

Best Practices in Student Course Evaluation

In this report, the Hanover Research Council examines best practices in the design and administration of student course evaluations. This report seeks to answer several key questions in regard to course evaluation policies and procedures, including whether evaluations should be standardized across the institution, what standard questions should be asked, whether participation should be required of students, and who should have access to the results.

Introduction

For this report, The Hanover Research Council reviewed the course evaluation instruments, policies and procedures in use at a national sample of colleges and universities in an effort to identify common institutional practices in this area. Our analysis seeks to answer several key questions:

- ❖ Can and should one survey instrument be used for all courses?
- ❖ What standard questions should be asked?
- ❖ Should students be *required* to complete course evaluations?
- ❖ Who should see the course evaluation results?
- ❖ Should all courses be evaluated every delivery cycle?
- ❖ Should evaluations be administered online or in paper format?

In order to provide information most relevant to XYZ College, we conducted a review of the *U.S. News and World Report's* top 25 baccalaureate colleges in the north. However, because our search revealed only limited information on the course evaluation practices of comparable baccalaureate colleges, we broadened our focus to include best practices among top-ranking national universities and liberal arts colleges, as well. Table 1 below lists the main institutions featured in this report. While other institutions may be discussed, these institutions provided the greatest level of detail and account for the vast majority of the practices profiled in this report.

Table 1: Featured Institutions

Institution	Ranking Category	Undergraduate Enrollment
University of California at Berkeley	National University	24,636
Columbia University	National University	7,285
Drexel University	National University	10,794
Northwestern University	National University	8,284
University of California at Irvine	National University	21,696
Yale University	National University	5,311
The University of Washington	National University	28,570
University of Wisconsin	National University	30,618
University of North Carolina Charlotte	National University	17,595
University of Southern Maine	Master's University	8,133
Washington and Jefferson	Liberal Arts	1,531
Pomona College	Liberal Arts	1,547
Bucknell University	Liberal Arts	3,520
Williams College	Liberal Arts	1,997
Seton Hill University	Baccalaureate	1,615
Curry College	Baccalaureate	2,832
Stevenson University	Baccalaureate	3,076

Ranking categories and undergraduate enrollment data provided by *U.S. News and World Report*.

Course Evaluation Instrument Selection

Traditionally, institutions have used only a single course evaluation form for all instructors, students, and courses. Insight Assessment, a division of the California Academic Press and provider of academic evaluation instruments, suggests that this practice “grew primarily out of the limitations of large mainframe data processing approaches to campus computing.”¹ Today, however, many institutions have the capacity to process data from non-standardized forms, which has led to greater opportunities for more individualized course evaluations.

In this section, we discuss both the advantages and disadvantages of the standardized and non-standardized course evaluation formats. We further discuss the most popular option among the institutions examined in this report—the “mixed format” alternative—and outline the various approaches used by institutions in our sample.

Benefits of the Standardized Form

The primary benefit of the standardized form is its ability to provide information that can be compared across departments, colleges, or schools, as well as across cohorts.² As Williams College’s Committee on Pedagogy and its Evaluation (CoPE) points out, this is critical as it “allows standards that are consistent from year to year and from department to department to be applied” in the evaluation of postsecondary instruction.³ Further, the committee notes that “the information gathered from the forms also serves to protect untenured faculty members from potential inconsistencies or biases within individual departments.”⁴ Another reason to favor the standardized form is cost, as the use of one form across campus (particularly in scantron format) can be less expensive than a diverse set of evaluation instruments.⁵

Benefits of a Non-Standardized Form

The ad hoc Committee on Student Course Evaluations at the University of Wisconsin, which rejects the use of a universal course evaluation form, cites the fact that “courses and departments differ too greatly for the same items to apply equally well to each.”⁶ The Committee notes that “although common formats (large lecture courses, small seminars, etc.) share similarities, there are enough differences in

¹ “Ten Discussion Questions – Student Course Evaluation Forms,” Insight Assessment and The California Academic Press (2002), p. 38. Available online at <http://www.insightassessment.com/pdf_files/CT_Course%20Evals.PDF>

² “Report of the Committee on Pedagogy and its Evaluation (CoPE) and the Steering Committee,” Williams College (May 12, 2004). Available online at <<http://www.williams.edu/resources/committees/scep/mandate.php#1>>

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Donna C. Bird and Susan A. G. King, “Student Course Evaluations at the University of Southern Maine: A Discussion Paper for Academic Leaders,” University of Southern Maine (January 2007), pp. 1-2. Available online at <http://www.usm.maine.edu/prov/faculty_resources/handbook/combined_sce_paper.pdf>

⁶ “UW Madison information on Student Course Evaluations,” University of Wisconsin (1997). Available online at <<http://teachingacademy.wisc.edu/archive/Assistance/MOO/adhocstu.htm>>

approach within different disciplines that even requiring common questions for similar formats can obscure cross-disciplinary variance.”⁷ Insight Assessment agrees that “to evaluate validly a large [lecture-based] general education course in history in terms of effectiveness of the instructor relative to the learning outcomes intended for that course one should be asking different questions that none might be asking with regard to a chemistry lab course, a freshman writing course, a junior level theater arts course, or a senior level business capstone course for working professionals.”⁸

In addition, it has been found that students required to fill out the same form multiple times may begin taking the questionnaire less seriously.^{9, 10} Thus, it has been suggested that different formats are necessary to engage students in the task of serious evaluation.

Alternative Approaches

Washington and Jefferson College recognizes that the question of the standardized versus non-standardized format reflects a tension between institutional and departmental or individual needs.

Institutions need comparative data within the institution that allow them to make decisions regarding promotion/tenure and resource allocation. Given those needs, a standard instrument is preferable to facilitate the comparisons. Departments and individuals have more precise needs with respect to course evaluation. Departments need feedback regarding how particular courses are contributing to the curriculum within the department. Individuals need feedback regarding particular elements of very distinct courses. Often, a standard form frustrates the needs of both departments and individual faculty.¹¹

As a compromise between the needs of the institution as a whole, the departments, and individual faculty members, Washington and Jefferson designed an instrument with sections to meet the needs of each. The sections of the course evaluation instrument are as follows:¹²

⁷ “UW Madison Information on Student Course Evaluations,” University of Wisconsin (1997). Available online at <<http://teachingacademy.wisc.edu/archive/Assistance/MOO/adhocstu.htm>>

⁸ “Ten Discussion Questions – Student Course Evaluation Forms,” *op. cit.*, p. 38.

