Electronic Faculty Activity Report and Course Evaluation Systems

This report by Hanover Research is composed of three main sections. The first section focuses on several examples of electronic faculty activity report systems currently implemented at higher education institutions across the country. The second section discusses electronic course evaluation systems at selected institutions. The final section provides an overview of key findings and common challenges associated with online evaluation systems.
Section 1: Electronic Faculty Activity Reports

Overview & Methodology

The first section of this report focuses on several electronic faculty activity report systems currently implemented at higher education institutions. In order to select institutions that successfully engage in electronic faculty activity reporting, institutions participating in the Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity data-sharing consortium were reviewed as an initial reference. According to the study’s website, The Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity is “an analytical tool that allows you to benchmark teaching workloads, instructional costs and productivity, by academic discipline.” Over 500 colleges and universities use the Delaware Study tool to analyze selected facets of out-of-classroom faculty activity. Such activities include those “related to advising, curriculum development, research and scholarship, professional development and institutional and public service.”

Although the data collected for the Delaware study primarily focuses on faculty activities outside the classroom, the University of Delaware issues annual briefing papers that identify “colleges and universities that are engaged in exemplary practices with respect to collecting data on the full range of faculty activities, particularly those occurring outside of the classroom.” Thus, several of the institutions profiled in this report were selected due to their identification as “institutional exemplars” in these briefing papers, in addition to their use of electronic faculty activity reports.

Peer institutions of XYZ University (XYZ) that employ electronic faculty report systems were also considered in the selection process. Peer institutions are defined as those that meet three Carnegie Foundation classifications:

- Basic Classification: Master’s Colleges and Universities, Larger Programs
- Size and Setting: Large Four-Year, Primarily Nonresidential
- Control of Institution: Public

Participation in the Delaware Study and classification as a peer institution of XYZ University (using the above criteria) were not mutually exclusive selection factors. Some institutions profiled here fall into both categories.

Given this approach, the remainder of this section will profile the electronic faculty activity report systems that are currently used at several higher education institutions. Information such as the software/database systems being used, types of data
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4 Ibid., p.5.
collected, and administration approaches will be addressed for each respective system. Institutions featured in this section include:

- Middle Tennessee State University
- Montana State University
- Clemson University
- Boise State University
- Marshall University
- SUNY Binghamton University

On the following page, we offer a table with key characteristics of the above mentioned institutions.
Table 1: Key Characteristics of Profiled Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Middle Tennessee State University</th>
<th>Montana State University</th>
<th>Clemson University</th>
<th>Boise State University</th>
<th>Marshall University</th>
<th>SUNY Binghamton University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>4-year or above</td>
<td>4-year or above</td>
<td>4-year or above</td>
<td>4-year or above</td>
<td>4-year or above</td>
<td>4-year or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>22,322</td>
<td>11,913</td>
<td>17,110</td>
<td>18,332</td>
<td>13,920</td>
<td>13,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Profile</td>
<td>Full-time four-year, selective, higher transfer-in</td>
<td>Full-time four-year, selective, higher transfer-in</td>
<td>Full-time four-year, more selective, lower transfer-in</td>
<td>Medium full-time four-year, selective, higher transfer-in</td>
<td>Full-time four-year, selective, higher transfer-in</td>
<td>Full-time four-year, more selective, higher transfer-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instructional Program Classification</td>
<td>Comprehensive doctoral (no medical/veterinary)</td>
<td>Doctoral, STEM dominant</td>
<td>Doctoral, STEM dominant</td>
<td>Single doctoral (education)</td>
<td>Doctoral, STEM dominant</td>
<td>Comprehensive doctoral (no medical/veterinary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size and Setting</td>
<td>Large four-year, primarily nonresidential</td>
<td>Large four-year, primarily residential</td>
<td>Large four-year, primarily residential</td>
<td>Large four-year, primarily nonresidential</td>
<td>Large four-year, primarily nonresidential</td>
<td>Large four-year, highly residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Classification</td>
<td>Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>Research Universities (high research activity)</td>
<td>Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Research Universities (high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employees with Faculty Status*</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenues*</td>
<td>$158,543,792</td>
<td>$237,433,094</td>
<td>$418,955,122</td>
<td>$150,859,253</td>
<td>$155,479,352</td>
<td>$169,150,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Carnegie Foundation. Variables with an “*” are from National Center for Education Statistics (2008 data).
Case Studies

Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU)

Middle Tennessee State University is a peer institution of XYZ and also participates in the Delaware Study. The University’s Office of Institutional Research stated the following on its website:5

In response to state level interest in performance budgeting, the appropriations bill specified new accountability measures for higher education. The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) and the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) decided on a national study out of the University of Delaware, the Delaware Cost Study, which could provide benchmarks for instructional cost comparisons with institutions outside of Tennessee.

Some key aspects of the University's administration of the activity report system are provided by its Office of Institutional Research:

- The Faculty Activity System is a web-based data collection system for collecting data for the qualitative dimension of the Study (the measure of selected facets of out-of-classroom faculty activity);6

- Faculty within each academic department complete a Delaware Study Faculty Activity Checklist, and department chairs aggregate data from these checklists onto Summary Forms;7

- This data collection focuses on out-of-classroom activity of only tenured and tenure-track faculty within departments for aggregate departmental information purposes, and should coincide with department chair annual performance reviews;8

- Participation in the Delaware Study is voluntary for faculty, however it is currently used in the University Strategic Plan and has been used to address accreditation issues;9

- The Faculty Activity Checklist for MTSU is housed on the university’s website. It is comprised of 42 fields in which whole numbers are entered to

6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
9 Middle Tennessee State University. 2009. “Faculty Menu.” http://frank.mtsu.edu/~instres/faculty.htm
indicate the amount of times each activity was performed in the current academic year;\textsuperscript{10}

- The deadline this year was May 21, 2010, the end of MTSU’s academic year.\textsuperscript{11} The website form allows faculty to enter a portion of responses, click the submit button, and return to complete or update their information prior to the deadline.\textsuperscript{12}

To view the Delaware Study Faculty Activity Checklist that MTSU currently uses, please refer to Figure 1 in the Appendix.

