



STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS

By

Lisa C. Toms, DBA
Assistant Professor of Marketing
College of Business
Southern Arkansas University
P.O. Box 9194
Magnolia, Arkansas 71754
870-235-4311, lctoms@saumag.edu

H. Sam Riner, Jr., DBA, CPA
Associate Professor of Accounting
College of Business
Southern Arkansas University
P.O. Box 9129
Magnolia, Arkansas 71754
870-235-4318, hsriner@saumag.edu

ABSTRACT

This study examined student participation in the evaluation of faculty members, including student beliefs about how student evaluations are used, how they should be used, and the relative importance of different uses of evaluation results. To gather data, a survey was conducted of students at Southern Arkansas University, a state-supported institution with approximately 3,000 students. 349 students completed the survey instrument from a diverse cross-section of the student population.

The authors hypothesized that students are somewhat distrustful of the evaluation process in terms of the importance of their participation and the uses that would be made of evaluation results. The study results indicate that students believe the most important reason for student

evaluations of faculty should be to improve the quality of teaching of faculty members. The study results also indicate that freshmen are more likely to believe that student evaluations are important than sophomores, juniors, and seniors. Another finding was that students with higher GPAs are more likely to doubt the fairness of evaluations and are also more likely to believe that the results are subjective.

The authors concluded that students do in fact distrust the evaluation process, but the level of distrust depends on other factors such as classification and GPA. Students believe that too little emphasis is placed on the results of student evaluations and that their participation may be a waste of their time.

Some of the findings were contradictory and need further study. Students indicated in their responses to some survey questions that evaluation results should have little impact on whether faculty should continue to be employed by the university but ranked continued employment as an important use of evaluation results. The study results indicate that more work is needed to get students to buy in to the evaluation process.

Student Participation in the Evaluation of Faculty Members

Student evaluations of faculty are widely utilized in higher education. However, student evaluation instruments are not standardized, and the amount of emphasis placed on the results of student evaluations differs from institution to institution and may differ within academic units of the same institution.

Several factors can impact the amount of emphasis placed on student evaluations. For example, institutions that define their mission as primarily teaching would likely place greater emphasis on the results of student evaluations than would institutions that define their mission as primarily research.

Criticisms of Student Evaluations

Despite their widespread use as an assessment tool, student evaluations have been roundly criticized by students and faculty alike. Students sometimes doubt that their opinions really matter and are truly anonymous. Some faculty members fear that students will evaluate them unfairly and give them low evaluations if their classes are difficult or grades are low.

Some institutions compare student evaluations of faculty without regard to teaching

experience or rank. When this is the case, less experienced faculty can feel pressured to dumb down their classes in order to avoid bad student evaluations, while tenured faculty may feel that student evaluations are unnecessary for them, because they have already demonstrated their teaching ability. Tenured faculty at some institutions have the option to select which classes will be subject to student evaluations or are exempt from the process.

In institutions with graduate programs, teaching assistants are sometimes instructed by senior faculty members to place little emphasis on teaching and concentrate on research, because research is essential for promotion and tenure. In fact, new full-time faculty members may not have any previous teaching experience.

In essence, student evaluations are at best flawed. Yet, most institutions regard them to be an essential element of the assessment process, and the authors of this study strongly believe that faculty members value constructive criticism as a means of improving their teaching skills. This paper examines and compares the perceptions of students and faculty about the student evaluation process.

Review of Literature

Chen et al (1984) examined marketing students' perceptions of teaching (student) evaluations. Their study applied expectancy theory to evaluate some key factors that motivate students in participating in the teaching evaluation process. Their results showed that students generally consider the improvement of teaching to be the most important outcome of teaching evaluations, followed by the improvement of course content and format. The least important outcome was making the results of evaluations available for students' decisions on course and instructor selection. Another finding was that students' motivation to participate in teaching evaluations is also affected by their expectation that they will be able to provide meaningful contact.

Clayson (2004) examined the reciprocity effect in student evaluations of instructors teaching marketing classes. He found that grades given to students and evaluations given to instructors are related. Every prediction made by a reciprocity hypothesis was validated.

