ED 038 964   JC 700 121

AUTHOR   Krupka, John G.
TITLE   Peport on Faculty and Student Evaluation of
                Instructor Rating Questionnaire.
PUB DATE   Mar 70
NOTE   11p.

EDRS PRICE   EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS   *Evaluation Criteria, Faculty Evaluation, *Junior
                Colleges, *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT
        A comparison of faculty and student evaluation of an
instructor-rating questionnaire at Northampton County Area Community
College, Pennsylvania, is the subject of this report. Students and
faculty members were asked to specify the relative importance of 12
given areas considered in instructor evaluation, and then to suggest
scores between 10 and zero for both a theoretically excellent and
poor teacher in each of the 12 areas. The comparison of responses
suggests that: a highly positive correlation exists between each
group's rating of the areas: the areas are not considered as having
equal importance; and the mean ratings of students indicating scores
for the excellent and poor teacher in each area were consistently
higher than those given by the faculty. [Not available in hard copy
due to marginal legibility of original document.] (JO)

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Report on Faculty and Student Evaluation of Instructor Rating Questionnaire

by John G. Krupka

March 1970

Faculty and students at Northampton County Area Community College participated in the evaluation of an Instructor Rating Questionnaire (IRQ). This report compares the way the faculty and students rated the twelve areas of the IRQ and the scores that they thought represented good and poor rating for each area. A copy of the questionnaire is appended.

One hundred and sixty students, selected systematically from the total list of students by the Office of Instruction, were sent the IRQ. Sixty returned and valid questionnaires represent the students' evaluation.

The first area of concern was whether or not the faculty and students felt that the twelve rating areas were equivalent, i.e., that each one is equal in importance in judging a teacher. Both groups were asked to rank the twelve areas from 1 to 12, from most important to least important. If each area was equivalent one would expect a mean rating of 6.50 for each area.

The following are the twelve rating areas:

1. Instructor's Knowledge of Subject
11. Organization of Course
111. Assignments
1V. Ability to Arouse Interest-Skill in Guiding the Learning Process
V. Classroom Presentation
V1. Mannerisms
V11. Grading
V111. Willingness to Help
1X. Speech and Enunciation
X. Use of Language
X1. General Estimate of Teacher
X11. General Estimate of the Course

The mean ratings and their standard deviations were computed for both groups. Standard deviation is a measure of central tendency. The smaller the S.D., the more numbers center around the mean. The following table compares the ratings of the two groups.

Distribution of Mean Ratings of the Twelve Areas of the IRQ by Faculty and Students (*)

AREA	FACULTY		STUDENTS	
	mean	S. D.	mean	S. D.
I	2.93	2.37 (1)	2.27	1.53 (1)
II	4.12	2.44 (4)	3.56	1.41 (3)
III	5.74	2.42 (5)	7.90	2.36 (7)
IV	3.51	2.67 (2)	2.67	1.85 (2)
V	4.00	2.31 (3)	4.25	2.31 (4)
VI	8.11	3.23 (8)	8.97	2.24 (10)
VII	7.35	2.45 (7)	7.57	2.51 (6)
VIII	6.11	2.63 (6)	5.25	2.06 (5)
IX	8.35	1.95 (9)	8.37	2.08 (8)
X	8.46	2.23 (10)	8.50	1.20 (9)
XI	8.86	3.21 (11)	9.30	3.19 (11)
XII	10.40	2.39 (12)	9.57	3.16 (12)

(*) The numbers in parentheses represent the ranking of the area. For example, both the faculty and the students rank areas I and IV as first and second in importance in the judgment of a teacher.

The rank-difference coefficient of correlation was computed between the rankings of the two groups and this is equal to 0.95. The interpretation is that there exists a very strong positive relationship between the way faculty judge these areas and the way students judge these areas.

Using the theoretical mean rating (6.50) as a point of division of those areas that are most important and least important, the areas judged most important by each group are:

Important Areas in the Evaluation of a Teacher

Faculty	Students
(1) Instru. Know. of Subject	(1) Instru. Know. of Subject
(2) Ability to Arouse Interest	(2) Ability to Arouse Interest
(3) Classroom presentation	(3) Organization of Course
(4) Organization of Course	(4) Classroom presentation
(5) Assignments	(5) Willingness to Help
(6) Willingness to Help	

In a comparison of the standard deviation of each group it can be seen that the students are more homogeneous in their thinking.

Conclusions:

(1) that both faculty and students feel that the twelve areas are not equivalent.

(2) that the faculty and the students rate the areas in a highly positive correlated manner.