⁹ Andrea Perkins, “Academic Affairs questions student reliability of evaluations,” Seton Hill University (November 20, 2006). Available online at <<http://blogs.setonhill.edu/Setonian/017737.html>>

¹⁰ “UW Madison Information on Student Course Evaluations,” *op. cit.*

¹¹ James M. Sloat, “Balancing the Power: An Egalitarian Model for Course Evaluation and Assessment,” Prepared for Presentation at the 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (August 31- September 3, 2006), p. 16. Available online at <http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/1/5/1/0/1/pages151019/p151019-1.php>

¹² Taken verbatim from *Ibid.*

- ❖ The first section consists of general pedagogical questions (about the course, instructor, and student). This section is included for every course.
- ❖ The second section consists of questions submitted by departments. These questions were solicited from departments as a way to allow them to gather data that they would find to be useful—either to assess more idiosyncratic elements of their courses or for more general program review.
- ❖ The third section consists of questions submitted by individual instructors. These questions could be unique to particular courses (or even particular sections of courses). This section was designed both to assess course-specific pedagogies (such as simulations) as well as to assess the student learning outcomes listed on the course’s syllabus.

The mixed format—that is, a course evaluation form including both a set of standardized and non-standardized questions—appears to be the most popular choice among the institutions examined in this report, as Table 2 demonstrates. For instance, Bucknell University established three types of questions to be included on all evaluations across the institution: core, supplementary, and open-ended. The Subcommittee on Course Evaluations at Bucknell University recommended that departments create their own evaluations, but that they employ the core questions in addition to supplementary questions that “expand on or clarify the ‘core’ areas of evaluation.”¹³

Another alternative is that selected by Drexel University, which standardizes course evaluations at the department level.¹⁴ Note, however, that at Drexel University, graduate course evaluations are course-specific. The University of Washington offers yet another alternative: offering standardized course evaluations for different types of courses (for example, small seminars versus large lectures). These arrangements are less popular than the mixed format and may be best suited to large universities.

Table 2: Course Evaluation Format at Selected Institutions

Institution	Course Evaluation Format
<i>Columbia University</i>	Mixed: The online evaluations include both a set of system-wide core questions and course-specific questions. ¹⁵

¹³ “Report and Recommendations from Subcommittee on Course Evaluations,” Bucknell University (April 29, 1996) p. 2. Available online at <<http://www.bucknell.edu/Documents/ArtsandSciences/coursevalfrm.pdf>>

¹⁴ “Improving the Process of Course Evaluation: The Online Alternative for Berkeley,” University of California, Berkeley (2005) p. 14.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

Institution	Course Evaluation Format
<i>Drexel University</i>	Alternative: Evaluation questions for undergraduate courses are standardized at the departmental level. Graduate level course evaluation questions are course-specific. ¹⁶
<i>Northwestern University</i>	Mixed: Questions are standardized at the campus level, with the capacity for course-specific questions included in the system. ¹⁷
<i>University of California, Irvine</i>	Mixed: The system uses a standard evaluation form that allows for four customized questions per course. ¹⁸
<i>Yale University</i>	Mixed: Six core questions are incorporated system-wide. Of those, two are course-specific. Instructors are permitted to include additional course-specific questions with approval from the Committee on Teaching and Learning. ¹⁹
<i>University of California, Berkeley</i>	Mixed: Flexibility to customize questions at the department and course levels. ²⁰
<i>University of Washington</i>	Alternative: Provides course evaluations based on the type of course/classroom. Different evaluation forms for small lecture/discussion courses, large lectures, and clinical, studio, or labs are available on the Office of Educational Assessment website. ²¹ The office also provides general comment forms and an evaluation based on “educational outcomes.” ²²

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

²¹ “Course Evaluation: Office of Educational Assessment,” University of Washington (2005). Available online at <http://www.washington.edu/oea/services/course_eval/index.html>

²² *Ibid.*

Institution	Course Evaluation Format
<i>University of Wisconsin</i>	Non-standardized: Has not adopted a universal form for all departments and courses. The Committee on Student Course Evaluations recommends that faculty develop their own open-ended questions to be used to complement fixed-point rating scales. ²³
<i>Washington and Jefferson College</i>	Mixed: Has developed a multi-sectioned instrument that provides some general, comparative, eventually longitudinal data that can be used for institutional purposes while also giving departments and instructors the opportunity to receive feedback and gather data for more narrowly-tailored purposes ²⁴
<i>Pomona College</i>	Non-Standardized: Since learning goals can vary based on course and discipline, the College encourages professors to create an evaluation form for each class in consultation with the relevant department and the Teaching & Learning Committee as appropriate. Each evaluation form must be approved by the Dean of the College before it can be distributed to students. ²⁵
<i>Williams College</i>	Standardized: One form is used by all departments except the athletics department, which has its own forms and uses a broader scale of responses (1-7 instead of 1-4 or 1-5). ²⁶
<i>Seton Hill University</i>	Standardized: Uses Scantron-type forms where the evaluator fills in the appropriate bubble in response to a question. Instructors are supposed to provide time in class for the students to fill out these questionnaires. ²⁷
<i>Stevenson University</i>	Mixed: The Student Course Evaluation form is standardized for the entire College of Arts and Sciences. Faculty and/or department chairs are encouraged to create additional questions in order to elicit student responses specifically tailored to their courses. In all cases, however, the standardized form must <i>also</i> be administered to students at the end of the course. ²⁸

²³ "UW Madison information on Student Course Evaluations," *op. cit.*

²⁴ Sloat, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

²⁵ "Pomona College: Course Evaluation Template," Pomona College. Available online at <www.pomona.edu/adwr/academicdean/forms/faccourseeval1.doc>

²⁶ "Report of the Committee on Pedagogy and its Evaluation (CoPE) and the Steering Committee," *op. cit.*

