

This is only a survey of the extensive literature concerning the value, validity, and effect of students' rating of instructors and courses. This does, however, accurately reflect the results of numerous studies concerning various programs.

Students most naturally form opinions about courses, instructors, and instruction. Although there may be some legitimate questioning of the significance of these opinions, there is also very definite value in (formally) viewing these opinions. This value is basically summarized in three points presented by W. Murray and James Anthony (An Inventory of Student Opinions, Jun. Col. J., D<sup>55</sup>, p. 224-7): "First, opinions may determine the need for improvement of content and method. Second, such opinions often indicate both the kind and quality of student adjustment to the institution. Third, the opinions may often serve as significant factors which motivate students' behavior in the classroom situation."

These three areas in and of themselves provide a firm basis for the advocacy of a program to determine students' reactions to courses and instructors. F.F. Mueller (Trends in Students Rating of Faculty, Bulletin of Am. Assoc. of U. Prof's., Vol. 37, p. 219-114) recently determined that over 250 colleges and universities have instituted and retained a program of student rating of instructors. Among those institutions possessing such a program are Harvard, Northwestern, Dartmouth, Purdue, Brooklyn College, University of Rochester, and University of Washington.

The validity and reliability of these programs have been specifically established. With regard to the types of questionnaires

employed W.J. McKeachie and Daniel Solomon (Student Rating of Instructors - A Validity Study, J. Ed. Res., Je '58, p. 617-621) found that the scientifically prepared questionnaires have a high degree of validity. The questionnaire proposed for use here at the University was derived directly from the University of Rochester's questionnaire which was carefully prepared and checked for validity and reliability. The reliability coefficient on the questionnaire was 0.94+.

The areas of consideration selected for this questionnaire were drawn from those which were found to be most frequently associated with effective teaching in studies by Frank Hart (Teachers and Teaching, N.Y., Macmillan and Co., 1934, p. 6), and W.W. Charters and Douglas Waples (The Commonwealth Teachers Study, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1929, p. 18).

Other studies, furthermore, have found that there is no significant relationship between a student's grades and his rating of a course and instructor. Earl Hudelson in viewing instructor rating programs in general (Validity of Student Rating of Instructors, Sch. and Society, p. 265-266) found no consistent relation between a student's grades and his approach to a rating program.

In a specific study by Virginia Vocks and Grace French (Are Students Ratings of Teachers Affected by Grades, J. Hig. Ed., Je '60, p. 330-4) at the University of Washington, which has had a program for over fourteen years, it was discovered that "both when judging their instructors over-all value as a teacher and when rating his skill in specific respects, such as clarity of presentation and development of interest, the students were rarely, if ever, influenced by their grades."

A study by H.H. Remmers, F.D. Martin, and D.N. Elliot (Studies of Higher Education, Purdue University, Vol. 66, 1949, p. 17-26) at Purdue University substantiates this result. They found that Purdue students' were not influenced in their ratings by their grades. Furthermore, they discovered that students generally rate their instructors average or above. These studies indicate the objectivity and responsibility with which students approach an evaluation program.

The results of the proposed University evaluation will also be treated in a manner which will provide for the greatest objectivity. There will be absolutely no editorial comment concerning any course or instructor. Each course and instructor will, instead, be rated in each specific area of consideration (i.e., text, homework, presentation). The ratings of the students (for each course and instructor) will be averaged in each specific area, such as organization, etc. These averages will be the statistics which will be published. A course and instructor might, therefore, rate as following:

Text	- 1.9
Content	- 1.7
Homework	- 2.2
Organization	- 1.6
Presentation	- 2.0

These results in the specific areas will be averaged to assign the course and instructor a final total rating/this type of presentation will provide specific breakdowns in numerous areas and also a total rating. Since all courses and instructors will be rated on the same questionnaire there will be over-all objectivity and uniformity, with the only possible variable being the students' responses.



