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Introduction

In September 2009, the Senate Committee on Course Evaluation (SCCE) began to consider revising the Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) form and its associated processes. Both were, at the time, approximately ten years old and had not been revised since their implementation. In addition, innovations and methodologies in pedagogy and teaching evaluation over the past ten years make it clear that revisions ought to be considered.

It was felt that it would be most appropriate to form a university-wide Course Evaluation Questionnaire Review Committee that would consult with the Memorial community at large, including students, staff, and faculty from all campuses. That Committee would report to the SCCE after completing its work. As a result, in the spring of 2010, members of such a committee were sought. The committee membership was approved by Senate in November 2010, and the committee consisted of the following members:

Shane O’Dea, English (retired), Chair
Antoinette Doyle, Faculty of Education, St. John’s
George Furey, Senate Committee on Educational Technology
Shoshannah Ganz, English, Grenfell Campus
Darcy Hollett, Psychology, St. John’s
Albert Johnson, DELTS
Robert Leamon, GCSU, Grenfell Campus
Hannah Munro, GSU
Élisabeth Simms, Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

The Review Committee presented its report to the SCCE in April 2011. As per the Terms of Reference for the review, the SCCE considered the report and, based upon it, is presenting a final report to Senate. In its report, the SCCE is presenting a number of specific recommendations that it hopes will be adopted by Senate.

Recommendations

1. **Pilot an online administration of the course evaluation questionnaire in winter 2012.**
   Should the pilot project prove successful, the model will be implemented as a permanent replacement for the current CEQ form and process.

A primary recommendation of the CEQ Review Committee was that the SCCE pilot an online administration of the CEQ, and the SCCE agreed with this recommendation. The SCCE believes that a well-designed online course evaluation process, incorporated into the Banner Student Self-Service system, will have numerous significant advantages over the current CEQ process:
• **Reduction of time and resources.** The time and resources currently required by the CIAP office for preparation and compilation and by academic units for in-class administration would be significantly reduced or unnecessary with an online system.

• **Reduction of paper.** In addition to significant cost-savings, the university would benefit from a more environmentally friendly course evaluation system.

• **Elimination of issues related to in-class administration.** An online system would create a higher level of standardization in administration across all courses and remove many of the variables that could potentially impact the integrity of the process.

• **Improved accessibility of the evaluation process.** Course evaluation forms would be accessible to all students enrolled in a course, and student participation would not be tied to their attendance on a particular day, thereby giving more opportunity for everyone to participate in the process.

• **Privacy for students.** Students would have a greater degree of privacy responding to open-ended questions electronically rather than on paper, where the possibility exists for an instructor to recognize a student’s handwriting.

• **Meaningfulness of data.** Completion of the form in an online environment would provide more time for students to reflect on the course, consider their responses and provide thoughtful comments in a truly anonymous way.

• **Timeliness of information.** Data collection would be in an immediate electronic format without the need for manual processing, which should allow for more timely compilation and return of reports to instructors.

• **Time and ability to analyze trends and issues.** With the automation of data collection within the Banner system, there would be more opportunity to analyze and reflect on course evaluation data so that the university can have a better understanding of trends in the data.

The following outlines the steps taken in the process:

(a) In August 2011, the SCCE contacted specific academic units to seek their permission to run the pilot project under their auspices. Confirmed participants are Grenfell Campus and the School of Music. We are hopeful that the Faculty of Education will participate, and we expect news by December 13.

(b) The SCCE will work closely with Enterprise Application Services (EAS) and colleagues in the Registrar’s Office in order to set up the online framework, as it was determined that Student Web would be the most appropriate platform for the online CEQ. The SCCE has also consulted Faculty Relations, who will, in turn, inform MUNFA and LUMUN of the implementation plan.

(c) The SCCE will begin a promotional campaign advertising at the appropriate unit levels that the CEQ will be completed online during the winter 2012 semester. This will involve working with the Office of the Registrar and Marketing and Communications to ensure that the messages are conveyed clearly regarding this pilot (especially at Grenfell Campus). Students will be given instructions on how to complete the CEQ form on the Student Web system. This work is currently at the idea generating phase.
(d) Students will be invited to complete the CEQ form online beginning in the second last week of classes and ending the day before the start of final examinations.
(e) The SCCE will ensure that there is a mechanism through which students, faculty, and staff can provide feedback on the new CEQ form and its administration method.
(f) Participation in the pilot would be voluntary for all faculty; those who choose not to participate (for instance, those concerned with ensuring that evaluation methods are consistent for P&T purposes) can still avail of the current system. CIAP will ensure that the administration of these CEQ forms is unaffected by the pilot project.

2. For the pilot, the SCCE recommends changing, modifying, and adding question items to the questionnaire.

The CEQ Review Committee reviewed the questions that currently comprise the CEQ form (developed in 1999) in terms of adequacy to measure students’ perception of effective teaching and appropriateness to a variety of course delivery strategies. As part of this process, a survey was conducted that asked students and instructors to rate the importance of the current CEQ questions and suggest questions that are perceived to be missing from the evaluation form. As a result of this survey and other consultations undertaken by the CEQ Review Committee, revisions to the question set were suggested. These proposed revisions were reviewed in detail by the SCCE and while there was agreement on many of the revisions, some items were subsequently adjusted, as detailed in Appendix B. Further to this, the SCCE requested additional feedback on the proposed new questions from students in a number of courses during the spring 2011 semester. The product of these consultations is included in Appendix C. The recommended changes consist of the following:

a) Organize the questions on the form into two categories – Course Delivery and Course Components. The instrument will be named the Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ), which is the title that has become more widely accepted than the original title of “Core Evaluation Questionnaire.”
b) Retain four original questions without revisions that rate instructor effectiveness in responding to students, generating interest in the subject matter, organizing the course, and overall instruction.
c) Remove two questions that were not directly related to course evaluation and have no bearing on teaching effectiveness.
d) Reword several questions to ensure the focus is specific to instruction or to the overall course.
e) Add five new questions, one of which focuses on delivery (communication), and four of which focus on course components (resources, activities, texts, assessments, and labs).

The SCCE feels that the revised questions:
- have been selected carefully based on wide consultation and feedback from the Memorial community;
- reflect current literature and perspectives on course evaluation and many of the factors
associated with teaching effectiveness (including research results specific to Memorial)\(^1\); 
- concur with areas identified as important to teaching and learning at Memorial; 
- are specific to areas that are appropriate for students to evaluate and do not include aspects of teaching that would be more appropriately evaluated by other means.

3. **Retain the ‘Instructor-Provided Questions’ and promote the use of this feature. A bank of questions for such use has been provided.**

The CEQ Review Committee supported the continuation of the ‘Instructor-Provided Questions’ portion of the form, and the SCCE recommends that this feature be retained and promoted. Individual instructors may elect to customize the CEQ by selecting questions that relate specifically to their teaching and learning environment. These questions may be selected from a pre-established question bank, generated by the individual instructors, or developed from within an academic unit as a whole.

Two types of questions are available: i) those with Likert-style answer formats (Strongly Agree → Strongly Disagree) for which a numeric summary can be generated, and ii) open-ended questions through which students are encouraged to elaborate on their learning experiences. An instructor may select up to ten (10) Likert-style questions and one (1) open-ended question per course offering, as per current procedures. These limits have been maintained so as to allow students to complete the overall CEQ within a 10-minute period.

A proposed question bank has been included in Appendix D. This bank includes questions recommended by the CEQ Review Committee as well as additional items created by the SCCE. Several parameters will be put in place:
- The results of all additional/custom questions will be made available to the instructor only, except in the case of units that use a customized CEQ form or set of IPQs for the entire unit.
- Instructors are not required to include additional/custom questions.
- Instructors may choose up to ten (10) questions from the additional Likert-style question bank and no more than one (1) question from the additional open-ended question bank.

---

\(^1\) A report published in 2010 by faculty researchers at Memorial, titled *Students’ Perception of Effective Teaching in Higher Education*, summarizes what Memorial University students consistently rated as characteristics of an effective instructor, namely: respectful, responsive, knowledgeable, approachable, communicative, organized, engaging, professional and humorous. These characteristics were consistent whether students were describing an on-campus instructor or an off-campus instructor. Regardless of the language used, other studies have shown similar emphasis on many of these characteristics (Eble, 1971; Lewis et al, 1982; Sheffield, 1974).
4. **As part of the pilot project, the SCCE recommends promoting and facilitating culture change toward course evaluation at Memorial in concert with the Teaching and Learning Framework.**

One of the best ways to reinvigorate the course evaluation process at Memorial will be to foster ‘buy-in’ from the groups on campus most affected by the process. Therefore, should the pilot program prove successful, the SCCE recommends promoting and facilitating culture change for course evaluation at Memorial to raise the profile of this process at Memorial.