²⁷ Perkins, *op. cit.*

²⁸ "Student Course Evaluations," Stevenson University. Available online at <<http://www.stevenson.edu/sharedmedia/fas/policy-manual/forms/student-course-eval.pdf>>

Institution	Course Evaluation Format
<i>Bowdoin College and Mt. Holyoke College</i>	Standardized: Both institutions use forms similar to Williams College. ²⁹
<i>Amherst College, Oberlin College, Trinity College, and Swarthmore College</i>	Non-standardized: No centralized form of evaluation. ³⁰
<i>UNC Charlotte</i>	Standardized: Template for common course evaluation. ³¹

²⁹ "Report of the Committee on Pedagogy and its Evaluation (CoPE) and the Steering Committee," *op. cit.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ "Memorandum: Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching," UNC Charlotte (2008), pp. 3-6. Available online at <clas.uncc.edu/docs/tfr.doc>

Standard Questions for Course Evaluation

In this section, we offer examples of the course evaluation templates used at a small sample of higher education institutions. Based on our examination of these forms, several questions and evaluation items emerged as standard components across the institutional sample. These include:

- ❖ An overall assessment of the course, a question to address whether students would recommend the course to peers, or an item that asks students to rate their agreement with a statement similar to “I learned a lot in this class”
- ❖ An overall assessment of the instructor and his or her performance
- ❖ A rating of the organization of the course
- ❖ A rating of the impartiality of the instructor
- ❖ A rating of the clarity/communication skills of the instructor
- ❖ A rating of the availability of the instructor outside of class
- ❖ A rating of the level of challenge, course difficulty, or workload³²
- ❖ An open-response item to allow for comments on how the course might be improved in the future

Other common questions on the reviewed course evaluation templates include:

- ❖ Describe the effort you put into this class.
- ❖ Will you use this course to fulfill major or general education requirements?
- ❖ Did the instructor provide timely and useful comments and feedback?
- ❖ Did the instructor instill an interest in the subject or promote your intellectual engagement with the subject matter?
- ❖ Describe or rate the overall educational/intellectual value of this course.

Five institutional profiles follow, with details provided on the types of questions and items presented on course evaluation instruments at each institution.

University of Wisconsin

The ad hoc Student Course Evaluation Committee at the University of Wisconsin recommended that departments develop questions that address the following areas:³³

- ❖ Course organization, planning, and structure, including an assessment of the level of student/instructor interaction and the course format

³² Interestingly, Gerald Gilmore, director of the University of Washington’s Office of Educational Assessment, found that students prefer challenging classes over less challenging ones and that they put more effort into classes that demand their effort for success. Gerald Gilmore, “What Student Ratings Tell Us about Academic Demands and Expectations,” Office of Educational Assessment, University of Washington (April 2001). Available online at <<http://www.washington.edu/oea/pdfs/reports/OEAReport0102.pdf>>

³³ “UW Madison Information on Student Course Evaluations,” *op. cit.*

- ❖ Clarity of instruction and the communication skills of the instructor
- ❖ Instructor accessibility outside of class (for instance, does the instructor hold regular office hours, responds to e-mails, etc.)
- ❖ Grading procedures (that is, how well the grading procedures are explained and followed)
- ❖ Overall experience in the course
- ❖ Overall performance of the instructor
- ❖ Work load and course difficulty
- ❖ Student learning, student self-rating of accomplishments or progress, and student self-rating of level of effort
- ❖ Descriptive information about the students and the course (for instance, is the course required or an elective, is the course team-taught, is the course introductory or advanced, is the student a major in the area or taking the course as an elective, etc.)
- ❖ An assessment of classroom and other instructional facilities

In regard to the last question, the Committee states:

We recommend that this question about facilities be asked with an open-ended format rather than with a fixed-point format. The information collected about facilities can be provided to campus administrators for use in setting budget and renovation priorities--with the objective that the overall emphasis on teaching and learning will lead to constructive change.³⁴

The Committee further recommended that the institution not ask questions about students' GPA, ability, age, and the time the course is offered.

Bucknell University

As demonstrated below, although "core questions" are included on all course evaluations, Bucknell University provides instructors with several choice menus, as well as the option to include questions generated by the department or individual instructors.

Figure 1: Bucknell University Course Evaluation Template³⁵

1. A standard agree/disagree, five-point, fully-anchored scale should be used for the core questions on all course evaluation forms.

1 - Disagree strongly	2 - Disagree	3 - Neutral/ mixed	4 - Agree	5 - Agree strongly
--------------------------	--------------	-----------------------	-----------	-----------------------

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ "Report and Recommendations from Subcommittee on Course Evaluations," *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

2. The following questions should serve as "core" questions and be included on all faculty evaluation forms (with the agree/disagree rating scale).

1. The course was well-organized.
2. The instructor was well-prepared for class meetings.
3. The instructor was fair and impartial with students.
4. I would recommend *this course* to other students interested in this subject.
5. I would recommend *this instructor* to other students.

3. Each department or faculty member's evaluation form should also include one or more questions in each of the following question clusters:

- 6(a) This instructor challenged me intellectually.
- 6(b) The instructor stimulates intellectual curiosity.
- 6(c) The instructor provided me with an effective range of challenges.

- 7(a) I could get the instructor's help outside of class if I needed it.
- 7(b) The instructor was available during office hours.
- 7(c) Talking to the instructor in his/her office was helpful.
- 7(d) The instructor was approachable for out-of-class consultations.

- 8(a) The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly.
- 8(b) The instructor recognized when some students did not comprehend course material.
- 8(c) The instructor used class discussion time effectively.
- 8(d) The instructor stimulated class discussion and student participation.

4. The core questions can be supplemented with questions generated by the departments and by individual instructors, OR from the following additional sample questions/clusters:

- 6(a) This course was helpful in developing new skills.
- 6(b) I gained an excellent understanding of concepts in this field.
- 6(c) This course helped me to become a more critical thinker.

- 9(a) The laboratory work was beneficial in terms of the overall goals of the course.
- 9(b) The laboratory section was a valuable part of this course.
- 9(c) The laboratory instructor adequately prepared me for the material covered in his/her section.