The rating system corresponds to the grading system of one through five except for those four questions with only three possible responses. These questions will be treated separately. The booklet will also contain a complete explanatory preface, a copy of the questionnaire, and data concerning the correlation - if any - between responses and year in school, major, sex, or grade average.

## DEVELOPMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE

This is the proposed final form of the questionnaire to be distributed. It was taken with only minor modifications from the questionnaire used by the Course Committee at the University of Rochester. The basic scale is a five point rating scale in accordance with the Likert system.

In addition to responding to the seventeen questions, the students will indicate their sex, year in school, major field of study (if it has been chosen), and their approximate accumulative grade average. This will provide information necessary to correlate the responses to grade average, major field, etc..

The questionnaire responses and student data will be reduced photographically so that the questionnaire will be only one page in length, and require only approximately ten minutes to complete.

It must be noted that past programs have revealed no significant relationship between grade average and type of student rating. Grade, sex, major, and student's grade average will be taken, however, to provide data which will allow a check to be made on the validity and reliability of the University program.

## QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your opinion of the principal text for this course?
  1. Outstandingly superior
  2. Good, well adapted to the course
  3. Adequate for the course
  4. Somewhat inadequate for the course
  5. Markedly deficient in most areas of the course
2. The assigned reading (text, supplement, outside) for the course is:
  1. Superior, concise and clear
  2. Good, generally effective
  3. Adequate
  4. Somewhat inadequate, wordy, vague
  5. Poor, ineffective, hard to understand
3. The homework in the course is:
  1. Superior, effectively augments lectures and class work
  2. Good, generally supplements class work
  3. Adequate
  4. Inadequate, somewhat fails to contribute to class work and understanding
  5. Poor, fails in most areas to aid understanding
4. Your opinion of the amount of homework is:
  1. Superior, reasonable in amount and emphasis
  2. Good, generally well proportioned
  3. Fair in most instances
  4. Somewhat deficient, often too much or too little with improper emphasis
  5. Poor in relation to the course
5. Your opinion of laboratory, project or field work in amount and value:
  1. Superior, reasonable in amount with excellent value
  2. Good, usually of significant value
  3. Adequate in amount and value
  4. Somewhat inadequate in value and not well proportioned
  5. Poor, of little value
6. What is your opinion of the instructor's preparation for class?
  1. Consistently well-prepared
  2. Almost always well-prepared
  3. Generally well-prepared
  4. Often inadequately prepared
  5. Frequently unprepared
7. What was your impression of the instructor's attitude toward the subject of the course?
  1. Superior, highly enthusiastic
  2. Good
  3. Fair, showed apparent interest
  4. Seemed often bored
  5. Bored, uninterested
8. Your opinion of the instructor's speaking ability is:
  1. Superior presentation, voice and presence excellent
  2. Good presentation
  3. Adequate presentation
  4. Somewhat deficient
  5. Markedly deficient, poor presence and speaking technique

9. How do you feel about the instructor's organization of the subject matter, and the classroom procedures (planning work, making assignments, announcing exams, etc.)?

1. Superior, systematic organization
2. Good organization
3. Adequate
4. Inadequate
5. Poor, ambiguous organization

10. Your opinion of the instructor's ability to explain is:

1. Superior, explanations clear and concise
2. Good
3. Usually adequate
4. Often vague, somewhat inadequate
5. Explanations lacking or inadequate

11. Your opinion about the extent to which the instructor stimulated students to independent thinking or reasoning is:

1. Superior, very successful in stimulating thought
2. Good, considerable stimulation
3. Adequate
4. Inadequate, little stimulation
5. Poor, no stimulation

12. Your opinion of the instructor's attitude toward and interest in students is:

1. Superior attitude, highly interested
2. Good attitude
3. Adequate attitude, some interest
4. Deficient attitude
5. Poor attitude, uninterested, aloof

13. Your opinion of the content of the course is:

1. Superior, well defined and highly relevant
2. Good, generally relevant and unified
3. Adequate
4. Somewhat inadequate
5. Poor, requires redefinition and organization

