

## Two Recommended Models for Course Evaluation

The following instruments have two very different approaches to gathering feedback from students: SEEQ is focused on students' perceptions of the quality of their learning environment, while IDEA focuses on students' perception of their progress made towards meeting learning objectives. Both instruments have significant evidence-based backing on their reliability and validity. Either option could be a good choice for your unit. However, changing from one survey instrument to another must be considered carefully, particularly if your units assessment plan relies on longitudinal uses of these data.

### SEEQ (Students' Evaluation of Educational Quality)

What it measures: Nine common dimensions (e.g., Learning/Value, Organization & Clarity, Enthusiasm, Group Interaction, Individual Rapport, Breadth of Coverage, Assessment/Exams, Assignments/Readings, Overall).<sup>[1]</sup>

Why it's recommended: Extensively validated across countries and disciplines; stable factor structure and acceptable reliability that improves with more respondents.<sup>[2][3]</sup>

Example Instrument:

- The course was well organized (clear goals, logical sequence).
- Explanations helped me understand difficult ideas.
- The instructor fostered meaningful interaction (e.g., discussions, questions).
- Feedback and assessments supported my learning.
- Assignments/readings were well aligned to outcomes.
- I gained valuable knowledge/skills in this course.
- Overall, this course/instructor contributed positively to my learning.

Reference example of SEEQ items (full form): <sup>[4]</sup>

### IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction

What it measures: Student progress on relevant objectives identified by the instructor (e.g., understanding concepts, applying knowledge, communication/professional skills), along with teaching methods and contextual adjustments.<sup>[5][6]</sup>

Why it's recommended: Strong internal consistency and validity evidence; reporting distinguishes progress on essential/important objectives and provides adjusted scores.<sup>[5][6]</sup>

Example Questions (tailor objectives to your outcomes):

- Rate your progress on: understanding key concepts; applying concepts; professional/communication skills; interest in the subject.
- Class activities and feedback supported progress on the instructor-identified objectives.
- My effort and preparation were sufficient for this course.

Instructor should select 3–5 essential/important objectives to anchor reporting. <sup>[7]</sup>

### Additional Considerations

- Do not rely on a single overall-effectiveness number; report distributions/medians and triangulate with peer review and instructor reflection.<sup>[11][12]</sup>
- Mitigate bias up front: include a brief anti-bias message before the survey and focus prompts on course design/behaviors.<sup>[15][16]</sup>
- Standardize administration: common window and instructions; dedicating brief in-class time for completion improves response rates and reduces mode effects.<sup>[17][18][19]</sup>
- Right-size comparisons: compare like with like—same course level, class size band, and modality. Avoid cross-discipline or very small-N comparisons.<sup>[13][12]</sup>
- Mind sample size: treat very small classes as formative; reliability increases with more raters ( $\approx 0.74$  with  $\sim 10$  students;  $\geq 0.90$  by  $\sim 25$ ).<sup>[21][20]</sup>
- Include two brief open-ended prompts: “What helped your learning most?” and “What change would most improve this course next time?” Place them before any global items.<sup>[13][12][14]</sup>
- Optionally add a short climate/inclusion add-on (3–5 items): e.g., respect, representation, and accessibility. Interpret alongside multiple evidence sources.<sup>[13][11]</sup>

### Summary of Recommended Instruments

- Template A: SEEQ-Short ( $\approx 16$  items + 2 open-ended) — recommended default for most departments; concise reporting by subscale.<sup>[1][2][3]</sup>
- Template B: IDEA-Style Objectives ( $\approx 10$  items + 2 open-ended) — for programs with clearly mapped outcomes; centers progress on relevant objectives.<sup>[5][6][7]</sup>

### Footnotes (sources keyed to superscripts)

[1] Marsh, H. W. (1982). SEEQ: A Reliable, Valid, and Useful Instrument for Collecting Students' Evaluations of University Teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. ERIC record: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ264777>

[2] Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' Evaluations of University Teaching: Dimensionality, Reliability, Validity, Potential Biases, and Utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. PDF: <https://www.wittenberg.edu/sites/default/files/media/faculty/Marsh1984.pdf>

[3] Grammatikopoulos, V., et al. (2015). Assessing the SEEQ in Greek Higher Education. *Higher Education*. Abstract: <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA425954547>

[4] Example SEEQ item set (McKendree University CTL). PDF: <https://www.mckendree.edu/academics/vcte/resources/StudentEvaluationofEducationalQuality.pdf>

[5] IDEA Research & Technical Reports (validity, fairness, objective-based reporting). <https://www.ideaedu.org/research-resources/research-technical-reports/index.html>