- 10(a) The seminar approach was effectively implemented in this course.
- 10(b) The seminar provided me with diverse insights into the course materials.
- 10(c) Class discussion was a valuable part of this course.

- 11(a) The team teaching method provided me with a valuable learning experience.
- 11(b) Instruction was well coordinated among the team members.
- 11(c) Team teaching provided insights that a single instructor could not.

- 12(a) The field trips were well planned.
- 12(b) The field trips offered insights that the lectures and/or readings could not.
- 12(c) The field trips were of instructional value.

5. Some opportunity for open-ended responses should be provided in addition to the scaled items.

Yale University

Course evaluations at Yale University include several core questions asked on all course evaluations at the institution, as well as standardized questions asked about all language, quantitative reasoning, writing, and science courses. Instructors have the option to add a custom question if they wish to do so.

Figure 2: Yale University Course Evaluation³⁶

1. Looking back on [course name], what is your overall assessment of the course? What are its strengths and weaknesses, and in what ways might it be improved?
2. Please evaluate each instructor of [course name]. What are the instructor's strengths and weaknesses, and in what ways might his or her teaching be improved?
3. Please evaluate your teaching assistant here (discussion section leader, lab section leader, grader, or other assistant). What are his or her strengths and weaknesses as an instructor, and in what ways might his/her teaching be improved? Please evaluate only the teaching assistant that you are most familiar with. Note: If the instructor of the course led your discussion section, please evaluate your discussion section in this part of the evaluation.

Please note that your responses to the following questions may also be made available to students.

4. How would you summarize [course name] for a fellow student? Would you recommend [course name] to another student? Why or why not?
5. Overall, how would you rate the workload of this course in comparison to other Yale courses you have taken? (Scale: 1=much less, 2=less, 3=same, 4=greater, 5=much greater)
6. What is your overall assessment of this course? (Scale: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent)

Questions added in Fall 2008

7. Do you expect to use this class for credit toward your major, or toward a pre-professional program? Yes/No

³⁶ "OCE FAQs for Faculty," Yale University. Available online at http://www.yale.edu/sfas/registrar/oce_faqs_faculty.html

8. Do you expect to use this class for credit toward the Yale College distribution requirements? Yes/No

Language Questions³⁷

- A. Please indicate your main reason for enrolling in [course name]: (1=To enhance my international education generally, 2=To prepare for a career or professional need, 3=To prepare for study or work abroad, 4=For personal enrichment, 5=To fulfill the distribution requirement.)
- B. What did you hope to accomplish in [course name]? Did you attain your goal or did you change your goal?

Quantitative Reasoning Questions

- A. Which of the following represents the primary reason you took [course name]? (1=It is required for my intended major or for planned postgraduate study, 2=Interest in the course material, 3=It fulfills the quantitative reasoning requirement, 4 =Both 2 and 3, 5=Other - please specify below in the text box for QR question B).
- B. Please describe one or two of the most valuable quantitative skills that you gained in [course name] and what aspects of the course were most effective in helping you to gain these skills. In what ways could the course have been more effective in helping you to develop these or other quantitative skills?

Writing Questions

- A. Which of the following represents the main reason you took [course name]? (1=To learn material, 2 =To improve writing skills, 3 =Course or instructor reputation, 4=To fulfill the WR requirement. 5 =Other.)
- B. In what specific ways has taking [course name] affected your writing? What have you learned about writing that you can use in future courses?

Science Questions

- A. Which of the following represents the primary reason you chose [course name]? (1=It is required for my intended major or for planned postgraduate study, 2=Interest in the course material, 3=It fulfills the science requirement, 4=Both 2 and 3, 5 =Other - please specify below in the text box for Sc Question B).
- B. Please describe one or two of the most valuable things you have learned about science through taking [course name] and what aspects of the course were most effective in teaching you these things. In what ways could the course have been more effective in helping to enhance your knowledge and understanding of science?

³⁷ "Yale University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Online Course Evaluation," Yale University. Available online at <<http://classes.yale.edu/help/itg/oce/faq.htm>>

Pomona College

While the course evaluation form is not standardized at Pomona College, the Teaching and Learning Center offers the following templates as guides for instructors.

Figure 3: Pomona College - Course Evaluation Template #1³⁸

<p>❖ Self-evaluation (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What is your college affiliation? b) What was your reason for taking this course? c) What prior coursework had you had in this field? d) On average, how many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class? <p>❖ Faculty evaluation (five-point scale, “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The professor made the goals of the course clear. b) The texts and other materials were appropriate given the stated goals of the course. c) Assignments were consistent with the stated goals of the course. d) Grading was fair and consistent with the stated goals of the course. e) The professor was organized and well prepared. f) The professor presented the subject matter clearly and answered questions effectively. g) The professor facilitated discussion well. h) The professor was effective in labs. i) The professor instilled interest in the field. j) Feedback was given in a timely manner. k) The professor was accessible to answer questions and explain material outside of class. l) I learned a lot in this course. <p>❖ Summary (short answer)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What has this faculty member done especially well? b) Do you have specific suggestions for improvement? If so, please elaborate.
--

Figure 4: Pomona College - Course Evaluation Template #2³⁹

<p>❖ What is your college affiliation? (select from list of college divisions)</p> <p>❖ On average, how many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class? (multiple choice, ranging from 0 to 10+)</p>

³⁸ “Pomona College: Course Evaluation Template,” Pomona College. Available online at <www.pomona.edu/adwr/academicdean/forms/faccourseeval1.doc>

³⁹ “Pomona College: Course Evaluation Template,” Pomona College. Available online at <<http://www.pomona.edu/adwr/academicdean/forms/faccourseeval2.pdf>>

- ❖ Were the goals of the course made clear to you?
- ❖ Did the content and structure of the course make sense given the stated goals of the course?
- ❖ Did the presentation of subject matter in class facilitate your learning?
- ❖ Instructor effectiveness in lecturing
- ❖ Instructor effectiveness in leading seminars and discussions
- ❖ Instructor effectiveness in guiding laboratories, studios, rehearsals, performances, independent studies, tutorials, and/or student research
- ❖ Were texts and other course materials appropriate given the stated goals of the course?
- ❖ Were assignments, grading, and feedback appropriate given the stated goals of the course?
- ❖ Outside of class, was the professor accessible, helpful, available for mentoring?
- ❖ Did the instructor instill interest in the subject?
- ❖ What has this faculty member done especially well?
- ❖ Do you have specific suggestions for improvement? If so, please elaborate.

