



Office of Evaluations & Examinations  
The University of Michigan  
200 Hill Street  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104-3297  
Telephone: 763-2482 ▪ Fax: 764-4221

Memo

MEMO TO: Teachers Using E&E's Teaching Questionnaires

FROM: James A. Kulik

Director

DATE: January 26, 2005

Enclosed is a tabulation of student responses to the E&E Teaching Questionnaire that you distributed recently in one of your classes. Enclosed along with this TQ report are the questionnaires on which students recorded their responses.

TQ reports contain questions drawn from three item groups:

- *University-wide questions.* Numbered 1 through 4, these items appear on most questionnaires. Departments often use results on these questions in their reviews of courses and teachers. The results provide an overview of student reactions to the course, teacher, and the amount learned in the course.
- *Teaching improvement questions.* Numbered 5 through 890, these questions help teachers find strengths and weaknesses in their teaching.
- *Course-guide questions.* Numbered 891 through 898, these student-written questions focus on areas that students consider top concerns. Students sometimes use results on these questions in their selection of courses.

It is a good idea to look first at endorsement frequencies when interpreting TQ results. How many students give favorable and unfavorable responses to each question? Is the distribution of responses consistent with your expectations? Which questions get unexpected responses? Are there any questions on which student responses are sharply divergent?

Many teachers find it useful to look next at median responses. The median gives the middle or typical response to each question. For E&E Teaching Questionnaires, the median is a value between 1.0 and 5.0. When all students respond "strongly agree" to a question, the class median is 5.0; when all students respond "strongly disagree," the class median is 1.0. A value between these extremes can be interpreted as the point on a continuous scale below which 50 percent of all responses fall. Identification of questions with high medians may help a teacher find relative strengths in teaching; lower medians may indicate relative weaknesses.

Success comes easier in some areas of teaching than in others, however. Some objectives are harder than others to achieve. Most teachers, for example, get good ratings on the question "The instructor appears to have a thorough knowledge of the course." Far fewer succeed on the question "This teacher motivates me to do my best work." Information about how other teachers are rated on specific questions can help a teacher distinguish between easy and hard objectives. Along with endorsement frequencies, therefore, users of E&E Teaching Questionnaires receive information about the medians of other University of Michigan classes on the questions. Instructors are given the point above which 25% of all class medians fall, the point above which 50% of all class medians fall, and the point above which 75% of all class medians fall.

Needless to say, there is much more to interpreting rating results than I have described here. I encourage you to visit our web site for more information. You can read or print a fuller interpretive guide by visiting our web site at [www.umich.edu/~eande/tq/](http://www.umich.edu/~eande/tq/).

Instructor: Cais, Bryden R

MATH 116, Section 001 (428-116-001-1)

Item	Responses from Your Students							Other Users of This Item *					
								University Wide			School/College		
	5	4	3	2	1	Your		75%	50%	25%	75%	50%	25%
SA	A	N	D	SD	NA	Median	Above	Above	Above	Above	Above	Above	
1 Overall, this was an excellent course. . . . .	4	15	4	0	0	0	4.00	3.88	4.20	4.63	3.25	3.74	4.06
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher. . . . .	12	9	2	0	0	0	4.54	4.04	4.50	4.80	3.71	4.10	4.53
3 I learned a great deal from this course. . . . .	9	8	6	0	0	0	4.19	3.91	4.23	4.63	3.33	3.75	4.08
4 I had a strong desire to take this course. . . . .	2	9	11	1	0	0	3.45	3.38	4.00	4.46	2.65	3.00	3.33
121 I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field. . . . .	5	13	4	0	0	0	4.04	3.95	4.17	4.50			
199 The instructor explains material clearly and understandably. . . . .	10	9	4	0	0	0	4.33	4.00	4.33	4.72			
200 The instructor handles questions well. . . . .	12	9	0	2	0	0	4.54	4.00	4.33	4.70			
217 The instructor treated students with respect. . . . .	18	4	1	0	0	0	4.86	4.50	4.75	4.88			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class. . . . .	17	3	2	0	0	1	4.85	4.25	4.60	4.81			
229 The instructor used class time well. . . . .	13	9	0	1	0	0	4.62	3.94	4.25	4.62			
230 The instructor seemed well prepared for each class. . . . .	13	9	1	0	0	0	4.62	4.22	4.60	4.82			
256 Working with other students helped me learn more effectively. . . . .	5	11	5	2	0	0	3.91	3.45	3.81	4.25			
365 Grades were assigned fairly and impartially. . . . .	10	11	2	0	0	0	4.36	3.90	4.14	4.50			
509 The instructor was concerned that we learn. . . . .	15	6	2	0	0	0	4.73	3.93	4.23	4.60			
510 The instructor was confident and in control of the class. . . . .	15	7	1	0	0	0	4.73	3.60	4.07	4.40			

Number of students responding to questionnaire: 23

\*The quartiles are calculated from Winter 2004 data. The university-wide quartiles are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college quartiles in this report are based on lower division classes with an enrollment of 16 to 74 students in the Division of Natural Sciences in the College of LS&A.