

EXAMPLE

MARQUETTE ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM (MOCES)

SPRING 2009 RESULTS

****CONFIDENTIAL****

Doe, John E

Example Department

You are receiving a copy of your results because the online software does not support the reporting of the median of the combined core items and benchmark statistics.

**These results do not include student comments. Comments can be accessed online at:
<https://courseval.marquette.edu/etw/crseval.asp>**

Please email courseval@marquette.edu with questions or concerns.

EXAMPLE

Doe, John E
Spring 2009
Instructor Summary

MARQUETTE ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM (MOCES)

Summary of Combined Core Items Median by Term and Class: Fall 2008 - Spring 2009

BENCHMARK STATS ²

Term	Class	Core Items Median ¹	Dept Mean(sd)	College Mean(sd)	Univ Mean(sd)	Total Enrollment	Number of Responders	Response Rate
Spring 2009	EXPL 1 1001	4.6	5.0 (0.72)	4.9 (0.68)	4.9 (0.69)	24	12	50.0%
Spring 2009	EXPL 2 1002	5.0	4.9 (0.42)	4.8 (0.60)	4.9 (0.69)	24	16	66.7%
Spring 2009	EXPL 10 1003	4.7	4.6 (0.72)	4.9 (0.68)	4.9 (0.69)	24	15	62.5%
Fall 2008	EXPL 1 1001	5.1	4.7 (0.77)	4.8 (0.68)	4.9 (0.68)	25	13	52.0%
Fall 2008	EXPL 2 1002	4.9	4.9 (0.61)	4.9 (0.65)	4.9 (0.68)	25	17	68.0%
Fall 2008	EXPL 10 1003	5.7	4.8 (0.62)	4.9 (0.65)	4.9 (0.68)	25	22	88.0%

¹ Median combines the responses to the four core items. These are: How was this class as a whole? How was the content of this class? How was the instructor's contribution to this class? How effective was the instructor in this class?

² Benchmark stats represent department, college, and university means and standard deviations (sd) calculated over class medians. The department and college means represent the department and college of the class, which may differ from the department and college of the instructor.

EXAMPLE

EXPLANATION OF MOCES COURSE PROFILES

These results summarize data obtained for a class from the 15 objective items of the MOCES instrument this term. The items are grouped according to whether they are core items, comparable to items that appeared on previous IAS Form X evaluations, or whether they assess other aspects of the class or the instructor(s). The item number indicates the order in which the item is presented on the MOCES instrument (visit www.mu.edu/oira/cevaldocuments/evaluation_form.pdf to view a sample MOCES form).

All of the objective items have a 1-6 response scale, but the core item responses have different labels than the others.

Core Items (1, 2, 10, 11)	Class & Instructor Items (3 – 9, 12 – 15)
Excellent (E) = 6	Strongly Agree (SA) = 6
Very Good (VG) = 5	Agree (A) = 5
Good (G) = 4	Somewhat Agree (OA) = 4
Fair (F) = 3	Somewhat Disagree (OD) = 3
Poor (P) = 2	Disagree (D) = 2
Very Poor (VP) = 1	Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1

Item Statistics

Percentages. These six columns contain the percentage distribution of obtained responses. A student can select only one response per item.

Median. This is the value on the response scale that divides the number of obtained responses in half. It has been adjusted to account for the categorical nature of the responses and rounded to the nearest tenth. **To compare core item medians from the MOCES with medians of corresponding core items from the IAS Form X evaluations (which have 0-5 response scales), you must first add 1.0 to the IAS median.** Medians from non-core items of the IAS (which have 1-7 response scales) are not directly comparable.

Mean and Standard Deviation (Department, College, and University). These statistics are provided as benchmarks. They are calculated across all class and instructor medians, but do not include classes with 5 or fewer responders whose response rate was less than 100%. Means and standard deviations are based on the number of classes (for class items), and number of instructors (for instructor items) displayed in the response summary at the bottom of each class profile. For purposes of calculating these statistics, courses are assigned to the department and college to which they belong administratively (displayed at the upper left of the class profile).

