Hits and Misses: What Faculty and Students Value in Classes

Elizabeth Cara, Occupational Therapy
Ronald Rogers, Psychology
Emily Allen, Chemical and Materials Engineering
Joanne Rossi Becker, Mathematics
San José State University
March 22, 2008
We’ll discuss...

- What makes good teaching assessment?
- How do such assessments relate to student engagement?
- An alternative assessment instrument: CLASSE
- Use as a Faculty Formative Assessment Tool
- Use as an Institutional Assessment Tool
- Future Research Directions
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Genesis / Purpose of Research

Purpose

To understand university faculty members' and students’ perspectives regarding multiple facets of student engagement.

Importance

To monitor student engagement, a students’ “connectedness,” and sense of belonging is very important because these factors individually and collectively contribute to student success.
Background Literature

Much of the research on student engagement has been conducted at the high school and elementary school levels; little exists on the university level (CLASSE still in pilot stage).

Much of the existing research is from the perspectives of the students; faculty perspectives are relatively unexplored.

Little of the research investigates faculty perceptions of the linkage between social characteristics (such as race and ethnicity, class, and gender) and the degree of student engagement.
Definition of Student Engagement

Student engagement depicts students’ willingness to participate in routine school activities, such as attending classes, submitting required work, and following teachers’ directions in class (Nystrand & Gamoran, 1992).

Motivated behavior is indexed by the kinds of cognitive strategies students choose to use and by their willingness to persist with difficult tasks by regulating their own learning behavior (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990; Pintrich & Schrauben, 1992).
NSSE Instrument

The National Survey of Student Engagement is a "best practices" survey. The survey asks students to report on how they choose to spend their time while in college, recognizing that some uses of time produce more benefits to students than others. The five NSSE benchmarks are aggregations of clusters of survey items and, as such, are defined by those clusters.

- Level of Academic Challenge
- Active and Collaborative Learning
- Student Interactions with Faculty
- Enriching Educational Experiences
- Supportive Campus Environment
Faculty assessment

Establish connection between student engagement and faculty classroom teaching effectiveness, faculty development
# The Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTOR:</th>
<th>CLASS: DATE</th>
<th>SPRING 2007</th>
<th>PAGE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOME SCORE RANGE COMPUTED USING 277 PARTICIPATING COLLEGE CLASSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING ITEM</th>
<th>CLASS MEAN</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrated relevance of the course content</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Used assignments that motivated learning</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Established an atmosphere that facilitated learning</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was responsive to questions and comments from students</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Distributed assignments that challenged learning</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Was approachable for assistance</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was responsive to the diversity of students in this class</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Showed interest in teaching this class</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Used intellectually challenging teaching methods</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Used fair grading methods</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Helped students analyze complex/abstract ideas</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provided meaningful feedback about student work</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Over-all the instructor’s teaching was:</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOME SCORE RANGE COMPUTED USING 207 PARTICIPATING UNIVERSITY CLASSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING ITEM</th>
<th>CLASS MEAN</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrated relevance of the course content</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Used assignments that motivated learning</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Established an atmosphere that facilitated learning</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was responsive to questions and comments from students</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Distributed assignments that challenged learning</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Was approachable for assistance</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was responsive to the diversity of students in this class</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Showed interest in teaching this class</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Used intellectually challenging teaching methods</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Used fair grading methods</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Helped students analyze complex/abstract ideas</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provided meaningful feedback about student work</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Over-all the instructor’s teaching was:</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTICE:** Each course evaluation is mailed to department office. One copy is to be returned to the faculty member. The other is to be kept in the department office and is stored for record. Evaluation action file in the faculty affairs office. Faculty members who wish to comment on the evaluations should contact respective department for placement with the student evaluations. Associate director for this statistical report are 14 written comments from 6 file in the department file.
The Classroom Survey of Student Engagement (CLASSE)

What is it and what can it tell us?
The CLASSE Survey

A two-component tool that compares faculty expectations with what students report experiencing in a class.