Gillmore and Greenwald (1999) reported that out of six published studies that manipulated grading leniency in actual classrooms, all found higher evaluations from students when grading was more lenient. Goldberg and Calahan (1991) found a highly significant

difference between the evaluations of business instructors who were more lenient and those who were less lenient.

Clayson and Haley (1990) found that academic rigor was not significantly related directly to teaching evaluations, but academic rigor was significantly positively related to learning and negatively related to personality and fairness. The combined overall effect of rigor was significant and negative; students admitted that they would learn more in a class with rigor, but their overall evaluations lessened as rigor increased.

The authors hypothesize that students are somewhat distrustful of the evaluation process in terms of the importance of their participation and the uses that would be made of evaluation results. A lack of understanding of students' perceptions of this process can lead to a general distrust by both faculty and administration of the results.

Design of Study

A survey was conducted of students at Southern Arkansas University, a state-supported institution with approximately 3,000 students, in the spring semester of 2005 during the week that student evaluations of faculty were administered. The survey questions were designed to elicit information about the participant's beliefs and attitudes concerning student evaluations. Most question responses were structured as Likert scales. Six items measured opinions about the reasons student evaluations of faculty are given, while nine items sought to determine the respondents' beliefs about how student evaluations *should* be used. Additionally, a ranking question concerning the appropriate use of the evaluations was used to check face validity of students' opinions. Five items used semantic differential scales to further test the validity of the responses. A copy of the instrument is included in the appendix.

The survey was administered in thirteen classes representing three of the four academic colleges at SAU. While no courses within the College of Education were surveyed, a number of the respondents identified themselves as Education majors. The following table presents the number of questionnaires completed and the classes in which they were administered. As indicated, a broad cross-section of the student population was surveyed.

Table 1
Courses Selected for Sample

Course Number	Course Number	Instructor Name	Surveys Completed
ENGL 1113	Honors Comp II	Belcher	12
ECON 1003	American Enterprise	Warrick	20
ECON 1003	American Enterprise	Toms	11
BIOL 2073	Anatomy & Physio II	Daniels	77
HIST 2023	US History II	Johnson	17
CJ 2003	Intro to Crim. Justice	Ulsberger	17
NURS 1007	Care Non-Acute Ind.	Tradewell	39
ACCT 2003 (2 sections)	Prin. Of Acct. I	Riner	57
PSCY 3123	Child Psychology	Otey	17
MKTG 3033	Prin. Of Marketing	Toms	28
MGMT 4093(2 sections)	Strategy & Policy	Wise	52
Total			347

When asked to indicate their major, 43 separate majors were recorded by the respondents.

Survey Results

Demographic data were gathered for gender, age, class level, GPA, and course load. The results were as follows, along with a comparison of the overall student population demographics:

Table 2
Gender of Students

Male	Female	Total
135	207	342
39.5%	60.5%	100.00%
SAU = 41.2%	SAU=58.8%	

Table 3
Age of Students

18 and Under	19 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 and Over	Total
28	255	42	14	5	344
8.14%	74.13%	12.21%	4.07%	1.45%	100.00%

The sample characteristics for gender and age are consistent with the characteristics of the population of the university. The university has a greater percentage of female students, and students tend to be traditional students or students beginning/returning in a relatively short time after graduating from high school.

Table 4

Class Level						
Frosh	Sophs	Juniors	Seniors	Graduate	Other	Total
76	87	77	98	4	4	344
22.09%	25.29%	22.38%	28.49%	1.16%	1.16%	100.00%
SAU=25.8%	SAU=20.6%	SAU=17.6%	SAU = 28.8.2%	SAU = 6.5%	SAU=3.4%	

All class levels are well represented except for graduate and other students. Southern Arkansas University has a very limited number of graduate programs.