The SCCE will develop a strategy in working with the Office of the VP Academic, the Office of the Registrar, student unions, and Marketing and Communications to promote the course evaluation process. In addition, as Memorial’s Teaching and Learning Framework is implemented, the SCCE proposes that connections be established between the groups guiding these processes and the SCCE so as to support the mandate of the Teaching and Learning Framework. Finally, in an effort to increase accountability, the SCCE will work to improve the accessibility of results by modifying the end-user agreement for those students attempting to access CEQ reports online.

5. **The SCCE recommends establishing a process to review regularly the course evaluation procedure.**

The current course evaluation form and procedures have been in place for over ten years. The process and forms ought to be reviewed at least once every ten years, ideally starting between the seventh and eighth year, or at such time as the committee feels a review is warranted. As per its Terms of Reference, the SCCE will continue to monitor the administration of the CEQ and report to Senate regularly on the operation of the policies and procedures. Through this mandate the SCCE can address many of the issues that may arise outside of a formal review process, or flag issues for inclusion in the next review. This could include identification of additional questions for the question bank; identification of issues concerning the administration process (pre, during and post administration to students, or technical issues); identification of issues concerning the instrument design; identification of issues concerning the reporting of results; and accounting for trends in post-secondary teaching and methods.

In addition to its work, the SCCE will oversee a review of the CEQ form and associated processes every ten years. This timeline is, we believe, workable and comparable to the timeline for a regular APR (Academic Program Review) at academic units across the university. For scheduled ten-year reviews, the SCCE will:

a) review statistical summaries of previous CEQ data from current and previous versions’ results;

b) convene to discuss statistical summaries and make recommendations for adjustment to the instrument or process based on results;

c) review issues, requests and inquiries reported since the last major review to determine what elements to include in the review;
d) develop terms of reference for the review;

e) determine an appropriate review implementation based on terms of reference.
University-wide consultation should be undertaken and, should the committee feel it necessary, the SCCE will have the option of forming a subcommittee to support the process;
f) review results of the consultation process and identify changes necessitated by the review process;
g) prepare a final report to Senate outlining the results of CEQ review process;
h) implement changes, including formative evaluation, and finalize a new CEQ instrument (if required) and processes for the forthcoming ten-year period pending approval of Senate.

Evaluation of the Pilot

A. Administration mode

a) Response Rate
Based on the literature and the experiences of other institutions who have initiated online course evaluations\(^2\), it is expected that response rate will be lower with an online administration. Currently, with the paper in-class administration, Memorial sees an average response rate across course sections of approximately 69-72\% for undergraduate courses (variable by campus and course level) and high 80\% for graduate courses. The online CEQ form used for distance courses within D2L achieves an overall response rate of approximately 30\%. It is anticipated that a form available through Student Self-Service will have a slightly higher rate of participation but will still be lower than for the in-class administration, particularly when the system is first established.

Other Canadian universities who have moved to an online system of course evaluation have reported lower response rates compared to paper forms; however, the drop is not always uniform across courses and it appears the rate of response can improve over time. For instance, McGill University has had an online course evaluation system in place for several years and in 2010-2011 reported a response rate between 46-50\% ("Course Evaluations", 2011). Similarly, UBC has presented several different analyses of response rate for its online evaluation system which suggest that in many cases response rate does not decrease significantly, and in 2009 many Faculties reported response rates in the 60-80\% range ("Student Evaluation", 2010).

In terms of response rate alone, survey research and sampling theory would suggest that a certain decrease in response could be tolerated without affecting the usefulness of the data. A document prepared by the University of Saskatchewan illustrates the relationship

---

\(^2\) Reports by Gravestock & Gregor-Greenleaf (2008), Avery, Bryant, Mathios, Kang & Bell (2006) and Johnson (2003) provide detailed reviews of the response rate issue as it relates to online course evaluation forms.
between class size and response rate and indicates that for very large class sizes a response rate as low as 33% is acceptable ("Online Course Evaluations", n.d.). The policy followed by McGill University suggests even more liberal sampling parameters with a response rate as low as 25% for large class sizes ("Policy", 2011). It is important to note, however, that a lower response rate will not necessarily mean that the results are any less valid or reliable than the results currently obtained through paper forms (see next section on Representativeness).

b) Representativeness
A careful analysis of responses will be important for determining the amount of change that occurs in responses when a different medium is used for administration. Other Canadian universities have found that despite the lower response rates which sometimes result for online evaluations, the ratings themselves do not differ between online and paper administrations ("FAQs About Response Rates", 2009; "FAQs for Full-Time Faculty", n.d.; "Student Evaluation", 2010). Means, standard deviations and distribution shape of responses will be analyzed for significant differences. This will be done by academic unit, course level (1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000-level), degree level (undergraduate and graduate) and campus. In addition to a new mode of delivery, new questions have been included in the pilot; however, there are four items that have been maintained between the two instruments, and these items will be used to determine the comparability of results between the in-class and online administration.

c) Quality/quantity of responses
An online mode of administration will allow students more time and opportunity to complete the form, which may lead to more thoughtful and reflective responses. It will not be possible to determine if any changes seen in responses to the common scaled-items between the former CEQ and the new form are the results of more thoughtful consideration (in either a positive or negative manner). The open-ended questions, however, can serve as a means to quantify the amount and type of information being provided online. Approximately 10-20% of instructors from the pilot units will be asked to volunteer their CEQs for analysis of the number of students who provide written commentary and the amount of commentary (word count) provided through the online form versus the paper form. These same instructors will also be asked for their perceptions of the overall value of the commentary obtained with the online form. Analysis will be carried out by CIAP staff trained in qualitative analysis. Some universities have noted that written comments provided for online evaluations are high in quantity and quality (Weiner & Sehgal, 2006; “CEVAL”, 2010).

B. Form

a) Consistency of scores
The results obtained for the four items retained from the original form will be analyzed by mean, standard deviation and distribution to determine if there are significant differences
between the scores obtained through an online and a paper medium. However, differences in scores may also arise as a result of changes in the representativeness of the respondents or due to the fact that students will have more time to consider carefully their responses to each item. This matter will have to be approached with these additional factors in mind.

b) Reliability and Validity
The form used in the pilot will be a new instrument, even though some items have been retained or reworded only slightly. Prior to the online pilot, the new set of questions were reviewed by students and faculty during Intersession 2011 (at various courses at Grenfell Campus) to ensure there were no issues with interpretation or ambiguous wording. The pilot will provide an opportunity to assess the new instrument for reliability between items and respondents, and in comparison to the former instrument. Since the varied purposes of the CEQ imply both a formative and summative function for the form, the results will continue to be reported for each item independently. The “global” item (original question 8) has been retained, as well as the open-ended comment questions which serve a formative purpose for the instructor. In the absence of formally assessing the validity of the course evaluations against other measures or indicators of quality instruction, all efforts have been made to ensure that the questions are well-constructed and relevant to the purposes of course evaluation at Memorial (as detailed in Recommendation 2).
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APPENDIX A

Final Report of the CEQ Review Committee
CEQ Review Committee
Report 21 April 2011

Chair Shane O'Dea, English

Members* Antoinette Doyle, Education
George Furey, Senate Committee on Educational Technology
Shoshannah Ganz, English (Grenfell)
Darcy Hallett, Psychology
Albert Johnson, DELT
Robert Leamon, GCSU
Hannah Munro, GSU
Élizabeth Simms, SCUGS

* Dan Campbell (MUNSU) was appointed to the Committee but only attended the initial meeting.
Joe Kelly (GSCU) contributed to the early meetings but was obliged by work commitments to resign and was replaced by Robert Leamon in March.
Terms of Reference

1. The Committee will address the following matters:
   a. The adequacy of the current standard CEQ questions and rating scale in measuring student perception of effective teaching;
   b. The adequacy of the ten standard CEQ questions for current methods of course delivery;
   c. The feasibility of electronic administration of the CEQ (in both on-campus and distance courses);
   d. The extent of student, faculty and administration awareness of the CEQ results.