**Montana State University (MSU)**

Montana State University was recognized as an “institutional exemplar” in a Delaware Study briefing paper in July 2004, demonstrating that the University has been successful with faculty activity data collection for several years. According to the briefing, MSU was using electronic faculty activity reporting methods as of 2004:\textsuperscript{13}

In moving toward full participation in the Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity phase of the Delaware Study, Montana State University decided to develop a web-based data collection form that exactly mirrored the data elements being collected on the Delaware Study Data Collection Form. The software tool of choice for Montana State University was Microsoft Access, which enables the creation of web-based data collection forms, and the manipulation and management of data collected therein.

Since 2004, the University has developed new ways to collect faculty activity data electronically. According to a 2006 presentation by Chris Fastnow, Associate Director of Planning and Analysis at MSU, the University moved from Access to a hierarchical database system with a web interface called NeuroSys. The software was originally developed in-house for scientific data collection, but was piloted for online faculty activity reporting. Data were organized in “trees” rather than across tables, and click and drag widgets were used to design and create data entry forms.\textsuperscript{14} Faculty then entered responses on a secure website, and the data could be exported as Excel files.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{10} Middle Tennessee State University. 2009. “Delaware Study Faculty Activity Checklist.” https://oirapp01.fsa.mtsu.edu/cgi-bin/IEPR/FA_Entry.pl
\textsuperscript{11} Middle Tennessee State University. 2009. “Faculty Menu.” Op. Cit.
\textsuperscript{14} Fastnow, C. 2006. “Creating a Faculty Activity Database: Three Practical Solutions and a Wish List.” Montana State University, p.25. www.montana.edu/opa/RMAIR06distribution.ppt
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 26-27.
The University’s Faculty Activity Database (FAD) has evolved from the NeuroSys software to the Yogo Data Management System, an enhanced software tool for designing and creating databases, and is in its third year of use. The Yogo database software is open source, and released under the MIT license.

The FAD provides department heads, deans, and administrators with data collected directly from faculty once per year, and the core of the FAD data is defined by the Delaware Study. A description of the new FAD system on the MSU website provides some insight into the relationship of the system with annual reviews of faculty and the Delaware Study:

This survey is an attempt to streamline the number of reports and surveys you are asked to fill out each year. In addition to serving as the basis for your annual review, your responses assist several campus constituencies in data collection. Your responses, usually aggregated to the department or college level, will be used by UPBAC and the Office of Planning and Analysis for budget and planning, reporting, and review purposes. Additionally, you and other faculty may use selected results for grant proposals and reporting.

Individual responses to questions about teaching and scholarship may be used to identify experts on campus. Most of the following questions also satisfy our participation in the Delaware Study of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity…

Annual reviews at MSU are conducted in the spring semester and based upon the previous calendar year’s activities. The University also conducts third-year reviews and tenure reviews which are conducted in the fall semester of the faculty member’s third year and sixth year of appointment in a tenurable position respectively.

To view sample screenshots of Montana State University’s online Faculty Activity Database, refer to Figure 2 in the Appendix.

Clemson University

Clemson University was selected by the Delaware Study as an “institutional exemplar” in its 2004 briefing. The University’s Institutional Research and Information Technology departments collaborated to develop its Faculty Activity System (FAS), which “has enabled the institution to fully participate in the out-of-

16 Montana State University. “Faculty Activity Database.” http://neurosys.msu.montana.edu/Yogo/fad.html
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
20 Montana State University. 2009. “Faculty Handbook: Review of Faculty.” www2.montana.edu/policy/faculty_handbook/fh600.html#610.00
21 Montana State University. “Faculty Activity Database.” https://fad.msu.montana.edu/surveys/1532/edit (Login with username: demo, password: demo)
classroom activity phase of the Delaware Study, while at the same time meeting a broad range of information needs from the Provost, Deans, and Department Chairs.”

The University’s guide to the Faculty Activity System (FAS) provides many details on the design, administration, and content of the system:

- Developed using input from faculty members, FAS reports faculty workload on an annual basis by tracking effort distribution across 11 activity areas on “Activity Report Pages,” which are designed to include every aspect of faculty activity. All information is saved to a database for use in subsequent reports, and Activity Report Pages can be copied from year to year for continuing activities;

- Annual evaluations will be based upon a FAS Report available at the end of each academic year, at which time information in FAS will be archived but will remain accessible on-line in a read-only version. According to the guide, “after FAS has been in place for a number of years, it will provide a significant portion of the information required for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews;”

- FAS provides summaries of workload in predefined activity areas for different academic units of the University. A measure of the relative emphasis that each faculty member places on various areas of work is required and is measured as a percentage distribution of their effort. Each semester totals to 100%;

- Faculty members record their goals early in the academic year along with the planned effort distribution for each semester in the year. Goals will be approved by the Department Chair and provide a basis for subsequent evaluation at the end of the year;

- FAS reports are created with faculty goals and end-of-year comments for each activity area in addition to information about the year’s activities and accomplishments as summarized from Activity Report Pages;

- A variety of FAS summary reports can be generated, either as a printable online format or exported Microsoft Word document;
Finally, FAS allows faculty members to store an electronic copy of their CV in the FAS database for the administration’s access, a requirement of the University. 29

As part of an FAS calendar for the 2008-2009 academic year, the University states:30

In order to complete all annual evaluations in a timely manner, all faculty members should complete entering FAS activities and accomplishments prior to the end of the spring term. Chairs may set appropriate dates for all members to complete FAS entries so that annual evaluations by the Chair can be completed by the middle of August.

