communication, has directed several theses and projects on instructional communication, and is a published author of instructional communication research.

Kathie Pelletier is a Professor in the Department of Management. She has expertise in survey development and design, quantitative and qualitative data analysis, personnel selection and performance appraisal. As a member of the Online SOTE Ad Hoc Committee in 2010/2011, she developed and piloted a revision to the SOTE communication students received which resulted in an increase in response rates. She has also developed and administered surveys in the private and public sectors. In addition to holding leadership positions in several large corporations for 25 years, she also consults in organizations on leadership, motivation, culture change, and has also worked as an executive coach. She has also published research on the relationship between lecture-embedded assessments on student engagement and self-efficacy. In recognition of exemplary teaching, she was the recipient of the 2017-2018 Golden Apple Award.

Becky Sumbera was a lecturer for 5 years before becoming an Assistant Professor and Coordinator in the Teacher Education and Foundations Department. She has spent 27 years in K-12 Education as a County, District, and Site Administrator, and Teacher. She has received ACSA Region 12 Continuation/Educational Options Administrator of the Year, Educator of the Year, and numerous recommendations within the field of education. She was a County lead in supporting San Bernardino and Riverside school districts in analyzing their state data to inform instructional decisions, creating protocols and training district and site administrators and coaches on classroom observation and instructional coaching techniques, and school reform. She currently serves as the President for the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA) and as an Editor for the *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development Journal*.

Cherie Ward is a professor in the department of Special Education, Rehabilitation and Counseling. She has coordinated graduate programs in Child Development and School Psychology for over 18 years. She served on the Institutional Review Board, as chair and college representative, for over 12 years. Her primary teaching responsibilities include classes in atypical child development (intro to special education), research methodology, and child assessment and she supervises students in applied school settings. Her most recent research focus is on early childhood assessment in various settings.