The second area of concern is what scores reflect excellent and poor ratings of an instructor in each of the twelve areas. The students were asked to give a score, from 10 to 0, for a theoretical excellent teacher and theoretical poor teacher for each of the twelve areas. The following table compares the ratings of the two groups.

Faculty-Student Theoretical Ratings

| | Faculty | | | | Student | | | |
| | E | | P | | E | | P | |
Area	mean	S. D.	mean	S. D.	mean	S. D.	mean	S. D.
I	8.23	0.88	2.58	1.29	9.25	0.77	3.48	2.28
II	8.02	1.12	2.60	1.27	8.45	1.11	3.20	1.96
III	7.47	1.45	2.32	1.18	7.85	1.36	3.03	2.06
IV	7.61	1.53	2.07	1.46	9.27	1.07	2.65	1.88
V	7.53	1.28	2.23	1.13	8.63	1.02	3.28	1.59
VI	6.88	1.64	2.28	1.34	7.77	1.45	3.18	2.20
VII	7.51	1.68	2.44	1.59	8.55	1.24	3.37	1.93
VIII	7.65	1.43	2.18	1.14	9.35	0.86	3.23	2.31
IX	7.11	1.38	2.07	0.95	8.15	1.26	3.52	2.28
X	7.02	1.47	2.04	1.02	8.27	1.18	3.53	2.08
XI	7.33	1.79	2.02	1.09	8.68	1.26	2.97	1.80
XII	6.49	2.48	1.65	1.20	8.57	1.21	3.27	2.08

The first thing that should be noted in the table is the consistant manner in which the faculty's rating of an excellent teacher is less than that of the students rating. This difference in mean ratings for the theoretical excellent teacher is significant at the .001 level. This difference could be caused by the "self-protection" effect. The faculty also feel that a poor teacher would be indicated by a lower score than that indicated by the students.

If all areas are rated equally, as they are now, the grand mean ratings for each category for each group is:

Grand Mean Ratings

| | Faculty | | Student | |
	Excellent	Poor	Excellent	Poor
Mean	7.40	2.21	8.57	3.23
S.D.	1.51	1.22	1.15	2.04

Using the students ratings for each area, and assuming these ratings of a theoretical teacher reflect the ratings these students would in fact make for a real live excellent instructor, then area norms can be established. These norm ranges will be established using the following method: for Area I the mean and standard deviation of the students rating for an excellent teacher are 9.25 and 0.77 respectively. A range of 9.25 ± 0.77 would represent the range in which most excellent teacher ratings would fall. A teacher receiving a rating below 9.25 - 0.77 = 8.48 would be judged not an excellent teacher. A teacher receiving a rating above mean + S. D. would really be an exceptionally excellent teacher. This same procedure will be used to determine area normative ranges for a poor teacher.

Normative Student Ratings of An Excellent Teacher

Area	Normative Range
I	8.48 - 10.00
II	7.34 - 9.56
III	6.49 - 9.21
IV	8.20 - 10.00
V	7.61 - 9.65
VI	6.32 - 9.22
VII	7.31 - 9.79
VIII	8.49 - 10.00
IX	6.89 - 9.41
X	7.09 - 9.45
XI	7.42 - 9.94
XII	7.36 - 9.78
Grand Mean	7.42 - 9.67

Normative Student Ratings of a Poor Teacher

Area	Normative Range
I	5.76 - 1.20
II	5.16 - 1.24
III	5.09 - 0.97
IV	4.53 - 0.77
V	4.87 - 1.69
VI	5.38 - 0.98
VII	5.30 - 1.44
VIII	5.54 - 0.92
IX	5.80 - 1.24
X	5.61 - 1.45
XI	4.77 - 1.17
XII	5.35 - 1.19
Grand Mean	5.26 - 1.19

The third area of concern of this study was student opinion of the IRQ. When the students were surveyed they were asked to comment on the rating questionnaire, was it good, bad, were there areas to delete or add. It seemed, to this researcher, that most of the students took advantage of this opportunity. The Instruction Office has recorded these comments.

Final Conclusions and Implications:

1. The scoring and evaluation of the ratings of the IRQ should be changed.

2. The actual ratings should be compared with these theoretical ratings.

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

INSTRUCTOR RATING QUESTIONNAIRE

PURPOSE

The main task of the college is teaching. It is of first importance that the college be continuously informed of the quality of its teaching and the respects in which that teaching can be improved. Students are in a position to judge the quality of teaching from direct experience, and in order to secure this information, you are asked to rate your instructor on the questionnaire which is attached.