To view Clemson University’s 11 activity areas and their respective Activity Report Pages, please refer to Figure 3 in the Appendix.31

Other Notable Institutions with Electronic Faculty Report Systems

Boise State University – Boise State is an XYZ peer institution and a participant of the Delaware Study. According to a 2009 University accreditation self-report, the University has recently begun a five-year contract with Digital Measures, which is a web-based software tool used to compile faculty research activity. Per the report, the University was planning to participate in the Delaware Study for the first time in fall of 2009, and was going to use Digital Measures software to compile the necessary faculty activity data.32 Boise State’s College of Business and Economics had previously been using the software to allow faculty to report their non-scheduled teaching activity, their research/creative activity, their service to the University and their profession, and their community partnerships. The 2009 report stated that after consultation with deans, chairs and faculty, the University was planning to implement Digital Measures campus-wide, and was expected to be in place for the preparation of annual activity reports for the 2009 academic year.33

Marshall University – Marshall University is also an XYZ peer institution and a participant of the Delaware Study. According to the University’s 2009 Faculty Handbook, Digital Measures software is being used to enter and maintain annual activity data for the University’s faculty. The data is used for the generation of faculty

29 Ibid., p.12.
annual reports and other college reports. The Digital Measures software is interfaced with Marshall’s Banner database system.

**SUNY Binghamton University** – Binghamton University was recognized as an exemplary institution by the Delaware Study. The University’s Faculty Personnel Information website states that the faculty reporting site was available from June 1, 2009 until the deadline to submit it to the Provost, which was May 31, 2010. The faculty reporting site is a dynamic, secure site in which faculty can update information throughout the year in order to complete their annual reports. Each faculty member must submit an Annual Faculty Report, and the University faculty handbook states that neither salary adjustments nor leave requests will be permitted without a complete sequence of Annual Faculty Reports on file in the Provost’s Office.

Dr. Michael McGoff, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and for Strategic and Fiscal Planning at Binghamton, stated that the University moved from paper to web-based activity data collection in spring 2001. The Provost and other administrators put collected data into spreadsheets to quantify an academic department’s credit hours taught, contributions to journals and other publications, lectures, presentations, and exhibitions, research expenditures, and other measures of faculty activity. The spreadsheets are “provided to Deans and to departments to facilitate discussions about a unit’s progress in achieving their goals and objectives.”

Please refer to Figure 4 in the Appendix to view descriptions of the information gathered from faculty at Binghamton University.
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36 SUNY Binghamton University. 2010. “Faculty Personnel Information.” www2.binghamton.edu/academics/provost/faculty/
Section 2: Electronic Course Evaluations

Overview & Methodology

Web-based student evaluations of courses and instruction have become more of an established practice at higher education institutions in the past decade. Although there is no official registry and therefore no definite count of institutions using such systems, the Center for Teaching and Learning at Brigham Young University hosts an informational website (OnSET) for current and prospective users of online course evaluation systems. In regards to the number of institutions using such systems, the website states:40

While online rating systems vary in scope and functionality from campus to campus, their purposes generally revolve around the automation of a previous paper-based system of collecting and reporting course evaluation data. The possibilities of conducting student ratings of teaching online are currently being explored at many institutions of higher education worldwide. As of May 2008, this OnSET website lists 26 campus-wide systems, 44 with at least one entire academic department, 30 online and distance course systems and 20 with less than one department using online rating systems.

This section of the report will profile several institutions with online course evaluation systems currently in place. Institutions were selected based on the relative length of time that their systems have been implemented, or their relative similarity to XYZ University according to Carnegie Foundation classifications. Institutions featured in this section include:

- Western Carolina University
- Northwestern University
- University of Idaho

In Table 2 on the following page we provide a listing of key characteristics of the above mentioned institutions.
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Table 2: Key Characteristics of Profiled Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Western Carolina University</th>
<th>Northwestern University</th>
<th>University of Idaho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
<td>4-year or above</td>
<td>4-year or above</td>
<td>4-year or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private not-for-profit</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>8,396</td>
<td>17,747</td>
<td>12,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Total</strong></td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>9,336</td>
<td>9,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergrad Full-time</strong></td>
<td>5,815</td>
<td>8,371</td>
<td>8,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergrad Part-time</strong></td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate &amp; Professional Total</strong></td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>9,955</td>
<td>2,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate &amp; Professional Full-time</strong></td>
<td>596</td>
<td>7,763</td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate &amp; Professional Part-time</strong></td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>1,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduates Under Age 25</strong></td>
<td>5,642</td>
<td>8,604</td>
<td>7,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduates Over Age 25</strong></td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-to-faculty Ratio</strong></td>
<td>15:1</td>
<td>7:1</td>
<td>16:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Faculty</strong></td>
<td>596</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Faculty</strong></td>
<td>545</td>
<td>2129</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time Faculty</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Core Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$139,669,839 (GASB)</td>
<td>$1,456,735,000 (FASB)</td>
<td>$301,322,227 (GASB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Case Studies**

**Western Carolina University (WCU)**

Western Carolina University, a peer of XYZ, piloted its current student evaluation system in 2007. The decision to move to online course evaluations was motivated by two factors. The hardware and software of the Scantron system that WCU had previously used had become inoperable, and prices for similar systems were prohibitive. In addition, a University taskforce recommended a new system which could compile University-wide course evaluation data in a standardized way, but also have the flexibility to measure unique aspects of different departments, programs, and courses.

