Online Course Evaluations Report
Updated: August 2006

This report attempts to update the Executive Committee about the current status of and the Elliott School’s experience using the online course evaluation (OCE). It follows the last update to the Faculty Senate, dated July 29, 2005, which is included in Appendix A. The 2005 memo summarized the status of the online course evaluation from its inception up to the summer of 2005. What follows is a synopsis of the recent deliberations of the Educational Policy Committee, a comparison of response rates between online and paper evaluations, a summary of the Elliott School’s experience piloting the online course evaluation, the status of online course evaluations nationally, and a sample from Ratemyprofessors.com, a website rating GW professors.

Educational Policy Committee
In the fall 2005 semester, the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) of the Faculty Senate was charged with following up on the Senate Resolution adopted March 8, 2002 “dealing with the possibility of departments adopting online teaching evaluations with enough flexibility to possibly allow student access to parts of the evaluation” (EPC: 2005-06 Annual Report). After lengthy discussions with its members, and working closely with Cheryl Beil, Executive Director of Academic Planning and Assessment, the Committee decided:

It is not in the purview of the Committee or the Senate to allow/disallow certain evaluation instruments for teaching evaluations. Instead, decisions on how to evaluate courses remain in the University’s departments (or other units). However, the Committee felt that it might be useful for departments (or other units) to have some guidance on the possible adoption of online teaching evaluations. In collaboration with Cheryl Beil, the Committee endorsed a document distributed with this year’s invitation to department chairs to use online evaluations that outlined (a) potential reasons for using these instruments and (b) remaining challenges with the online evaluation process. (A copy of the document, “Benefits of and Challenges to Using the Online Course Evaluations can be found in Appendix B.)

Elliott School’s Experience Piloting the Evaluation
The Elliott School piloted the online course evaluation beginning in the spring 2004 semester. The OCE is used in almost all IAFF courses. While the Elliott School believes students should have access to summary data from selected questions, student access has not been available for most of the semesters of the pilot. For the one or two semesters for which the data were available online, it was not publicized. Graph 1 tracks the response rates beginning in the spring 2004 semester. It indicates that the percentage of students completing the evaluations increased between spring 2004 to fall 2005, from a low of 51% in its first semester to a high of 57% in fall 2005. The response rate declined slightly in spring 2006, yielding a 51% response. As to be expected, the percentage of students completing the evaluations varied across courses. The variation in response
rates can be attributed to a number of factors. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that when the instructor strongly encourages students to complete the evaluation and explains how the information provided will be used, the number of students completing the evaluation tends to be very high.

**Graph 1. Students’ Response Rate for ESIA Online Course Evaluations**

![Graph showing response rates for ESIA online course evaluations](image)

Associate Dean David Grier, who oversees the online course evaluation in the Elliott School, was asked to summarize his school’s experience piloting the OCE. His evaluation, sent in an email, follows:

**Faculty and student response to the format:**

*The response has been almost non-existent. The students assume that this is how course evaluations are done. The faculty don’t think about it. There has been no negative feedback from the system. The only response I have heard this year concerns the questions—concerns that are independent of the media. (You’ve heard me complain about the questions before. Could we make the questions more consistent and more in line with what the students can actually judge? It’s tough for the students to summarize the quality of the professor but they can judge if the professor uses up-to-date literature, uses ideas without obvious contradictions and handles questions confidently. These things are concrete issues that can be used with professors to improve their courses.)*

*To be honest, the value of the format comes from the fact that we know that all of the courses are being evaluated by students and that all the professors are seeing the evaluations. After each semester, I sit down and review every evaluation and send it, with my assessment, to the professor. First, with paper evaluations professors can ignore them and we can do nothing about them. Second, it would be very difficult for me to get the comments back to all the professors with paper evaluations and paper summaries.*
Usefulness of the responses:
They are, at most, a mixed bag. I tend to use them to find problems rather than to identify good teachers. As you read them, you see pretty clearly that there is a wide interpretive range in the responses. If you see answers in the upper end of the numerical spectrum, all you can assume is that there are no obvious problems. When you get an odd comment here, a few low marks there, you can be pretty sure that there is a problem somewhere. The most common problem we find is inexperienced teachers who have trouble putting their ideas in context and keeping the continuity of the course. However, we also see clear evidence of professors who are entertaining and enjoyable but offering no real intellectual content.

