

Course Teacher Evaluation at SUNY Cortland

A Guide to Teacher Evaluation at SUNY Cortland

**Committee on Teaching Effectiveness
2000-2002**

Meg Richardson, Ilyas Ba-yunas, Ben Wodi,
Jalal Alemzadeh, Regina Grantham, Rena
Janke, Kevin Halpin

(Updated for the web, September 2017)

A Guide to Teacher Evaluation at SUNY Cortland

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
PHILOSOPHY ON THE VALUE OF CTE's IN EVALUATING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	2
PRINCIPLES OF TEACHING EVALUATION AT CORTLAND.....	4
COMPOSITION AND ROLE OF THE COMMITTEE ON TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS.....	4
COURSE TEACHER EVALUATION	5
A. Questionnaire Selection and Approval	5
B. CTE Instruments.....	6
C. Schedule of CTE Administration	8
D. Exemption from CTE Requirement Option -Visitation System	8
COURSE DOSSIER EVALUATION.....	9
A. Content.....	9
B. Evaluation.....	10
C. Scheduling and Concurrent Evaluation	10
D. Special Situations.....	11
REPORTING COMPLIANCE	11
CONCLUSION.....	11
APPENDIX A: INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE APPRAISAL CAFETERIA SYSTEM.....	13
APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES FOR DEPARTMENTALLY DEVELOPED QUESTIONNAIRES.....	21
APPENDIX C: CRITERIA FOR COURSE TEACHER EVALUATION WITH MATCHING PURDUE ITEMS	22
APPENDIX D-1: SUGGESTED CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATION OF COURSE DOSSIERS	23
APPENDIX D-2: SAMPLE OF DEPARTMENTALLY-DEVELOPED COURSE DOSSIER EVALUATION FORM.....	26
A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SELECTED READINGS	28

INTRODUCTION

The evaluation system at Cortland, designed by the Faculty Senate and administered by the Senate's Committee on Teaching Effectiveness, is intended to be an evaluation program whose primary goal is the formative improvement of the teaching performance of the faculty. A secondary function of the system is summative in nature, providing data in support of departmental judgments about the strengths of an individual teacher in performance of his or her classroom responsibilities.

The current policy of the Provost's Cabinet is that no positive decision will be rendered on promotion, retention, tenure or merit unless evidence is offered of an instructor's teaching ability¹. It is the responsibility of the faculty to demonstrate clear and persuasive evidence of teaching effectiveness in materials submitted for all personnel decisions. This may be done using anyone of the following combinations of evaluation materials:

- 1) Course Dossier Evaluation (CDE) and Course Teacher Evaluation (CTE)
- 2) Course Dossier and peer evaluation of teaching using classroom visitation procedures outlined below.
- 3) Course Dossier, CTE's and peer evaluation.

Departments will provide an example (s) of what constitutes effective teaching in their specific discipline. This should include specific references to what materials a candidate could provide to this or her personnel committees for renewal, tenure, promotion and merit. Departments should also clearly state their position on how they view Subjective assessments of an instructor's presentational style versus a focus on learning outcomes.

These evaluation materials are the property of each instructor and his or her department. The degree to which this evaluation material is transmitted to administrative officials in the making of personnel decision is solely the judgment of each department. Faculty members will have the right to provide, in writing, their interpretation of any teaching evaluation materials at any level of the personnel review.

¹ Appendix A from: Atkins, Bruce. (1987) *Course Teacher Evaluation Policies and Procedures*. Committee on Teaching Effectiveness (1986-1987).

PHILOSOPHY ON THE VALUE OF CTE's IN EVALUATING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS ²

In any system which attempts to measure the teaching quality of college faculty members CTE's play only a partial, yet important, role. The literature on CTE's is extensive and, at times, contradictory. There appears to be agreement that "the validity of student ratings is modest at best and quite variable. (Dowell and Neal, p. 59.) This is because the act of teaching is neither scientific nor does it lend itself to precise scientific measurement.

Despite the imprecision of CTE's as valid scientific indicators of teaching quality, however, they can play a limited role when used with caution as one part of a teaching evaluation system. As to the charge that they are unscientific, Dowell and Neal accurately conclude "few university policies have a truly scientific basis."(Dowell and Neal, pp. 61.)

It is essential to keep in mind that CTE's reflect student perceptions of teaching, not the quality of teaching in any absolute sense. It is important that these perceptions, along with the claims of faculty members about their teaching, comprise one component of comprehensive teaching evaluation system. For it is student perception that is the clue to fostering or discouraging essential academic attitudes: the attitudes of inquiry, of humility, in recognizing our individual ignorance, of diligence, of dedication, of perseverance, of a reverence for open debate and reflective thinking. In short, the college must do all it can to foster positive student perceptions and discourage negative student perceptions. The former will open the door to further learning, the latter might close it, perhaps forever.

There are at least three reasons why CTE's should be part of a teaching evaluation system. First, students can provide certain types of information that helps describe the classroom environment through their assessment of the overall learning atmosphere, the general communicative skills of the teacher and the degree to which course goals and objectives have been accomplished or the teacher's professional responsibilities have been met.

Second, students are in an excellent position to render some judgments about instruction. If good teaching can be defined as combining several elements -instructional techniques, reading assignments, course content, the teacher's personality, and student motivation and attitudes -in such a way as to have a positive effect on student behavior, then students are the most logical ones to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the components of a course since they are the ones who have been directly and extensively exposed to them.