Response Summary

The response summary displays counts on which the other statistics are based. The number of responders is the total number of evaluations submitted by enrolled students. Total enrollment is the total number enrolled students and is a duplicated headcount at department, college, and university levels. Response rate is the percent of students enrolled that responded. The number of classes evaluated is computed across all sessions in the term, but excludes classes with 5 or fewer responses whose response rate was less than 100%. The number of instructors evaluated may be greater than the number of classes due to team-taught classes.

EXAMPLE

EXPL 1 1001
Example Department
Example College

Doe, John E
Spring 2009
Course Profile

MARQUETTE ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM (MOCES)

		PERCENTAGES						BENCHMARK STATS ²			
Core Questions		E (6)	VG (5)	G (4)	F (3)	P (2)	VP ¹ (1)	Median ³	Dept Mean(sd)	College Mean(sd)	Univ Mean(sd)
1	How was this class as a whole?	8	33	58	0	0	0	4.4	4.8 (0.78)	4.7 (0.69)	4.7 (0.69)
2	How was the content of this class?	0	58	42	0	0	0	4.6	4.8 (0.75)	4.8 (0.63)	4.8 (0.64)
10	How was the instructor's contribution to this class?	8	58	17	17	0	0	4.8	5.2 (0.70)	5.1 (0.69)	5.1 (0.72)
11	How effective was the instructor in this class?	0	50	25	25	0	0	4.5	5.1 (0.79)	5.0 (0.78)	5.0 (0.79)
COMBINED CORE ITEMS		4	50	35	10	0	0	4.6	5.0 (0.72)	4.9 (0.68)	4.9 (0.69)

Course Questions		SA (6)	A (5)	OA (4)	OD (3)	D (2)	SD ⁴ (1)	Median	Dept Mean(sd)	College Mean(sd)	Univ Mean(sd)
3	This class positively impacted my comprehension of written material in this subject.	0	58	42	0	0	0	4.6	4.8 (0.62)	5.0 (0.55)	5.0 (0.55)
4	This class positively impacted my problem solving abilities in this subject.	0	50	50	0	0	0	4.5	4.8 (0.68)	4.9 (0.56)	5.0 (0.56)
5	This class positively impacted my ability to communicate orally and/or in writing.	8	75	17	0	0	0	4.9	4.8 (0.73)	4.9 (0.61)	4.9 (0.60)
6	This class was intellectually challenging.	8	58	25	8	0	0	4.8	4.2 (0.57)	5.1 (0.57)	5.0 (0.60)
7	Evaluations of course work (e.g. exams, papers) were consistent with class learning objectives.	0	50	42	8	0	0	4.5	5.0 (0.55)	5.2 (0.49)	5.1 (0.50)
8	Assistance and/or extra help were available outside of class time.	8	50	42	0	0	0	4.7	5.1 (0.66)	5.2 (0.48)	5.2 (0.53)
9	Expectations of students were presented clearly.	0	25	42	17	17	0	3.9	5.0 (0.68)	5.1 (0.57)	5.1 (0.59)

Instructor Questions		SA (6)	A (5)	OA (4)	OD (3)	D (2)	SD ⁴ (1)	Median	Dept Mean(sd)	College Mean(sd)	Univ Mean(sd)
12	This instructor provided explanations that reduced confusion.	0	58	33	0	8	0	4.6	5.1 (0.74)	5.1 (0.68)	5.1 (0.68)
13	This instructor was well organized.	0	50	25	8	17	0	4.5	5.1 (0.73)	5.2 (0.62)	5.2 (0.64)
14	This instructor was interesting.	33	33	17	17	0	0	5.0	5.3 (0.42)	5.1 (0.75)	5.1 (0.74)
15	This instructor encouraged student participation.	67	33	0	0	0	0	5.8	5.5 (0.50)	5.3 (0.71)	5.3 (0.66)

RESPONSE SUMMARY

	Number of Responders	Total Enrollment	Response Rate	Number of Classes Evaluated	Number of Instructors Evaluated
EXPL 1 1001	12	24	50.0%	1	1
Department	215	344	62.5%	11	14
College	11,613	20,035	58.0%	634	643
Marquette University	22,964	38,713	59.3%	1,231	1,266