WCU initially considered using WebCT software, which the University uses to create and host online courses. However, the taskforce determined that the software did not have sufficient faculty and student privacy safeguards. Banner was also considered, but surveys could not be customized to include follow-up and open-ended questions. A software tool called Ultimate Survey was another option, but the system was not robust enough for the University’s needs. Finally, a new taskforce researched outside
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42 Western Carolina University. “Background on Course Evaluations at WCU.” p.1. http://www.wcu.edu/WebFiles/WordDocs/Background_on_Course_Evaluations_at_WCU.doc
vendors of course evaluation software and selected CourseEval3, produced by Academic Management Systems. The software was piloted in five volunteer departments in 2007 and was recommended for campus-wide implementation after a successful review of results.

Western Carolina University’s procedural manual describes how student assessments of instruction are administered using the software:

- The evaluation form is organized into five main sections that represent the “seven dimensions of teaching” in the University faculty handbook: Organization and Clarity, Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation, Rapport and Respect, Feedback and Accessibility, and Student Perceptions of Learning. There is a “standard course” form, which provides four statements for each of the five sections- a total of 20 statements that students respond on a scale of 1) Strongly Agree 2) Agree 3) Disagree 4) Strongly Disagree 5) N/A. However, the Faculty Senate adapted the 20 statements in the standard course form to suit different types of courses such as lab courses, independent research courses, seminars, and so on. Faculty wishing to use a different evaluation form from the default can consult their department chair;

- The evaluation also contains a section with the following two open-ended questions:

  1. Describe the best aspects of this course.
  2. Describe changes that could be made to improve the course.

  All open-ended responses are available only to the individual faculty member and department head, and can be included in annual evaluation and promotion documents if desired by the faculty member;

- The evaluation period opens when approximately 80% of a course is completed. During this period, notifications are sent to students’ e-mail accounts indicating that course evaluations are now open. These e-mails include instruction about when and how to log onto the CoursEval system. The University also has banners, flyers, and billboards displayed on campus that encourage student participation in the evaluation process;

- Faculty members receive a message several days prior to their CoursEval opening, and an additional email is sent to the faculty member when
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CoursEval is open. Approximately half way through the evaluation period, an e-mail is sent to the faculty member indicating the percentage of students that have responded at that time. Once grades have been finalized, the faculty member receives a final email indicating evaluation results are available. Evaluation reports are available as long as the faculty member is employed at WCU.48

**Figure 5 in the Appendix provides sample screenshots of Western Carolina’s online course evaluation system.**

**Northwestern University**

Northwestern University is one of the first institutions to employ an electronic course evaluation system, implementing it campus-wide in the spring of 2000.49 Northwestern is particularly noteworthy because of its success in improving student response rates. Average response rates until 2004 were below 50%. In fall 2004, the University implemented a policy in which students must complete their evaluations in order to view campus rating results, which can assist students in their selection of future classes and instructors. Consequently, the University has maintained a response rate of 73-75% since the change.50

Northwestern University’s website details the components and administration of its electronic course evaluation system:

- The evaluation is administered through the University’s CAESAR system, the web interface through which students can access their records and accounts and enroll in classes. Given that instructors cannot view the names of respondents, evaluations are completely anonymous;51

- Students give numerical ratings to six basic core questions regarding overall quality of instruction, the course, level of intellectual challenge and stimulation, and average number of hours spent per week on coursework outside of class. Evaluations also consist of five open-ended questions regarding teaching strengths/weaknesses of the instructor and teaching assistant, suggestions for improvement, and whether the course helped the student learn;52

- In addition to the core rating questions and open-ended questions, schools and departments of the University can add individualized numerical rating

48 Ibid., p.12-14.
50 Ibid., p.15.
51 Northwestern University. 2010. “CTEC Instructions.” www.registrar.northwestern.edu/courses/CTEC_instructions.html
52 Ibid.
questions. Faculty may choose three course-specific questions to add, which are chosen from a multidimensional question bank of 73 items. Question categories include teacher/student interaction, grading and exams, course materials, course organization, and instructor enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{53}

- When the evaluation site opens, an e-mail is sent to all students giving them instructions on how to enter their evaluations. Reminder messages are sent at the beginning and end of the second week and every day during the third week of the evaluation entry window;\textsuperscript{54}

- Students can access the evaluation sites for their classes beginning at midnight on Sunday at the beginning of the last week of classes. The site will remain open for three weeks and close at midnight on the Sunday following finals week, before any grades are posted by the Office of the Registrar. Evaluation results will be made available to faculty during the week following finals week only after all grades have been submitted to the Registrar’s Office;\textsuperscript{55}

- Evaluation results of all classes will be available on CAESAR. The information posted will include a composite of demographic information and the results of five core questions, the time-survey question, and the comments from a summary essay question. Posted results will be available to all active Northwestern students who have entered evaluations for all of their classes for the previous quarter.\textsuperscript{56}

**University of Idaho**

In 2000, the faculty council at the University formed a task force to assess the feasibility and worth of an online evaluation system in 2000.\textsuperscript{57} The first system was successfully implemented during the 2002-2003 academic year.\textsuperscript{58} Information about the University of Idaho’s Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) system is provided on its website:

- The SET system is administered through the University’s Banner interface, powered by software from SunGard Higher Education;\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{53} Northwestern University. 2010. “CTEC Multidimensional Question Bank.” www.registrar.northwestern.edu/courses/CTEC_Instructor_Question_Bank.html
\textsuperscript{54} Northwestern University. 2010. “CTEC Guidelines.” www.registrar.northwestern.edu/courses/CTEC_Guidelines.html
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{57} University of Idaho. “Frequently Asked Questions.” www.webs.uidaho.edu/studentevals/faq.htm#What happened to the old paper evaluations
\textsuperscript{59} University of Idaho. “Information for Students.” www.webs.uidaho.edu/studentevals/instruction_for_students.htm
The evaluation period for a course typically begins three weeks before the course ends. The evaluation period for full-semester courses ends on the Sunday before the semester’s final exam week.\(^{60}\)

