



Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness

Administration of Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

“SETE”

Dr. Allen Clark

Assistant Vice President – Institutional Research & Effectiveness

&

Dr. Richard Kent Plott

Institutional Effectiveness



Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness

Administration of Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

“SETE”

2009/2010 Academic Year



Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness

Administration of Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

“SETE”

2009/2010 Academic Year

Contact Information

Institutional Research & Effectiveness
940.565-2085
IRDept@unt.edu
1155 Union Circle P.O. Box 311306
Denton, TX 76203-1306

Contents

Introduction	1
Evaluation of Teaching Committee.....	1
Charge	1
Response	1
Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE)	2
Reporting	2
SETE Cycle	5
SETE Pre-Processing.....	5
Initial Data Request.....	5
Data Cleaning	6
Data Integration.....	6
Data Transformation.....	6

Data Reduction 6

Data Discretization..... 6

SETE Live Administration 7

 Delivery of Files to CITC 7

 Host of Live Administration 7

SETE Data Analysis and Posting of Results..... 7

 SETE Data Analysis 7

 SETE Results Posting 7

Reference Materials..... 8

Introduction

The Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) is the inventory which the University of North Texas implements online to comply with the State of Texas House Bill 2504.

- “06/19/2009 E Effective immediately – relating to requiring a public institution of higher education to establish uniform standards for publishing cost of attendance information, to conduct student course evaluations of faculty, and to make certain information available on the Internet”
(<http://www.legis.state.tx.us/billlookup/History.aspx?LegSess=81R&Bill=HB2504>).

Evaluation of Teaching Committee

Charge

This committee shall recommend to the Provost an assessment tool to facilitate student evaluations of their instructors, allowing university-wide comparison in key areas. The tool should balance standard questions with the opportunity for appropriate flexibility for college, disciplinary and course-specific differences. The committee is asked to provide the recommendation to the Provost no later than Oct. 1, 2008.

Response

After a review of the literature and input from committee members, it was determined that the committee should focus on measuring teaching effectiveness and recommend that course effectiveness be treated separately and by a different committee. It was also determined that the survey instrument should be structured on the dimensions and elements presented on pages 51-53 in Berk (2006) as synthesized by Davis (1993) from research on good teaching (Chickering & Gamson, 1991; Eble, 1988; Murray, 1991; Reynolds, 1992; Schon, 1987) and on student achievement and success (Noel, Levitz, Saluri, & Associates, 1985; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, Tinto 1987). Berk’s book, *Thirteen Strategies to Measure College Teaching*, was selected as a handbook and guide for the project.

Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE)

The Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) represents the student perception of teacher effectiveness in three domains. These domains are:

1. **Organization and Explanation of Materials** - This score reflects the student's perception of how well the instructor makes the course requirements and student learning outcomes clear to the students, gives assignments, activities, and materials that are helpful and contribute to understanding the subject, explains difficult material clearly, shows the relationships among topics and new concepts, and evaluates student work in ways that are helpful to learning;
2. **Learning Environment** - This score reflects the student's perception of how well the instructor establishes a climate of mutual respect, encouragement, motivates students to work and engage in learning, is available and encouraging, is skillful in actively engaging students in learning, and provides useful feedback;
3. **Self Regulated Learning** - This score reflects the student's perception of how well the instructor guides and encourages self-directed learning in which the student is encouraged to be open to viewpoints of others, develop new viewpoints, connect course topics to a wider understanding of the subject, and contribute to the learning process.

Reporting

Domain scores use a Likert scale from 1-4. Each response represents a level of student perception:

- Strongly Disagree (1);
- Disagree (2);
- Agree (3);
- Strongly Agree (4).

A preset model will tabulate all raw data and provide scale scores. A sample report form is available on page 3. This report model is a sample and may receive adjustments in appearance for online access.

UNT
Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE)
Fall 2009

SD = strongly disagree D = disagree A = agree SA = strongly agree

Organization and Explanation of Materials		SD	D	A	SA
1	My instructor explains difficult material clearly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	My instructor communicates at a level that I can understand.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	My Instructor makes requirements clear.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	My instructor identifies relationships between and among topics.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Learning Environment		SD	D	A	SA
5	My instructor establishes a climate of respect.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	My instructor is available to me on matters pertaining to the course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	My instructor respects diverse talents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	My instructor creates an atmosphere in which ideas can be exchanged freely.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Self Regulated Learning		SD	D	A	SA
9	My instructor gives assignments that are stimulating to me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10	My instructor encourages me to develop new viewpoints.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11	My instructor arouses my curiosity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12	My instructor stimulates my creativity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Overall opinions		SD	D	A	SA
1	<i>I like this instructor</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	<i>I am interested in this subject</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	<i>I think the classroom was appropriate for this class</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	<i>I would recommend a course taught by this instructor</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