Williams College

Williams College offers departments the option to include two customized questions on the course evaluation. Included in the course evaluation are several self-evaluation questions for the student.

Figure 5: Williams College Course Evaluation Form⁴⁰

- ❖ Based on my performance in the course so far, the grade I expect to receive is
- ❖ I took this course primarily as a (elective, divisional requirement, grad school requirement, major requirement, or major elective⁴¹)
- ❖ I would describe the effort I put into this course as (“very little” to “very great”)
- ❖ Compared to other courses I have taken at Williams, the workload in this course is

⁴⁰ “Williams Student Course Survey Form: Proof,” Williams College. Available online at <<http://www.williams.edu/resources/committees/scep/41016proof.pdf>>

⁴¹ Choices are elective, divisional requirement, grad school requirement, major requirement, and major elective.

- ❖ Please rate your instructor on the following (seven-point scale, from “very poor” to “truly exceptional”):
 - a) Organization of course material and class time
 - b) Conveying the subject matter of the course in a clear way
 - c) Approachability and responsiveness
 - d) Providing useful comments and other feedback on course work
 - e) Developing my analytical and/or critical thinking skills
 - f) Promoting my intellectual engagement within the subject matter of the course
- ❖ *If discussion featured prominently in the course*, rate your instructor in promoting class discussion.
- ❖ *If lecture featured prominently in the course*, rate your instructor in presenting effective lectures.
- ❖ *If the course included laboratory, field work, or studio/performance courses:*
 - a) Organization of the laboratory, field work, studio/performance portion of the course and its ability to illustrate important principles, concepts, or methods of the course in general
 - b) Overall quality of the instruction in the laboratory, field work, studio/performance portion of the course
- ❖ *For foreign language courses, rate the course in each of the following:*
 - a) Developing my FOREIGN LANGUAGE listening comprehension
 - b) Developing my FOREIGN LANGUAGE speaking ability
 - c) Developing my FOREIGN LANGUAGE reading ability
 - d) Developing my FOREIGN LANGUAGE writing ability
- ❖ Two questions selected by the individual department
- ❖ Two overarching summary questions:
 - a) Overall quality of instruction
 - b) Overall educational and intellectual value

For examples of the course evaluation forms used at Wellesley College, Carleton College, Middlebury College, Bowdoin College, Davidson College, Claremont McKenna College, Wesleyan University, Grinnell College and Dartmouth College, please refer to the Trinity College report, “Student Course Evaluation Items by University.”⁴²

© 2009 The Hanover Research Council – Academy Administration Practice

Student Participation Requirements

As with any survey, low response rates raise concerns about the generalizations that can be made. While policies that require students to participate in course evaluations appear to offer a solution to this problem, many instructors across institutions have cited concerns that requiring students to fill out course evaluations may either result in unthoughtful, and therefore useless, responses or promote a negative response bias.⁴³ Below, we summarize how different institutions have chosen to navigate this issue.

Table 3: Approaches for Promoting Higher Response Rates

Institution	Approach
<i>University of California, Berkeley</i>	Offered incentives to students during the trial period of the evaluation instrument (prize drawing, discounts, etc.). ⁴⁴ Since the instrument has been implemented, students are required to either complete or opt out of completing evaluations prior to viewing grades online. ⁴⁵
<i>Columbia University</i>	During the transition period, incentives such as iPod drawings and extra credit points, were used to encourage student participation. After implementation was complete, incentives were discontinued. Current practice is to withhold grades for a course until the evaluation is complete. ⁴⁶
<i>Northwestern University</i>	Incentives include offering two extra points on grades, access to grades as soon as evaluations are completed, and the ability to view peer responses for future course selection. ⁴⁷
<i>University of California, Irvine</i>	No mandated incentives, although some faculty members give extra credit ⁴⁸

Liberal%2520Arts%2520Colleges%2520and%2520Universities%2520-%2520III%2520101507.doc&ei=v3KBSrKHEoawNrCywKcL&usg=AFQjCNEG0wDXaQOCj3qdsZHGjHqzZy-OHg>

⁴³ “Improving the Process of Course Evaluation: The Online Alternative for Berkeley,” *op. cit.*, p. 30.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

Institution	Approach
<i>Yale University</i>	Offered incentives to students during the trial period of the evaluation instrument. Current practice is to withhold grades for a course until the evaluation is complete. ⁴⁹

On this topic, a report prepared by the University of California, Berkeley titled “Improving the Process of Course Evaluation” concludes:

...best practices at peer institutions allow student to opt out of the evaluation process. This is generally accomplished by presenting students with a screen requesting that they complete their course evaluations prior to being allowed to view their grades. At this point students can opt out of completing the evaluations, and can move on to view their grades.⁵⁰

It should be noted that this practice assumes an online course evaluation system.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

Distribution of Course Evaluation Results

The question of access to student course evaluation results is a controversial one. While the primary function of student course evaluations is to improve instruction, it is widely recognized that student course evaluation results are integral to decisions concerning promotion, tenure, and salary increases. In addition, in recent years, students across the county have been claiming rights to access course evaluation results, suggesting that such information is needed to make decisions about course enrollment. As a result, an increasing number of institutions are making these results accessible to the student community.⁵¹

One argument in favor of providing the entire campus community with access to course evaluation results is that the publication of results can be used as an incentive for students to complete course evaluations. In one survey, UC Berkeley found that “forty-four percent, or 230 of 517 student respondents, indicated that having access to evaluation data would be necessary to motivate them to complete course evaluations.”⁵² Further, publicizing course evaluation results is seen by some as an important sign of an institution’s commitment to transparency and accountability.