14. The manner in which the quizzes or exams covered the course material is:

1. Very adequate, well-balanced, covering important areas in lectures and text
2. Too detailed or too broad, covering basically text material only
3. Too general or too detailed, covering basically lecture material only

15. The amount of written work required is:

1. About the right amount in relation to the course
2. Too much in relation to the type of course
3. Too little in relation to the course

16. The number of examinations or quizzes in the course is:

1. About the right number
2. Somewhat too many
3. Somewhat too few

17. The amount of time given for examinations or quizzes is:

1. Usually sufficient in relation to the type of test
2. Too much time in relation to the type of test
3. Too little in relation to the type of test

The University of Arizona

Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

February 7, 1966

PRESENT: Bartlett, Beattie, Brewer, Carlson, Chadwick, Coleman, Coulter, Damon, Delaplane, DuVal, Forrester, Gegenheimer, Hall, Harris, Harshbarger, Hillman, Johnson, Joyner, Krutzsch, Little, Lynn, Marcoux, McCarthy, McCaughey, McDonald, McMillan, Myers, Patrick, Quinn, Rhodes, Roy, Shields, Simonian, Sorensen, Stanislawski, Stromberg, Svob, Tucker, Wilson, Windsor, Yoshino.

ABSENT: Blecha, Blitzer, Cockrum, Gaines, Gries, Harvill, Hull, Lyons, Paulsen, Picard, Rappeport, Steelink, Voris.

SENATORS RETURNING FROM SABBATICAL LEAVES, WELCOME TO: Vice President McMillan welcomed back to the Senate Professor Chadwick of the College of Architecture and Professor Bartlett of the Department of Psychology, who had returned to the campus following sabbatical leaves.

DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY OF SENATE MINUTES: Following a report to the Senate that the not-yet approved minutes of the meeting of December 13, 1965 as originally prepared by the secretary, together with a statement of proposed corrections in those minutes submitted by Dr. James McDonald which had been distributed to members of the Senate, had been reproduced and sent to members of an off-campus organization, the Tucson Commission on Human Relations, the Senate adopted the following motion: Minutes of Senate meetings should have the widest possible circulation among members of the University Faculty, with the understanding that a Senate member does have the prerogative of commenting on Senate proceedings as an individual but that the minutes of the Senate meetings should not be made available to persons outside the University Faculty prior to one year following the date of the meeting in question.

CECIL ROBINSON AS SENATOR-AT-LARGE, ELECTION OF: The Senate elected Dr. Cecil Robinson, Associate Professor of English, as a Senator-at-large, serving a term extending until June 30, 1967. Dr. Robinson will fill the vacancy created when Mr. Robert S. Svob, formerly a Senator-at-large, became University Dean of Men and, consequently, an ex-officio member of the Senate.

CATALOGUE MATERIAL: The following catalogue material was accepted:

New Courses - Regular Session: Mathematics 75, Introduction to Automatic Computers (2) I,II Staff; Mathematics 175, Introduction to Numerical Techniques for Computers (2) I,II Staff; Music 217 Ba, Baritone Horn (Individual Instruction) (1-4) I,II Weldy (Fee-Regular Applied); Music 218 Ba, Baritone Horn (Individual Instruction) (1-4) I,II Weldy (Fee-Regular Applied); Speech 298, Seminar (1-3) I, II; New Course-Summer: Agriculture 180s, Travel-Study Program (6) I Day-Schuh, Fee \$50; National Science Foundation Institute Course: Geology 8200ai-8200bi, Introduction to Earth Science (3-3) I,II McCullough; Change: Geochronology 309, Geology of Early Man Sites, change I to II, add 1 Field Trip, Fee \$10. (Note Re: Mathematics 75. Dr. Tucker moved that this course not be approved because he said it would be a duplication of course work already available in Systems Engineering 78, Fortran. Dean Roy pointed out that the Department of Mathematics would teach this course in such a way that it would differ substantially from S.E. 78. Dr. Tucker's motion lost.)

David L. Windsor, Secretary