Third, CTE's provide one type of communication between students and instructors that might not exist otherwise. Such communication about student perception of the teaching-learning atmosphere can serve as the stimulus for an instructor to make changes in the course

² pp. 5-6 from (September 21, 1982) *Final Report of the 1981-82 Committee for the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness at SUNY Cortland to SUNY Cortland Faculty Senate*

and how it is taught; or it can serve to reinforce the teacher's belief that the course is currently being taught well.

Any system of evaluation of teaching which includes the systematic use of CTE's as a component must be designed to reassure faculty members that two common abuses associated with CTE's will be guarded against. The most common abuse is for evaluators to use CTE results as a highly reliable statistical indicator of the quality of one's teaching. That is, faculty members must be convinced that the process of evaluating teaching will not be reduced to a mere statistical measure, drawn mainly from CTE's. Moreover, faculty members must be assured that any data drawn from CTE's will be used as longitudinal data over a period of several years and several courses. Only when faculty members are convinced that CTE results are to be used with extreme caution over a period of time should they be willing to allow for their systematic use.

Second, while most of the literature on CTE's is concerned with the statistical uncertainty of CTE's, a sizable portion of it is devoted to legitimate fears faculty members have about any evaluation system which relies too heavily on CTE results. Thus, faculty members must be assured that CTE's will comprise only one component of a multi-faceted approach to the evaluation of teaching. They must know that they will have significant input into the evaluation process, thereby insuring that student centered CTE's will not be the only factor in an evaluation system that recognizes the complexity of the art of teaching.

According to the literature on CTE's, one of the greatest fears is that the use of CTE's throw professors into a sort of Nielsen rating contents with one another, with academic standards and professional integrity being the casualties. The Committee has been especially sensitive to this concern. No system, no matter how judiciously applied, can negate this fear entirely. It can be minimized, however, by a system which allows the faculty to control the evaluation process and by a college philosophy that places academic and professional standards above a reliance on statistical ratings of teaching. This can only be accomplished as faculty members develop confidence in a comprehensive evaluation system that is cautiously and fairly applied.

Another legitimate fear is that the use of CTE's will serve to stifle teaching creativity and experimentation. This fear must be addressed by a system that allows the teacher to have significant input, that uses CTE results with great caution over time, and which is embedded in a teaching philosophy in which experimentation and creativity are to be encouraged.

Another fear is that a reliance on CTE's, with its danger of statistical simplification, will obfuscate the success particular teachers may have particular subgroups of the student population - for example those with greater academic talent or higher motivation. Any evaluation system must have sufficient teacher input to allow evaluators to become aware of these facts and to guide the interpretation evaluators may give to overall CTE ratings.

In summary, CTE's do not provide statistically precise information and while their use is encouraged to allow for student input -since student perceptions of teaching are important and need to be recognized -they must be used with great caution over time as one part of a multi-component system of teaching evaluation.

PRINCIPLES OF TEACHING EVALUATION AT CORTLAND³

1. Teaching is the major priority of SUNY Cortland.
2. A systematic, regular evaluation of teaching is necessary for fair, responsible faculty evaluation, and maximum professional growth.
3. The teaching faculty should control the teaching evaluation system.
4. Everyone who teaches should be evaluated on a regular basis.
5. A teaching evaluation system must allow for a high degree of departmental autonomy.
6. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness requires examination of multiple indicators in order to assess the appropriateness of course content, classroom performance, and academic standards.
7. A teaching evaluation system should have components that are common for all teaching faculty.
8. The college must provide adequate support services to the teaching evaluation system.

COMPOSITION AND ROLE OF THE COMMITTEE ON TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS⁴

1. Composition: The "Committee on Teaching Effectiveness" will be composed of five faculty members, one from each of the following areas -Mathematics and Science; Social and Behavioral Sciences, Fine Arts and Humanities; Health, Physical Education and Recreation; and Education and Speech Pathology -and two students. The students will have attained at least junior standing (60 credits) and have spent at least one year of full-time residence at the College. Faculty members will be elected for a four-year term, with the initial terms being staggered so that eventually one new member joins the Committee each year. Faculty members will not be allowed to serve consecutive terms. Student committee members will be elected by the students, with the consent of the Senate, and are to serve for a one-year, renewable term. All of the College's Distinguished Teaching Professors will be permanent on-call consultants to the Committee.
2. Responsibilities: The "Committee on Teaching Effectiveness" when charged by the "Faculty Senate or appropriate administrative body, will have the following responsibilities:
 - a. To monitor the development and implementation of the teaching evaluation system;

³ pp. 6-7 from (September 21, 1982) *Final Report of the 1981-82 Committee for the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness at SUNY Cortland to SUNY Cortland Faculty Senate*

⁴ p. 8 from (September 21,1982) *Final Report of the 1981-82 Committee for the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness at SUNY Cortland to SUNY Cortland Faculty Senate*

- b. to monitor departmental compliance with the teaching evaluation system;
- c. to monitor whether or not quantifiable data drawn from CTE's are used on a longitudinal basis;
- d. to ensure that departments are making qualitative judgments about teaching based on all documentation that is present;
- e. to approve departmental additions to the required core items if the changes are department-devised additions.
- f. to act as an ombudsman with whom faculty and students can discuss complaints about the teaching evaluation system and to make recommendations to the departments and division deans to resolve problems;
- g. to work with the evaluation system administrative support staff to ensure the availability of adequate administrative resources (e.g., CTE forms, clerical assistance, computer time, etc.);
- h. to make recommendations to the administration regarding resources needed by faculty to improve teaching;
- i. to work with the Task Force on Teaching and Learning and other organizations to implement seminars, talks, and consultant meetings with individuals and the general faculty to discuss teaching strategies and problems of evaluating students and
- j. to make recommendations to the Senate to improve the quality of the teaching evaluation system.