**Table 5
GPA**

No Credits	< = 1.99	2.00 to 2.49	2.50 to 2.99	3.00 to 3.49	3.50 or >	Total
3	5	36	88	127	80	344
.09%	1.5%	10.5%	25.6%	36.9%	23.3%	100.00

**Table 6
Course Load**

Full-Time	Part-Time	Total
337	7	344
98.0%	2.0%	100.00%
SAU=82.7%	SAU=17.3%	

Questions one through three of the survey asked the students about the frequency of student evaluations, their attitudes toward student evaluations, and their perception of faculty attitudes toward evaluations. Regarding the mean reported on these three questions, the responses “too often” and “very seriously” were coded as a three, “often enough” and “somewhat seriously” were coded as a two, and “not enough” and “not at all seriously” were coded as a one.

General Attitudes of Students Toward Evaluations of Faculty

Questions one through three of the survey asked the students about the frequency of student evaluations, their attitudes toward student evaluations, and their perception of faculty attitudes toward evaluations.

Table 7

Frequency of Student Evaluations

Too Often	Often Enough	Not Enough	Total
24	274	49	347
6.92%	78.96%	14.12%	100.00%

The sample result clearly indicates that the students believe that student evaluations are given frequently enough. About twice the number of students felt that the frequency was not enough rather than too often.

Table 8
Most Students Take Evaluations of Faculty

Very Seriously	Somewhat Seriously	Not at All Seriously	Total
43	229	76	348
12.36%	65.80%	21.84%	100.00%

Table 9
Most Faculty Take Evaluations of Faculty

Very Seriously	Somewhat Seriously	Not at All Seriously	Total
92	184	70	346
26.59%	53.18%	20.23%	100.00%

The sample results indicate that students believe they take evaluations of faculty less seriously than the faculty. At Southern Arkansas University, student evaluations are administered by other faculty members. Those who administer the evaluations do not handle finished evaluations and are instructed to stress the anonymity of results and that results are not given to the evaluated faculty members until after the end of the semester and grades are submitted. Faculty members are encouraged not to talk about their evaluations either before or after they are administered.

Student Beliefs About Why Evaluations Are Given

Questions four through nine asked the students about the reasons student evaluations are given. Responses were on a Likert scale with five being strongly agree, three being neither agree nor disagree, and one being strongly disagree.

Table 10

Why Student Evaluations Are Given

	Strongly Agree = 5	4	Neither Agree Nor Disagree = 3	2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Total	Mean
They are required by law.	39	74	158	41	36	348	3.11
Faculty value feedback.	107	130	68	25	19	349	3.80
They are the only way students get to grade teachers	145	107	57	23	17	349	3.97
The administration needs the information to make good decisions about the faculty.	116	123	76	23	10	348	3.90
Faculty need to know whether or not they are doing a good job.	169	120	42	9	9	349	4.23
They help "weed out" bad faculty.	56	51	105	64	73	340	2.87

The sample results indicate that students most strongly agree that evaluations are given because faculty want to know whether or not they are doing a good job. The students most strongly disagree that evaluations are used to help weed out bad faculty. The overall conclusion from this series of questions is that students believe that evaluations are mandatory and used in a positive way by faculty. They do not believe that they are used to get rid of bad faculty members.

What Students Believe Faculty Evaluations Should Be Used For

Questions ten through eighteen were asked to determine what students believe that student evaluations of faculty should be used for.

Table 11
Why Student Evaluations Should Be Given

	Strong Agree 5	4	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Total	Mean
Used to determine which professors are better teachers	82	96	99	42	30	349	3.45
Used to determine which professors should receive pay raises	54	62	127	52	54	349	3.03
Used to determine which professors should be terminated	79	60	111	48	50	348	3.20
Used by faculty to make them better teachers	184	109	35	10	10	348	4.28
Used to determine which professors should be promoted	71	90	125	29	34	349	3.39
Used to determine which professors	137	122	58	17	15	349	4.00

should receive special recognition for excellence in teaching							
Used to determine which professors should receive tenure	60	93	138	31	25	347	3.38
Used to determine which professors should not receive a contract for the next semester	55	54	116	62	59	346	2.95
Available to be viewed by other students to determine which instructor to take for a class	112	67	68	40	57	344	3.54

The results for what students believe faculty evaluations should be used for are mostly consistent with what they believe they are used for. Students most strongly believe that evaluations should be used by faculty to make them better teachers and to give them special recognition for excellence in teaching. They most strongly disagree that evaluations should be used to determine which faculty members should not get a contract for the next semester.

