

Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) Standardized Instrument at OSU

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and course. Results will be reported to the Department Chairperson to be used as part of the overall evaluation of the instructor. These evaluations will have budgetary and promotional implications so please take it seriously. Your responses will remain anonymous (unless you consent to giving your name) and the summaries will not be given to the instructor until after final grades have been assigned.

INSTRUCTIONS: Reflect on the course structure, activities, and experience thus far. Please answer the following questions.

LEARNING (This header not visible to student)						
1	You found the course intellectually challenging and stimulating.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
2	You have learned something which you consider valuable.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
3	Your interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
4	You have learned and understood the subject materials in this course.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

ENTHUSIASM (This header not visible to student)						
5	Instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the course.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) Standardized Instrument at OSU

6	Instructor was dynamic and energetic in conducting the course.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
7	Instructor enhanced presentations with the use of humor.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
8	Instructor's style of presentation held your interest during class.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

	ORGANIZATION (This header not visible to student)					
9	Instructor's explanations were clear.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
10	Course materials were well prepared and carefully explained.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
11	Proposed objectives agreed with those taught so you knew where course was going.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
12	Instructor gave lectures that facilitated taking notes.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

	GROUP INTERACTION (This header not visible to student)					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) Standardized Instrument at OSU

13	Students were encouraged to participate in class discussions.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
14	Students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
15	Students were encouraged to ask questions and were given meaningful answers.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
16	Students were encouraged to express their own ideas and/or question the instructor.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

INDIVIDUAL RAPPORT (This header not visible to student)						
17	Instructor was friendly towards individual students.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
18	Instructor made students feel welcome in seeking help/ advice in or outside of class.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
19	Instructor had a genuine interest in individual students.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
20	Instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class.	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

BREADTH (This header not visible to student)						
21	Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree

Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) Standardized Instrument at OSU

		(1)				(5)
22	Instructor presented the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
23	Instructor presented points of view other than their own when appropriate	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
24	Instructor adequately discussed current developments in the field	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

	EXAMINATIONS (This header not visible to student)					
25	Feedback on examinations/graded materials was valuable	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
26	Methods of evaluating student work were fair and appropriate	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
27	Examinations/graded materials tested course content as emphasized by the instructor	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

	ASSIGNMENTS (This header not visible to student)					
28	Required readings/texts were valuable	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
29	Readings, homework, etc. contributed to appreciation and understanding of subject	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) Standardized Instrument at OSU

	OVERALL					
30	How does this course compare with other courses you have had at Oregon State University (OSU)?	Very Poor (1)	Poor (2)	Moderate (3)	Good (4)	Very Good (5)
31	How does this instructor compare with other instructors you have had at OSU?	Very Poor (1)	Poor (2)	Moderate (3)	Good (4)	Very Good (5)

	OSU							
30	The instructor's contribution to the course was	Very Poor (1)	Poor (2)	Moderate (3)	Good (4)	Very Good (5)	Excellent (6)	Unable to Rate
31	The course as a whole was	Very Poor (1)	Poor (2)	Moderate (3)	Good (4)	Very Good (5)	Excellent (6)	Unable to Rate
32	Please provide any additional comments or feedback.							