I. Guiding Principles & Parameters
1. The University should rename the current “CourseEvalUM” system to better communicate that it gathers students’ perceptions and experiences about a course or instructor and does not serve as an evaluation.

2. The University should replace the existing CourseEvalUM items with new survey items that follow these principles:
   a. The number of University-level items should stay within the current length of the survey instrument.
   b. The survey items should focus on measuring progress relative to baseline teaching practices and on utilization of best practices of teaching effectiveness.
   c. The survey should include only those items that students can reliably answer and should focus on those items where students are the best or only source of data.
   d. The majority of survey items should be designed so that responses can inform actionable changes by the instructor.
   e. The survey items should be written using language that makes clear what is being asked of students.
   f. Students should understand who will be reviewing their responses, in order to inform their thinking as they are filling out the survey.
   g. The survey items should focus on asking students to speak to their own student experience, rather than asking for general feedback or input based on other students’ experiences, unless there is a compelling rationale to do otherwise.
   h. The survey items should be relevant for in-person, blended, and online courses.
   i. The survey items should clearly indicate whether they relate to the instructor or the course.
   j. The survey items should be positively worded so that a high score on an item is positive and a low score indicates that adjustments in practices may be needed.

3. The survey item development process should involve a pilot or other mechanism for testing and refining the new items.

4. The Course Evaluation Advisory Group and Office of Institutional Research, Planning, & Assessment (IRPA) should provide an informational report to the Senate on new survey items to gather feedback before implementation.

5. The University should consider ways to ensure that survey results are not utilized as the sole basis for giving teaching awards or for assessing progress towards accreditation standards.

II. Recommendations on Constructs & Items
1. The Course Evaluation Advisory Group and IRPA should work with subject-matter experts to develop new survey items that align with constructs that assess teaching effectiveness, inform
student registration decisions, provide opportunities for open-feedback, and allow for feedback on teaching assistants as follows:

**Constructs that Assess Baseline and Best Practices in Teaching Effectiveness**
- Timely feedback; clear assignment expectations; clear grading expectations; focus on course content in class sessions; value of required texts; climate; instructor support; quality feedback; scaffolding; cognitive engagement and/or rigor; and alignment of instruction to assessment

**Constructs that Inform Student Registration Decisions**
- Course satisfaction; instructor satisfaction; time invested; major/non-major

**Constructs for Open-Ended Feedback**
- Positive aspects and areas for improvement

**Constructs Related to Teaching Assistants**
- Climate; timely feedback; effective use of class time; open-ended item on positive aspects; open-ended item on areas for improvement

2. The Course Evaluation Advisory Group, in consultation with the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center (TLTC), should develop a bank of additional items—based on baseline and best practices of teaching effectiveness and literature in the field—that Colleges/Schools and units may include in addition to the University-level items.

3. The University should limit Colleges/Schools and units to a maximum of five additional survey items, which should be developed in consultation with the TLTC.

4. The Course Evaluation Advisory Group should carefully consider the order in which items are presented to students on the survey and whether they should correspond to the order of responses provided in reports available to administrators and instructors.

5. The Course Evaluation Advisory Group should ensure that survey items are clearly identified as applying to either the instructor or to the course.

**III. Recommendations on Implementation and Usage of Survey Results**
1. The University should encourage instructors to gather mid-semester feedback on their teaching, using tools such as Qualtrics and resources provided by the TLTC.

2. The University should encourage instructors to set aside time in class for students to complete surveys and to explain to students the value and impact of survey responses on teaching practices.

3. The University should make numeric data from survey results available to instructors, administrators, and students. Responses to open-ended items should remain accessible to instructors and administrators only, not students.

4. The University should consider ways to incorporate survey results in information available to students during the course selection process.
5. The Course Evaluation Advisory Group should prioritize efforts to add existing CourseEvalUM data and future survey results to the data warehouse.

6. IRPA should discontinue the practice of including department-wide and College-wide averages across all courses of a given level in survey results.

7. The University should again make course grade distributions available to students.

8. The University should not release survey results from courses with fewer than 5 students and should continue the practice of not releasing results to students if the response rate for a given course is less than 70%.

9. The University should consider how best to ensure that survey results are not utilized as the sole basis for personnel determinations of PTK faculty.

10. The Provost’s Office should develop guidance on best practices for utilizing statistical analysis of data from survey results in the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) and Annual Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion (AEP) processes.
Recommended Constructs
The below constructs represent specific practices associated with teaching effectiveness. While example item text is provided parenthetically to illuminate the constructs, the committee is not recommending these specific items. Actual items and wording would be developed by subject-matter experts, tested using cognitive interviews, and piloted before being adopted.

Constructs that Assess Baseline and Best Practices in Teaching Effectiveness
- **Timely feedback** (e.g. “I get timely feedback on my work” or “The instructor returned assignments and exams in a timely manner”)
- **Clear assignment expectations** (e.g. “Assignment expectations are clear to me” or “The instructor provided guidance for understanding course exercises”)
- **Clear grading expectations** (e.g. “Grading criteria are clear to me” or “The instructor grades consistently with the evaluation criteria”)
- **Focuses on course content in class sessions** (e.g. “Class sessions help me learn course material” or “The instructor used time effectively”)
- **Value of required texts** (e.g. “The required texts (e.g., books, course packs, online resources) help me learn course material”)
- **Climate** (e.g. “The instructor helps students feel welcome” or “The instructor treats students with respect”)
- **Instructor support** (e.g. “I think the instructor wants students to succeed” or “The instructor was helpful when I had difficulties or questions”)
- **Quality feedback** (e.g. “The feedback (e.g., grades, comments, discussions, rubric scores) I get from the instructor helps me improve” or “The instructor provided constructive feedback”)
- **Scaffolding** (e.g. “My instructor helps me understand new content by connecting it to things I already know” or “The course presented skills in a helpful sequence”)
- **Cognitive engagement and/or rigor** (e.g. “The course developed my ability to think critically about the subject” or “This course was intellectually challenging”)
- **Alignment of instruction to assessment** (e.g. “Assessments (e.g., tests, quizzes, papers) relate to course content” or “Graded assignments helped me understand the course material”)

Constructs that Inform Student Registration Decisions
- **Course satisfaction** (e.g. “I would recommend this class” or “This course made me want to learn more about the subject”)
- **Instructor satisfaction** (e.g. “I would take another course from this instructor if given the opportunity” or “I consistently enjoyed coming to class” or “I enjoyed learning from this instructor”)
- **Time invested** (e.g. “On average, about how much time did you spend on this class each week (e.g., doing homework, meeting with project team, studying)?”)
- **Major/Non-Major** (e.g. “How does this class fit into your academic plan or course of study?”)

Constructs for Open-Ended Feedback
- **Positive aspects** (e.g. “What did the instructor do that helped improve your learning in this course?”)
- **Areas for improvement** (e.g. “What could the instructor do better or differently next time to help improve your learning in this course?”)

Constructs Related to Teaching Assistants
- Climate, timely feedback, effective use of class time, open-ended item on positive aspects, pen-ended item on areas for improvement