The SET “Standard Form” consists of nine items that are included on all evaluation forms.\(^{61}\) However, instructors have the opportunity select from a “menu” of additional items to add to their evaluation forms in order to better suit each course.\(^{62}\) Course instructors can add and change items as many times as they wish until the first evaluation is completed. Up to 10 items pertaining to the quality of instruction and 10 items pertaining to the quality of the course can be added to a course evaluation form.\(^{63}\)

Students receive an e-mail when a course opens for evaluation. The e-mail includes information on each course to be evaluated, how to evaluate, and when the evaluation window closes. For each course, students receive a reminder each Wednesday following the initial email until they have evaluated the course, or the evaluation period has ended.\(^{64}\)

Instructors will be able to view the student responses for their courses after final grades have been submitted. Summary reports with aggregate statistical data and detailed reports with individual responses and comments are available. Faculty members are also able to view online response rate reports that show real time response rate data for each course.\(^{65}\)

To view the University of Idaho’s SET Standard Form and a sample of Menu Items, please refer to Figure 6 in the Appendix.
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\(^{60}\) University of Idaho. “Frequently Asked Questions.” www.webs.uidaho.edu/studentevals/faq.htm#When are the new Online Student Evaluations of Teaching

\(^{61}\) University of Idaho. “Sample Standard Form.” www.webs.uidaho.edu/studentevals/sample_standard_form.htm

\(^{62}\) University of Idaho. “Menu Items.” www.webs.uidaho.edu/studentevals/menu_items.htm

\(^{63}\) University of Idaho. “Information for Course Instructors.” www.webs.uidaho.edu/studentevals/instruction_for_teachers.htm


Section 3: Key Findings

Electronic Faculty Activity Reports

Although there is no single electronic faculty report system that could be identified as being ideal for XYZ University, the preceding profiles are intended to provide an idea as to how other institutions are currently implementing and administering electronic faculty report systems, and the technologies they use. However, there are several key characteristics that contemporary electronic faculty report systems share. These characteristics can be found in some or all of the systems profiled in this section of the report to different degrees.

- The development of original electronic faculty report systems are frequently done within the institution, often through collaboration between the Institutional Research and Information Technology departments, as in the case of Clemson University and Montana State University. Institutions also frequently seek outside software solutions to replace or supplement their existing database software, as seen with Boise State and Marshall Universities’ use of Digital Measures software. The development and/or selection of a system often benefits from input from multiple stakeholders, particularly faculty members, as in the case of Boise State and Clemson Universities.

- Contemporary systems are generally web-based. Past iterations of electronic faculty reporting, such as at Montana State University, were frequently Excel-based. Faculty entered information into Excel forms; department heads then aggregated the data, sent it to deans, and so forth. More advanced contemporary systems often comprise of web-based software with data entry forms and the ability to generate Excel summary tables and other reports more efficiently.

- Most institutions have annual deadlines for faculty reports, usually in the spring. Many electronic reporting systems are dynamic, however, allowing faculty to enter, update, and save data throughout the year in preparation for deadlines.

- Some institutions have integrated online report systems with existing student and personnel databases such as Banner, so that course data is automatically populated into faculty’s online report.

- Some institutions incentivize faculty reporting by linking salary increases and sabbatical leave to the completion of reports. SUNY Binghamton University currently uses such an incentive.

Electronic Course Evaluations

Challenges and Potential Strategies

There are many benefits of using electronic student evaluations of teaching and courses, many of which address the shortcomings of paper-based evaluations. According to a report by McGill University, benefits of online course evaluations include:67

- Enhanced data analysis and communication
  - Rapid turnaround time for professors to get results; hours vs. months after submitting grades
  - Standardized reporting functions available within units and University-wide
  - Supports custom analyses
  - Facilitates dissemination of results
  - Provides secure archiving
- An online system offers every student equal access to the evaluation process
  - Every student enrolled in the course has a voice; missing one class does not silence a student
- Improved administrative efficiencies
  - Easy to standardize and customize forms
  - Reduced workload for administrative staff in academic units
  - Lower costs
- Improved data quality
  - Increased quantity and quality of comments
  - Increased anonymity for students
- Reduced Environmental Impact
  - Reduces paper consumption by eliminating paper questionnaires, computer response sheets and reports to professors, unit heads and students.

Although there are many potential advantages to an online evaluation system, there are also challenges.

Response Rate & Non-response Bias

Many institutions that conduct online course evaluations consider response rates to be the biggest challenge. In a 2000 survey of the 200 most “wired” institutions, response rates of 30% to 40% were reported as a common problem with online evaluations.68 The first year of an online course evaluation pilot at Brigham Young University (BYU) in 1997 yielded a response rate of approximately 40%. In a second pilot in 1999, online and paper evaluation forms were compared in 74 course sections. For these 74 sections, the online evaluation response rate was 50%.

compared to 71% for paper evaluations. However, the following year the online pilot yielded a 62% response rate, and consequent campus-wide implementation of the system yielded rates of 58% and 60% in 2002 and 2003 respectively. This suggests that response rates increase gradually over time.

Non-response bias as a result of low response rates is a primary concern, particularly negative bias. It is often believed that students who are dissatisfied with a course or really like an instructor, for example, are more motivated to complete online evaluation forms. However, there has been research indicating that low response rates do not result in lower ratings of courses or faculty. In a study by McGill University, results from 93 courses evaluated online were matched with results from paper-based evaluations for the same courses taught by the same instructor in previous years. Responses did not differ in terms of mean ratings or in terms of the shape or standard deviation of the distributions. A BYU study indicated that online evaluations may be less sensitive to response rate bias than paper evaluations. The study found a higher correlation between response rate and overall ratings for paper evaluations (0.41) than for online evaluations (0.09).