How the evaluation is being used:
Primarily to evaluate the teaching skills of the professor. I regularly sit down with the problem teachers. Secondarily, to get a sense if a course is fulfilling a need in our curriculum.

Do you plan on continuing to use it?
Yes.

Comparison of usage and response rates between the OCE and paper versions of course evaluations
It is expected that all courses taught at GW will be evaluated by students enrolled in the course. Currently, only two of the undergraduate schools, ESIA and GWSB, use a standard form for all their courses. In CCAS and SEAS, departments develop their own evaluation forms.

One of the questions raised in the initial deliberations about the OCE was the extent to which courses at GW are being evaluated. While that question has not been addressed in any comprehensive way, data collected from a few selected departments may provide insight about the extent to which courses are being evaluated during any given semester.

For this report, five departments agreed to share the response rates in their end-of-semester course evaluations. The departments were selected because they distribute paper versions of course evaluations and because the departments place great value on the information provided in the evaluations. The five departments were computer science, marketing, mathematics, political science, and psychology.

Each department provided a spreadsheet with the number of completed course evaluations collected in each course and the semester for which the information was provided\(^1\). The course numbers were then compared to the courses listed in Banner for the same semester. Courses such as Independent Research, Dissertation Research, and Internships, for which there are no formal “classes” were deleted from the Banner list.

\(^1\) For some departments, data were available for only one semester. In other departments, data were available for multiple semesters.
The percentage of courses within each department for which there were course evaluations varied considerably\(^2\). In one department, there were only course evaluations for 55% of the courses offered; in the other departments, the percentage of courses for which evaluations were available varied between 71% and 79%. By comparison, between spring 2004 and spring 2006, the range of IAFF courses for which evaluations are available was between 89% and 100% (see Graph 2).

While department chairs expect instructors to distribute and collect course evaluations, the practice does not appear to be enforced. One advantage to using the online course evaluation is that it does not require instructors to allocate instructional time to the distribution and collection of evaluations.

**Graph 2. Range of courses for which there are courses evaluations: Spring 2004-Spring 2006**
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\(^*\text{Note: ESIA includes only IAFF courses. The selected departments are Computer Science, Marketing, Mathematics, Political Science, and Psychology.}\)

One of the major concerns about the OCE is its low response rate. However, no benchmark for what a respectable or even comparable response rate was available. The response rates in IAFF courses using the OCE were compared with the response rates in the selected departments using paper evaluations. Please note that data from the five departments were not available for all the semesters for which ESIA response rates were available. As Graph 3 indicates, the response rate in courses using paper evaluations are much higher, although the rate varies between 55% and 82%, depending upon the

\(^2\text{It is not known if the course evaluation was distributed in class but not turned in to the department chair or never distributed and collected.}\)
number of students who were in class the day the evaluations were distributed. However, as in the OCE, there is much variation in response rates across courses.

**Graph 3. Student response rates for in-class course evaluations in selected departments**
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**Other concerns about the OCE**
Another area of concern expressed by departments using or considering using the OCE is its length: The current version of the OCE lists 38 questions (see Appendix C for a copy of the evaluation). While it only takes five minutes to complete, some departments have decided not to adopt it because of its length. A much shorter version of the survey, consisting of approximately 12 standard questions with the option of customizing it with additional questions, will be available in the fall 2006 semester.

**The Status of OCE nationally**
According to a recent article (Anderson, Brown, & Spaeth, 2006), at least 33% of universities across the country were using online student evaluations in 2005, up from 2% in 2000. Their percentages were based on a variety of institutions reporting this information to Brigham Young University’s (BYU) Online Student Evaluation of Teaching in Higher Education (OnSET) Web resource. Of major concern to all universities that adopt the online format is the potential for low response rates.