¹ E(6)=Excellent, VG(5)=Very Good, G(4)=Good, F(3)=Fair, P(2)=Poor, VP(1)=Very Poor

² Benchmark stats represent department, college, and university means and standard deviations (sd) calculated over class medians

³ The MOCES course evaluation median is based on a 1-6 scale whereas the IAS median is based on a 0-5 scale

⁴ SA(6)=Strongly Agree, A(5)=Agree, OA(4)=Somewhat Agree, OD(3)=Somewhat Disagree, D(2)=Disagree, SD(1)=Strongly Disagree

EXAMPLE

EXPL 2 1002
Example Department
Example College

Doe, John E
Spring 2009
Course Profile

MARQUETTE ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM (MOCES)

		PERCENTAGES						BENCHMARK STATS ²			
Core Questions		E (6)	VG (5)	G (4)	F (3)	P (2)	VP ¹ (1)	Median ³	Dept Mean(sd)	College Mean(sd)	Univ Mean(sd)
1	How was this class as a whole?	19	44	38	0	0	0	4.8	4.8 (0.35)	4.7 (0.59)	4.7 (0.69)
2	How was the content of this class?	25	56	19	0	0	0	5.1	4.8 (0.40)	4.8 (0.55)	4.8 (0.64)
10	How was the instructor's contribution to this class?	38	50	13	0	0	0	5.3	5.1 (0.52)	5.0 (0.67)	5.1 (0.72)
11	How effective was the instructor in this class?	31	44	25	0	0	0	5.1	4.9 (0.48)	4.8 (0.69)	5.0 (0.79)
COMBINED CORE ITEMS		28	48	23	0	0	0	5.0	4.9 (0.42)	4.8 (0.60)	4.9 (0.69)

Course Questions		SA (6)	A (5)	OA (4)	OD (3)	D (2)	SD ⁴ (1)	Median	Dept Mean(sd)	College Mean(sd)	Univ Mean(sd)
3	This class positively impacted my comprehension of written material in this subject.	44	38	19	0	0	0	5.3	5.2 (0.33)	5.0 (0.44)	5.0 (0.55)
4	This class positively impacted my problem solving abilities in this subject.	13	38	44	6	0	0	4.5	5.0 (0.37)	5.1 (0.42)	5.0 (0.56)
5	This class positively impacted my ability to communicate orally and/or in writing.	19	25	25	19	13	0	4.3	4.9 (0.54)	4.8 (0.50)	4.9 (0.60)
6	This class was intellectually challenging.	19	63	13	6	0	0	5.0	5.2 (0.47)	5.1 (0.49)	5.0 (0.60)
7	Evaluations of course work (e.g. exams, papers) were consistent with class learning objectives.	44	50	6	0	0	0	5.4	5.1 (0.31)	5.1 (0.44)	5.1 (0.50)
8	Assistance and/or extra help were available outside of class time.	19	25	31	19	0	6	4.3	4.9 (0.56)	5.1 (0.56)	5.2 (0.53)
9	Expectations of students were presented clearly.	44	38	19	0	0	0	5.3	5.0 (0.38)	5.1 (0.44)	5.1 (0.59)

Instructor Questions		SA (6)	A (5)	OA (4)	OD (3)	D (2)	SD ⁴ (1)	Median	Dept Mean(sd)	College Mean(sd)	Univ Mean(sd)
12	This instructor provided explanations that reduced confusion.	25	69	6	0	0	0	5.1	5.1 (0.55)	5.0 (0.60)	5.1 (0.68)
13	This instructor was well organized.	44	38	19	0	0	0	5.3	5.2 (0.51)	5.2 (0.57)	5.2 (0.64)
14	This instructor was interesting.	25	38	25	13	0	0	4.8	5.1 (0.37)	5.0 (0.65)	5.1 (0.74)
15	This instructor encouraged student participation.	6	19	44	13	19	0	3.9	5.0 (0.46)	5.1 (0.58)	5.3 (0.66)

RESPONSE SUMMARY

	Number of Responders	Total Enrollment	Response Rate	Number of Classes Evaluated	Number of Instructors Evaluated
EXPL 2 1002	16	24	66.7%	1	1
Department	228	375	60.8%	14	14
College	1,589	2,641	60.2%	90	96
Marquette University	22,964	38,713	59.3%	1,231	1,266