COURSE TEACHER EVALUATION

A. Questionnaire Selection and Approval

Each department will use the required core set of Purdue items to ensure consistent coverage of the Criteria for Evaluation of Course Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire, Appendix C. The Committee has chosen the Purdue Cafeteria System (Appendix A) for the use of the College on the assumption that its menu of questions with its attendant computer software minimizes the work of creating and processing an evaluation form by a department. Nonetheless, no department need feel any obligation to use the Purdue form except for the required core set of items. All questionnaires using the Purdue items, including the required items, will be processed by the **Office of Institutional Research and Assessment**.

B. CTE Instruments

1. Departments are encouraged to add to the required core of items from the Purdue menu by adding other Purdue items, or by adding items of their own.
2. All CTE forms are to be submitted for approval to the CTE Committee by the Department Chair.
3. Printed questionnaires, an "Instructions for Faculty Administering CTE's Sheet" and an "Instructions for Students Administering CTE" Sheet will be given to each faculty member administering CTE's in time for the use in the appropriate sections.
4. Each faculty member shall administer the questionnaire according to the following procedures:
 - a. Instruction Sheet for Faculty Administering CTE
 - i. Announce a class in advance –“Bring a No.2 pencil for the CTE next class period." Also it would be wise to bring a box of No. 2 pencils to class the day the CTE is to be administered.
 - ii. Each packet is marked with the course and section to be evaluated.
 - iii. Please check accuracy of the questionnaires inside the packet. If there are any discrepancies, please contact the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (Purdue CTE form) or the Departmental secretary (Departmentally-derived CTE forms.)
 - iv. Take the packet unsealed to a class period.
 - v. It is imperative that the Instructor say nothing about the CTE questionnaire except what is specified in these Instructions for Faculty.⁵
 - vi. Select a student in the class to hand out and collect the CTE.
 - vii. The instructor is not to be present in the room until after the evaluations are collected, sealed, and signed by the student.
 - viii. The student administering the CTE is to follow the instructions below for administration of the CTE. Hand the student administering the CTE this sheet.

⁵ p. 1 from (March 26, 1984) *Supplementary Guidelines on Evaluation Procedures*. A memo from Bruce Atkins to Department Chairs and Personnel Committee Chairs, approved by the Faculty Senate.

- ix. After collecting the forms (including any unused forms), the student returns the unopened, sealed packet to the departmental secretary. If the CTE instrument is the Purdue system, forms will be forwarded by the secretary to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for processing. Results will be returned to the department secretary only after grades are submitted.

The following two guidelines are minimum requirements to ensure student anonymity

- x. Departmental secretaries (under supervision of the Chair or a designee of the Chair) will be responsible for reviewing all CTE forms to see if any students have indicated (using the method below) that they wish their comments to be typed. In any class in which there is one or more students who want this anonymity, the Departmental Secretary will be responsible for typing all the comments of students who have so indicated PLUS 5-10 other students' comments (to fully insure anonymity). These student comments should be typed verbatim (no correction of spelling, grammar, etc.). This, and any other duties associated with the collation, filing etc. of CTE results cannot be delegated to work-study students. The original CTE forms of these students requesting anonymity will be stored by the secretary in a locked container that is not accessible to faculty members and will be destroyed after typing of comments is completed.
 - xi. The Computer center printout of the quantitative data, the original CTE forms from those students not requesting anonymity (or those not containing written comments) and the typed comments shall then be given to the instructor after final grades are submitted to the registrar. A copy may be retained, at the prerogative of the instructor, for inclusion in his or her personnel file.
- b. Instruction Sheet for Students Administering CTE
 - i. Distribute one evaluation form to each student in the class.
 - ii. Read aloud the following instructions: "This form is for the evaluation of this course and teacher. In case of team teachers, evaluate the current teacher. Be sure the course title printed on the top of the form is correct. Use a No.2 pencil only. Fill in the appropriate circles completely. If you wish to change an answer, erase completely. Your instructor will not be given this evaluation until after the grades for this course have been sent to the Registrar. Place any written comments you may wish to make in the white box on the back of the form. If you do not wish the instructor to read your comments in your own handwriting, then put the words TYPE THIS in block letters in the upper right

hand corner of the comment box. "If there are any concerns about the administration of this evaluation, please contact the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Please begin."

- iii. Collect all forms when everyone is finished. Include any unused forms. Place them into the envelope and seal the envelope. After sealing the packet, sign your name across the seal.
- iv. Give the unopened, sealed packet to the Departmental Secretary. Alternatively, if the packet is pre-addressed it may be placed in the campus mail.

C. Schedule of CTE Administration

The faculty Senate stipulates that a course must be evaluated every third time it is taught, although a course may be evaluated more frequently if any instructor wishes. It is the responsibility of each Department to devise a system and method for keeping track of the frequency with which each course is taught and to notify an instructor of his or her obligation to administer a CTE in a given course during a given semester. Verification of timely evaluation should be sent to the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness annually.

1. CTE's should be administered only during the last two weeks of semester or quarter course. Every attempt must be made to ensure the confidentiality of the individual student's responses and comments. No instructor should receive the results of his or her questionnaires until after he or she has handed in their grades for a given course.
2. Multiple sections of the same course taught by the same instructor should not be construed as counting more than once toward the total of three times a course is given. A course should be evaluated the first time an instructor teaches under this system; then the instructor need not evaluate the course again until the course is taught by him or her a third time.