BYU’s website lists 18 universities that use online course evaluations in all their courses. Two of these universities are in GW’s market basket: Washington University and Northwestern University. Washington University boasts response rates between 70% to 73% over a three semester period. It is achieved by a massive email campaign to various campus constituents encouraging their support. For example, resident assistants are asked to remind students in their residence halls to complete the evaluations; similar emails are sent to fraternity and sorority advisors, the athletic council, and to students encouraging their participation. Northwestern’s response rates varied between 50% and
46% over a two semester period. To boost their results, they plan to permit only those students who complete the evaluations to have access to the results. Both universities allow students access to some of the data collected.

Queries on various listserves yield reports of response rates as high as 80-90%, usually achieved by imposing a sanction for not completing the evaluation. For example, Smith College’s response rate in the high 90th percentile is achieved by fining students $25 for failure to complete the evaluations. Other schools with response rates in the 70th to 80th percentiles permit only students who complete the evaluations to view their end-of-semester grades online. All others must wait for the grades to arrive by the US Postal Service. All the schools reporting high response rates indicate a strong campus culture that promotes the importance of course evaluations and that students are informed about how the information will be used.

Anderson, Brown, and Spaeth (2006) suggest that lower response rates are not a result of the method used to distribute the survey (paper or online); rather it is an indication of students’ and instructors’ level of engagement. Response rates were much higher in those courses in which the faculty or department were actively engaged in developing the online survey. They propose that more needs to be done to “promote and nurture a culture that engages both institutions and students more fully in the evaluation process.”

GW has yet to develop a culture of engagement, whereby students realize the importance of course evaluations in improving teaching and learning. While partial data from Elliott School course evaluations are available online, the website has yet to be promoted. Many students are not aware that they have access to the information. Moreover, anecdotal information reported by various instructors suggests that some students do not believe that online course evaluations are really anonymous. Other students have a “what’s-in-it-for-me” attitude, and do not see the value in completing the evaluation. Another concern is that in some WID courses, students may be asked to complete two online evaluations: the standard online evaluation and another to evaluate the WID component. In the future, these two surveys will be combined into one evaluation.

\textit{The Alternative}

Whether or not the Faculty Senate chooses to endorse the online course evaluation and have selected summary information available to students, the reality is that students have already identified and are using an online website to learn about professors and courses taught at GW. A recent visit to Ratemyprofessor.com indicated that there are 964 GW course evaluations on the website. (GW Law School courses are listed separately.) Below is the course evaluation form used for the Ratemyprofessor.com website.
Chart 1. Rate My Professor: Student Questionnaire

**Easiness**
1

**Helpfulness**

**Clarity**

**Your Interest**
How interested were you in this class BEFORE taking it?

**Prof Status**
Still Teaching
Retired/Gone

**Appearance**
Hot
Not

**Class:**
(i.e. HIST 101, ACCT 202)

**Comments:**
Please keep comments clean. Libelous comments will be deleted.

*Optional Fields*
Submitted data become the property of RateMyProfessors.com
Students who go to the website can access information by instructor or by course. Next to each course/instructor there is a smiley/sad face, depending upon the ratings. “Hot” professors or courses are identified by a chili pepper icon. The quick view also includes the mean score for “course quality” and “ease.” Clicking on an instructor’s name produces the mean scores for the other evaluation questions: “clarity” and “helpfulness.” User comments from a sampling of ratings of GW professors range from “beware of Dr. Death” to “great professor.” (Appendix D includes a sampling of comments about GW professors on Ratemyprofessor.com.)