However, there is concern that widespread accessibility of course results will create an incentive for teachers to “dumb-down” or simplify course material to get better evaluation results,⁵³ and that evaluation results will become a disproportionately weighted factor in students’ course choices.⁵⁴ As the University of Wisconsin’s ad hoc Committee on Student Course Evaluations notes, “‘officially’ published evaluations receive a ‘stamp of approval’ that is not commensurate with their role in the evaluation process, nor with their merit.”⁵⁵ In addition, there is concern over student anonymity, as well as concern over student comments being made widely available.⁵⁶ Finally, the fact that first-year teachers typically receive lower ratings than more experienced teachers raises concern that new instructors or probationary faculty might suffer if ratings from their first instructional efforts were made “officially” public by the campus.⁵⁷

In its investigation, UC Berkeley found:

⁵¹ See Larry Diamond, “ASSU Must Insist on Public Availability of Course Evaluations,” (April 11, 2007). Available online at

<http://74.125.95.132/search?q=cache:xOPWOuqiBlwJ:tusb.stanford.edu/2007/04/assu_must_insist_on_public_a va.html+public+course+evaluation+results&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=firefox-a>

Austin Davis, “Student Activist Pushes for Public Course Evaluations,” (October 30, 2008). Available online at <<http://media.www.middleburycampus.com/media/storage/paper446/news/2008/10/30/News/Student.Activist.Pushes.For.Public.Course.Evaluations-3513617.shtml>>

⁵² “Improving the Process of Course Evaluation: The Online Alternative for Berkeley,” *op. cit.*, p. 32

⁵³ “UW Madison Information on Student Course Evaluations,” *op. cit.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ “Improving the Process of Course Evaluation: The Online Alternative for Berkeley,” *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁵⁷ “UW Madison Information on Student Course Evaluations,” *op. cit.*

...some institutions were able to reach agreement on these issues by making sure that the decision making process was inclusive of those affected by it. Columbia, Northwestern and Yale publish quantitative responses, but qualitative responses are available only to faculty, deans, chairs and individuals responsible for the accumulation and presentation of data pertaining to personnel review and retention processes. Drexel publishes quantitative results, and qualitative results after departmental review.⁵⁸

Although the Course Evaluation Team at Washington and Jefferson College argued vigorously for faculty ownership of the evaluations, it found that various constituencies (the VPAA, the Faculty Review Committee, and department chairs) made credible claims for the need to access the data.⁵⁹ At Seton Hill University, the vice president of academic affairs is the first to see evaluation data, followed by the division chair, and finally the instructor who taught the course.⁶⁰ The Committee on Pedagogy and its Evaluation at Williams College suggests that one of the advantages of online forms is that they allow instructors “to add questions specific to their own courses, which could be tabulated and communicated to the instructor without being passed on to the instructor’s department or used in evaluation.”⁶¹

Table 4 below presents different institutions’ approaches to the issue of student access to course evaluation results.

Table 4: Student Access to Evaluation Results

Institution	Student Access
<i>University of California, Berkeley</i>	Provides students access to some results. ⁶²
<i>Columbia University</i>	Students are given access to core question responses to assist in course selection. ⁶³

⁵⁸ “Improving the Process of Course Evaluation: The Online Alternative for Berkeley,” *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁶⁰ See: <http://blogs.setonhill.edu/Setonian/017737.html>

⁶¹ “Report of the Committee on Pedagogy and its Evaluation (CoPE) and the Steering Committee on the Student Course Survey Form,” *op. cit.*

⁶² “Improving the Process of Course Evaluation: The Online Alternative for Berkeley,” *op. cit.*, p. 32.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

Institution	Student Access
<i>Drexel University</i>	Quantitative data is made available to students. Qualitative data is reviewed by the department prior to publication. ⁶⁴
<i>Northwestern University</i>	Evaluation results of all classes are posted on the one section of the Registrar's web page, unless instructors specifically request in writing that their results be withheld. ⁶⁵
<i>University of California, Irvine</i>	Results are not made public. ⁶⁶
<i>Yale University</i>	Responses to three of the six core questions are accessible by students. ⁶⁷
<i>University of Wisconsin</i>	The ad hoc Committee on Student Course Evaluations recommended that the university campus administration should not itself publish course evaluations – electronically or otherwise. However, if individual departments or student groups desire to do so, the committee indicated that they should be allowed to do so. ⁶⁸
<i>University of Oregon</i>	The online course evaluation web site allows anyone to search the database. ⁶⁹
<i>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</i>	Restricts access to its online database to members of the MIT community. ⁷⁰ The course evaluation site requires an MIT personal certificate to be stored on the computer, which restricts outsider access.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ "UW Madison Information on Student Course Evaluations," *op. cit.*

⁶⁹ "Instructor and Course Evaluation Search," University of Oregon. Available online at <<http://courseevals.uoregon.edu/>>

⁷⁰ "About the Student Subject Evaluations," MIT. Available online at <<http://web.mit.edu/acadinfo/sse/www/>>

Institution	Student Access
<i>Curry College</i>	The Curry Web Information System (CWIS) provides access to all class lists, course evaluations, course enrollment data and other important data. ⁷¹

Building on its finding that four out of five institutions surveyed for best practices made quantitative results available to students and that a majority of students endorsed publication of the results, the online course evaluation research team at UC Berkeley developed several strategies for approaching publication:

- ❖ Publish the results of UC Berkeley's single standardized question.⁷²
- ❖ Create a set of 2-3 questions that are intended only for student use and are not included in the faculty personnel data;
- ❖ Allow faculty to opt out of having their results published for any given semester.
- ❖ Provide students access to evaluation data only if they participate.⁷³

Another example of an institutional decision in regard to results publication comes from Carnegie Mellon University. There, "students and faculty strongly supported the idea of establishing a *minimum percentage* of respondents in a class in order for the [evaluation] results from that class to be public."⁷⁴

⁷¹ "Academic Policies," Curry College. Available online at
<<http://www.curry.edu/faculty+staff/Academics/Academic+Policies.htm>>

⁷² "Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?" (Rated on a 7-point scale, from "Not at all effective" to "Extremely effective")

⁷³ "Improving the Process of Course Evaluation: The Online Alternative for Berkeley," *op. cit.*, p. 32

⁷⁴ Robert Cavalier, "Results of Deliberative Poll on Faculty Course Evaluations," Carnegie Mellon University (October 12, 2006), p. 11. Available online at
<http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/cc/polls/sep06/report/FCE_CC_FinalReport.pdf>

Course Evaluation Cycle

Research on the topic of course evaluation cycles suggests that, beyond the question of whether evaluations should be administered for all courses every delivery cycle, the question for many institutions is whether they should not be evaluated *more than once* per delivery cycle. While it is hoped that end-of-semester evaluations offer data that enables instructors to improve and enhance their teaching skills and course material, it is often the case that mid-semester evaluations are more effective in this respect.⁷⁵ Further, with only end-of-semester evaluations, months may pass before a lecture is evaluated by the students, and even longer before the instructor receives those evaluations. In our review, those institutions that spoke directly to the question of evaluation cycles indicated that they either require or facilitate a mid-semester evaluation in addition to an end-of-semester evaluation.