D. Exemption from CTE Requirement Option -Visitation System⁶

1. Any faculty member who wishes to be exempt from the CTE questionnaire requirement may be granted an exemption by the department. In such cases a visitation evaluation will be substituted for the CTE evaluation.
2. The visitation team will consist of three members chosen according to the following guidelines:

⁶ pp. 10-11 from September 21, 1982) *Final Report of the 1981-82 Committee for the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness at SUNY Cortland to SUNY Cortland Faculty Senate.*

- a. The faculty member being evaluated will select one member drawn from the department.
 - b. The department, according to its own procedures, will select a different member drawn from the department.
 - c. The Division Dean will select one member drawn from a list of faculty members who have been awarded an excellence in teaching award or hold the rank of Distinguished Teaching Professor. This initial list may be expanded on recommendations of the "Committee on Teaching Effectiveness" with the approval of the Senate.
3. The visitation team as a whole will observe at least three classes in the course over a period of at least four weeks. Each visitor will write an independent observation report and will send copies to the person being evaluated and to the department.
 4. The visitation team will be subject to modification by the "Committee on Teaching Effectiveness," with the approval of the Senate.

COURSE DOSSIER EVALUATION

The system of teacher evaluation as created by the Faculty Senate is a two-part system. Along with the required course teacher evaluation by students, the Senate desires a peer evaluation of the same course by means of a review of course material prepared by the instructor.

A. Content

This course dossier should contain, at a minimum, a syllabus of the course which states:

1. the purpose or goals of the course
2. a list of required texts,
3. a calendar of readings and/or activities in the course, and
4. the policy on the grading or other evaluative procedures in a course indicating the relative weight to be assigned various evaluative measures.
5. Optionally, the teacher may provide a written description of the course including observations about the students in the course. Such a description might include: a general description of the level of the course, the student composition in terms of class year and major, information as to whether the course is required or not, and a general comment on the teacher's perceptions of the motivation and general intellectual level of the students in the course.

In addition, the dossier should contain copies of evaluation instruments used in the course, such as exams, paper assignments, and the like. Departments should decide what additional materials, if any, their disciplines require to make a just evaluation of a course. The dossier may also include examples of student work and peer reviews based on classroom visitations.

B. Evaluation

It is a department's responsibility, usually through the action of the Personnel Committee, to evaluate the instructor's dossier in terms of judging whether the goal or purpose of the course coincides with the catalog description of the course, whether in the judgment of peers an instructor's choice of text and assignment of workload is appropriate for the stated goals and level of the course. In addition, peers should make an evaluation of the testing component of course to determine if evaluation of students is fair and equitable and if examination materials are appropriate for the stated goals of the course.

Such judgments require peers to make precise discrimination between appropriate criticism and infringement on an instructor's prerogatives of innovation and personalization of his or her material. Indeed, negative criticism of a particular instructor's methods, text selection, or examination philosophy should only be made if there are gross inconsistencies between stated goals and purposes and requirements, examination requirements, workload demands, or the catalog description of a course and the instructor's purposes. It should also be borne in mind that the course dossier evaluation is intended to be a positive experience for an instructor, the tendering of aid and advice rather than hectoring judgment. Of course, in those rare cases where an instructor has been in some degree derelict in his or her responsibilities, it is the responsibility of peers to demand that professional standards be maintained.

The mechanism of course dossier evaluation in a large department is a significant labor, not to be entered into lightly. While the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness has offered a checklist for course dossier evaluation (see Appendix D), every department should propose, discuss and vote on a course dossier checklist that is appropriate for their particular discipline. Some disciplines, such as Studio Art course, Physical Education activity courses, and Music performance courses, may find the course dossier requirements discussed in this Guide inappropriate to their purposes and should device and submit to the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness models of more appropriate evaluative materials. Course dossier checklists will be included in the personnel files of the faculty. Course dossiers will be returned to the faculty after evaluation by the personnel committee.

C. Scheduling and Concurrent Evaluation

For those departments, however, for whom the course dossier system outlined above is appropriate, a schedule paralleling every third course teacher evaluation should be set up so that when a course teacher evaluation form is administered in a course, a peer evaluation of the

course dossier shall take place concurrently. The point of concurrent evaluation is to balance any student opinion with peer evaluation of course materials. It should be pointed out that since course teacher evaluations are processed mainly by computer (in the case of the Purdue Cafeteria system), instructors should be encouraged to solicit student opinion on their course as often as the instructor wishes. Course dossier evaluation, however, since it is a much more labor intensive endeavor, should occur only as often as the Department mandates it should occur.

D. Special Situations

In the case evaluation of multi-section, departmentally-prepared courses, evaluation of such course dossiers soon may become a largely mechanical task. If experience proves that evaluation of such courses becomes a situation nearly automatic compliance, a department should decide to limit the evaluation of such courses to less often than every third time. The department should seek and receive approval from the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness for such special scheduling, explaining the circumstances which experience has shown to be the case.

REPORTING COMPLIANCE

Departmental Personnel Committees or other authorized persons designated by departments have a reporting responsibility to the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness. Each semester the authorized person should report to the Chair of the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness the course title and number of courses in which student teacher evaluation questionnaires were administered the previous semester and should also send verification that the course dossier evaluation has been made.

The faculty should know that the purpose of this reporting function is solely in order that the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness can monitor the operation of the Teacher Evaluation system. The Committee can, with such reports, tabulate the number of courses and the number of dossiers actually evaluated during a given semester. Please note that the Committee needs to be informed only of those courses which are required to be evaluated in a given semester.

CONCLUSION

This system represents an additional burden of work for faculty members. In a large department, course dossier evaluation can represent a significant portion of a personnel committee's time and work. In addition, secretarial time may be usurped as a consequence of the increase in duplicating and typing generated by the demands of the evaluation system. The justification for this added work is that it is motivated by a genuine concern of the Cortland Faculty that teaching should be judged and achievement recognized on a basis of empirical data: the judgments of both students and peers. It is probably true to say that few colleges in New

York State demonstrate the kind of concern about teaching quality as the teaching evaluation at Cortland makes manifest.

