

IDEA Course Evaluation Results 2015-2016

IDEA course evaluation results below demonstrate that University of Northwestern students have a positive perception of faculty and courses taken. These ratings were more positive than the IDEA database sample results. The IDEA database sample included nearly 45,000 courses. The University of Northwestern sample included 7,315 students in 385 classes.

	UNW	IDEA
Overall, I rate this professor as excellent.	4.4	4.2
Overall, I rate this class as excellent.	4.2	3.9

Scale: 5=Definitely true 1=Definitely false

Student Perceptions of Amount of Reading, Work Required & Difficulty of Subject matter

University of Northwestern student ratings of the amount of reading required in their classes and the difficulty of subject matter were similar to the ratings of students in the IDEA sample. However, University of Northwestern students rated the amount of work required, outside of reading, higher than the IDEA sample. When compared to the IDEA database, a higher percentage of University of Northwestern students (28% compared to 18%) indicated the class evaluated included “more work than most courses.”

		Average	% of classes below 3.0	% of classes 4.0 or above
Amount of Reading required	UNW	3.2	28%	15%
	IDEA	3.2	33%	15%
Amount of Work in other (non-reading assignments)	UNW	3.5	19%	28%
	IDEA	3.4	21%	18%
Difficulty of the subject matter	UNW	3.4	21%	19%
	IDEA	3.4	20%	18%

Scale 5=Much more than most courses 1=Much less than most courses

Student Perceptions of Progress on Achievement

University of Northwestern students reported greater progress toward achievement of course objectives than the IDEA database for all 12 objectives on the IDEA evaluation form. It should be noted that student responses are tabulated for an objective, **only** if the faculty member selected this as an “Important” or “Essential” expected objective of the course.

Objective	UNW	IDEA
Factual knowledge	4.2	4.0
Specific skills	4.2	4.0
Apply course materials	4.3	4.0
Principles and theories	4.2	3.9
Develop creative capacities	4.1	3.9
Commitment to personal values	4.1	3.8
Analyze and critically evaluate ideas	4.1	3.8
Learn by asking own questions	4.0	3.8
Work as a team member	3.9	3.9
Oral or written communication skill	3.9	3.8
Broaden appreciation (cultural, literature)	4.0	3.7
Use resources to solve problems	3.9	3.7

5=Exceptional progress on objective—1=No apparent progress

Student Perceptions of Christ-Centered Teaching

Two institutional questions were added to the form to measure student perceptions of a Christ-centered teaching approach in their University of Northwestern course. These results (below) show high levels of agreement with these statements.

1. My instructor taught the course from a Christian viewpoint.	4.73
2. My instructor modeled Christ-like behavior during this course.	4.78

Scale: 5=Strongly Agree 1=Strongly disagree

Teaching Methods and Style

The use of specific teaching methods and procedures is closely related to the achievement of student objectives. On the IDEA evaluation form, students were asked to indicate the extent to which common teaching methods and procedures were utilized in the course evaluated. The table shows the percentage of classes where students reported that the method was used “Frequently” or “Almost Always.” This data is only collected for courses where the instructor indicated that the corresponding objective is “Important” or “Essential.” Therefore, it would be expected that the teaching method should be used with frequency. Percentages of more than 60% are considered very positive. The mean score using the scale below is also shown.

Teaching Method and Style	% Frequently or Almost Always	Mean Score
Displayed personal interest in students and their learning	83	4.6
Demonstrated the importance of subject matter	82	4.6
Related course material to real life situations	69	4.5
Gave tests, projects & covered important points	72	4.5
Made it clear how each topic fit into course	74	4.5
Found ways to help students answer their own questions	67	4.4
Scheduled course-work to encourage students to stay up-to-date	67	4.4
Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject	67	4.4
Gave projects that required creative or original thinking	63	4.3
Encouraged students to use multiple resources	62	4.3
Inspired students to set and achieve goals that challenged them	59	4.3
Formed team or discussion groups to facilitate learning	77	4.3
Explained course material clearly and concisely	61	4.3
Asked students to help each other understand ideas or concepts	66	4.3
Explained the reasons for criticism of students’ academic performance	67	4.2
Asked students to share ideas and experiences with others whose backgrounds and viewpoints differed from their own	65	4.2
Involved students in “hands-on” projects	59	4.2
Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond required by most courses	58	4.2
Encouraged student-faculty interaction outside of class	46	4.1

Scale: 5= Almost always ; 4= Frequently; 3=Sometimes; 2=Occasionally; 1=Hardly ever

Primary and Secondary Instructional Approaches

The table below shows the relative frequency of various approaches to instruction. The information was provided by course instructors on the Faculty Information Form. Faculty report the most-utilized instructional approaches are Lecture, Discussion and Skill related activities. There is no comparative information available for this data.

	Percent indicating instructional approach as:	
	Primary	Secondary
Lecture	49	21
Discussion/Recitation	16	29
Seminar	7	3
Skill/Activity	17	18
Laboratory	2	7
Field Experience	0	5
Studio	4	1
Multi-Media	1	2
Practicum/Clinic	1	2
Other/Not indicated	3	13

Course Emphasis

This table shows the course emphasis or the degree to which classes expose students to various kinds of academic activities. The information was provided by course instructors on the Faculty Information Form. Reading, Critical thinking, and Writing received the most emphasis in rated courses. There is no comparative information available for this data.

	Percent indicating amount required was:		
	Much	Some	None or little
Writing	29	53	18
Oral Communication	22	53	26
Computer application	14	32	54
Group work	18	52	30
Math/quantitative work	9	10	81
Critical thinking	50	42	8
Creative/artistic/design	39	19	67
Reading	39	49	13
Memorization	8	39	53