The students were then asked in question 19 to rank five uses for student evaluations according to how they should be used. A one would signify the most appropriate reason and a five would signify the least appropriate reason. The results are given in Table 11.

Table 12
Importance of Uses for Evaluations

	Most Appropriate = 1				Least Appropriate = 5
To determine pay raises	10	32	80	93	93
To determine continued employment	32	115	49	39	72
To determine promotions	2	74	107	99	25
To determine tenure	8	64	60	72	102
As feedback for faculty to improve their teaching	256	22	12	2	15

Students overwhelmingly ranked feedback for faculty to improve their teaching as the most important of the five uses of student evaluations. They ranked determining continued employment as the second most important use, which is not consistent with the previous set of questions in which they most strongly disagreed that evaluations should be used to determine whether faculty should be given a contract for the following semester. Determination of tenure

was ranked as the least appropriate use. One possible explanation for this finding is that students do not fully comprehend the meaning of tenure.

The last set of questions asked students to rank pairs of descriptors in terms of which descriptor they most strongly agreed with. This was done according a seven-point Likert scale. The results are given in Table 12.

Table 13
Descriptors of Student Evaluations of Faculty

Student evaluations are:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Student evaluations are:	Mean
Objective	22	19	20	132	87	29	30	Subjective	4.38
Important	7	7	22	66	90	70	78	Unimportant	5.20
Reliable	30	26	53	105	81	23	23	Unreliable	4.00
Just a waste of time	45	68	54	100	37	20	16	Essential	3.41
Fair	12	13	29	132	68	49	38	Unfair	4.50

Though students had reacted mostly positively to previous questions about evaluations of faculty, they tended to be negative in their descriptions of evaluations. When the descriptors were paired, they picked the following descriptors: Evaluations are subjective, unimportant, just a waste of time and unfair. On the question of reliability, the results were evenly distributed between reliable and unreliable.

After examining the overall results of the research, the data was segmented according to different demographic categories to determine if any pattern could be observed. The data will be examined first according to student classification, then by self-reported GPA, and last by gender. Because the graduate and other categories represented such a small portion of the respondents, they have been eliminated.

Results by Class

Again, the students were asked to answer questions regarding three broad areas of interest. First the students were asked six questions to determine their knowledge and opinions about why evaluations are given, with responses being on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being “strongly agree” and 1 being “strongly disagree.” The table below represents the means of each question segmented by classification.

Table 14
“Student Evaluations Of Faculty Are Given Because...”

Question	Freshman Mean	Sophomore Mean	Junior Mean	Senior Mean	Overall Mean
They are required by law.	2.88	3.20	3.24	2.94	3.11
Faculty value feedback.	4.23	3.75	3.61	3.63	3.8
They are the only way students get to “grade” teachers.	3.88	3.72	4.13	4.01	3.97
The administration needs the information to make good decisions about faculty.	4.16	3.93	3.7	3.81	3.90
Faculty need to know whether or not they are doing a good job.	4.42	4.22	4.16	4.14	4.23
They help “weed out” bad faculty.	2.92	3.01	2.82	2.60	2.87

As indicated, all classes most strongly agreed with the statement that evaluations are given because faculty need to know whether they are doing a good job or not. They most strongly disagreed with the statement that evaluations are given to help “weed out” bad faculty. Only the freshman had a lower mean on an item, and this may be because of their lack of knowledge of evaluations.

The second set of questions asked the students what evaluations *should* be used for, again using a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being “strongly agree,” and 1 being “strongly disagree”. The table below indicates the means by class for each question.

Table 15
“Student Evaluations SHOULD BE...”