Recommendation:
It may be beneficial for the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to revisit the original Resolution of the Faculty Senate regarding the sharing of online course evaluation information with students. There would appear to be two immediate benefits from making selected course evaluation data available to GW’s students. First, response rates would likely increase substantially. Second, students would utilize the well-constructed GW course evaluations rather than crude instruments such as the one used for Rateleyprofessor.com.
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Appendix A: Online Course Evaluation report of July 29, 2005

To: Lilien Robinson, Chair
    Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

From: Cheryl Beil, Executive Director
    Academic Planning and Assessment

Re: Online course evaluations

Date: July 29, 2005

Institutional assessment of student learning is essential to the pursuit of academic excellence at GW and throughout the academy. In addition to monitoring quality, assessment provides information that leads to improvement of teaching and learning. It is a fundamental obligation of faculty to develop learning outcomes for their courses, implement appropriate measures to assess achievement of those outcomes, and, most importantly, use the assessment results to refine course content and teaching strategies.

Identification and assessment of student learning goals is an important component of the accreditation standards established by Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE), Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), to name a few GW accreditation agencies. Moreover, assessment is critical to GW’s achievement of academic excellence through quality undergraduate education (Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, Goal 1, Objective 1A), top-ranked graduate programs (SPAE, Goal 1, Objective 1B), and graduate professional programs (SPAE, Goal 2).

In its “Resolution to Develop a Revised Student Evaluation of Courses (01/10), the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students proposed the development of a “reliable, and well-crafted” set of surveys that join the Student Association’s “Academic Update,” student evaluations of courses with teaching evaluations conducted by faculty under the auspices of the Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs. Once the JCFS endorsed the result, it was resolved that the

Faculty Senate would take the opportunity to review the proposed surveys, considering what value publishing student evaluations of teaching might have for the University in terms of engendering a spirit of good will between faculty and students and leading toward the gradual further improvement of our educational environment.

Rather than developing multiple surveys, the Committee charged with developing a workable plan for student evaluation of courses decided to develop an online evaluation
that would be composed of two segments: 1) a set of core questions common to all evaluations; 2) a process whereby departments and faculty can customize the evaluation by adding discipline-specific. (See Attachment A for the Committee’s Report.) An online evaluation process standardizes the method of distributing evaluations and the collection and summary of data. It also facilitates collecting data across schools and departments, and it releases human and departmental resources as the production, collection, and summary of the data are performed electronically. Most importantly, the process enables the electronic archiving of evaluations across time so that the data is readily available for promotion and tenure deliberations and overall assessment efforts in support of accreditation activities.

In 2003-2004, the instrument was vetted through the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, department chairs in Columbian College and faculty in the Elliott School of International Affairs. The Student Association reviewed the document and asked that summary data from 13 of the 38 core questions be made available to students. A copy of the core set of questions is in Attachment B. The 13 questions for student viewing are circled.

The Office of Interactive Media and Graphics (IMAG) agreed to develop the online evaluation website and have it interface with Banner; ESIA agreed to test the online evaluation beginning in the spring 2004 semester. For lack of another volunteer, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment agreed to coordinate the online evaluation effort.

A description of how the online course evaluation system works from a student and faculty perspective can be found in Attachment C. To view samples of the survey, report, and student report, go to: http://www.gwu.edu/~oapa/online_sum.htm

Pilot of Online Evaluation System and Instrument
ESIA and Exercise Science agreed to pilot the instrument in 130 of their spring 2004 semester courses. CCAS departments were invited to participate in fall 2004, and SEAS faculty expressed interest in spring 2005. Only the core questions were included in the spring and fall 2004 semester pilots. Two new features were added in the spring 2005 pilot:

- Department chairs and faculty could customize their evaluations by adding up to 20 unique questions. They had the option of creating a new question or selecting one from the 100+ questions listed in the general Question Pool. Questions in the Pool are culled from department surveys that were distributed in past semesters.
- Department chairs and instructors could determine for which courses the online course evaluation summary report would be posted for student viewing. (Note: Until Spring 2005, students did not have access to summary reports of course evaluations. Students now have access to summary reports for ESIA courses. As yet, SEAS and CCAS faculty have not made the information available in their respective courses.)
Graph 1 shows the increase in departmental participation beginning with two departments in spring 2004 and 29 departments in spring 2005 semesters.