Every member of the evaluation system should bear in mind that no enforcement or punishment power exists in the Faculty Senate system. Only the Administration has the power to enforce compliance with this evaluation system. It is hoped that in an atmosphere of collegiality and through the mechanism of group dynamics instructors will wish to share the respect of their colleagues and meet the mutual agreed upon standards of teaching at Cortland.

APPENDIX A: INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE APPRAISAL CAFETERIA SYSTEM

Cafeteria is a computer-assisted, course and instructor appraisal system developed by the Measurement and Research Center, Purdue University. Cafeteria is intended to serve faculty and all information pertaining to individual instructors; courses and departments is treated confidentially.

DIRECTIONS

1. To initiate Cafeteria service, the department should obtain an item, selection from for each class to be evaluated. Information is needed giving the instructor's name, course title, campus address, department, date on which evaluation materials are required and number of student questionnaires needed.
2. Questions are selected by the department members from the selection below. These items must meet the criteria described in Appendix C.
3. All faculty are required to use the Purdue Questions fixed by his or her Department, but additional questions may be added from the Cafeteria 207 item catalog, if a faculty member so desires, up to a total of 40 questions.
4. A selected number of questions, requested by a department to meet special needs not covered by the Catalog, may be added permanently to the menu with approval of the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness. These questions must be limited to matters of substance, not writing style, since very few places are available in the computer program for additional items.
5. Early in the semester. Instructor and Course Appraisal Order Forms the previous semester will be sent to the department for distribution to each faculty member. Additional blank: forms will be included for faculty teaching a course for the first time. An order form should be completed by the instructor of each course to be evaluated.
6. Completed item selection forms should be returned to the Advisement Office.

INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE APPRAISAL: CAFETERIA ITEM CATALOG

CLARITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESENTATIONS

- 001 I understand easily what my instructor is saying.
- 002 My instructor displays a clear understanding of course topics.
- 003 My instructor is able to simplify difficult materials.
- 004 My instructor explains experiments and/or assignments clearly.
- 005 Difficult topics are structured in easily understood ways.
- 006 My instructor has an effective style of presentation.
- 007 My instructor seems well-prepared for class.
- 008 My instructor talks at a pace suitable for maximum comprehension.
- 009 My instructor speaks audibly and clearly.
- 010 My instructor draws and explains diagrams effectively.
- 011 My instructor writes legibly on the blackboard.
- 012 My instructor has no distracting peculiarities.

STUDENT INTEREST/INVOLVEMENT IN LEARNING

- 013 My instructor makes learning easy and interesting.
- 014 My instructor holds the attention of the class.
- 015 My instructor senses when students are bored.
- 016 My instructor stimulates interest in the course.
- 017 My instructor displays enthusiasm when teaching.
- 018 This course supplies me with an effective range of challenges.
- 019 In this course, many methods are used to involve with this course.
- 020 My instructor makes me feel involved with this course.
- 021 In this course, I always felt challenged and motivated to learn.
- 022 My instructor motivate me to do further independent study.
- 023 This course motivates me to take additional related courses.
- 024 This course has been intellectually fulfilling for me.

BROADENING STUDENT OUTLOOK

- 025 My instructor has stimulated my thinking.
- 026 My instructor has provided many challenging new viewpoints.
- 027 My instructor teaches one to value the viewpoint of others.
- 028 This course caused me to reconsider many of my former attitudes.
- 029 In this course, I have learned to value new viewpoints.
- 030 This course fosters respect for new points of view.
- 031 This course stretched and broadened my views greatly.
- 032 This course has effectively challenged me to think.

- 033 The class meetings helped me see other points of view.
- 034 This course develops the creative ability of students.
- 035 My instructor encourages student creativity.

TEACHING/LEARNING OF RELATIONSHIPS AND CONCEPTS

- 036 My instructor emphasizes relationships between and among topics.
- 037 My instructor helps me apply theory to solve problems.
- 038 My instructor emphasizes conceptual understanding of material
- 039 My instructor effectively blends facts with theory.
- 040 My instructor clarifies topics with developments in other fields.
- 041 My instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations.
- 042 Relationships among course topics are clearly explained.
- 043 This course builds understanding of concepts and principles.

INSTRUCTOR PROVIDES HELP AS NEEDED

- 044 My instructor is actively helpful when students have problems.
- 045 My instructor recognizes when some students fall to comprehend.
- 046 Everything possible is provided to help me learn.
- 047 My instructor's explanations and comments are always helpful.
- 048 My instructor evaluates often and provides help where needed.
- 049 My instructor appears to grasp quickly what a student is saying.
- 050 My instructor is careful and precise when answering questions.
- 051 My instructor is readily available for consultation.

PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS

- 052 My instructor regularly checks and rewards progress in learning.
- 053 My instructor suggests specific ways I can improve.
- 054 My instructor recognizes and rewards success in this course.
- 055 My instructor can gauge what I know and what I should do next.
- 056 Exams are used to help me find my strengths and weaknesses.
- 057 My instructor returns papers quickly enough to benefit me.

ADAPTING TO INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

- 058 This course shows a sensitivity to individual interests/abilities.
- 059 My instructor adjusts to fit individual abilities and interests.
- 060 The flexibility of this course helps all kinds of students learn.
- 061 My instructor tailors this course to help many kinds of students.
- 062 The design of this course lets me learn at my own pace.