2. The Committee will make a recommendation on whether the current CEQ instrument should be retained in its existing form, or whether it requires modification.

3. In the case of modification or replacement, the Review Committee will make recommendations concerning an instrument-construction working group to be formed for the purpose of designing and pilot-testing a revised instrument.

4. The Review Committee will make recommendations on the administration of the CEQ process, and the appropriate dissemination of CEQ data.

5. In conducting its review the Committee will:
   o interview members of the Memorial community (instructors, administrators, researchers and students);
   o research best practice student evaluations;
   o poll other universities concerning their procedures;
   o consult the SCCE and the staff of CIAP.

6. The Committee’s work in gathering information from members of the Memorial community will include consultations at the three campuses.

Consultation

As directed by the terms of reference, one of the first actions of the Committee was to consult students and faculty about the strengths and weaknesses of the CEQ. The first step in this consultation process was the administration of an online survey. During the month of December, 2010, all students were invited, by email, to complete this survey, which was hosted on the D2L system. During the beginning of January, 2011, faculty were also invited, via email, to complete a survey hosted on a website designed by CIAP for this purpose. Except for a couple of questions, the student version and the faculty version of the survey were identical. A total of 1926 students and 237 faculty completed this survey.

A report detailing the results of this survey is included as Appendix B. In summary form, these results are:

- Students rarely use the CEQ results to help them make course choices, but this may be because very few of them know where to find the CEQ results. Many students requested
that the results be more accessible.

- Regarding the current CEQ questions, both students and faculty rated the "The instructor responded to students' questions effectively." and "Overall the quality of instruction was" most favourably and "This course is required for my program." least favourably.
- Many students perceive that CEQ results are not taken seriously and do not necessarily lead to better teaching. Students seem to believe, however, that this is only true for some faculty while others do pay attention to CEQ results.
- Faculty perceive that CEQ results may not necessarily reflect good teaching but instead are more of a popularity contest or a reflection of how easy a course is. At the same time, many faculty do find the written comments useful and most have at least occasionally used the CEQ results to improve their teaching.

The second part of the consultation and research process was to gather information about what other universities are doing in regard to course evaluation. On our behalf CIAP sent out a questionnaire to its ListServ to which fourteen institutions, most of which have been using evaluations for 20-30 years, responded. Of those, eleven reported having some form of evaluation and, of those, two noted that it was only for probationary faculty. In terms of purpose all reported that the intent was to improve teaching and assess institutional and individual teaching performance. Only five used it for instructor/course choice. In terms of delivery, seven used a paper form, three used an online system and four used both with two of that four using paper for probationary instructors and online for full-time. Half of the institutions post the results of which five allow student access to those results and two seek faculty permission before posting the results.

A draft of this report was circulated to the Memorial community and all campuses were invited to participate in the consultation. On 13 April a consultation was held at St. John's and on 14 April at Grenfell. These consultations, while widely advertised, were very poorly attended despite the fact that they were scheduled at a time when there were few exams and before students had left campus. At St. John's six people, apart from the Committee, attended and engaged in a lively discussion for an hour. No one came to the Grenfell session. There were, however, email comments from twenty-four persons. Attendance aside, the input was useful and did provide some new and useful perspectives on some of the Committee's recommendations.

**Recommendations**

1. a. *The adequacy of the current standard CEQ questions and rating scale in measuring student perception of effective teaching.*

The Committee was of the view that the current form was misleadingly named a "course" evaluation when the majority of the questions related to instructor performance. It was thought that a division of the form into Instructor-Related and Course-Related questions would improve the initial perception of the process by the students completing the form thus producing a more thoughtful response. It was also thought that such a division would better enable students to read the posted results and instructors to see what applied to their performance. In light of that the Review Committee recommends changing the name of the form from *Course Evaluation Questionnaire* to *Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire*. This change would make the name better reflect the intent of the evaluation process: to enable the students to make course choices based on their individual learning styles; faculty
to reflect on and improve their teaching and administrators to be aware of and make provision for the improvement of teaching in the University.

While this division involved a change and some modification of the questions there was a concern to maintain a connection with the original format so that there could be consistency between the forms. This, the Committee felt, was very important for instructors who wished to use the evaluations for their teaching dossiers in the promotion and tenure process. With that in mind the Committee reviewed the five-point Likert scale and found it allowed for a sufficient range of discrimination and should be retained.

The modifications/changes are based in part on the survey in which we asked for suggestions for new questions and they increase the number of standard questions by four. In the process one of the original questions was dropped (original CEQ #10), five were modified (proposed CEQ 1, 3, 5, 7, 13) and six were added (proposed CEQ 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14). It is recognized that not all questions in the Course-Related section of the questionnaire are going to be relevant to all courses hence the direction: “answer as appropriate to this course”.

It is proposed that the following questions be used on the new form:

1. Instructor-related Questions:
   1. The instructor clearly explained what was required of students in the course.
   2. The instructor responded to students’ questions effectively.
   3. The instructor was considerate of students’ concerns and treated them respectfully.
   4. The instructor stimulated my interest in learning the subject matter of the course.
   5. The instructor gave me useful feedback on my work.
   6. The instructor communicated effectively.
   7. The instructor was well organized.
   8. Overall the quality of instruction was (1 = Poor > 5 = Excellent).
   9. The teaching technology (e.g., D2L, email, chalkboard, film) chosen for this course was used effectively.

2. Course-related Questions Course (answer as appropriate to this course):
   10. The textbook(s) helped me learn course concepts and material.
   11. The labs helped me learn course concepts and material.
   12. The assignments helped me learn course concepts and material.
   13. The workload was appropriate to the course.
   14. The teaching technology (e.g., D2L, email, chalkboard, film) chosen for this course was accessible.

The ten instructor-generated questions will be retained. However, to facilitate their use the Committee recommends the creation of an item pool from which faculty could draw easily to add extra questions. This item pool would include standard items for situations like laboratory courses so CEQs could be tailored to different
kinds of courses. Faculty would not be restricted to these items and would still be able to create their own questions.

b. The adequacy of the ten standard CEQ questions for current methods of course delivery.

In the survey there was frequent comment on the inability of the original form to address all situations but most faculty seemed unaware of the possibility of using the additional ten self-generated questions to get around this difficulty. Only a third (31%) used these questions occasionally and almost half (49%) never used them. This points to a need for better information regarding the use of evaluations (a matter to be addressed later in this report). The section of additional self-generated questions should remain an important part of the form and could solve such problems as the assessment of teaching assistants, tutors and lab instructors attached to a course. We have appended a list of “Potential additional Instructor/Department questions” to trigger ideas in this regard.

It should be noted that 57% of faculty report using other methods to collect feedback. Perhaps the format and timing of professor-directed feedback mechanisms are felt to be more effective because of the individualized nature of these. This may partly explain the degree of uptake of the opportunity to ask extra questions on the CEQ.

c. The feasibility of electronic administration of the CEQ (in both on-campus and distance courses).

There are many arguments in favour of administering the CEQs electronically. First it will allow for a much faster reporting of results to faculty. At present it can take eight to ten weeks for preparation of the CEQ results. This has been a long-acknowledged problem of the current system because it – especially in the move from Fall to Winter semesters – does not allow faculty to reflect on and change their teaching strategies as they start anew in January. This is particularly important for new faculty or faculty attempting innovative approaches in their classrooms.

Online administration would also address a concern mentioned by the students in our survey: that professors might be able to recognize their handwriting and, potentially, retaliate in later courses. Online administration would allow the students to provide comments with security of anonymity.

Online administration would also be much less costly in terms of personnel hours, paper and administration. Indeed, it would eliminate the need for and problems with (mentioned below in this report) in-class administration.

The principal concern with online administration is with the low response rate in comparison to that for in-class CEQs. Memorial recently piloted online CEQs for its distance courses and the response rate was generally around 35%, but varied from a low of 5% to a high of 70%. Before implementing its own online system, McGill University did a study to compare their online and in-class response rates. They found that while the online response rate was around 45% (compared to their in-class response rate of between 60% and 80%), the evaluation rating did not significantly differ in mean, standard deviation, or distribution shape. McGill also
cited several other universities that reported the same results in similar studies. As an interesting aside, students in our survey reported that they believed the response rate would be about the same in online as in in-class administration.