Table 5: Timing of Course Evaluations

Institution	How often should students complete evaluations?
<i>University of California, Berkeley</i>	In their research on online evaluation systems, the UC Berkeley team found that sixty-two percent of faculty interviewed said that they use an informal mid-semester evaluation, noting the value of this data. They also expressed interest in using an online tool for this purpose if it were available and easy to use. Eighty percent of faculty participants in the Spring 2005 mid-semester online pilot stated how useful it was to receive immediate feedback during the term, when suggested changes could be addressed. ⁷⁶ Ultimately, it was recommended that the institution develop an online course evaluation system that allows for mid-semester evaluations.
<i>University of Wisconsin</i>	The ad hoc committee on student evaluation recommended that faculty and instructional staff engage in their own formative evaluations at mid-semester. These evaluations, termed “formative” for their helpful nature, seek constructive feedback on the course while it is still in progress. They differ from those termed “summative,” which are used for making decisions and are normally given at the end of the semester. The formative evaluations provide a chance to make changes in response to the student comments, whereas the summative ones provides only a chance to influence how the particular course is taught in a subsequent semester. ⁷⁷
<i>Pomona College</i>	The Teaching and Learning Center at Pomona College offers a mid-semester evaluation template (see below). ⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Bird and King, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

⁷⁶ “Improving the Process of Course Evaluation: The Online Alternative for Berkeley,” *op. cit.*, p. 31.

⁷⁷ “UW Madison Information on Student Course Evaluations,” *op. cit.*

⁷⁸ “Mid-Course Evaluation,” Pomona College. Available online at <<http://www.tlc.pomona.edu/MidCourseEvaluationTemplateForFaculty.pdf>>

Institution	How often should students complete evaluations?
<i>Seton Hill University</i>	The student course evaluation questionnaire is used for all adjuncts, all full- and part-time faculty, and for all pre-tenure courses. Once a faculty member is tenured, they only have to give out the evaluations one semester per year. ⁷⁹

Research has suggested that instructors may be well served by using course management programs to solicit feedback after *every lecture*. According to a recent study, “real-time evaluations are likely to be more accurate and contain more constructive suggestions than those completed months after the lecture has taken place.”⁸⁰ Of course, a course management system or online survey would be necessary to facilitate this type of “real-time evaluation.” While the authors of this study go as far as to suggest that “real-time online evaluations may prove to be a valuable assessment tool that could replace standard end-of-course evaluations,”⁸¹ real-time evaluations would have to prove capable of generating the kind of data that can be useful not simply in improving and enhancing teaching, but also in decision-making about tenure and pay raises.

Figure 6: Mid-Course Evaluation Form - Pomona College

What about this course has been especially useful to you thus far?

What about this course, if anything, could be improved? If you have suggestions on how the improvements could be carried out, please indicate those as well.

Are there ways that you—and the other students—could make the course more effective?

Optional: Thus far, how would you rate this course?

⁷⁹ Perkins, *op. cit.*

⁸⁰ Benjamin Chavez and Mary Wagner, “Real-time Student Evaluations of Faculty Teaching Using a Web-Based Course Management Program,” Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (July 19, 2008). Available online at http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/2/5/5/0/8/p255082_index.html

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

Evaluation Delivery: Online Versus Paper Forms

Paper evaluations involve significant costs; not only are there significant resource costs, but the process is labor intensive and often entails long wait times for results. However, it is assumed that institutions that use paper evaluations are likely to have higher response rates than institutions that use online evaluations, as it is often the case that students who attend class on the last day are required to fill out course evaluations. Further, paper evaluations may not raise some of the privacy concerns that online evaluations do.

Online evaluations, on the other hand, are very efficient in regard to administration and analysis. In terms of analysis, “collecting responses into a database is easy to do with an on-line form, more difficult with a paper form, and still more complicated if there are different versions of the paper form.”⁸² Further, an online system offers the possibility of generating more flexible and informative analyses based on relevant comparisons within meaningful course categories. In terms of administration, “there is no need to order, organize, and collect evaluation forms, or to deal with damaged or incorrectly completed forms.”⁸³ Further, the attempt to limit questions to what will fit on one sheet of paper is no longer an issue. An online system also offers the advantages of “reduced cost, convenience to students, [and] better use of class time.”⁸⁴ Finally, while “tailoring” forms to the type and format of individual courses would be very easy to do with an online form, it would be less easy to do with a paper form.⁸⁵

Research suggests that online survey forms may, in fact, encourage participants to respond to survey questions at least as thoroughly, if not better, than do paper forms. Using a randomized experimental design, Heath, Lawyer, and Rasmussen (2007) compared web-based with in-class course evaluations and found that “there was no significant difference in quantitative student responses based on administration method, but students who completed evaluations over the Internet were more likely to give qualitative feedback compared to students who completed their evaluations in the classroom.”⁸⁶

The major concern with online evaluations is low overall participation rates. However, it seems that institutions have found effective ways to combat low response rates, by either offering incentives to fill out course evaluation forms (lotteries with prizes ranging from bookstore cash to free parking) or by requiring students to either fill out or opt out of course evaluations before they can access their

⁸² “Report of the Committee on Pedagogy and its Evaluation (CoPE) and the Steering Committee on the Student Course Survey Form,” *op. cit.*

⁸³ Bird and King, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

⁸⁴ “Memorandum: Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching,” *op. cit.*, p. 7.