This Class is:	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>A Required Course</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>An Elective</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>I am not sure</i>		
What grade do you expect to earn in this course?	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>A</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>B</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>C</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>D</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>F</i>

Copyright © 2009 University of North Texas

All Rights Reserved

**UNT
STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
TEACHER REPORT**

Part A

10/20/09

Draft

Instructor: _____

Department: _____

Date: _____

College: _____

<p><i>Note: The SETE Scale Score replaces the mean score. It is like the standard scores used on the SAT, GRE, and state tests like the TAKS. It allows the SETE scores to be put on an interval scale. Each of the three effectiveness factors has its own unique scale score. The overall construct of Teaching Effectiveness also has its own scale score, and thus is not simply the average of the factor scores. Each scale goes from 1 to 1000.</i></p>	<p>Scale Score</p>
<p>Organization and Explanation of Materials This score reflects the student’s perception of how well the instructor: makes the course requirements and student learning outcomes clear to the students; gives assignments, activities, and materials that are helpful and that contribute to understanding the subject; explains difficult material clearly; shows the relationships among topics and new concepts; and evaluates student work in ways that are helpful to learning.</p>	<p>600.29</p>
<p>Learning Environment This score reflects the student’s perception of how well the instructor: establishes a climate of mutual respect and encouragement; motivates students to work and engage in learning; is available and encouraging; is skillful in actively engaging students in learning; and provides useful feedback.</p>	<p>575.32</p>
<p>Self-regulated Learning This score reflects the student’s perception of how well the instructor guides and encourages self-directed learning in which the student is encouraged: to be open to the viewpoints of others; to develop new viewpoints; to connect course topics to a wider understanding of the subject; and to contribute to the learning process.</p>	<p>650.89</p>
<p>Overall Teaching Effectiveness Score</p>	<p>645.52</p>

Copyright © 2009 University of North Texas
All Rights Reserved

SETE Cycle

The SETE Cycle for Fall and Spring Semester administrations are as follows:

- Students will be able to access the online SETE for the final 11 regular class days prior to the start of final exams;
- The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness will post results for faculty review (access will not be public domain while the review process is in progress);
- Results are public domain after the review process;
- As of August 01, 2009; UNT will post SETE results in the Faculty Profile System online for compliance with House Bill 2504.

The SETE Cycle for Summer Semester administrations are as follows:

- Students will be able to access the online SETE for the final 5 regular class days prior to the start of final exams;
- There will be two Summer Semester live administrations (one for 5WI & one for 5WII/10W);
- The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness will post results for faculty review (access will not be public domain while the review process is in progress);
- Results are public domain after the review process (Beginning with Fall 2010 Semester data);
- As of August 01, 2010; UNT will start to post SETE results in the Faculty Profile System online for compliance with House Bill 2504.

SETE Pre-Processing

The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IR&E) will oversee the pre-processing for the SETE administration. The following procedures are for the pre-processing of the three separate files associated with the live administration for the SETE each Fall, Spring, and Summer semesters. Not all procedures may be necessary for data sets provided by EIS.

Initial Data Request

These are the steps for data population (Course, Faculty, Student) from EIS:

- Request data 30 days after 12th class day for Fall and Spring semesters;
- Request data 2 days after first day of class for 5WI, 5WII, and 10W Summer sessions;
- THECB identifier is – 1 (lecture courses) for course population.

Data Cleaning

Fill in missing values, smooth noisy data, identify or remove outliers, and resolve inconsistencies. Data cleaning task include:

- Fill in missing values;
- Identify outliers and smooth out noisy data (random error or variance in a measured variable);
- Correct inconsistent data.

Data Integration

Integration of multiple databases, data cubes, or files:

- Combine data from multiple sources into a coherent store;
- Detect and resolve data value conflicts.

Data Transformation

Normalization and aggregation:

- Smoothing – remove noise from data;
- Aggregation – summarization, data cube construction;
- Generalization – concept hierarchy climbing;
- Normalization – scaled to fall within a small, specified range.

Data Reduction

Obtains reduced representation in volume but produces the same or similar analytical results

Data Discretization

Part of data reduction but with particular importance, especially for numerical data. Obtains a reduced representation of the data set that is smaller in volume but yet produces the same (or almost the same) analytical results.

Attributes are:

- Nominal – values from an unordered set;
- Ordinal – values from an ordered set;
- Continuous – real numbers.