There is, however, another consideration. While the form contains numerical questions it also contains open-ended questions. It is in the responses to these open-ended questions that instructors find the material that allows them to see what works and what needs improvement in their teaching or their course. It is in these open-ended questions that individual responds to individual; that the student moves from being merely a number to being a critic of the teaching process. A reduction in the number of responses may mean a reduction in the possibility of full formative evaluation. On the other hand it is also possible that the students who are more likely to offer open-ended comments are also those students who will be more likely to complete the CEQ online. Furthermore, online administration would also allow students to have more time to write comments rather than being restricted to the time allotted in class.

Considering both the advantages and potential disadvantages, the Committee recommends that SCCE pilot online administration of CEQ but that, in conducting this pilot, a comparison be made of the results of the means and distributions of scores for online versus in-class administration. This would alleviate faculty concerns about the skewing of data in an online administration, provided that measures would be taken to address such findings.

d. The extent of student, faculty and administration awareness of the CEQ results.

Anecdotal information had suggested that students were unaware of the availability of CEQ results and the survey confirmed this. Only 18% of students knew where they could access CEQ results and, very significantly, over 90% said they had never used the CEQ to influence their course choice.

2. The Committee will make a recommendation on whether the current CEQ instrument should be retained in its existing form, or whether it requires modification.

See recommendations 1.a and 1.b.

3. In the case of modification or replacement, the Review Committee will make recommendations concerning an instrument-construction working group to be formed for the purpose of designing and pilot-testing a revised instrument.

The Committee has recommended a modified instrument to be administered online. Should SCCE wish to proceed with testing online administration, the Committee recommends that SCCE first conduct a pilot study to determine if the online administration will result in similar CEQ results compared to the in-class administration. This pilot project could also investigate whether the number of open-ended comments is reduced in online as compared to in-class administration.
4. The Review Committee will make recommendations on the administration of the CEQ process, and the appropriate dissemination of CEQ data.

Administrative Process
Those who wrote us identified several problems with the administrative process. At present, with the use of paper, the evaluations have to be completed in class under the supervision of a CEQ administrator who is neither the instructor nor a student of that class. These guidelines were instituted to protect the integrity of the process. However, because the work falls on individual departments who do not have the personnel to manage multiple sections in the two week CEQ period (Grenfell has particular difficulties with this), it can be a hardship. If the paper administration is to continue some means has to be found to assist departments with this.

We also heard complaints of CEQ administrators who rushed students to complete the forms and who failed to read the directions for doing the evaluations. Training and observation of administrators may be necessary to address this situation which, while uncommon, works against the positive climate in which the evaluations should be conducted. With an online administration more standardized instructions and email reminders could be used to make clearer the directions and rationale for the CEQ.

Outliers
Another concern raised was of the impact of outliers – those who (distressed by a result or infatuated with the instructor) provide an assessment which has a considerable influence on the mean rating a given CEQ question. The example used was of a class with fifteen respondents, in which fourteen gave the instructor an average of 4.20, number fifteen giving a 1.00. The effect of that would be to lower the instructor’s CEQ average from 4.20 to 3.99. One might counter this by saying that the opinion of all students in a class is important and so that disgruntled number fifteen has a right to her opinion. However, if that student had not attended regularly and had failed to meet the course requirements should her evaluation be given equal weight with that of her fellow students?

One approach to this problem has been to trim the mean by removing a percentage of the extremes; that is, removing the highest and lowest scores. That could be workable in a class with large enrolment in which there is a large number of respondents. To do this in a class of ten would be to seriously skew the results: to remove 20% at either end would be to reduce the respondents to six. Under the current arrangement classes of less than ten do not have to do CEQ although many instructors with less than ten students do use it for their own purposes. Do we need to look at a required percentage of respondents before we publish the results? The Committee considered but did not reach a conclusion on this approach. It was, however, pointed out that, for faculty concerned about the effect of outliers on their Teaching Dossiers and, consequently, on their prospects for promotion and tenure, there is both a possibility and an obligation to be self-protective and to address such anomalies in the narrative for their dossiers.

Nevertheless, the Committee believes that the issue of outliers warrants further study. Perhaps it would be worthwhile to examine past CEQ distributions to see how much influence outliers actually have on these scores. If this analysis does
demonstrate that outliers are numerous enough, SCCE may want to consider: 1) removing the top and bottom percentage of a distribution for all CEQ scores (probably no more than 5% at each end) before calculating a mean; 2) removing all outlier scores (e.g., any score more two standard deviations away from the mean, or more if the class is larger) before calculating a mean; or, 3) including the percentage of outliers (low and high separately) as part of the report to faculty about each question, but still include them in the calculation of the mean.

Publication
The matter of student use of the published results came up several times in the course of the review. CIAP has tracked this usage which appears to have peaked in 2004-06, a time when both the process and publication were new and when there was an article in *The Muse* which misread the data and created considerable controversy. CIAP's usage figures were confirmed by our survey in which the students indicated that less than 10% used it for course choice – one of the CEQs three purposes. This led to some discussion as to the utility of publication and a proposal was made that publication should cease.

To this proposal several counter arguments were made: that the site was not used because it was too difficult to access in Banner; that the site did not allow students easy access to instructor performance but could only be searched semester by semester by individual course section; that the site had a very intimidating legal agreement which the user had to sign and, finally, that the site suggested that the results might not be reliable. It was also pointed out that publication had the salutary affect of encouraging faculty to think that the quality of their teaching had an impact on student choice of their classes.

One aspect of the published material which has caused particular difficulty is the reporting of decile scores. These are difficult for the non-specialist to interpret and have, in the past, led to serious misinterpretation and problems for the process. An instructor who gets a rating of 4 (a very good rating) on a question might end up in 20th decile because the average scores for that question are in the 4-5 range. So while the decile gives a comparative ranking, it does not give a full sense of the student's perception of the effectiveness of the instructor in relation to that specific question.

This all suggests that there is a need for improvement in accessibility. The Review Committee recommends that:

a) access to results be made easier;

b) results be searchable by instructor and by course;

c) reporting of deciles be removed from Banner (but not from instructor reports);

d) the legal agreement be presented in a similar manner to those found when downloading software;

e) once these recommendations have been in place for three years, a review be conducted of the frequency of use of the published results.

Publication of Comments
Should the CEQ move to online administration and publication be retained there would be an opportunity to allow for better-informed student choice by publishing
the student comments. At present these comments go with the original forms to the instructor and are unavailable to students. Were the comments published, students (as they can with the Ratemyprofessors website where the comments are provided) would be better able to understand an instructor's teaching strategies and so be able to make better instructor/course choices.

However, this proposal is not without difficulties. Comments can often be inappropriate and an instrument designed for formative evaluation should not be allowed to degenerate into a forum for invective. If online administration is adopted and publication retained and if the publication of comments is seen as useful then some safeguards need to be developed. If online administration is approved and if the SCCE recommends that comments be published, the Review Committee recommends that instructors be given three options: to a) opt out publication of all results (as at present); b) opt out of publication of comments only; c) opt out of publication of quantitative results only.

Enhancing the Importance of Evaluation at Memorial

The Committee felt strongly that there was a need for a cultural change regarding teaching evaluation at Memorial. The survey revealed a significant percentage of student and faculty respondents have a somewhat cynical view of the process: “students perceive that CEQ results are not taken seriously and do not necessarily lead to better teaching. Faculty perceive that CEQ results may not necessarily reflect good teaching but instead are more of a popularity contest or a reflection of how easy a course is.” It is recommended that SCCE take a very active role in promoting this cultural change. One way of doing this would be to create a website for Teaching Evaluation in the manner of McGill’s (http://www.mcgill.ca/tls/courseevaluations) where all aspects of the evaluation process are explained in detail. It is important to encourage a positive attitude in students, faculty and evaluation administrators and to make the evaluations part of a university-wide initiative to foster better teaching. Faculty could, in the week before evaluations are administered, speak to their classes emphasizing the importance of the students’ responses to the teaching process. Faculty need to make clear that they care about what the students think and, if possible, show how the evaluations have helped them modify their teaching or courses. This will encourage students to provide useful and objective criticism to their instructors. But it is also crucial that those who administer the evaluations are full participants in this matter – that they fully understand their role in encouraging the students to be effective critics of teaching. Student members of the Committee reported that they had observed administrators ignoring the requirement to read the evaluation directions or rushing students to complete the forms. Such conduct only demeans the process for the students and, likely, has a negative effect on the results for the instructor.

