

Summary of Consultant's Recommendations

Dr. John Centra, the consultant, who reviewed the current and proposed versions of UCF Student Perception of Instruction documents, has delivered his report. Based on his analysis of the documents provided to him Dr. Centra has proposed the following points for consideration.

1. There appear to be four major areas of emphasis in the current and proposed student evaluation of instruction instruments. Therefore, in order to facilitate students' consideration of major aspects of instruction, Dr. Centra recommends that the items be reorganized into four categories and be labeled with the following designations:
 - a. Organization and planning of the course
 - b. Communication ability of the instructor
 - c. Relationship or interaction of the teacher with students
 - d. Grading and learning materials used in the course. (See compendium of Student Instructional Report II, an instrument available to institutions from ETS. It is not copyrighted, so can be adapted.)
2. The instrument should include one final question regarding the overall assessment of the instructor. This question is important, because according to Dr. Centra's research, it correlates best with student learning, and forms the bases for summative decisions for faculty members' teaching effectiveness.
3. Dr. Centra recommends that the instrument would be most effective if questions relate to instruction and students' learning outcomes, rather than instructors' characteristics.
4. If the current rating scale is to be continued, consider modified syntax with Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Fair, and Poor.
 - a. The current scale is non-symmetric and is heavily weighted in a positive direction (Excellent, Very good, Good – only 2 on the negative side – Fair, Poor.)
 - b. A scale that includes an ambivalent midpoint (e.g. neither) is problematic because students use that response as a way of not committing one way or the other.
5. Dr. Centra recommends that UCF consider an alternative scale that addresses instructional effectiveness is a five-point scale with the following syntax: Ineffective, Somewhat Ineffective, Moderately Effective, Effective, Very Effective. This pattern of response choices helps point to quality of instruction, organization, communication and interaction.
6. A summary or total score, calculated mean or standard deviation for any of the evaluation forms should not be used. Use of a summary score assumes that the separate items are weighted equivalently. This is not the case. Items with the larger variance have greater weight in composite scores those items with smaller variances.

7. Use a common set of questions (Part III of draft SPoI) for all modes of instruction. If additional items are desired (Part I and Part II), they should be appended or linked to the evaluation according to the delivery mode of the course. Questions for additional items should be consistent with the five-point scale that addresses instruction and how it relates to student learning.
8. Reports of evaluation results provided to instructors and/or supervisors should provide item scores, mean, standard deviation to allow instructors to compare their individual performance:
 - a. on items for their performance in different semesters/years;
 - b. on items for their performance with those of their department's item scores, means, standard deviations; and
 - c. on items for their performance with those of their college faculty item scores, means, standard deviations
9. All reports of evaluation results provided should include a link to the online compendium of resources developed by Dr. Centra for Educational Testing Service, which could be used to provide context for the results for both the instructor and supervisor using the results.