- [6] IDEA Interpretive Guide (Diagnostic Form reporting, adjusted scores). PDF: [https://www.tntech.edu/iare/pdf/assessment/Interpretive\\_Guide\\_Diagnostic\\_Report.pdf](https://www.tntech.edu/iare/pdf/assessment/Interpretive_Guide_Diagnostic_Report.pdf)
- [7] IDEA faculty guidance on selecting objectives (USU/URI). <https://www.usu.edu/oda/idea/idea-faculty-faqs> and <https://web.uri.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1970/Thoughts-on-selecting-IDEA-objectives.pdf>
- [11] American Sociological Association (2019/2020). Statement on Student Evaluations of Teaching. PDF: [https://www.asanet.org/wp-content/uploads/asa\\_statement\\_on\\_student\\_evaluations\\_of\\_teaching\\_feb132020.pdf](https://www.asanet.org/wp-content/uploads/asa_statement_on_student_evaluations_of_teaching_feb132020.pdf)
- [12] Stark, P. B., & Freishtat, R. (2014). An Evaluation of Course Evaluations. PDF: <https://www.stat.berkeley.edu/~stark/Preprints/eval14.pdf>
- [13] University of California Academic Council (2020). Teaching Evaluation Task Force Report. PDF: [https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/\\_files/reports/kkb-divs-teaching-evaluation-task-force-report.pdf](https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/kkb-divs-teaching-evaluation-task-force-report.pdf)
- [14] UC Berkeley Course Evaluations Question Bank (ordering specific items before global). <https://teaching.berkeley.edu/teaching-guides-resources/course-evaluations-question-bank>
- [15] Peterson, D. A. M., et al. (2019). Mitigating gender bias in student evaluations of teaching. PLOS ONE. <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0216241>
- [16] Kim, F. (2024). Bias-intervention messaging in student evaluations (overview of recent studies). <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2405844024131714>
- [17] Gupta, V., et al. (2020). Impact of moving to online evaluations on response rates (drop from ~56% to ~33%). Open-access: <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7055417/>
- [18] Guder, F., & Malliaris, M. (2010). Online vs. paper course evaluations (mode effects). PDF: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1060301.pdf>
- [19] Evidence and guidance that offering in-class completion time boosts response rates (e.g., review & strategies). <https://apps.weber.edu/wsuiimages/ie/Evaluations/Top%2020%20strategies%20to%20increase%20online%20response%20rates.pdf>
- [20] Pitt (OMET) summary of IDEA reliability by class size (split-half reliability rises with N). PDF: [https://teaching.pitt.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/OMET-idea-paper\\_50.pdf](https://teaching.pitt.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/OMET-idea-paper_50.pdf)
- [21] Marsh overview: reliability vs. number of student raters ( $\approx .74$  @  $\sim 10$ ;  $\approx .90$  @  $\sim 25$ ;  $\approx .95$  @  $\sim 50$ ). PDF summary: [https://evidencenet.pbworks.com/f/Students\\_evaluations\\_of\\_university\\_teaching.pdf](https://evidencenet.pbworks.com/f/Students_evaluations_of_university_teaching.pdf)

### Complete source list (with links)

- American Sociological Association (2019/2020). Statement on Student Evaluations of Teaching. [https://www.asanet.org/wp-content/uploads/asa\\_statement\\_on\\_student\\_evaluations\\_of\\_teaching\\_feb132020.pdf](https://www.asanet.org/wp-content/uploads/asa_statement_on_student_evaluations_of_teaching_feb132020.pdf)
- Guder, F., & Malliaris, M. (2010). Online And Paper Course Evaluations. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1060301.pdf>
- Gupta, V., et al. (2020). Qualitative Analysis of the Impact of Changes to Course Evaluation System. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7055417/>
- IDEA. Research & Technical Reports. <https://www.ideaedu.org/research-resources/research-technical-reports/index.html>
- IDEA Interpretive Guide (Diagnostic Form Report). [https://www.tntech.edu/iare/pdf/assessment/Interpretive\\_Guide\\_Diagnostic\\_Report.pdf](https://www.tntech.edu/iare/pdf/assessment/Interpretive_Guide_Diagnostic_Report.pdf)
- Kim, F. (2024). Bias intervention messaging in student evaluations. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2405844024131714>
- Marsh, H. W. (1982). SEEQ article (ERIC record). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ264777>
- Marsh, H. W. (1984). JEP overview of SET/SEEQ. <https://www.wittenberg.edu/sites/default/files/media/faculty/Marsh1984.pdf>
- McKendree University CTL. SEEQ item set. <https://www.mckendree.edu/academics/vcte/resources/StudentEvaluationofEducationalQuality.pdf>
- Pitt OMET summary of IDEA reliability by class size. [https://teaching.pitt.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/OMET-idea-paper\\_50.pdf](https://teaching.pitt.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/OMET-idea-paper_50.pdf)
- Peterson, D. A. M., et al. (2019). Mitigating gender bias in SET (PLOS ONE). <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0216241>
- UC Academic Council (2020). Teaching Evaluation Task Force Report. [https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/\\_files/reports/kkb-divs-teaching-evaluation-task-force-report.pdf](https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/kkb-divs-teaching-evaluation-task-force-report.pdf)
- UC Berkeley Course Evaluations Question Bank. <https://teaching.berkeley.edu/teaching-guides-resources/course-evaluations-question-bank>
- URI/USU guidance on IDEA objective selection. <https://web.uri.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1970/Thoughts-on-selecting-IDEA-objectives.pdf> ; <https://www.usu.edu/oda/idea/idea-faculty-faqs>
- Stark, P. B., & Freishtat, R. (2014). An Evaluation of Course Evaluations. <https://www.stat.berkeley.edu/~stark/Preprints/eval14.pdf>

- Summary of reliability vs. number of raters.

[https://evidencenet.pbworks.com/f/Students\\_evaluations\\_of\\_university\\_teaching.pdf](https://evidencenet.pbworks.com/f/Students_evaluations_of_university_teaching.pdf)