While the survey made clear that many faculty took evaluations seriously, so seriously that they also conducted their own evaluations (some at mid-term, some at end of term; some formally, some informally), there are many faculty who find the evaluations useless, punitive or hurtful. They get their evaluations; they file their evaluations; they seldom read or learn from their evaluations. They are, potentially, lost teachers – people who must teach to maintain their place in the University but who feel shut out from that side of our academic lives. It is very important that the SCCE find a means to or encourage the University to aid and assist these faculty so
that they become better teachers, find some pleasure in that side of their work and become full participants in the academic life of Memorial University.

5. **In conducting its review the Committee will:**
   - Interview members of the Memorial community (instructors, administrators, researchers and students);
     - see Consultation
   - research best practice student evaluations;
     - see Bibliography. The Gravestock/Gregor-Greenleaf report was of particular value because it directed us to all the most recent work on evaluations.
   - poll other universities concerning their procedures;
     - see Consultation
   - consult the SCCE and the staff of CIAP;
     - We met with SCCE at beginning and were in regular contact with CIAP for advice and assistance.

6. **The Committee’s work in gathering information from members of the Memorial community will include consultations at the three campuses.**
   - See Consultation
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## Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ)

### Part I: Instructions, Please Read.

Using an HB pencil or ball-point pen only, fill completely the numbered circle and/or write your response in the designated area corresponding to each statement.

All responses are voluntary and anonymous. Results will be available to the instructor only after final course marks have been submitted.

The information obtained from these questions may be used as stipulated by Memorial's Policies and the MUN/MUNFA Collective Agreement and published in printed and electronic form for access by students.

**Course Name and Number:**

(e.g., English 1000)

**Section Number:**

(e.g., 001)

### Part II

1. The student requirements in the course were clear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The instructor responded to students' questions effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The instructor showed concern for how well students progressed in the course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The instructor stimulated my interest in learning the subject matter of the course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Students were given constructive feedback on written work, i.e., assignments and exams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Overall the course was well organized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I would recommend this course taught by this instructor to another student with interests and preparation similar to my own even if it was not required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Overall the quality of instruction was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Compared to other courses at the same level (e.g., all 2000 level courses you have taken) the workload was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much Lower</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>About the Same</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Much Higher</th>
<th>This is the first course I have taken at this level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. This course is required for my program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor provided questions (if applicable):

11.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PLEASE TURN OVER 🔄 🔄 🔄
PART III

21. If you had to select the best aspects of this course, what would they be?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

22. What aspects of this course could be improved and how could they be improved?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Instructor Requested Feedback (if applicable):

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

THANK YOU
CEQ Survey Report

In December of 2010 and January 2011, students and faculty at Memorial University were asked, via an online survey, to give feedback regarding the Course Evaluation Questionnaire. This survey asked both forced-choice and open-ended questions. Students and faculty were asked mostly the same questions, with some minor differences applicable to their perspectives. This report describes the findings from this survey, dealing with students and faculty in turn.

It should be noted that there was a problem with several of the survey questions which were misleadingly formulated. The phrasing of the scale for questions 12-20 ("somewhat important") suggested a modestly positive statement but its position in the scale had a more negative implication. When this was drawn to our attention we thought to modify the survey questions but, by that stage, too many had responded to make change feasible. It was also felt that most respondents, used to filling out such questionnaires, would treat the questions as reading in a scale from most to least positive and that we, in interpreting the results, could, as we did, take account of the problem.

Students

A total of 1926 students responded to the survey. From the demographic questions, it seems that this sample is representative of the MUN student population, with a 65%-35% female to male gender split, most of the students from the St. John’s campus, and students from every faculty and division and across all year groups.

Knowledge and Use of the CEQ

Using forced-choice questions, students were asked questions that related to their knowledge, use and impressions regarding the CEQ. When asked how often they actually fill in the CEQ, 75% of students say they fill it in “Most of the time” or “Always”. If the CEQs were given online, 40% of students said that the response rate would be about the same, while the rest of the students were evenly split on whether there would be a higher or lower response rate.

Regarding their use of the CEQ published ratings, 90% of students say that they never use the CEQs to influence their choice of courses. This may be because 82% of students say that they are not aware of where the CEQ results can be found. Unfortunately, students were not asked if they would use the CEQ results more if they were easier to access.

Students were also asked to what extent they believed that professors used the CEQs to help them improve their teaching. On the one hand, almost half of students believed that professor’s use of CEQ scores was “limited” or “none”. At the same time, more than 36% of students said that this use
depended on the professor. One plausible interpretation of these results is this: students perceive that while many professors do not heed the CEQ scores, there are still many that do.

*Ratings of Current CEQ Questions*

Students were asked to rate each of the current CEQ questions, on a 1-to-5 Likert scale, on its suitability for the purpose of the CEQ. The students rated many of the CEQ questions relatively highly, with all questions getting a mean score of greater than 3 out of 5. The questions students most preferred were “The instructor responded to students' questions effectively.”, “Students were given constructive feedback on written work, i.e., assignments and exams.”, and “Overall the quality of instruction was....”. The least preferred question was “This course is required for my program.”

*Open-ended Questions*

Students were asked two open-ended questions. The first question asked for suggestions for questions that should be included in the CEQ. The results are summarized in the appendix, and responses vary widely, but it should be noted that most responses (55%) asked for questions that had to do with the professor (e.g., teaching ability, style, availability, enthusiasm, etc.) rather than the course. In addition, there was some demand for questions about fairness/difficulty of assignments and tests, and some students also wanted separate questions for TAs and labs.

The second question asked students for general comments about the CEQ. The responses again varied considerably, but the most common responses generally reflected the sentiment that the CEQs did not help to improve teaching. A quarter of responses said that professors do not take the CEQs seriously and another 10% said that CEQs do not have any consequences for professors, and another 4% call the CEQ useless. Aside from this theme, one of the most common student complaints was the CEQ data needs to be more accessible.

*Faculty*

A total of 237 faculty completed the survey and they, like the students, appear to be representative of all faculty across MUN.

*Usefulness of the CEQ*

Examination of the forced-choice questions seems to indicate an overall feeling among faculty that the CEQ is somewhat useful, but only somewhat. When asked outright if the CEQ was useful, about 60% of faculty said that it was. When given opportunity for more nuanced information, however, nearly half of faculty say that they only “occasionally” use the CEQs to help improve their teaching. On the other hand, a further 37% said that they “frequently” or “always” used the CEQs for this purpose. Finally, when asked if the standard questions on the CEQ provided useful information
about course delivery, there was a slight tendency toward the “disagree” end of the scale rather than the “agree” end of the scale.

At the same time, faculty do seem to embrace the idea of getting student feedback about their teaching, as 57% of them say they solicit feedback using something other than the CEQ. When given the chance to add their own questions to the CEQ, however, half of the faculty have never taken advantage of it, and another 30% have only done it occasionally.

*Ratings of Current CEQ Questions*

Ratings of the CEQ questions themselves demonstrate some interesting similarities and differences compared to the student responses. Like the students, two of the questions ranked more highly by faculty were “The instructor responded to students' questions effectively." and “Overall the quality of instruction was..." but two other questions (“Students were given constructive feedback on written work, i.e., assignments and exams.” and “Overall the course was well organized.")) were rated almost as highly. Faculty also agreed with students by ranking "This course is required for my program." as one of their least favourite questions, but, unlike students, they also ranked “Compared to other courses at the same level (e.g., all 2000 level courses you have taken) the workload was..." and “I would recommend this course taught by this instructor to another student with interest and preparation similar to my own even if it was not required." just as negatively. Finally, faculty seemed to rate the questions less positively across the whole scale compared to students, with this difference averaging more than half a point less across the five-point scale.

*Open-ended Questions*

The first open-ended question asked of faculty was what other ways they collect student feedback other than CEQs. Over half of those faculty who answered this question (which was around half of the faculty in the survey), indicated that they did some kind of written evaluation. The form of these evaluations varied significantly. Most were anonymous, but many did not say. Many had an evaluation part-way through the course, and sometimes more than one evaluation. Many faculty (around 40%) also said, however, that they collect information informally from students either through separate conversations with them or by asking their classes outright.