Question	Freshman Mean	Sophomore Mean	Junior Mean	Senior Mean	Overall Mean
Used to determine which professors are better teachers.	3.58	3.38	3.37	3.51	3.45
Used to determine which professors should receive pay raises.	2.96	2.94	2.99	3.19	3.03
Used to determine which professors should be terminated.	2.73	3.07	3.32	3.38	3.20
Used by faculty to make them better teachers.	4.64	4.05	4.33	4.28	4.28
Used to determine which professors should be promoted.	3.35	3.34	3.3	3.43	3.39
Used to determine which professors should receive special recognition for excellence in teaching.	4.04	3.8	4.04	4.01	4.0
Used to determine which professors should receive tenure.	3.35	3.29	3.36	3.46	3.38
Used to determine which professors should not receive a contract for the next semester.	2.88	2.89	2.91	3.1	2.95
Available to be viewed by other students to determine which instructor to take for a class.	4.5	3.68	3.07	3.25	3.54

Again, there seems to be no discernable difference concerning the way in which student evaluations should be used when examined according to class. All four classes most strongly agreed that evaluations should be used by faculty to make them better teachers. The highest level of agreement came from freshmen (mean 4.64) and the lowest from sophomores (mean 4.05). The three upper classes indicated that they most strongly disagreed with student evaluations being used to determine which professors should not receive a contract for the next semester. This corresponds with freshmen choosing "...which professors should be terminated" as the statement with which they most strongly disagreed (mean 2.78).

The next set of questions used a semantic differential scale to measure five descriptors of student evaluations. These scales were ranked from 1 to 7, anchored on each end with the opposite descriptors. Note that the fourth set is reversed from the others, so the mean should be interpreted differently.

Table 16
Descriptors of Student Evaluations

Descriptors	Freshman Mean	Sophomore Mean	Junior Mean	Senior Mean	Overall Mean
Objective vs. Subjective	4.6	4.27	4.27	4.24	4.38
Important vs. Unimportant	5.57	5.0	4.93	5.19	5.2
Reliable vs. Unreliable	4.23	3.97	3.93	3.84	4
Just a waste of time vs. Essential	3.41	3.34	3.22	3.65	3.41
Fair vs. Unfair	4.85	4.26	4.64	4.51	4.55

The obvious difference in this set of data is the surprising fact that freshmen consider student evaluations more important than other classes. This may be attributable to the evaluation procedures being new to those students. No one may have ever asked their opinion before. Overall, however, this data agrees with the other two sets of questions. Students at SAU understand both the importance and the intentions of the student evaluation process.

Results By Gender

The second cross-tabulation of the data will be gender specific. The three sets of questions will again be examined to determine if the two genders have differences in opinions.

Table 17
"Student Evaluations of Faculty Are Given Because..."

Question	Male Mean	Female Mean	Overall Mean
They are required by law.	3.05	3.16	3.11
Faculty value feedback.	3.7	3.88	3.8
They are the only way students get to “grade” teachers.	3.83	4.09	3.97
The administration needs the information to make good decisions about faculty.	3.94	3.86	3.90
Faculty need to know whether or not they are doing a good job.	4.19	4.26	4.23
They help “weed out” bad faculty.	2.9	2.84	2.87

Table 18
“Student Evaluations SHOULD BE...”

Question	Male Mean	Female Mean	Overall Mean
Used to determine which professors are better teachers.	3.5	3.39	3.45
Used to determine which professors should receive pay raises.	3.06	3.0	3.03
Used to determine which professors should be terminated.	3.38	3.08	3.20
Used by faculty to make them better teachers.	4.26	4.32	4.28
Used to determine which professors should be promoted.	3.43	3.37	3.39
Used to determine which professors should receive special recognition for excellence in teaching.	3.88	4.10	4.0
Used to determine which professors should receive tenure.	3.43	3.35	3.38
Used to determine which professors should not receive a contract for the next semester.	3.1	2.86	2.95
Available to be viewed by other students to determine which instructor to take for a class.	3.63	3.48	3.54

Table 19
Descriptors of Student Evaluations

Descriptors	Male Mean	Female Mean	Overall Mean
Objective vs. Subjective	4.1	4.48	4.38
Important vs. Unimportant	5.05	5.29	5.2
Reliable vs. Unreliable	3.93	4.05	4
Just a waste of time vs. Essential	3.61	3.28	3.41
Fair vs. Unfair	4.49	4.60	4.55

Examining each of the three sets of data above, we see that females tend to have slightly higher means on the strongly agree end, slightly lower means on the disagree end. This may simply indicate that females are more likely to be more expressive in their opinions. Overall, however, there was little difference between the genders and the overall means.