The number of courses using the form increased from 130 in spring 2004 to 861 courses in spring 2005. Graph 2 illustrates the increase.
The overall response rate improved over the three semesters. In spring 2004 only 37% of the eligible students participated. By spring 2005, 52% participated overall; 55% of ESIA students completed the evaluation. Graph 3 summarizes student response rate, separating out IAFF courses.

**Graph 3: Student Response Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>IAFF</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200401 (ESIA)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200403 (ESIA &amp; CCAS)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200501 (ESIA, CCAS, SEAS)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty reaction to online evaluations**
A short questionnaire soliciting feedback on the Online Course Evaluation was sent to all faculty participating in the fall 2004 pilot. (A copy of the questionnaire is in Attachment D.) Of the 498 courses (not faculty) included in the system, 59 faculty completed the questionnaire. (As survey responses were anonymous, it is not possible to determine how representative the sample is.) The questionnaire sought information about the extent to which faculty encouraged students to complete the survey, possible inducements to increase response rates, comparison of number and quality of student comments on web surveys with those on paper surveys, and faculty recommendations about continuing with online course evaluations. (A summary of faculty comments is in Attachment E. It is important to remember that the standard instrument of 38 core questions was in use during the fall 2004 semester. Faculty could not customize the instrument to meet their particular needs.)

To summarize the findings:
- The main concern with the online course evaluations is its low response rate.
- 81% indicated that they encouraged students, at least once, to complete the only course evaluation. Of those who encouraged students, 30% reminded students one time, 46% encouraged them twice, and 23% encouraged them three or four times. Only 7% offered students any inducement (e.g., extra credit) for completing the survey. (Faculty are strongly divided about using inducements.)
• Compared to paper evaluations, 66% thought that fewer students wrote comments on the online survey; 25% thought that the same number of students wrote comments; and 10% thought more students wrote comments.
• Compared to paper evaluations, 57% of the faculty thought that the quality of student comments was equal; 30% thought the quality was worse, and 13% thought they were better.
• 57% recommended that online student evaluations should be continued; 23% that it should not continue; and 20% were unsure.

Now that the instrument has been developed and piloted for a year and feedback has been solicited and summarized, I would like to request that the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate revisit Resolution 01/10, with attention to the second to last paragraph of the resolution clause which states:

That once the panel has done its work, and the JCFS endorsed the results, the faculty Senate will take the opportunity to review the proposed survey, considering what value publishing student evaluations of teaching might have for the University in terms of engendering a spirit of good will between faculty and students and leading toward the gradual further improvement of our educational environment.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

cc: Donald Lehman, Executive Vice President
    Academic Affairs
Appendix B: Benefits to and Challenges of Using the Online Course Evaluation

The Educational Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate agreed that departments or faculty that wish to use the online course evaluation are welcome to do so. In the interest of obtaining information that will prove most useful in course development, it is recommended that departments and faculty review the benefits to and challenges of using the online evaluation before they proceed.

Reasons to consider the use of online course evaluation:
- An online course evaluation does not take up valuable class time. It also provides students with a longer and more flexible timeframe to complete the survey, so they can consider their responses and provide more thoughtful feedback.
- It has the potential to reach a wider audience (e.g., students who were absent the day the paper evaluation was distributed in class).
- Instructors and departments can customize the evaluation by adding up to 20 questions of their choosing. In addition, there is a Question Pool of 200+ questions culled from paper evaluations from many GW departmental surveys. Items in the pool can easily be added to the online evaluation. Moreover, faculty or departments that create new questions may add them to the question pool.
- It standardizes the method of distributing evaluations and of collecting the data.
- It provides a faster turnaround time for producing summary data of the evaluations. This benefits faculty who may want to consider and act upon students’ feedback in a timely fashion and departments that are hiring part-time or adjunct faculty on a semester-basis.
- It frees up valuable staff time, as the distribution of surveys, tabulation of results, including comments, are done electronically.
- It has the potential to produce specialized reports including analyses across different types of classes, course sections, and departments.
- Summary reports are accessible on line and are available 24/7.
- It saves natural and financial resources as paper versions of the evaluations do not need to be printed.
- It frees up valuable office space. The data are stored in a secure server that is operated by ISS, thus eliminating the need to store paper versions of the evaluations and eliminating the possibility of faculty or staff inadvertently losing evaluations or selecting out certain responses. In addition, the evaluations are stored indefinitely and are readily assessable.
- A standardized process of course evaluations will contribute to GW’s ability to meet the assessment expectations of the Middle States accrediting process.
- Faculty who wish to do so have the option of sharing summary data with students for selected questions.
- The “net” generation of students is more comfortable and accustomed to completing surveys online.