Discretization includes:

- Divide the range of a continuous attribute into intervals;
- Some classification of algorithms only accept categorical attributes;
- Reduce data size by discretization.

SETE Live Administration

The live administration process begins with the initial delivery of the course file to Computer Information Technology Center (CITC).

Delivery of Files to CITC

Following the pre-processing of all data files, IR&E will forward the course file to CITC for load bearing and initializing for the current administration of the SETE.

Host of Live Administration

The CITC will host the live administration of the SETE. CITC will forward a cleaned raw data set to the IR&E to begin analysis.

Student Access:

- Student access will begin the final 11 days (prior to final exams) for Fall Semester administration;
- Student access will begin the final 11 days (prior to final exams) for Spring Semester administration;
- Student access will begin the final week (prior to final exams) for Summer 5WI and the final week for 5WII/10W and remain open for 7 days each administration.

SETE Data Analysis and Posting of Results

IR&E will begin SETE data analysis and posting of results upon receipt of the raw data file from the CITC.

SETE Data Analysis

Data analysis will involve “R”, “M+”, and “PASW” software. Data analysis will be overseen in at the IR&E office. Algorithms for the analysis model are provided by the SETE Analytical Team. Model fit is supported by Research and Statistical Support (RSS). Data analysis is to be complete 30 days after receipt of the raw data file from the CITC.

SETE Results Posting

Results for SETE administrations will be available after the analysis is complete of all SETE data. The results will be available for faculty to review on a secure SharePoint site. Faculty will be able to access their results from behind the firewall on the UNT server.

Beginning with the Fall 2010 Semester, all results will be posted on the appropriate faculty page (Faculty Profile System) starting with data from the Fall 2010 Semester SETE administration.

Reference Materials

- AERA. (2005). *Valid faculty evaluation data: Are there any?* 2005 AERA Symposium Montreal: April 14, 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.cedanet.com/meta>
- Altschuler, Glenn C. (1999). Let me edutain you. *The New York Times*, Section 4A; Page 50; Column 1; Education Life Supplement Education Life Section, April 4, 1999 Retrieved from <http://www.bus.lsu.edu/accounting/faculty/lcrumbley/edutain.html>
- Belcheir, M. J. (2003). *The campus environment as viewed through the lens of the National Survey of Student Engagement*. (Report No. BSU-RR-203-01). Boise, ID: Office of Institutional Advancement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED480932).
- Berk, Ronald A. (2006). *Thirteen strategies to measure college teaching: A consumer's guide to rating scale construction, assessment, and decision making for faculty, administrators, and clinicians*. Stylus Publishing, Sterling, VA:
- Berman, Robert.(1998).Making Up the Grade: Notes from the Antiversity. *Academic Questions*, 11 (2), Spring 1998, 38-52.
- Cantor, Paul A.(1997). It's not the tenure, it's the radicalism. *Academic Questions*, 11 (1), Winter 1997-98, 28-36.
- Carini, R. M., Kuh, G. D., & Klein, S. P. (2006). Student engagement and student learning: Testing the linkages. *Research in Higher Education*, 47 (1), 1-32.
- Carini, R., Hayek, J., Kuh, G., Kennedy, J. & Ouimet, J. (2003). College student responses to web and paper surveys: Does mode matter?. *Research in Higher Education*, 44, No. 1, February 2003, 1-19
- Cashin, W. E. (1995). Student ratings of teaching: The research revisited. *IDEA paper 32*. Manhattan KS Kansas State University Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Centra, J. A., and Gaubatz, N. B. (1998). Is there gender bias in student ratings of instruction?: *Journal of Higher Education*, v 70, 17-33.
- Coren, Staney. (1998). Student evaluations of an instructor's racism and sexism: Truth or expedience? *Ethics and Behavior*, 8:3 201-213.
- Darby, Jenny A. (2007). Are course evaluations subject to a halo effect? *Research in Education* 77:16, 46-55 Loughborough University.
- Dickey, David & Carolyn Pearson (2005). Recency effect in college student course evaluations. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 10(6).
- Ernst, D. (2006, October). *Student evaluations: A comparison of online vs. paper data collection*. Paper Presentation at the EDUCAUSE National Conference, Dallas, TX.
- Feeley, Thomas H. (2002). Evidence of halo effect in student evaluations of communication instruction, *Communication education*, 51:3. 225-236.
- Haladyna, T. M., & Hess, R. K. (1994). The detection and correction of bias in student ratings of instruction. *Research in Higher Education*, 35(6), 669-687.
- Hardy, N. (2003). Online ratings: Fact and fiction. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 96, Winter 2003, 31-38.
- Haskell, Robert E. (1997).Academic freedom, tenure, and student evaluation of faculty: gplloping Polls in the 21st century. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 5 (6), February 12, 1997, 1-30.