Results By GPA

The last cross-tabulation of the data will analyze the data by the students' self-reported GPA.

Table 20
“Student Evaluations of Faculty Are Given Because...”

Question	No credit & under 2.0	2.0 – 2.49	2.5-2.99	3.0-3.49	3.5-4.0	Overall Mean
They are required by law.	3.63	3.19	3.01	3.14	3.10	3.11
Faculty value feedback.	4.13	4.08	3.61	3.71	3.99	3.8
They are the only way students get to “grade” teachers.	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.03	3.87	3.97
The administration needs the information to make good decisions about faculty.	4.0	4.08	3.94	3.87	3.81	3.90
Faculty need to know whether or not they are doing a good job.	4.4	4.33	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.23
They help “weed out” bad faculty.	3.25	3.11	2.8	2.80	2.81	2.87

There is very little variation between the different GPA groups about why student evaluations are given at SAU. The highest mean across all groups is the need for faculty to know how good a job they are doing, and the lowest mean across all groups indicates student don't think evaluations are used to “weed out” bad faculty.

Table 21
“Student Evaluations SHOULD BE...”

Question	No credit & under 2.0	2.0 – 2.49	2.5-2.99	3.0-3.49	3.5-4.0	Overall Mean
Used to determine which professors are better teachers.	3.5	3.28	3.55	3.56	3.23	3.45
Used to determine which professors should receive pay raises.	3.38	3.28	3.08	2.98	2.81	3.03
Used to determine which professors should be terminated.	3.50	3.5	3.2	3.29	2.85	3.20
Used by faculty to make them better teachers.	4.50	4.58	4.11	4.26	4.36	4.28
Used to determine which professors should be promoted.	3.25	3.47	3.50	3.39	3.19	3.39
Used to determine which professors should receive special recognition for excellence in teaching.	4.38	4.03	3.87	4.07	3.98	4.0
Used to determine which professors should receive tenure.	3.50	3.53	3.34	3.48	3.18	3.38

Used to determine which professors should not receive a contract for the next semester.	3.13	3.31	2.91	2.99	2.70	2.95
Available to be viewed by other students to determine which instructor to take for a class.	4.50	3.4	3.3	3.43	3.29	3.54

This cross-tabulation indicates that students across all GPA's most strongly agree that student evaluations should be used faculty to make them better teachers. They most strongly disagree that student evaluations should be used to determine which professors should receive another contract and which should be terminated.

Table 22
Descriptors of Student Evaluations

Descriptors	No credit & under 2.0	2.0 – 2.49	2.5-2.99	3.0-3.49	3.5-4.0	Overall Mean
Objective vs. Subjective	4.5	4.7	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.38
Important vs. Unimportant	5.88	5.29	5.08	5.39	4.92	5.2
Reliable vs. Unreliable	3.88	4.26	3.97	4.11	3.81	4
Just a waste of time vs. Essential	4.0	3.46	3.37	3.41	3.38	3.41
Fair vs. Unfair	4.63	4.54	4.68	4.55	4.48	4.55

Of all the descriptors, importance had the most outstanding score across all GPA's. Surprisingly, those with no earned credit or a GPA under 2.0 rated them as the most important, while students with GPA's from 3.5 to 4.0 had the lowest score on this descriptor pair. Combining this with the data discussed above, freshmen and students with low GPA's by far feel place a higher level of importance on student evaluations of faculty.

Conclusions

The study results indicate that students believe the most important reason for student evaluations of faculty should be to improve the quality of teaching of faculty members. The study results also indicate that freshmen are more likely to believe that student evaluations are important than sophomores, juniors, and seniors. Another finding was that students with higher GPAs are more likely to doubt the fairness of evaluations and are also more likely to believe that the results are subjective.

The authors concluded that students do in fact distrust the evaluation process, but the level of distrust depends on other factors such as classification and GPA. Students believe that too little emphasis is placed on the results of student evaluations and that their participation may

be a waste of their time.