The next two open-ended questions were the same questions that were answered by students. The first question asked for suggestions for additional CEQ questions. The answers to this question were quite variable, but demonstrated a different pattern than the students. The most common single response was a question that rated aspects of the course content (e.g., textbook, website, etc.), but many responses also requested more information about the student filling out the form (e.g., their attendance, expected mark, amount of work put into the course, even their name). One other common response was a request for more open-ended responses, which mirrors some of the findings from the next question.
When asked for their general comments, about half of faculty responded (compared to about 18% of students). The responses were even more variable than any of the other open-ended questions, but most of the answers had a negative view of the CEQ. Around 33% of responses say that the CEQ is useless, is driven by things like popularity, or is based on the grade a student receives. Many faculty say that CEQ is not useful for tenure because professors may make changes to make a course easier to get better scores rather than improve their teaching. On a separate note, many faculty do seem to indicate that the written, open-ended question are more useful than the forced-choice questions. All of these responses are relatively infrequent, however, as the largest category in the classification of these answers is “Other”, which was given to 43% of faculty responses. Because there were so many in this category, here is a sense of what some of these responses were:

- www.ratemyprofessor.com is seen by students (and some faculty) as more useful
- Would like to know more about what administration does with the forms
- Rephrase/rework questions
- Questions on why they attended class or not
- Different times (before or after final, multiple times during course) for evaluation
- There are not enough consequences for professors who get poor ratings
- Hard to interpret results

**General Conclusions**

The results of this survey seem to illustrate both positive and negative aspects of the CEQ in the eyes of students and faculty. The negatives seem to focus on the usefulness of the CEQ. Many students perceive that CEQ results are not taken seriously and do not necessarily lead to better teaching. Faculty perceive that CEQ results may not necessarily reflect good teaching but instead are more of a popularity contest or a reflection of how easy a course is. Furthermore, many of the proposed solutions offered by students and faculty, would be difficult to implement. Requests that all CEQs be published are not currently possible given the results of past MUNFA arbitrations. As another example, having the CEQs being reviewed by superiors with potential consequences may be possible for untenured faculty, but would be difficult to enforce with tenured faculty.

Nevertheless, there are some positive messages that can be gleaned from this survey. Although many students appear to believe that CEQ results are sometimes ignored, there also seems to be a recognition that this is only true for some faculty. Although some faculty say that parts of the CEQ are not helpful, there are many who say that the written comments are sometimes very useful. Furthermore, the survey does identify complaints that could potentially be addressed. For example, some students indicate that they want more flexibility about when they can fill out the CEQ and many faculty say they would like less of a delay in their feedback. Both of these concerns might be alleviated with an online administration of the CEQ.
Overall, the survey provided valuable insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the CEQ as seen by the students and faculty. In combination with research and wisdom from other institutions, it can be useful information in attempts to improve the measure.
APPENDIX – SURVEY DATA SUMMARY

Student Responses – Close-ended Questions (1926 Respondents)

Gender

- Female: 1262 (65.52%)
- Male: 637 (33.07%)

On which Memorial University campus do you study?

- St. John's campus: 1771 (91.95%)
- Grenfell campus: 36 (1.87%)
- Distance Education: 0 (0.00%)
- Marine Institute: 65 (3.37%)

In which faculty/school/division do you study?

- Arts: 340 (17.65%)
- Business Administration: 237 (12.31%)
- Education: 301 (15.63%)
- Engineering and Applied Science: 152 (7.89%)
- Fine Arts (Grenfell campus): 3 (0.16%)
- Human Kinetics and Recreation: 102 (5.30%)
- Medicine: 10 (0.52%)
- Music: 21 (1.09%)
- Nursing: 156 (8.10%)
- Other: 0 (0.00%)
- Pharmacy: 47 (2.44%)
- Science: 437 (22.69%)
- Social Science (Grenfell campus): 0 (0.00%)
- Social Work: 43 (2.23%)
- Fisheries and Marine Institute: 58 (3.01%)
In which year of your program are you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>22.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>20.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>19.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>14.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>9.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>11.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often have you filled out Memorial University's Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) for your courses here at MUN?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>12.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>11.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>31.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>44.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.08      SD: 1.03

Are you aware of where the results of the CEQ can be found?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>81.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have used the CEQ to influence my course choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>90.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>7.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 1.12      SD: 0.42
To what degree do you think professors use the CEQ in assessing their teaching?

- None: 173 (8.98%)
- Limited: 786 (40.81%)
- Significant: 216 (11.21%)
- Very significant: 34 (1.77%)
- Depends on professor: 707 (36.71%)

One of the CEQ questions is "The student requirements in the course were clear." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

- Not important: 49 (2.54%)
- Somewhat important: 213 (11.06%)
- Neutral: 182 (9.45%)
- Important: 789 (40.97%)
- Very important: 684 (35.51%)

Mean: 3.96  SD: 1.07

One of the CEQ questions is "The instructor responded to students' questions effectively." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

- Not important: 17 (0.88%)
- Somewhat important: 104 (5.40%)
- Neutral: 118 (6.13%)
- Important: 773 (40.13%)
- Very important: 901 (46.78%)

Mean: 4.27  SD: 0.97
One of the CEQ questions is "The instructor stimulated my interest in learning the subject matter of the course." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

Not important | 64 (3.32%)
Somewhat important | 179 (9.29%)
Neutral | 307 (15.94%)
Important | 792 (41.12%)
Very important | 567 (29.44%)

Mean: 3.84  SD: 1.01

One of the CEQ questions is "Students were given constructive feedback on written work, i.e., assignments and exams." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

Not important | 14 (0.73%)
Somewhat important | 103 (5.35%)
Neutral | 177 (9.19%)
Important | 731 (37.95%)
Very important | 884 (45.90%)

Mean: 4.24  SD: 0.98

One of the CEQ questions is "Overall the course was well organized." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

Not important | 27 (1.40%)
Somewhat important | 108 (5.61%)
Neutral | 237 (12.31%)
Important | 858 (44.55%)
Very important | 680 (35.31%)

Mean: 4.08  SD: 0.90
One of the CEQ questions is "I would recommend this course taught by this instructor to another student with interest and preparation similar to my own even if it was not required." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

Mean: 3.64  SD: 1.13

One of the CEQ questions is "Overall the quality of instruction was...." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

Mean: 4.27  SD: 0.93

One of the CEQ questions is "Compared to other courses at the same level (e.g., all 2000 level courses you have taken) the workload was..." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

Mean: 3.51  SD: 1.06
One of the CEQ questions is "This course is required for my program." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>19.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>12.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>27.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>24.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>15.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.03  SD: 1.18

If the CEQ was administered electronically would you be more likely to complete the questionnaire?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>27.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>42.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>29.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Responses – Open-ended Questions

**Question 19** - Is there a question that the CEQ does not contain that you think should be included in it? If so, please write it in the text box below (182 Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More written/open-ended questions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty/effectiveness/fairness of tests and assignments</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor spoke English well/communicated clearly</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor returns marks/work in a timely manner</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions needed concerning labs/TAs/distance learning courses</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of workload appropriate (too much, not challenging enough)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective/useful was course content (textbook, website, lectures)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors abilities to teach course (preparation, knowledgeable, interacts with students)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often did they attend lectures</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The least/best part of the course and how to improve</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of textbook, are they necessary for this course</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant question - already on CEQ</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor is respectful/polite/professional/treats students well</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors availability/approachability</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of teaching method/styles</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 20 - Please use the text box below to offer comments and or state concerns that you have about the CEQ.  (345 Respondents)

- CEQ should be online – not enough time in class/timing in class is poor: 21 (6.09%)
- CEQ data needs to be more accessible: 60 (17.39%)
- CEQs need to be different across faculty/department: 1 (0.29%)
- CEQs need to differentiate between TAs and profs: 5 (1.45%)
- CEQs need to differentiate between labs/lectures/distance...: 7 (2.03%)
- More written questions (elaboration of likart/professor written) are needed: 12 (3.48%)
- Questioning is too general, limited in categories it touches on – questions on...: 16 (4.64%)
- CEQs do not have any consequences, for bad professors or tenured faculty: 33 (9.57%)
- Professors should not be able to opt out (or be left out) of CEQ: 7 (2.03%)
- Make all results public: 20 (5.80%)
- Handwriting recognition makes students unlikely to comment frankly/form...: 34 (9.86%)
- CEQ is useless: 15 (4.35%)
- CEQ should be administered for distance education/online courses/don’t...: 18 (5.22%)
- Change Q7 – separate recommendations for course and instructor: 7 (2.03%)
- A CEQ is important, but improvements on form are needed: 19 (5.51%)
- CEQ is important/useful/no changes are needed: 21 (6.09%)
- Other: 49 (14.20%)
- CEQs should be reviewed by/have changes enforced by senior...: 21 (6.09%)
- Professors don’t take the CEQ seriously/don’t make changes/should use...: 86 (24.93%)
- CEQs should be done in class: 7 (2.03%)
- CEQs should be mandatory for all students/courses: 13 (3.77%)
- Students don’t take time/don’t care/don’t fill out properly: 9 (2.61%)
- More options/different times/better announcement of time needed for...: 22 (6.38%)
- Need more information about how CEQ results are used: 9 (2.61%)
Faculty Responses – Close-ended Questions (237 Respondents)

Gender

- Female: 96 (40.51%)
- Male: 138 (58.23%)

How would you categorize yourself?