Challenges for online course evaluations:
• Response rate: Although the response rates have increased steadily over the past three semesters, the most recent overall response rate in ESIA is 56%. However, response rates vary considerably by department, ranging as low as 38% in some departments and as high as 98% in others. We are still in the process of piloting online course evaluations. Faculty and departments which offer minimal extra credit for completion receive the best responses. High response rates are found in those classes where the instructors encourage their students to participate. Survey data collected from other universities using an online system report that sending out frequent email communication, publicizing it through campus posters and in campus newspaper ads, educating students about the importance of the course evaluations and how the information will be used by department chairs and faculty all help to improve the response rate.

• The data is inconclusive about whether students’ comments are compromised in an online venue. In some courses faculty found that students typed in more comments, while in others, the opposite occurred. Many faculty identified bias among respondents as a major problem: students who took the time to fill out the online survey tended to be either very positive or very negative. Some faculty worried that the online course evaluations yielded fewer comments than the paper evaluations, while others praised the comments as more extensive and thoughtful; one instructor summed it up, “Fewer students wrote comments, but those who did wrote in greater detail about the course.”

• The survey is too long. At the present time the survey includes 38 questions, five of which are open-ended. While it takes less than five minutes to complete, some faculty and students have complained about its length. A shorter version will be developed in the near future.

_Educational Policy Committee_
3.15.2006
Appendix C: Online Course Evaluation Sample

This sample does not display the department or course-specific questions.

Click on the response that best reflects your appraisal of the course, instructor, and what you learned. Please be candid. Your comments are especially welcomed.

* = required

General Questions

1. Primary reason for taking this course
   o Fulfills general curriculum/education requirement
   o Required for major, minor, or program
   o Interested in subject
   o Reputation of professor
   o Other

2. Expected grade in the course
   o A  o B  o C  o D  o F  o Don't know

Course characteristics

3. Type/format of course
   o Large lecture
   o Small lecture / discussion
   o Seminar / discussion
   o Other

4. Difficulty of subject matter
   o (1)  (2)  (3)  (4)  (5)
   Very  Very

16

Academic Planning and Assessment 08.2006
easy  difficult

5. Number of hours per week outside of class typically spent doing readings, assignments, reviewing notes, writing papers, studying for exams

- Less than one hour or none
- 1-2 hours
- 3-4 hours
- 5-6 hours
- 7-8 hours
- 9-10 hours
- More than 10 hours

6. * Amount you learned in the course

(1) Almost nothing
(2) (3) (4) (5) A great deal

7. Use this space for comments: (e.g., about the value of the readings and assignments)

**Overall rating of the course**

8. * The overall quality of instruction was

(1) Not at all effective
(2) (3) (4) (5) Very effective

9. * The overall quality of the course was

(1) Poor
(2) (3) (4) (5) Excellent

10. * Overall, how would you rate your level of intellectual challenge in the course?

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
11. * Overall, how would you rate your level of engagement in the subject matter?

Not at all engaged

12. Use this space for comments: (e.g., strong or weak points of course)

**About the course**

Use the scale below each statement to evaluate different aspects of this course or to indicate your level of agreement with the statement. Please consider each statement separately rather than letting your overall feelings about the professor determine your response.