- 063 Students proceed at their own pace in this course.
- 064 I was able to keep up with the work load in this course.
- 065 My background is sufficient to enable me to use course material

RESPECT AND RAPPORT

- 066 A teacher/student partnership in learning is encouraged.
- 067 Each student is encouraged to contribute to class learning.
- 068 I am free to express and explain my own views in class.
- 069 When I have a question or comment I know it will be respected.
- 070 I feel free to ask questions in class.
- 071 I feel that I am an important member of this class
- 072 Mutual respect is a concept practiced in this course.
- 073 My instructor respects divergent viewpoints.
- 074 My instructor respects constructive criticism.
- 075 I feel free to challenge my instructor's ideas in class.
- 076 My instructor relates to me as an individual.
- 077 My instructor deals fairly and impartially with me.
- 078 My instructor readily maintains rapport with this class.
- 079 This instructor encourages divergent thinking.
- 080 The climate of this class is conducive to learning.

COURSE GOALS OR OBJECTIVES

- 081 This course has clearly stated objectives.
- 082 The objectives of this course were clearly explained to me.
- 083 The stated goals of this course are consistently pursued.
- 084 I understand what is expected of me in this course.
- 085 The course objectives allow me to know when I am making progress.
- 086 I was able to set and achieve some of my own goals.
- 087 I had an opportunity to help determine course objectives.
- 088 Lecture information is highly relevant to course objectives.
- 089 The course content is consistent with my prior expectations.

USEFULNESS/RELEVANCE OF CONTENT

- 090 This course material is pertinent to my professional training.
- 091 This course contributes significantly to my professional growth.
- 092 I can apply information/skills learned in this course.
- 093 This course will be of practical benefit to me as a student.
- 094 My technical skills were improved as a result of this course.
- 095 This course directly contributes to my vocational preparation.

- 096 This course is a valid requirement for my major.
- 097 The relationship of this course to my education is apparent.
- 098 The practical application of subject matter is apparent.
- 099 This course gives me an excellent background for further study.
- 100 This course is up-to-date with developments in the field.
- 101 This course includes adequate information on career opportunity.
- 102 This course includes a sufficient number of practical exercises.
- 103 The content of this course is relevant to my needs.
- 104 The amount of material covered was reasonable.

DISCUSSION

- 105 My instructor develops classroom discussion skillfully.
- 106 There is sufficient time in class for questions and discussions.
- 107 My instructor allows student discussion to proceed uninterrupted.
- 108 My instructor encourages students to debate conflicting views.
- 109 My instructor does not monopolize classroom discussion.
- 110 One real strength of this course is the classroom discussion.
- 111 Challenging questions are raised for discussion.
- 112 This course provides an opportunity to learn from other students.

EXAMS AND GRADES

- 113 Exams accurately assess what I have learned in this course.
- 114 Exams are fair.
- 115 Exams are free from ambiguity.
- 116 Exams cover a reasonable amount of material.
- 117 Exams stress important points of the lectures/text.
- 118 Exams in this course have instructional value.
- 119 Exams are creative and require original thought.
- 120 I know how I stand relative to others in the class on exams.
- 121 Exams are reasonable in length and difficulty.
- 122 Exams are coordinated with major course objectives.
- 123 My final grade will accurately reflect my overall performance.
- 124 Grades are an accurate assessment of my knowledge in this course.
- 125 Grades are assigned fairly and impartially.
- 126 The grading system was clearly explained.
- 127 The contract grading method is used appropriately in this course.
- 128 My instructor has a realistic definition of good performance.

ASSIGNMENTS

- 129 The assigned readings significantly contribute to this course.
- 130 The assigned reading is well integrated into this course.
- 131 Length and difficulty of assigned readings are reasonable.
- 132 Assigned readings are interesting and hold my attention.
- 133 Assignments are of definite instructional value.
- 134 Assignments are related to goals of this course.
- 135 Complexity and length of course assignments are reasonable.
- 136 Directions for course assignments are clear and specific.
- 137 The number of course assignments is reasonable.
- 138 Class projects are related to course goals and objectives.
- 139 The course's programmed learning materials are effective.
- 140 The group work contributes significantly to this course.
- 141 Student presentations significantly contribute to this course.
- 142 Student presentations in class are interesting/stimulating.
- 143 I am generally pleased with the text(s) required for this course.
- 144 I find the course emphasis on individual projects stimulating.
- 145 My instructor is not overly demanding of my time.

MEDIA: FILMS, TV, ETC.

- 146 This course has made excellent use of TV.
- 147 The televised portions of class are a great help to learning.
- 148 TV reception was of good quality.
- 149 Audio reception (TV, recorder, etc.) was of good quality.
- 150 The use of television made the course very interesting.
- 151 Media (films, TV, etc.) used in this course are well chosen.
- 152 Media (films, TV, etc.) are an asset to this course.
- 153 Films in this course contributed significantly to my learning.
- 154 This course has made excellent use of films.
- 155 Films in this class were well-integrated with course topics.

TEAM TEACHING

- 156 Team teaching is effectively used in this course.
- 157 Instruction is well-coordinated among the team teachers.
- 158 Team teaching provided insights a single instructor could not.
- 159 The team teaching approach adequately meets my needs/interests.

GENERAL METHOD

- 160 Course topics are dealt with in sufficient depth.
- 161 Teaching methods used in this course are well chosen.
- 162 The format of this course is appropriate to course purposes.
- 163 The teaching strategy used in this course is appropriate.
- 164 This course is accurately described in the catalog.
- 165 Lecture information is adequately supplemented by other work.
- 166 Class lectures contain information not covered in the textbook.
- 167 Bibliographies for this course are current and extensive.
- 168 Mimeographed handouts are valuable supplements to this course.
- 169 The guest speakers contribute significantly to this course.
- 170 The speakers who addressed us communicated effectively.
- 171 An appropriate number of outside lecturers are used.