- Dean, Director, or Department/Division Head: 8 (3.38%)
- Tenured faculty: 114 (48.10%)
- Tenure track faculty: 59 (24.89%)
- Contractual lecturer: 25 (10.55%)
- Per course lecturer: 13 (5.49%)
- Other: 3 (1.27%)

On which Memorial University campus do you primarily teach?

- St. John’s campus: 203 (85.65%)
- Grenfell campus: 27 (11.39%)
- Distance Education: 3 (1.27%)
- Marine Institute: 2 (0.84%)
In which faculty/school/division do you primarily teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/Division</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Applied Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts (Grenfell campus)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Kinetics and Recreation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science (Grenfell campus)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries and Marine Institute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you find the information provided by the CEQ useful?

- No: 83 (35.02%)
- Yes: 142 (59.92%)

To what degree do you think students use the CEQ to make course choices?

- None: 41 (17.30%)
- Limited: 114 (48.10%)
- Significant: 14 (5.91%)
- Very significant: 2 (0.84%)
- Depends on the student: 56 (23.63%)
I use the CEQs to help me improve my teaching.

Mean: 2.38  SD: 0.89

Do you collect data from students regarding the teaching of your course via mechanisms other than the CEQ?

Mean: 2.77  SD: 1.00

The standard questions on the CEQ provide useful information on current methods of course delivery.

Mean: 1.74  SD: 0.93

I use the additional ten open questions (questions 11 to 20) to refine the main questions or to address issues of specific concern to my course.
One of the CEQ questions is "The student requirements in the course were clear." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

Not important: 22 (9.28%)
Somewhat important: 48 (20.25%)
Neutral: 35 (14.77%)
Important: 83 (35.02%)
Very important: 45 (18.99%)

Mean: 3.34  SD: 1.15

One of the CEQ questions is "The instructor responded to students' questions effectively." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

Not important: 16 (6.75%)
Somewhat important: 33 (13.92%)
Neutral: 31 (13.08%)
Important: 98 (41.35%)
Very important: 55 (23.21%)

Mean: 3.61  SD: 1.11

One of the CEQ questions is "The instructor stimulated my interest in learning the subject matter of the course." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

Not important: 30 (12.66%)
Somewhat important: 49 (20.68%)
Neutral: 27 (11.39%)
Important: 86 (36.29%)
Very important: 40 (16.88%)

Mean: 3.24  SD: 1.21
One of the CEQ questions is "Students were given constructive feedback on written work, i.e., assignments and exams." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.51 SD: 1.19

One of the CEQ questions is "Overall the course was well organized." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.52 SD: 1.19

One of the CEQ questions is "I would recommend this course taught by this instructor to another student with interest and preparation similar to my own even if it was not required." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 2.70 SD: 1.31
One of the CEQ questions is "Overall the quality of instruction was...." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>35.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.60  SD: 1.23

One of the CEQ questions is "Compared to other courses at the same level (e.g., all 2000 level courses you have taken) the workload was..." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 2.55  SD: 1.18

One of the CEQ questions is "This course is required for my program." How important is this question for the purpose of the CEQ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 2.62  SD: 1.23
## Faculty Responses – Open-ended questions

**Question 9** - If you answered "yes" to question 7 please explain in the text box below how you collect the student data.  (122 Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbally ask the class during class</td>
<td>20 (16.39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate written evaluation (anonymous) part way</td>
<td>8 (6.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate written evaluation form (anonymous, time)</td>
<td>3 (2.46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate written evaluation (anonymous) multiple</td>
<td>9 (7.38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate written evaluation (anonymity unknown)</td>
<td>2 (1.64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate written evaluation (anonymous) at end of</td>
<td>2 (1.64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate written evaluation (non-anonymous) at</td>
<td>2 (1.64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using additional CEQ questions</td>
<td>3 (2.46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal feedback (through office hours, asking</td>
<td>7 (5.74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal conversations with students</td>
<td>22 (18.03%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback requested (format/time/anonymity)</td>
<td>18 (14.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate written evaluation form (when/anonymity)</td>
<td>28 (22.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (exit interviews, observations of class, etc.)</td>
<td>8 (6.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate written evaluation (anonymity unknown)</td>
<td>7 (5.74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate written evaluation (anonymity unknown)</td>
<td>7 (5.74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through TA's/staff</td>
<td>1 (0.82%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 21 - Is there a question that the CEQ does not contain that you think should be included in it? If so, please write it in the text box below.  (61 Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More written/open-ended questions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty/effectiveness/fairness of tests and...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of effort/preparation student put in to...</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected mark in course</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did they learn from the course</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of workload appropriate (too much, not enough)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective/useful was course content</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors abilities (approachable, helpful, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often did they attend lectures</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The least/best part of the course and how to improve it</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are you taking this course/would you take it again?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 22 - Please use the text box below to offer comments and or state concerns that you have about the CEQ.  (125 Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay in feedback</td>
<td>6 (4.80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students aren’t qualified to evaluate professor/teaching method</td>
<td>8 (6.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQs need to be different across faculty/department</td>
<td>7 (5.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQs need to differentiate between TAs and profs</td>
<td>4 (3.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQs need to differentiate between labs/lectures/distance</td>
<td>6 (4.80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written/qualitative responses most useful/only important responses</td>
<td>13 (10.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more written/qualitative questions</td>
<td>8 (6.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative/likert questions are not useful</td>
<td>8 (6.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative questions can be misinterpreted by students</td>
<td>9 (7.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make all results public</td>
<td>3 (2.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not make results public</td>
<td>5 (4.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ is useless, it doesn’t help improve teaching</td>
<td>12 (9.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make students sign their CEQ forms</td>
<td>5 (4.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ scores are driven by grade student received</td>
<td>10 (8.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQs are driven by things like popularity, charisma, and ease of...</td>
<td>19 (15.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on forms are untrue, unfounded, inappropriate</td>
<td>5 (4.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors should make their own questions/questionnaires</td>
<td>9 (7.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handwriting recognition makes students unlikely to comment</td>
<td>1 (0.80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning is too general, limited in categories it touches on...</td>
<td>10 (8.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>54 (43.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ is punitive/disagree with use for tenure and promotions</td>
<td>15 (12.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not change form/form is good</td>
<td>1 (0.80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEQ is important, but improvements on form are needed</td>
<td>16 (12.80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses are not representative – not everyone fills them out...</td>
<td>15 (12.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ results cannot be compared to one another – too many factors</td>
<td>4 (3.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions need to differentiate between instructor abilities and...</td>
<td>6 (4.80%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Potential additional Instructor/Department questions

- I would recommend taking this course.
- The instructor was well prepared for each class.
- The instructor’s lectures were clear and understandable.
- The instructor used challenging questions or problems.
- The instructor was willing to listen to student opinions.
- The instructor was actively helpful to the students.
- The instructor was available to students outside of class.
- The instructor had a genuine interest in individual students.
- Considering class size, the instructor was available for individual consultation.

- The course content matched the course objectives.
- The learning activities were well integrated into the course.

- The assignments engaged me in learning.
- The assignments in the course were clearly related to the course goals.
- The scheduling of assignments and examinations was appropriate.

- The course materials (e.g., readings, notes, in-class exercises) facilitated learning.

- The general climate in this course was good for learning.
- There was a collaborative atmosphere in this course.

- The facilities and configuration of the classroom facilitated learning.