13. The course objectives were clear.

The course objectives were achieved.

15. Level of class participation / discussion was appropriate to size and objectives of course.
16. Course content was organized in a manner that facilitated learning.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Amount of effort / work required was:

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Effectiveness of assignments in reinforcing or solidifying learning.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Effectiveness of exams in reinforcing or solidifying learning.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Use this space for comments: (e.g., about the clarity and organization of the course, student/instructor interaction)

*What you learned*

22. Enhanced writing ability.

23. Enhanced quantitative or analytical skills.

24. Increased conceptual understanding and/or critical thinking.

25. Use this space for comments: (e.g., about what you learned; type of thinking you did)

About the professor

26. Demonstrated concern about whether students were learning.
27. Clarity of lectures.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all clear</td>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>/ No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Was knowledgeable about the subject and course material.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all knowledgeable</td>
<td>Very knowledgeable</td>
<td>/ No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Enthusiasm for topic/subject.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all enthusiastic</td>
<td>Very enthusiastic</td>
<td>/ No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Accessibility outside of class.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all accessible</td>
<td>Very accessible</td>
<td>/ No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Designed and used fair grading procedures.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all fair</td>
<td>Very fair</td>
<td>/ No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. Use this space for comments: (e.g., about the strengths and weak points of the instructor or the instruction)

Discussion, lab, or recitation integration

34. Integration of discussion, lab, or recitation into the course structure.

Not adequate (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Not applicable

Very adequate / No opinion

Use of technology

35. Instructor's use of Blackboard contributed to learning.

Not at all (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Not

Very well applicable integrated / No opinion

36. Instructor's use of technology in the classroom (e.g., power point, spreadsheets, Web) contributed to learning.

Not at all (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Not

A great applicable deal / No opinion

37. Use this space for comments: (e.g., about instructor's use of technology)

Additional Comments
38. Use this space for any additional comments you have about the course

Thank you. Please click Submit once you have filled out all of the questions.

Submit
## Appendix D: Student Comments from Ratemyprofessor.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Easiness</th>
<th>Helpfulness</th>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>Rater Interest</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/5/06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only good TA, made my only 8 am class my favorite class to go to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4/27/06 | 5        | 1           | 1       | 3              | 😞      |
|         |          |             |         |                |         |
| Brutal teacher...only positive value is you don't really have to go to class. BORING - most every class, she literally reads the slides prepared by the textbook's authors - no teaching going on here. A couple of simplistic case studies and exams that require precise memorization of definitions and you're done |

| 5/30/06 | 4        | 5           | 5       | 5              | 😊      |
|         |          |             |         |                |         |
| She's great, very helpful and thoughtful. An expert in body movement, if you have a question concerning a character she'll help you out tremendously. She'll really go out of her way to make you feel involved in the theater community as well. |

| 4/26/06 | 3        | 1           | 1       | 5              | 😞      |
|         |          |             |         |                |         |
| This professor will go down as one of my worst educators ever. He is not professional, incredibly arrogant, and is a disgrace to the caliber of the university. The title of the class is attractive, but he offers nothing, and his class is entirely personal opinion. This will be the one professor you wish you could have avoided. |

| 5/25/06 | 4        | 5           | 4       | 5              | 😊      |
|         |          |             |         |                |         |
| Very smart teacher. Go to her office hours and she will be very helpful. If you revise your paper, no matter what your previous grade was you will probably get an A. Interesting choice of texts, but she makes it work for the class. Very fair. Stress participation a little too much, class is completely discussion based. |

| 3/29/06 | 1        | 1           | 2       | 4              | 😞      |
|         |          |             |         |                |         |
| AVOID AT ALL COSTS! This is the most biased, idiotic professor I have encountered. His lectures are irrelevant, boring, and unorganized. His tests are impossible to study for, he makes you look like an idiot if you don't word things exactly how he wants, and plays favorites. Killed my GPA |