There are several common strategies for increasing response rates. Communication regarding the evaluation system is particularly important for its success. Many institutions with electronic course evaluation systems, including those profiled above, encourage faculty to discuss the system and its importance in class early in the semester, as well as before the evaluation period. E-mail reminders are also a primary method of increasing response rates. An online evaluation pilot at the University of Michigan’s engineering school found success with e-mail reminders, yielding a response rate of 74%. However, administrators at Michigan noted that sending too many e-mail reminders could be problematic- in their pilot study, students received separate messages for each of their classes, with some students receiving around a dozen e-mails.

Incentives such as extra credit and raffles, and sanctions such as withholding grades have been suggested to increase response rates. Columbia University has experienced very high rates mostly due to communications and incentives: the system allows response rates to be monitored during the evaluation period in order to target e-mails to faculty and students when incremental urging is required, and provides incentives such as prizes and pizza parties when evaluations are completed in designated computer labs. As previously mentioned, Northwestern University students are required to complete their evaluations in order to view campus results, which they

use for future course selection. Researchers at BYU found that response rates were higher when instructors made evaluations a course assignment compared to simply encouraging students to complete evaluations, regardless of whether points were given.  

Student and Faculty Buy-in

From the viewpoint of students, anonymity is a common concern with regards to online evaluation systems. With paper evaluations, students usually do not have to provide their names or any other forms of identification. Electronic evaluation systems require some form of identification at log-in for the system to confirm eligibility and to monitor who has and has not responded, at least during the evaluation period. In a well-designed electronic evaluation system, it should be impossible for faculty, department chairs, deans, or staff members to find out names of students who gave specific ratings or comments.

At University of Idaho, student identities are separated from the evaluation they submit. A flag is entered into one file which contains the student's identity, to indicate to the system whether a student has completed an evaluation for a particular course. Responses to the evaluation are entered into a separate table that does not include the student's identity. The two tables cannot be linked and the process is completed automatically so that human intervention is not possible. In addition, only courses with enrollments of five or more are reported to further ensure student anonymity.

Students and faculty must also believe that the system is fair and that evaluation results are not influenced by extraneous factors. As observed at the institutions profiled in this report, most evaluation periods are scheduled before grades are released, so that ratings are not influenced by how well a student did in a class. Conversely, evaluation results are usually not released to faculty and administrators until after grades are released, to ensure that ratings do not influence grades.

Institutions increase faculty buy-in in various other ways. Allowing customization in the design of evaluations is one method. The systems profiled in this section of the report allow faculty to include additional items to their evaluations in order to better suit different courses and different teaching styles. Additionally, it is recommended that all stakeholders, particularly faculty, are involved in the design or selection of a new evaluation system to increase buy-in. Taskforces with faculty members have been formed for the initial planning of online systems, as observed at the University of Idaho. Finally, the profiled systems, as well as others, were initially piloted at individual departments and schools within the institution to build confidence for campus-wide implementation.

---

76 University of Idaho. “Frequently Asked Questions.” www.webs.uidaho.edu/studentevals/faq.htm#Students: How do I know that this process is confidential
Perhaps most importantly, the various aspects of an online evaluation system must be clearly communicated to students and faculty to gain their trust and support, which is vital to a system’s effectiveness.
Appendix

Figure 1

Delaware Study Faculty Activity Checklist

1. Total number of separate course preparations.

2. Number of existing courses where you have redesigned the pedagogy or curriculum under the auspices of a grant or course-release time.

3. Number of new courses you have created and have been approved for delivery.

4. Number of courses indicated in the previous items which you deliver fully or primarily online.

5. Unduplicated headcount of undergraduate academic advisees formally assigned to you.

6. Unduplicated headcount of graduate academic advisees formally assigned to you.

7. Number of thesis/dissertation committees on which you served as chairperson.

8. Number of thesis/dissertation committees on which you served in a non-chairing role.

9. Number of undergraduate senior theses (e.g., senior portfolio project, recital, art show, other capstone experience) you have supervised.

10. Total number of students you have taught individually in independent or directed studies (e.g., one-on-one student-faculty interaction for credit toward satisfying a degree requirement).

11. Number of undergraduate students formally engaged in research with you.

12. Number of graduate students formally engaged in research with you.

13. Number of clinical (e.g., student nurses), practicum students (e.g., student teachers), internship students, and students in cooperative and service learning programs who are formally assigned to you.

14. Number of students (undergraduate and graduate) who have co-authored a journal article or book chapter with you.

15. Number of students (undergraduate and graduate) who have co-presented a paper at a state, regional, national and international professional meeting with you.

16. Number of assessment projects or separate assignments for purpose of program evaluation (as distinct from individual courses) you have undertaken.

17. Number of institution-sanctioned professional development activities related to teaching efforts (e.g., attending conferences on General Education, participating in workshops on undergraduate research, participating in workshops offered by Center for Teaching Effectiveness).

18. Number of print or electronic refereed journal articles, book chapters, reviews, and creative works you have published.

19. Number of print or electronic non-refereed journal articles, book chapters, reviews, and creative works you have published.

20. Number of single-author or joint-author books or monographs you have written and have had published by an academic or commercial press.