LABORATORY

- 172 Lab procedures are clearly explained to me.
- 173 My instructor thoroughly understands lab experiments/equipment.
- 174 Assistance is always available throughout lab sessions.
- 175 The lab sessions are well-organized.
- 176 The content of the lab is a worthwhile part of this course.
- 177 Lab assignments are reasonable in length and complexity.
- 178 Lab assignments have instructional value.
- 179 The lab in this course has adequate facilities.
- 180 My lab assignments are promptly returned to me.

GENERAL STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

- 181 The class mixture of Fr., So., Jr., Sr., or Grad is appropriate.
- 182 The size of this class is appropriate to course objectives.
- 183 The facilities for this course are excellent.
- 184 I have easy access to equipment/tools required in this course.
- 185 I had sufficient opportunity to use lab/practice room facilities.
- 186 The lab/practice room is well equipped.
- 187 I highly recommend this course...
- 188 I would enjoy taking another course from this instructor.
- 189 I like the way the instructor conducts this course.
- 190 Frequent attendance in this class is essential to good learning.
- 191 I am satisfied with my accomplishments in this course.
- 192 These items let me appraise this course fully and fairly.

COMMITTEE SUPPLIED ITEMS

- 193 My instructor's explanations and comments are helpful.
- 194 My instructor helps me identify my strengths and weaknesses.
- 195 I would take another course from this instructor.
- 196 My instructor motivates me to do my best work.
- 197 My instructor explains difficult material clearly.
- 198 Course assignments are interesting and stimulating.
- 199 Overall, this course is among the best I have ever taken.
- 200 Overall, this instructor is among the best teachers I have known.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

- 201 My instructor identifies major or important points in the course.
- 202 I have put much effort into this course.
- 203 I feel that I have done very well in this course.
- 204 Field trips offered insights that lectures or readings could not.
- 205 Field trips, relating to course objectives, are well planned.
- 206 Overall, this course has been worthwhile.
- 207 Overall, this instructor has been effective.

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES FOR DEPARTMENTALLY DEVELOPED QUESTIONNAIRES

1. All departments are encouraged to extend their CTE forms to include more Purdue items or departmentally-devised questions.
2. After approval by the department such an extended form must be submitted to the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness for approval.
3. Duplicating, processing, tabulating and distribution of results of department generated questionnaires using items other than Purdue items, is the responsibility of the department.
4. The department must also have a written policy which explicitly states where a student should deliver the completed questionnaires, who will be responsible for tallying student responses and typing student comments, who will dispose of the original questionnaires, and who will insure that the results of the evaluation will not be reported to the instructor until after his or her graded have been submitted for the course.⁷ Instructions to students returning the completed packets should include sealing and signing the envelope, and directions on to where/whom they should be given.
5. Each department shall have a set of written instructions titled: "Instructions for Faculty Administering CTE" and another titled "Instructions for students administering CTE" to be given to the instructor to explain the administration of the questionnaire. These sheets should be identical "in principle" to those used in the Purdue system.

⁷ p. 1 from (March 26, 1984) *Supplementary Guidelines in Evaluation Procedures. A Memo from Bruce Atkins to Department Chairs and Personnel Committee Chairs, approved by Faculty Senate.*

APPENDIX C: CRITERIA FOR COURSE TEACHER EVALUATION WITH MATCHING PURDUE ITEMS

1. There will be a standard CTE form approved by the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness and available for use by any department that so chooses.

2. **SUNY CORTLAND CRITERIA FOR COURSE TEACHER EVALUATION WITH MATCHING PURDUE ITEMS**

Criterion in the CTE Manual	Matching Purdue Item
A. Definition of and adherence to the announced course requirements and coverage of content	Purdue item 083 "The stated goals of this course are consistently pursued."
B. The teacher's effectiveness in presenting the course material (organization, structure, clarity, communication, teaching style, or lecturing ability)	Purdue item 006 "My instructor has an effective style of presentation."
C. The teacher's availability to meet with students outside of class	Purdue item 051 "My instructor is readily available for consultation."
D. Workload or course difficulty	Purdue item 135 "Complexity and length of course assignments are reasonable."
E. Fairness in evaluating students	Purdue item 125 "Grades are assigned fairly and impartially."
F. Teacher-student interaction or rapport	Purdue item 078 "My instructor readily maintains rapport with this class."
G. Impact on students or students' sense of accomplishment	Purdue item 191 "I am satisfied with my accomplishments in this course."
H. Global, overall rating of the course/teacher	Purdue item 207 "Overall, this instructor has been effective."

APPENDIX D-1: SUGGESTED CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATION OF COURSE DOSSIERS

The following checklist has been developed by the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness to aid Departmental Personnel Committees in evaluating the course dossiers submitted by members of your department in conjunction with student course-teacher evaluation.

Questions are designed to be answered either YES or NO or STRONGLY AGREE (SA), AGREE (A), UNDECIDED (U), DISAGREE (D), STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD), INSUFFICIENT DATA (ID), or NOT APPLICABLE (NA).

1.a. Are the course material for this course departmentally prepared?

YES	NO

b. Do students receive a statement of goals or objectives in this course?

YES	NO

c. Is the statement of goals or objectives of the course consistent with the catalog description of the course?

YES	NO

d. The topics covered in this course are relevant to the stated goals of the course.

SA	A	U	D	SD

e. Do students receive a syllabus and/or calendar of the course?