⁸⁵ “Report of the Committee on Pedagogy and its Evaluation (CoPE) and the Steering Committee on the Student Course Survey Form,” *op. cit.*

⁸⁶ “Memorandum: Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching,” *op. cit.*, p. 7.

course grade. In fact, far from a declining response rate, a number of institutions featured in the UC Berkeley study saw increasing response rates when they transitioned to Web-based evaluations. Columbia University's response rate increased by 30-40 percentage points, Drexel University's response rate improved by 49-59 percentage points, and Northwestern University's response rate increased by 55 to 65 percentage points.⁸⁷

UC Berkeley, Yale, Northwestern, Drexel, and UC Irvine all administer course evaluations online. The University of North Carolina at Charlotte has similarly decided that the benefits of web-based course evaluations "outweigh the inefficiencies of paper and pencil."⁸⁸ Stevenson University⁸⁹ and Curry College⁹⁰ also administer course evaluations online. The Committee on Pedagogy and its Effectiveness at Williams College, however, recommended that course evaluations stay in a paper-based form, filling both sides of a sheet of standard-sized paper, as "online evaluations raised too many questions about privacy and proper form completion to receive COPE's endorsement."⁹¹

⁸⁷ "Improving the Process of Course Evaluation: The Online Alternative for Berkeley," *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15.

⁸⁸ "Student Evaluation of Courses: Kicking and Screaming into the 21st Century," p. 14.

⁸⁹ "Stevenson University," *OnSET.com*. Available online at <http://onset.byu.edu/index.php?title=Stevenson_University>

⁹⁰ "Online Course Evaluation Instructions," Curry College. Available online at <http://www.curry.edu/NR/rdonlyres/3F1D0CAD-1893-40EC-81AA-00D3F82ABBD5/0/course_evaluations_instructions.pdf>

⁹¹ "Report of the Committee on Pedagogy and its Evaluation (COPE) and the Steering Committee on the Student Course Survey Form," *op. cit.*

Building an Egalitarian Model of Course Evaluation

In this final section, we focus primarily on how an institution might be more egalitarian in its development of a student course evaluation form and system, and why this is important. While student course evaluations are intended to remediate the power imbalance between students and professors, these evaluations are often seen as exacerbating the power imbalance between faculty and administration: while the faculty is judged, the administration either evaluates or mandates the judgments. This may result in a resistance to student course evaluations among faculty, or a resistance to taking the results of these evaluations seriously. In 2006, James M. Sloat, the Associate Dean for Assessment and New Initiatives, presented a paper at the American Political Science Association's Annual Conference which detailed the development of an "egalitarian model for student course evaluations" at Washington and Jefferson College. This egalitarian model is intended to alleviate the power imbalance between faculty and administrators and to promote buy-in of the new campus-wide student course evaluation system among the faculty.

Just as with UC Berkeley, Washington and Jefferson College learned that "all of the College's peer comparison group had developed their own in-house instruments."⁹² Essential to the egalitarian model of course evaluation is collaborative design of the evaluation instrument. "Some amount of the faculty resistance was driven by their lack of involvement in either the decision to employ a common instrument or the choice of (or design of) the instrument."⁹³ Hence, at Washington and Jefferson, the drafting of the course evaluation instrument was done by working groups with strategic representation, which "included the different divisions (Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, Humanities, Arts), gender balance, junior/senior rank, and at least one 'productive skeptic.'"⁹⁴ Further, these groups "erred intentionally in the direction of disseminating early drafts and seeking both formal and informal feedback."⁹⁵ Allowing the faculty to create the instrument by which they would be evaluated served to minimize the power disparity between faculty and administrator.⁹⁶

The use of pilot projects before full implementation was another component of the egalitarian model of course evaluation. Piloting "allows evaluation administrators to identify and correct instrument and procedure errors before full implementation."⁹⁷ Identifying and correcting errors saves instructors both time and energy, and gives instructors the confidence that the instrument which is being used to evaluate them is not faulty.

⁹² Sloat, *op. cit.*, p. 10

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 13

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 12

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

Also integral to the egalitarian model of course evaluation is a commitment to listening and adapting. “As faculty became increasingly aware that their feedback was incorporated in both the construction of the instrument and the design of policies/procedures, they became increasingly willing both to offer additional feedback and to accept the instrument that came out of the discussions.”⁹⁸

Washington and Jefferson also considered administering a faculty course evaluation in addition to the student course evaluation.

The rationale behind this faculty course evaluation was that faculty would be in a better position to reflect on the elements of a course while those elements were still “fresh.” Politically, the faculty course evaluation also provided faculty with the chance to frame the course and the student course evaluations. In cases where the course did not function as well as anticipated, the faculty member would have the opportunity to offer an explanation—which might either mitigate or enhance the student comments.⁹⁹

However, ultimately it was decided that the faculty course evaluation be left out of the pilot project.

Finally, to prevent the potential abuse of quantitative data by those who see only the summary report and do not have the opportunity to read student comments or to review other forms of course assessment, the Course Evaluation Team at Washington and Jefferson College recommended that “a document addressing interpretive constraints be distributed both to individual faculty recipients and also to reviewing parties.”¹⁰⁰ This document – “How to Read/Interpret Your Pilot Course Evaluation Summary Instructor Report” – provided step-by-step guidance to understanding the summary report.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

Note

This brief was written to fulfill the specific request of an individual member of The Hanover Research Council. As such, it may not satisfy the needs of all members. We encourage any and all members who have additional questions about this topic – or any other – to contact us.

Caveat

The publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this brief. The publisher and authors make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this brief and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of fitness for a particular purpose. There are no warranties which extend beyond the descriptions contained in this paragraph. No warranty may be created or extended by representatives of The Hanover Research Council or its marketing materials. The accuracy and completeness of the information provided herein and the opinions stated herein are not guaranteed or warranted to produce any particular results, and the advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for every member. Neither the publisher nor the authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages. Moreover, The Hanover Research Council is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. Members requiring such services are advised to consult an appropriate professional.