21. Number of manuscripts (e.g. journal articles, books) you have submitted to publishers.

22. Number of books, collections, and monographs you have edited.
**Delaware Study Faculty Activity Checklist**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Number of pre-publication books, journal articles, and chapters you have <strong>reviewed</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Number of grant proposals you have reviewed related to your field of expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Number of editorial positions you have held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Number of juried shows, commissioned performances, creative readings, and competitive exhibitions in which you have participated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Number of non-juried shows, performances, creative readings, and exhibitions in which you have participated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Number of digital programs or applications (e.g., software development, web-based learning modules) you designed related to your field of expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Number of provisional or issued patents based on products that are registered in your name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Number of your works in progress (e.g., journal articles, paintings, musical compositions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Number of formal presentations you have made at state, regional, national, and international professional meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Number of external and internal grant, contract, and scholarly fellowship proposals you have submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Number of <strong>new</strong> external grants, contracts, and scholarly fellowships which have been formally awarded to you or your institution on your behalf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Total dollar value of the <strong>new</strong> externally funded grants, contracts, and scholarly fellowships reported in Item 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Number of <strong>new</strong> internal grants and contracts which have been formally awarded to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Total dollar value of the <strong>new</strong> internal grants and contracts reported in Item 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Number of continuing external and internal grants, contracts, and scholarly fellowships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Number of institution-sanctioned professional development activities related to scholarship (e.g., participating in a grant writing workshop, attending a training session to learn a new research tool or software application, enrolling in a statistics course).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Number of activities related to service to your institution (e.g., faculty governance, faculty committees, peer mentoring, academic programs in residences, recruiting efforts, student activity advisor, other student activity involvement) in which you have engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Number of extension and outreach activities related to your field of expertise (e.g., civic service, K-12 service, community workshops, invited talks to community groups, seminars, lectures, demonstrations) in which you have engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Number of activities related to recognized or visible service to your profession (e.g., service on a regional or national committee, service on a self-study visitation team for another institution, serving as an invited or volunteer juror for a show, performance, or exhibition) in which you have engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Number of positions in professional associations where you held a leadership role (e.g., elected officer, committee chairperson, conference chair).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Middle Tennessee State University Office of Institutional Research
## Figure 2
Montana State University Faculty Activity Database Screenshots

### Teaching Activities Sample

1. List each separate course section you have taught or supervised in the calendar year.

   This item has been populated with data from Banner listing you as the instructor. For each course, please click "edit course data" and check any boxes that apply or fill in remaining information. If there is a course missing, please add it by clicking "Add another response." This will not automatically feed Banner. Please contact your department's administrative staff to add courses or correct errors in Banner. If you taught independent studies that are not recorded here, there is another item specifically for that purpose.

2. List each seminar in which you participated.

3. How many students did you supervise in internship, practica, or clinical experiences who were not enrolled for credit for those experiences?

4. List the students you have taught individually in independent or directed studies.

5. List undergraduate students whom you worked closely with this year.

   Please list the student's last name, first name, (ID if available). Check each box that applies. If none apply, leave all boxes blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's major or major if not in this dept:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID (known):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis/Project Advising</th>
<th>Non-Credit Co-op or Service Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was the student's formal advisor:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was the primary senior thesis/project advisor:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis or project title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student participated in a non-credit, co-op or service experience under my supervision:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of the service project:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research/creative activity</th>
<th>Research Credit/Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student was formally engaged in research or creative activity with me:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of research project:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student received course credit for the research:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student received pay (not work study) for the research:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Montana State University
## Research & Creative Activities Sample

### Activities Related to Teaching

### Research & Creative Activities

1. Provide citations of print or electronic publication of your original research.

These data should also include submitted materials that have not yet been published.

#### Citation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and co-authors</th>
<th>Publication Month</th>
<th>Co-author(s) was an undergraduate student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- select one -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publication Year</td>
<td>Co-author(s) was a graduate student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal/Publisher</td>
<td></td>
<td>This piece was refereed (peer-reviewed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Publication Information

- During this calendar year, this piece: appeared in print
- This piece was primarily: pedagogical
- The primary audience was: MSU
- This was multidisciplinary (see definition)
- This was a: journal article

#### Comments:

Source: Montana State University
Figure 3
Activity Areas and Their Corresponding Activity Report Pages
Source: Clemson University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework</th>
<th>Student Advising/Honors and Graduate Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Graduate Thesis/Dissertation Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Advising/Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Activities</td>
<td>Undergraduate Advising/Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education Programs</td>
<td>Honors Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Pedagogy</td>
<td>Honors Thesis Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Innovations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Courses and Institutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars/Guest Lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Duties and Elected Offices</td>
<td>Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected University Position or Office</td>
<td>Department Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assignments</td>
<td>College Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Sponsored Public Service</td>
<td>University Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Project</td>
<td>Professional Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues, Fees, and Gifts</td>
<td>Public Service Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Other Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarianship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Scholarship</td>
<td>Professional Services and Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded Research Projects</td>
<td>Editorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Proposal Submissions</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Gifts</td>
<td>University Development/Fund Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Publications</td>
<td>Leadership of Collaborative Endeavors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations/Performances/Exhibits</td>
<td>Leave/Sabbatical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Scholarship and Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 4  
Binghamton University’s Annual Faculty Report Components  
Source: SUNY Binghamton University

❖ **Teaching & Mentoring Effectiveness:** These entries might include: major alterations in class format, use of technology (example: distance learning), service learning, community partnerships, inclusion of international perspective, language across curriculum, undergraduate research, creative use of traditional materials or any techniques that you have instituted. Please provide a summary of the teaching techniques that you have found most effective during this academic year.

❖ **Principal Advisor:** Please list all undergraduate and graduate students individually for whom you served as principal advisor during this academic year. At the doctoral level this includes the chair of the doctoral committee and major professor/advisor; at the master’s level this includes the chair of the thesis committee and the faculty advisor for a particular student; and at the undergraduate level this includes the faculty member that is listed as the advisor for a particular student or the advisor to an honor’s project. A comments field has been included for you to add any additional student information you would like to add.

❖ **Committee Member:** Please list all students for whom you served as a committee member during this academic year.

❖ **Clinical and Practicum Supervision:** Please list the total number of undergraduate and graduate students for whom you served as course clinical and practicum supervisor during this academic year.

❖ **Book/Book Editor:** Please individually list all books which you have authored or edited during this academic year. Please submit this form as many times as you feel necessary to report your works. When the publication date is close to the dividing line between one reporting year and the next, individuals should use their best judgment as to the year to be credited with the publication, but the same publication should not be listed for both years.

❖ **Lectures, Conference Publications, Presentations, and Exhibitions:** Please list all lectures, presentations, exhibitions and conference publications during this academic year.