Some of the findings were contradictory and need further study. Students indicated in their responses to some survey questions that evaluation results should have little impact on whether faculty should continue to be employed by the university but ranked continued employment as an important use of evaluation results. The study results indicate that more work is needed to get students to buy in to the evaluation process.

References

Chen, Yining, Ashok Gupta, and Leon Hoshower, 2004. "Marketing Students' Perceptions of Teaching Evaluations: An Application of Expectancy Theory," *Marketing Education Review* (Summer) 23-36.

Clayson, Dennis E., 2004. "A Test of the Reciprocity Effect in the Student Evaluation of Instructors in Marketing Classes," *Marketing Education Review* (Summer) 11-21.

Clayson, Dennis E., and Debra A. Haley, 1990. "Student Evaluations in Marketing: What Is Actually Being Measured," *Journal of Marketing Education* (December) 9-17.

Gillmore, Gerald M., and Anthony G. Greenwald, 2004. "Using Statistical Adjustment to Reduce Bias in Student Ratings," *American Psychologist* (Volume 54, Issue 7) 518-519.

Goldberg, Gerald, and John Callahan, 1991. "Objectivity of Student Evaluation of Instructors," *Journal of Education for Business* (July/August) 377-378.

Appendix

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions ask your opinion and impressions about student evaluations of faculty that are conducted each semester at Southern Arkansas University. **Circle the response** that most closely indicates your attitude for each question. Please consider your responses carefully, as your opinion is important to us.

1. Student evaluations of faculty are given (choose one) Too Often Not
often enough enough

2. Most students take evaluations of faculty (choose one) Very Somewhat Not at all
seriously seriously seriously

3. Most faculty take student evaluations of faculty
(choose one) Very seriously Somewhat seriously Not at all seriously

Strongly Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Strongly Disagree

Student evaluations of faculty are given because:

4. They are required by law. 5 4 3 2 1

5. Faculty value feedback. 5 4 3 2 1

6. They are the only way students get to “grade” teachers. 5 4 3 2 1

7. The administration needs the information to make good decisions about the faculty. 5 4 3 2 1

8. Faculty need to know whether or not they are doing a good job. 5 4 3 2 1

9. They help “weed out” bad faculty. 5 4 3 2 1

Student evaluations SHOULD BE

10. Used to determine which professors are better teachers. 5 4 3 2 1

11. Used to determine which professors should receive pay raises. 5 4 3 2 1

12. Used to determine which professors should be terminated 5 4 3 2 1

13. Used by faculty to make them better teachers. 5 4 3 2 1

14. Used to determine which professors should be promoted. 5 4 3 2 1

15. Used to determine which professors should receive special recognition for excellence in teaching. 5 4 3 2 1

16. Used to determine which professors should receive tenure. 5 4 3 2 1
17. Used to determine which professors should not receive a contract for the next semester. 5 4 3 2 1
18. Available to be viewed by other students to determine which instructor to take for a class. 5 4 3 2 1

19. Please rank the following uses of student evaluations according to how they should be used. For example, if you feel the most appropriate use for them is to determine pay raises, rank that use as “1”, the next most appropriate would be “2”, etc.

- _____ To determine pay raises.
- _____ To determine continued employment.
- _____ To determine promotions.
- _____ To determine tenure.
- _____ As feedback for faculty to improve their teaching.

Of each of the pair of descriptions of student evaluations given below, please choose a number that corresponds with the best descriptor of the evaluations.

Student evaluations are:

- | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| Objective | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Subjective |
| Important | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Unimportant |
| Reliable | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Unreliable |
| Just a waste of time | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Essential |
| Fair | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Unfair |

Please tell us a little about yourself.

Gender Male Female Major: _____

Age: 18 and under 19 to 24 25 to 34 35 to 44 45 and over

Current GPA: No credits earned 1.99 or below 2.00 – 2.49 2.50 – 2.99 3.00 – 3.49 3.50 or above

Class

Level: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate Other

Current Class Load: Full-time Part-time