YES	NO

2.a. The test or texts for this course are appropriate in terms of degree of difficulty.

SA	A	U	D	SD

b. The text or texts for this course cover the majority of topics included in the syllabus.

SA	A	U	D	SD	ID

c. The assignments in this course constitute a reasonable workload for the level or the course.

SA	A	U	D	SD

d. Texts and assignments are consistent with goals and objectives set forth in the statement of objectives for the course.

SA	A	U	D	SD

3. a. Are standards and/or grading criteria explained in writing for students?

YES	NO	ID

b. Are there evaluation instruments used by instructors to evaluate students in this course?

YES	NO

c. Evaluation instruments administered in this course ask clear and relevant questions.

SA	A	U	D	SD	ID	NA

d. Evaluation instruments administered in this course do not rely excessively or inappropriately upon rote memorization.

SA	A	U	D	SD	ID

e. Do evaluation instruments ask questions which this course prepares students to answer?

YES	NO	ID	NA

APPENDIX D-2: SAMPLE OF DEPARTMENTALLY-DEVELOPED COURSE DOSSIER EVALUATION FORM

NAME: _____ COURSE _____ SEMESTER: _____

The following checklist is based on the one developed by the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness. I.D. means Insufficient Data. N.A. means Not Applicable.

1. The materials for this course are departmentally prepared.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ In part

2. Students receive a written statement of goals or objectives in this course.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Inadequate

3. The statement of goals or objectives of the course is consistent with the catalog description of the course and, where relevant, the departmental outline.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I.D.

4. The topics covered in this course are relevant to the stated goals of the course.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I.D.

5. Students receive a syllabus and/or calendar of the course.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Inadequate

6. The text or texts for this course are appropriate in terms of degree of difficulty.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Too Difficult _____ Too Easy _____ I. D.

7. The reading assignments in this course constitute a reasonable workload for the level of the course.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Too Much _____ Too Little _____ I. D.

8. The writing assignments in this course constitute a reasonable workload for the level of the course.

_____Yes _____No _____Too Much _____Too Little _____I. D.

9. Texts and assignments are consistent with goals and objectives set forth in the statement of objectives for the course.

_____Yes _____No _____I.D.

10. Students receive written information as to the relative weight assigned to performances evaluated in the course.

_____Yes _____No _____N.A.

11. Examinations and tests administered in this course ask clear and relevant questions, which test students' understanding of concepts and relationships as well as their comprehension of information.

_____Yes _____No _____I.D. _____N.A.

12. If the course is a WR course or a 400-level course, the amount and nature of the writing assignments clearly fulfill the requirements for such courses.

_____Yes _____No _____I.D. _____N.A.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SELECTED READINGS

- Aleamoni, L. "Student Ratings of Instruction." In J. Miliman (Ed.), Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publishing, 1981.
- Bausell, R. B. and Magoon, J. "Expected Grade in a Course, Grade Point Average, and Student Ratings of the Course and the Instructor." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1972, 32, 1013-1023.
- Bausell, R. B., Schwartz, S. and Purohit, A. "An Examination of the Conditions Under which Various Student Rating Parameters Replicate Across Time." Journal of Educational Measurement, 1975, 12 (4), 273-280.
- Brophy, J. E. "Stability of Teacher Effectiveness." American Educational Research Journal, 1973, (3), 245-252.
- Cohen, P. A. "Student Ratings of Instruction and Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of Multisection Validity Studies." Review of Educational Research. 1981, 51 (3), 281-309.
- Costin, J., Greenough, W. T., and Menges, R. J. "Student Ratings of College Teaching: Reliability, Validity, and Usefulness." Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41 (5), 511-535.
- Dowell, D. A. and Neal, J. A. "A Selective Review of the Validity of Student Ratings of Teaching." Journal of Higher Education 1982, 53 #1, 51-62.
- Downie, N. W. "Student Evaluation of Faculty." Journal of Higher Education. 1952, 23, 495-496.
- Feldman, K. A. "Consistency and Variability Among College Students in Rating Their Teachers and Courses: A Review and Analysis." Research in Higher Education, 1977, 6, 223-74.
- Feldman, K. A. "The Superior College Teacher From the Student's View." Research in Higher Education, 1976, 5, 243-88.
- Frey, P. W., Leonard, D. W., and Beatty, W. N. "Student Ratings of Instruction: Validation Research." American Educational Research Journal, 1975, 12 (4), 435-437.
- Hamilton, L. C. "Grades, Class Size, and Faculty Status Predict Teaching Evaluations." Teaching Sociology, 1980, 8, 47-62.
- Levinson-Rose, J. and Menges, R. "Improving College Teaching: A Critical Review of Research." Review of Educational Research 1981, 51 (3), 403-4.

- Pendse, S. G. "Faculty Evaluation as Interpersonal Reinforcement." Psychological Reports 1977, 41, 416-418.
- Read, R. R. "Components of Student-Faculty Evaluation Data." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1979, 39, 353-360.
- Renner, Richard R. "Comparing Professors: How Student Ratings Contribute to the Decline in Quality of Higher Education." Phi Delta Kappan October, 1981, 128-130.
- Rodin, M. and Rodin, B. "Student Evaluations of Teachers: Students Rate Most Highly Instructors from Whom They Learn Least." Science, 1972, 117, 1164-1166.
- Scrivin, M. "Summative Teacher Evaluation." In J. Miliman (Ed.), Handbook of Teacher Evaluation Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, 1981.
- Tyler, R. W. "The Functions of Measurement in Improving Instruction." In E.F. Lindquist (Ed.), Educational Measurement. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1951.
- Zelby, L. W. "Student-Faculty Evaluation." Science, 1974, 183, (267-) 270.