- Hocutt, Max O. (1988). De-Grading student evaluations: What's wrong with student polls of teaching." *Academic Questions*, 1 (4), autumn, 1988, 55-65.
- Hoffman, K. (2003). Online course evaluation reporting in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 96, Winter 2003, 25-29.
- Johnson, T. (2003) Online student ratings: Will students respond? *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 96, Winter 2003, 49-59.
- Kolevzon, Michael S. (1981). Grade inflation in higher education: A comparative study. *Research in Higher Education*, 15 (3), 1981, 195-212.
- Krajewski, S. & Pike, D. (2006, October). *From pencils to pixels: Course evaluations go from online pilot to production*. Paper Presentation at the EDUCAUSE National Conference, Dallas, TX.
- Machlup, Fritz. (1979). Poor learning from good teachers. *Academe*, 65, October 1979, 376-380.
- Marsh, H. W. (1987). Students evaluations of university teaching: Research findings, methodological issues, and directions for future research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11, 253-388.
- Marsh, H.W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(5), 707-754.
- Marsh, Herbert W., Lawrence A. Roche. (1997). Making students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective: The critical issues of validity, bias, and utility. *American Psychologist*, 52 (11), November 1997, 1187-1197.
- Masi, A., Sehgal, R., & Winer, L. (2005, October). *MOLE: The McGill OnLine course evaluation project*. Paper Presentation at the EDUCAUSE National Conference, Orlando, FL.
- McGhee, D. & Lowell, N. (2003). Psychometric properties of student ratings of instruction in online and on-campus courses. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 96, Winter 2003, 39-48.
- McKeachie, Wilbert J. (1979). Student ratings of faculty: A reprise. *Academe*, 65, October 1979, 384-397.
- McKeachie, Wilbert J. (1997). Student ratings: The validity of use. *American Psychologist*, 52 (11), November 1997, 1218-1225.
- Neath, Ian. (1996). How to improve your teaching evaluations without improving your teaching. *Psychological Reports*, 78, 1996, 1363-1372.
- Nicol, David and Debra Macfarlane-Dick. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*. 31.2 April 2006.
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (2003). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Rodin, M., & Rodin, B. (1972). Student evaluations of teachers: Students rate most highly instructors from whom they learn least. *Science*, 177, 1164-1166.
- Scriven, M. (1994). Duties of the teacher. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*. 8.151-184
- Steven M Downing & Thomas M Haladyna. (2004). Validity threats: overcoming interference with proposed interpretations of assessment data. *Medical Education* 2004; 38: 327-333

- Theall, Michael, and Jennifer Franklin. (1991). Using student ratings for teaching improvement. *Effective practices for improving teaching*, ed. by Michael Theall and Jennifer Franklin. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991 83-96.
- Theall, Michael.(1997). On drawing reasonable conclusions about student ratings of instruction: a reply to Haskell and to Stake. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 5 (8), 21 May 1997..
- Tinto, Vincent. (2002). *Enhancing student persistence: Connecting the dots*. Paper presented at the Optimizing the nation's investment: persistence and success in postsecondary education October 23-25, 2002.
- Trout, Paul. (1997). How to improve your teaching evaluation scores without improving your teaching. *The Montana Professor*, 7 (3), Fall 1997, 17-22.
- Trout, Paul. (1997). Student anti-intellectualism and the dumbing down of the university. *The Montana Professor*, 7 (2), Spring 1997, 4-10.
- University of Michigan, Center for Learning and Teaching. (2005). Gender and student evaluations: An annotated bibliography. Retrieved from <http://www.crlt.umich.edu/multiteaching/gsebibliography.pdf>
- Weimer, M. (2002). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*: San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Williams, Wendy M., Stephen J. Ceci. (1997). 'How'm I doing?' Problems with student ratings of instructors and Courses. *Change*, September/October, 1997, 13-23.
- Wilson, Tom C. (1988). Student evaluation-of-teaching forms: A critical perspective. *The Review of Higher Education*, 12 (1), Autumn 1988, 79-95.
- Wright, N., Anita, M., Enterline, M., & Wilkins, P. (2008, March). *Moving targets: MIT's transition to an online subject evaluation system and the need for flexibility*. Presentation given at the Educause 2008 NERCOMP Conference, Providence, RI.