CLASSE faculty
CLASSE student

Based on National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) supported by CIBER at Indiana University.
Surveys have 38 questions distributed among domains:

- Engagement Activities
- Cognitive Skills
- Other Educational Practices
- Class Atmosphere

4-point Likert scale on all items

Additional demographic items for both faculty and students
Survey Question Format

Faculty Survey

Faculty rate the importance of each item
Score is high if the item is important for student to be successful

Student Survey

Students rate frequency or amount of performance
Score is high if they have higher performance on this item
Sample CLASSE and Results

Quadrant Analysis

- Faculty Rating of Importance vs. Student Performance
- Quadrants labeled as MISSSES and HITS
- Data points for Q1, Q3, Q6, Q17, Q18, Q25, Q37

Diagram showing the relationship between faculty rating and student performance.
**MISSES:** Students **Not** Performing Despite Importance to Faculty

- **Engagement Activities**
  - Q1: Students are not asking questions during class
  - Q6: Students are not coming to class prepared, i.e., having done the readings or assignments
  - Q18: According to the students, you are not providing prompt feedback on their academic performance

- **Class Atmosphere**
  - Q38: Students report that they struggle a bit with following your lectures
MISSES: **Less Important to Faculty** - **Students Are Performing**

- **Other Educational Practices**
  - Q25: Students are writing multiple 5-page papers despite your rating this aspect of the course as only somewhat important

- **Class Atmosphere**
  - Q37: Student perceive the course material as more difficult than you might think.
Discussion of CLASSE

• What do you think are strengths/weaknesses of this survey instrument?

• Would this replace or enhance your existing instruments?
The CLASSE Study
University-Wide Results and Implications
Study Details

- **Data Collections**
  - Spring 2007 and Fall 2007
  - Collections occurred during the last third of the semester

- **Sample:**
  - 58 individual courses across 19 departments
  - 44 faculty participants
  - 1058 student participants
Hits and Misses: University-Wide

Quadrant Analysis

- 58 Classes (n = 1058)
- 44 Faculty
MISSES: Important to Faculty - Students Not Performing

- Engagement Activities
  - Q13: “Discussed grades or assignments with the instructor of your class”
  - Q12: “Used email to communicate with the instructor”
  - Q15: “Made a presentation in your class”
  - Q19: “Worked harder than you thought you could to meet your instructor’s standards or expectations”
MISSES: Important to Faculty - Students Not Performing

- Other Educational Practices
  - Q27: “Homework assignments taking more than an hour to complete”
  - Q28: “More than 3 hrs/wk preparing for class”
  - Q31: “How often do you review your notes prior to the next scheduled meeting?”
  - Q32: How often do you participate in a study partnership with a classmate to prepare for a quiz or a test?”
MISSING: Less Important to Faculty - Students Are Performing

• Engagement Activities
  • Q14: “Discussed ideas from your class with others outside of class”

• Cognitive Skills
  • Q20: “Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form”
Hits and Misses: Across Engagement Subscales

Quadrant Analysis
(Engagement Domains)

Faculty Rating of Importance

Student Performance

- Other Ed. Practices
- Engageement Activities
- Cognitive Skills
- Class Atmosphere
Classroom-Level Engagement: Upper- vs. Lower-Division

The graph compares engagement activities, cognitive skills, other educational practices, and class atmosphere between Upper-Division (n = 505) and Lower-Division (n = 553) students.
Classroom-Level Engagement: 1st-Year Experience vs. Control

The re

![Bar chart showing engagement activities, cognitive skills, other educational practices, and class atmosphere for first-year experience and comparison groups.](chart.png)
Classroom-Level Engagement: Native vs. Non-Native English
Classroom-Level Engagement: Non-Native English Subgroups

- Engagement Activities
- Cognitive Skills
- Other Ed. Practices
- Class Atmosphere

Native English (n = 610)
Spanish (n = 82)
Vietnamese (n = 54)
Chinese (n = 49)
Future Directions

• **Validation of the Instrument**
  • Contribute our data to the larger collaborative pilot project
  • Begin psychometric analyses (e.g., factor analysis) on our dataset

• **Value as a Formative Assessment Tool**
  • We will be seeking further feedback from faculty as to the value of the CLASSE as formative assessment tool

• **Further Mining of our Dataset**
  • E.g.,
    • How does technology within the classroom impact engagement?
    • How does engagement (CLASSE) relate to academic outcome?
    • Etc ...