❖ **Journal Article, Book Chapter, Book Review, Encyclopedia Entry or Creative Composition:** Please list each journal article, Book Chapter, Book Review, Encyclopedia Entry or Creative Composition, and its status, during this reporting period. When the publication date is close to the dividing line between one reporting year and the next, individuals should use their best judgment as to the year to be credited with the publication, but the same publication should not be listed for both years.
- **Other Accomplishments**: Use this form to provide information about other accomplishments that you would like to include. (Note to Nursing Faculty: Please include your practice in this section)

- **Fellowships, Honors, Awards, Citations and Patents**: Please list all the fellowships, honors, awards, citations and patents you have received during this academic year. Please report funded research & grants on the funded research page.

- **Society Memberships**: Please list all memberships held in professional or honor societies during this academic year

- **International Honors**: Please note that information submitted on this page may be used in university publications. Please write a brief description of international honors or awards received during the past academic year.

- **Editorial and Manuscript or Proposal Review Services**: Please list all agencies or journals for which you have reviewed during this academic year

- **Conference/Conference Session Organized**: Please list all the professional conferences or conference sessions you organized during this academic year

- **Other Professional Activities**: Use this section to provide information about other professional activities that you would like to include for this academic year, this would include professional development activities such as workshops attended.

- **Community and Public Service**: Please list activities where you used your professional expertise to serve persons, groups, agencies, organization or governments external to Binghamton University during this academic year

- **External Thesis/Tenure/Promotion Review or Outside Examiner**: Please report those times during this period when you have been an external reviewer for a thesis or personnel case and those times that you have served as an examiner for a student outside of your department

- **Funded Research/Grants**: Please list any internally or externally sponsored program activity for this academic year. Briefly describe the nature of this work and note if it includes a collaborator from another academic unit

- **Current Scholarship/Research/Creative Production [Unfunded]**: Please list any unfunded scholarship, research and/or creative activities for this academic year. Briefly describe the nature of this work and note if it includes a collaborator from another academic unit

- **Future Scholarship/Research/Creative Production**: Please outline your future research activities as you presently see them for the next three years. Briefly describe
the nature of this work and note if it includes a collaborator from another academic unit

- **Campus Service:** Use this section to list extra service provided to the campus
Figure 5
Western Carolina University’s Online Course Evaluation
Source: Western Carolina University

Student view of survey

Faculty evaluation report view
### Open-ended response view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty:</th>
<th>Mount, Cat A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question:</td>
<td>Describe the best aspects of this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate:</td>
<td>80.00% (4 of 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The instructor explains concepts really clearly and always has time to meet after class.
2. I have learned so much from this class.
3. I really like the writing assignments.
4. This is one of the best courses that I have ever taken at Western. The instructor is really helpful and does everything possible to help us learn the material. I like the format of the tests, even though I really have to spend lots of time studying - I feel like it’s worth it. I like the assignments. The grading seems fair and reasonable. I feel like the instructor pushes me to do my best work. I think I will even be able to use some of the assignments in a portfolio when I go to job interviews!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty:</th>
<th>Mount, Cat A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question:</td>
<td>Describe changes that could be made to improve the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate:</td>
<td>80.00% (4 of 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I wish the tests were more spread out over the semester.
2. We cover too much material in a short time.
3. The syllabus is confusing. Other than that, I can’t really think of anything. This professor is excellent, and I would definitely recommend this course to my friends.
Figure 6
University of Idaho Standard Form and Sample Menu Items
Source: University of Idaho

Standard Form

**Evaluation of Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGL 101 Section 01 – Kelly C. Grammar</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What grade do you expect to receive?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What grade were you working to achieve?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often did you attend class?</td>
<td>90%+</td>
<td>80%+</td>
<td>70%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>&lt;60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often were you fully prepared for class?</td>
<td>90%+</td>
<td>80%+</td>
<td>70%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>&lt;60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the quality of your effort in this class?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Instructor. Rate the instructor of this course relative to each of the qualities listed below (highest rating is 4).

   Overall, how would you rate the instructor’s performance in teaching this course? 4 3 2 1 0

   **Instructor Menu Item will be inserted here.**
   **Click here for a list of Instructor Menu Items (#101-137)**

Comment on the instructor’s performance. What was most helpful? What could be improved?

---

**Course Development Items**

2. Course. Rate the course itself relative to each of the qualities listed below (highest rating is 4).

   Overall, how would you rate the quality of this course? 4 3 2 1 0

   **Course Menu Item will be inserted here.**
   **Click here for a list of Course Menu Items (#301-706)**

Comment on the quality of this course. What was most helpful? What could be improved?

---

**Sample Menu Items**

- **Instructor Items**
  - 101 Clarity of instructor’s explanations
  - 105 Instructor’s ability to make course material interesting
  - 109 Instructor’s use of multimedia presentations
  - 114 Instructor’s enthusiasm for subject matter
  - 127 Instructor’s treatment of students
Course Items
- 301 Appropriateness of the pace at which material is covered
- 332 Course’s value in gaining an understanding of the subject matter
- 481 Quality of the recitation sections
- 541 Relevance of written assignments to course materials
- 601 Textbook’s contribution to the course
- 665 Reasonableness in length and difficulty of exams
Project Evaluation Form

Hanover Research is committed to providing a work product that meets or exceeds member expectations. In keeping with that goal, we would like to hear your opinions regarding our reports. Feedback is critically important and serves as the strongest mechanism by which we tailor our research to your organization. When you have had a chance to evaluate this report, please take a moment to fill out the following questionnaire.


Note

This brief was written to fulfill the specific request of an individual member of Hanover Research. As such, it may not satisfy the needs of all members. We encourage any and all members who have additional questions about this topic – or any other – to contact us.

Caveat
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