Results of CSU Teaching Evaluation – Spring 2010

(prepared by Office of Institutional Research, San Jose State University, April 27, 2010)

Participated		Not Participated
1. Bakersfield	12. Monterey Bay	23. Stanislaus
2. Channel Island	13. Northridge	
3. Chico	14. Pomona	
4. Dominguez Hills	15. Sacramento	
5. East Bay	16. San Bernardino	
6. Fresno	17. San Diego	
7. Fullerton	18. San Francisco	
8. Humboldt	19. San Jose	
9. Long Beach	20. San Marcos	
10. Los Angeles	21. SLO	
11. Maritime Academy	22. Sonoma	

What is the current status of your teaching evaluation on your campus?

Survey Options:	# (%)	Campuses
Completely online evaluation	4	San Bernardino, San Diego, Channel Islands, Monterey Bay
Both paper and online evaluation, but mostly online	0	
Both paper and online evaluation, but mostly paper	6	Dominguez Hills, San Jose, Pomona, Northridge, Bakersfield, San Francisco
Complete paper evaluation	10	Los Angeles, Fresno, Chico, Sacramento, East Bay, Maritime Academy, San Marcos, Fullerton, Long Beach, Humboldt, Sonoma
No teaching evaluation at all	0	
Don't know	1	SLO

How is your teaching evaluation administered on your campus?

Survey Options:	# (%)	Campuses
Same evaluation is used across campus	13	Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Maritime Academy, Monterey Bay, San Bernardino, San Jose, San Marcos, Sonoma, Monterey Bay
Each college has its own evaluation	1	San Diego
Each department has its own evaluation(s)	7	Fresno, Fullerton, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, SLO, San Francisco
No teaching evaluation at all	0	

What is the department/unit in charge of administering these evaluations and analyzing the results?

	# (%)	Campuses
Institutional Research	6	San Jose, Long Beach, Northridge, Sonoma, San Marcos, Fresno
Academic Computing/IT	2	San Bernardino, Fullerton
Dean's or Chair's Offices	0.5	Humboldt, Bakersfield (paper only)
Center for Teaching and Learning	2.5	Sacramento, Maritime Academy, Bakersfield (online only)
Testing Office	3	East Bay, Chico, San Francisco
Outsourcing	1	Channel Islands
Unknown/Not Responded	5	Los Angeles, SLO, San Marcos, Monterey Bay

What was the campus strategy (procedure) for implementing for implementing an online evaluation?

Dominguez Hills: We designed a procedure in which the identified classes and student rosters are uploaded by IT to a server. E-mail notifications are sent to students on their student accounts advising them that they may begin the online PTE process. There is a link in the e-mail message which students click on to complete the evaluations. We tested this procedure with three cohorts of volunteer courses, and are now administering it to all full Professors and for our online classes (the latter being primarily Nursing, MBA and MPA courses).
San Bernardino: The Faculty Senate appointed a committee who decided to revamp the old version of the faculty evaluation. They came up with a new set of questions and implemented it using Campus Climate (i.e., scanners, software). Classes to be evaluated are selected by departments. Paper evaluations are handed out in classes a few weeks before classes end. These evaluations are scanned through a machine that reads responses and takes snapshots of open-ended comments. Data are compiled by Academic Personnel. The IR office also receives the data and adds a report by college on the mean and frequency of responses by items.
Channel Island: We adopted not just online administration, but also a new instrument. Over the course of two years, two large task forces composed of Faculty from most of our academic programs met to develop the content of this evaluation form. In Spring 2008 the Academic Senate voted to submit the form to a pilot study which was conducted in Fall 2008. Based on the data gathered and discussed, the Senate voted in Spring 2009 to adopt an online version of the Student Ratings of Teaching (SRT) instrument. Simultaneously with the development of the instrument, staff from Faculty Affairs, along with our Faculty Development Director, reviewed various vendor options (knowing in advance that we did not have the capacity to build a home-grown system), and ultimately chose AMS CoursEval. Implementation has been technically very smooth.
Northridge: The departments offering on-line courses have developed their own forms. IR just processes and summarizes evaluations; we do not get involved in the development of form content. In the case of online courses, we send out an e-mail inviting students to evaluate their courses using Class Climate. Needless to say, the response is poor in most cases.
San Marcos: Faculty Affairs Committee of Senate developed an online evaluation with the advent of online courses.