GUIDELINES FOR INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS

Student Feedback Survey
(taken in part from Kapiolani Community College's statement on this subject)

These guidelines were prepared to assist instructors in utilizing and interpreting the results of student feedback survey. They are not meant to limit instructors from using their own ideas and applications.

I. ADMINISTRATION'S VIEWPOINT

"There are no magic thresholds that distinguish a 'good' teacher from a 'bad' teacher."

There are no simple rules that say that a particular score, say 4.0 out of 5.0 on a student evaluation question, is a minimum criterion, or that a course completion ratio of 70% is the lowest acceptable value. There are too many variables related to student motivation, nature of the class, time of day, etc. to allow such a simplistic approach to evaluation.

However, this does not mean that the actual evaluation results should be ignored. Rather, if an individual shows up with low ratings in an item or a subset of items consistently over time, then discussion or explanation of "why" should be provided. Some of the reasons may well be outside the faculty member's control; some may be improved by mentoring or employing new or different strategies; and some may be attributed to the nature of the class subject. What causes concern is a consistent showing at the low end of the measures without any attempt to understand, explain, or improve.

"There should be multiple measures of different facets of teaching performance."

One of the problems in our present system of teaching evaluation is that we treat the measurement tools, such as student or peer evaluation, as the focus of our discussion or debate. Instead, we should be focusing on what we believe to be the key components of being a good teacher, and then using multiple measures to examine performance. This means that for some factors of teaching, such as being accessible to students, student evaluation results on items related to accessibility would be an important (but not the sole) component of the measure, while for other factors, such as knowledge of subject matter, peer evaluations, academic credentials, and professional development activities, etc. would be components of the measure. The important idea is that discussion should focus on what factors we believe to constitute a good teacher and how we can provide information on performance related to those factors.

II. THE EVALUATION FORM

The evaluation forms consist of 21-25 items on the front side of the form and 4 open-ended questions on the backside. Instructors may add their own questions to another sheet of paper that can be collected with the College's standardized form.
III. INTERPRETING THE RESULTS

Only results of the items on the front page will be scanned and summarized.

1. Weights

Answers to each of the scaled items have been weighted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Total Responses

The number of responses to each item is shown on the printout. Please keep the following points in mind:

a. Students who filled out the course code incorrectly may not be properly grouped. Instructors are urged to double-check the count of student responses they have received.

b. When marks are not dark enough, they are not picked up in the electronic scanning process.

IV. USE OF THE DATA

It is recommended that instructors use and compare their results for the same course over time. This type of comparison is in general more useful and reliable than that in which different instructors are compared. Also, instructors are free to use data based on all students, data based on students from the same courses (e.g., ENG 100 vs. ENG 250) only, or both.

V. OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Results of open-ended questions often enhance the rigid statistical analysis. In these items students have the opportunity to expand on their first page, forced-choice responses. It is often believed that these comments are more valuable than the front-page evaluations because they provide more specific information on the positive and negative aspects of the instructional method.