TO THE STUDENT

Space is provided on the questionnaire for you to include comments after each question. Please make comments that will clarify your rating and/or that will help the instructor in improving his teaching. You are asked to sign your evaluation (on this cover sheet which will be detached and turned in separately), but the cover sheet with your signature will never be identified with the questionnaire by the instructor unless your permission has first been obtained by the Dean of Instruction. However, the instructor, his Division Chairman and/or the Dean of Instruction may review the completed questionnaires (without the cover sheets) and the comments you made on them.

_____
Date

_____
Course title and section

_____
Instructor

_____
Your signature

DIRECTIONS

For each item on the questionnaire that you feel you can answer, circle the place on the rating scale which seems to you most appropriate for the instructor you are rating. The highest possible rating for an item is 10; the lowest is 0, with nine gradations between. To aid you in making your marking, note the three descriptions for each item -- the one at the left for the best rating, the one at the right for the poorest rating.

PLEASE MAKE COMMENTS THAT WILL CLARIFY YOUR RATING IN THE SPACE PROVIDED AFTER EACH QUESTION.

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

INSTRUCTOR RATING QUESTIONNAIRE

Date

Course title and section

Instructor

1. INSTRUCTOR'S KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Knowledge of subject
broad and accurate

Knowledge of subject
somewhat limited
occasionally

Knowledge of subject
occasionally deficient
or inaccurate

Comment on whether his knowledge of the subject is up-to-date...AND/OR...Pin-point areas of excellence or weakness...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. ORGANIZATION OF COURSE

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Course exceptionally well
organized.

Course satisfactorily
organized

Organization very poor

Comment on whether the textbooks are particularly appropriate...AND/OR...
Comment on whether the course organization aided your note-taking...AND/OR...
Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. ASSIGNMENTS

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

Exceptionally clear and reasonable; coordinated with class work; imaginative & well-constructed

Clear, reasonable, coordinated with class work

Confused or indefinite or unrelated to class work

Comment on whether time allowed for assignments was sufficient...AND/OR... Pin-point areas of excellence or weakness...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. ABILITY TO AROUSE INTEREST - SKILL IN GUIDING THE LEARNING PROCESS

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

Interest among students usually runs high

Students seem interested

Majority of students inattentive most of time.

Comment on the ways he stimulated your thinking or encouraged your participation...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. CLASSROOM PRESENTATION

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

Classroom techniques always skillful and well-chosen

Classroom techniques generally effective

Classroom techniques often inappropriate or unskillful

Comment on whether he employs a variety of techniques (lecture, discussion, demonstration, visual aids)...AND/OR...Pin-point areas of excellence or weakness AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. **MANNERISMS**

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Mannerisms pleasing   Mannerisms not   Constantly exhibits
                                       objectionable   annoying mannerisms

Pin-point examples (speech, gestures) worthy of mention...AND/OR...Comment
on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. **GRADING**

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Always fair and impar-   Usually fair and   Unfair; shows partiality
tial; makes comments that   impartial
are helpful to student

Comment on whether the system of grading was made clear to the class or
yourself...AND/OR...Comment on whether the tests adequately covered the
content of the course...AND/OR...Explain your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. **WILLINGNESS TO HELP**

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Always willing   Willing to help   Unwilling to help
to help students   students   students

Comment on whether the instructor was available to you...AND/OR...Comment on
the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. SPEECH AND ENUNCIATION

   10   9   8   7   6   5   4   3   2   1   0
   Speaks clearly and   Speaks clearly and   Words sometimes Indis-
   distinctly; has varied   distinctly   tinct and hard to hear
   or vivid style

   Pin-point areas of excellence or weakness...AND/OR...Comment on the reason
   for your rating: _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

10. USE OF LANGUAGE

   10   9   8   7   6   5   4   3   2   1   0
   Uses language carefully;   Uses language appro-   Uses language too
   improves vocabulary of   priate to the level   difficult for the
   the class.   of the class   class

   Make suggestions...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

11. GENERAL ESTIMATE OF TEACHER

   10   9   8   7   6   5   4   3   2   1   0
   Very superior teacher   Average teacher   Very poor teacher

   Comment on what advice you would give to a friend who was considering taking
   a course from this instructor...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating:

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

12. GENERAL ESTIMATE OF THE COURSE

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

One of the most inter-
esting, informative, use-
ful, personally helpful
courses

About average in inter-
est, usefulness, etc.

One of the least inter-
esting, informative,
useful, personally
helpful courses

Comment on whether you think the course is too difficult for the level
intended...AND/OR...Make suggestions...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for
your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____