| 5/11/06 | 3        | 5           | 5       | 3              | 😞      |
|         |          |             |         |                |         |
| "best history teacher ever" i love this man. He's so cool in his own quirky way. lectures are clear and organized. great orator so makes the material and lectures more interesting and entertaining. exams are straightforward. just read and go to lecture and you'll do fine |

| 2/1/06  | 1        | 1           | 1       | 5              | 😊      |
|         |          |             |         |                |         |
| Beware of Dr. "DEATH"...few rarely come out alive....for real dont take her. She is an awful person. mean and scary |
4/30/06  3  5  5  4
Very good professor! The class content is very interesting to both PubH majors, minors, or other majors. Lots of reading, but very organized and relevant. Discussion is a must, but class is small enough to express your opinions.

1/23/06  4  1  1  3
Nice guy, but just no logic to the way he speaks. He has a very circular way of talking and by the time you think he has finally made his point, you realize you have no idea of how he got there. Class discussion is like two ships passing in the night. Neither one can tell the other one is there.

12/15/05  3  5  5  4
Great professor! He is very passionate about what he teaches which makes his classes enjoyable. The tests can be tough but you'll do fine if you study. He's always willing to answer questions. He really increased my interest in art history.

12/31/05  2  2  2  5
She tends to be an extremely easy grader on tests, but then takes off a lot of points on quizzes for small details. Overall, she doesn't teach well, you don't learn a lot, and she tends to give random final grades that have more to do with how much you suck up versus how much you know. Avoid her.

11/18/05  2  5  5  3
Brilliant Prof. Comes off as a pain in the arse, but he's really a nice guy as long as you prove yourself to be interested and thoughtful. Do the readings and don't be afraid to challenge him. You probably won't win an argument, but he'll respect you for it. One of my favorites.

12/19/05  4  1  2  5
Very disappointing class, for an interesting topic, he makes class very dull. He is narrow minded, and repeats the same lesson over and over. Grades fairly easy on papers though.

11/16/05  3  5  5  4
Hes a really good teacher and if you do the reading and participate, then the essays aren't hard. I found him very helpful and would love to take another one of his classes. Definitely recommend him for anyone taking UW and thought this class was very useful.

12/17/05  1  3  4  3
ATTENTION: This class is not to be confused with "rocks for jocks". It is boring as hell, he never stops talking, and frankly...who gives a damn about. But if studying for hours upon hours, and keeping up w/ your assignments, and getting all 90s on the labs...but still getting a C+ is what you're looking for....then by all means, take this class.
9/29/05  4 5 5 2 😊
Fantastic teacher. Lectures are clear and interesting. Tests are straightforward if you pay attention in class and look over your notes. The Professor is extremely helpful and really tries to make class interesting.

12/13/05  1 1 1 5 😞
Totally unprofessional, a total snot-nose, obnoxious, and didn't teach the whole second half. Plays favorites and I wasn't one of them. This was a 5 person course and there was universal condemnation. This man should be locked in a booth doing research.

9/12/05  3 5 5 4 😊
she is so sweet so nice so fun just a great person and a great professor take her class and speak french right after the semester.. i love her

12/7/05  2 1 1 3 😊
The amount of things wrong with this class won't fit here. Just don't take it. Trust me.

9/7/05  3 5 5 4 😊
Great section leader. Truly helps students learn and become engaged in understanding educational technology.

11/1/05  4 1 1 2 😊
The professor was awful. For a 2 credit course, the workload was unreasonable and he wasn't knowledgeable. I have a marketing background, and the best he could do was talk about a few token consulting gigs from his past. Not sure if he ever actually did any marketing.

9/2/05  2 5 5 5 😊
brilliant and kind. fairly difficult teacher, because she pays attention and expects well of you. she was great!

8/29/05  2 1 2 3 😞
worst prof ever....and the crankiest, most unclear woman who makes you completely lose any interest you ever had in anthropology. i don't know if she's still at gw but avoid her at all costs!