- I have attended all classes (1=>20%, 3=>60, 5=>100%).
- I have been putting a great deal of effort into this course.
APPENDIX B

Revisions to CEQ Form
Q1. The student requirements in the course were clear.
Q2. The instructor responded to students’ questions effectively.
Q3. The instructor showed concern for how well students progressed in the course.
Q4. The instructor stimulated my interest in learning the subject matter of the course.
Q5. Students were given constructive feedback on written work, i.e., assignments and exams.
Q6. Overall the course was well organized.
Q7. I would recommend this course taught by this instructor to another student with interests and preparation similar to my own even if it was not required.
Q8. Overall the quality of instruction was (1=Poor >5=Excellent)
Q9. Compared to other courses at the same level (e.g., all 2000 level courses you have taken) the workload was: (much lower; lower; about the same; higher; much higher; this is the first course I have taken at this level)
Q10. This course is required for my program. (yes; no; don’t know)
Q11. The labs helped me learn course concepts and material.
Q12. The assignments helped me learn course concepts and material.
Q13. The workload was appropriate to the course.
Q14. The teaching technology (e.g., D2L, email, chalkboard, film) chosen for this course was accessible.
# Rationale for SCCE Modifications to CEQ Review Committee Proposed Form

(question numbers refer to the Review Committee Proposed Form):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grouping of Items and Title of Form</td>
<td>Accept RC recommendation to group the questions into two sections but label the sections “Course Delivery” and “Course Components”. Retain form title “Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item. Reword to passive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item. Original CEQ item, retain as is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item. However, “double-barreled” item; should only ask about a single concept. Based on student feedback, retained the second half.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item. Original CEQ item, retain as is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item. Reword to passive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item. Based on student feedback, add in the term “course concepts” to clarify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Do not accept RC recommended item. Instead, retain the original CEQ item Question 6 and move it to the end of the second section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item. Original CEQ item, retain as is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item. Move to second set of questions, after Question 12. Remove word “effectively” and reword to a similar format as other questions in this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item. However, “double-barreled” item; should only ask about a single concept, replace “concepts and material” with “content”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item. However, “double-barreled” item; should only ask about a single concept, replace “concepts and material” with “content”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item. Replace “assignments” with “assessments (tests, assignments, presentations)”. However, “double-barreled” item; should only ask about a single concept, replace “concepts and material” with “content”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Accept RC recommended item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Do not accept RC recommended item as the content overlaps with proposed question 9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Student Feedback on Proposed Revisions to Form
Students’ Feedback on Changes to the Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ)
Anna Fowler, Institutional Analyst, CIAP
July 2011

Background
This document presents a summary of comments concerning the proposed changes for the CEQ form.

The current CEQ form was revised (as per the CEQ Review process) to add additional questions or rephrase some of the existing questions. Below each question was a box for comments with a larger space for additional comments at the end of the form.

Students were asked to comment on each question’s clarity and meaning. The forms were handed out to five classes at Grenfell Campus over the period of June 13 to June 17, 2011 and 59 of those came back with written responses.

Analysis of Comments
For each question, the comments were grouped and categorized as being positive or negative and any changes suggested by the students are noted. Please note that the sample form that was created for this purpose was not a complete match to what the revised CEQ would look like in its final draft. As such, some students made comments regarding the comment boxes below each question and the lack of space to comment on the best aspects of the course and the aspects that could be improved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Summarized Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: The requirements of the course were clear.</td>
<td>This question was generally very clear to the students and well received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2: The instructor responded to students’ questions effectively.</td>
<td>For the most part, this question was rated well; however there were a few comments regarding concerns with the meaning of “effectively”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3: The instructor was considerate of students’ concerns.</td>
<td>Though many respondents thought this question was very important, some thought the wording was vague.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: The instructor stimulated my interest in learning the subject matter of the course.</td>
<td>The question was rated positively with a few questioning its relevance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: Useful feedback was provided on my work.</td>
<td>This question was rated well and seemed important to students and a few also appreciated the word choice <em>Useful</em> in the question. Many suggested there should be a question about actually receiving timely, if any, feedback from tests or assignments, for example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6: The instructor communicated effectively.</td>
<td>Although many thought this was a good question, it was also thought to be too vague and it was not clear what communications the instructor was being rated on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7: The teaching technology (e.g., D2L, email, chalkboard, film) chosen for this course was used effectively.</td>
<td>Many thought this was a clear question and a great topic; however, others thought that it was unnecessary or badly worded or tackled too many items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8: Overall the quality of instruction was...</td>
<td>Most of the students who commented on this question thought it was clear; however, a few suggested a verbatim space to further explain their rating with examples would be helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9: The course was well organized.</td>
<td>This question was generally well received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10: The textbook(s) helped me learn course content.*</td>
<td>This question was very well received and more than half thought it was a valid question. Many remarked on buying a text that was never used during the course. Some thought that the question would not be applicable to courses where no text book is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11: The labs helped me learn course content.*</td>
<td>Although many people were pleased to see a question on labs, many thought this question would only be relevant to smaller percentage of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12: The assessments (tests, assignments, presentations) helped me learn course content.</td>
<td>Although most of the comments for this question were positive, there were some negative responses to the fact that there are so many items listed and the meaning of learn as opposed to comprehend was questioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13: The workload was appropriate to the course.</td>
<td>While approximately half liked this question, others thought that is should include “as compared to other courses at the same level”, as in the current CEQ form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part IV - Comments**

The proposed changes to the CEQ form were thought to be an improvement by many students. Some also made positive comments here regarding the inclusion of Q10 and Q5 (as they felt instructors need to return assessments in a timely manner). There were several students who were most pleased with having comment boxes after each question. They thought it would be a good way to explain their rating. *In relation to Q10 and Q11, in particular, one student suggested that I don’t know be changed to not applicable after each question. Some also mentioned that the validity of the CEQ is based on the instructors’ consideration of the results. Concerning an online CEQ, several students were pleased to hear about it and a couple suggested students be asked to fill out the CEQs upon registering for the next semester. Others were concerned about how many people would fill it out if it was not administered in class. In addition, a couple of students commented on their perceived risk of being identified by their handwriting with the current CEQ.
APPENDIX D

Pool of Items for Instructor Provided Questions
Likert-style Questions

1. I would recommend taking this course.
2. The instructor was well prepared for each class.
3. The instructor’s lectures were clear.
4. The instructor used challenging questions.
5. The instructor was willing to listen to student opinions.
6. The instructor was actively helpful to the students.
7. The instructor was available to students outside of class.
8. The instructor had a genuine interest in student learning.
9. Considering class size, the instructor was available for individual consultation.
10. The learning activities were well-integrated into the course.
11. The assignments engaged me in learning.
12. The assignments in the course were clearly related to the course objectives.
13. The scheduling of assessments (e.g., assignments and examinations) was appropriate.
14. The course materials (e.g., readings, notes, in-class exercises) facilitated learning.
15. The general atmosphere in this course was good for learning.
16. There was a collaborative atmosphere in this course.
17. I have attended all classes regularly.
18. I have been putting a great deal of effort into this course.
19. The instructor related to students in ways that promoted mutual respect.
20. The instructor communicated what students could expect to learn as a result of taking this course.
21. The instructor set attainable expectations for this course.
22. The instructor encouraged students to participate.
23. The instructor provided adequate opportunities for questions and discussion during class time.
24. The instructor graded student work promptly.
25. The instructor made effective use of examples.
26. As the course progressed the instructor showed how each topic fit into the course as a whole.
27. The instructor conducted class sessions in an organized manner.
28. Overall, the instructor’s explanations were clear.
29. The instructor summarized material in a way that helped me remember.
30. The instructor used effective teaching aids.
31. The course respected diverse ways of learning.
32. The course content matched the course objectives.
33. In general, the level of difficulty in this course was appropriate.
34. Students were invited to share their ideas.
35. The evaluation methods used in this course were appropriate.
36. Feedback on course assignments contributed to my learning.
37. There was close agreement between the stated course objectives and what was actually covered.
38. The evaluation methods reflected the important aspects of the course.
39. In this course, I felt motivated to learn.
40. As a result of this course, I have greater appreciation for this field of study.
41. The course outline was consistently followed.
42. The physical facilities provided for this course were appropriate (e.g., classroom/lab space, structure, furnishings).

Open-ended questions

1. Describe the three best elements of the instruction in the course
2. Describe three elements of instruction in this course that need improvement
3. How would you describe the instructional style used in the course?
4. Describe your experience with the labs in the course.
5. Describe the three best elements of the course.
6. Describe three elements of this course that need improvement.
7. What have you taken from this course that you will bring forward to your future studies and career?
8. Describe your experience with group assignments in the course.