¹ E(6)=Excellent, VG(5)=Very Good, G(4)=Good, F(3)=Fair, P(2)=Poor, VP(1)=Very Poor

² Benchmark stats represent department, college, and university means and standard deviations (sd) calculated over class medians

³ The MOCES course evaluation median is based on a 1-6 scale whereas the IAS median is based on a 0-5 scale

⁴ SA(6)=Strongly Agree, A(5)=Agree, OA(4)=Somewhat Agree, OD(3)=Somewhat Disagree, D(2)=Disagree, SD(1)=Strongly Disagree

EXAMPLE

EXPL 10 1003
Example Department
Example College

Doe, John E
Spring 2009
Course Profile

MARQUETTE ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM (MOCES)

		PERCENTAGES						BENCHMARK STATS ²			
Core Questions		E (6)	VG (5)	G (4)	F (3)	P (2)	VP ¹ (1)	Median ³	Dept Mean(sd)	College Mean(sd)	Univ Mean(sd)
1	How was this class as a whole?	27	20	40	13	0	0	4.4	4.5 (0.73)	4.7 (0.69)	4.7 (0.69)
2	How was the content of this class?	33	20	40	7	0	0	4.7	4.6 (0.60)	4.8 (0.63)	4.8 (0.64)
10	How was the instructor's contribution to this class?	33	33	20	7	7	0	5.0	4.6 (0.77)	5.1 (0.69)	5.1 (0.72)
11	How effective was the instructor in this class?	13	47	13	20	7	0	4.7	4.5 (0.88)	5.0 (0.78)	5.0 (0.79)
COMBINED CORE ITEMS		27	30	28	12	3	0	4.7	4.6 (0.72)	4.9 (0.68)	4.9 (0.69)

Course Questions		SA (6)	A (5)	OA (4)	OD (3)	D (2)	SD ⁴ (1)	Median	Dept Mean(sd)	College Mean(sd)	Univ Mean(sd)
3	This class positively impacted my comprehension of written material in this subject.	27	47	20	7	0	0	5.0	4.7 (0.52)	5.0 (0.55)	5.0 (0.55)
4	This class positively impacted my problem solving abilities in this subject.	13	60	20	7	0	0	4.9	4.6 (0.57)	4.9 (0.56)	5.0 (0.56)
5	This class positively impacted my ability to communicate orally and/or in writing.	20	27	33	13	7	0	4.4	4.4 (0.71)	4.9 (0.61)	4.9 (0.60)
6	This class was intellectually challenging.	47	47	7	0	0	0	5.4	4.9 (0.61)	5.1 (0.57)	5.0 (0.60)
7	Evaluations of course work (e.g. exams, papers) were consistent with class learning objectives.	40	33	20	7	0	0	5.2	4.8 (0.58)	5.2 (0.49)	5.1 (0.50)
8	Assistance and/or extra help were available outside of class time.	53	33	13	0	0	0	5.6	5.0 (0.44)	5.2 (0.48)	5.2 (0.53)
9	Expectations of students were presented clearly.	27	60	7	0	7	0	5.1	4.8 (0.69)	5.1 (0.57)	5.1 (0.59)

Instructor Questions		SA (6)	A (5)	OA (4)	OD (3)	D (2)	SD ⁴ (1)	Median	Dept Mean(sd)	College Mean(sd)	Univ Mean(sd)
12	This instructor provided explanations that reduced confusion.	13	33	40	7	7	0	4.4	4.7 (0.75)	5.1 (0.68)	5.1 (0.68)
13	This instructor was well organized.	27	47	13	7	7	0	5.0	4.7 (0.71)	5.2 (0.62)	5.2 (0.64)
14	This instructor was interesting.	20	27	40	7	0	7	4.4	4.7 (0.77)	5.1 (0.75)	5.1 (0.74)
15	This instructor encouraged student participation.	40	20	33	7	0	0	5.0	5.0 (0.59)	5.3 (0.71)	5.3 (0.66)

RESPONSE SUMMARY

	Number of Responders	Total Enrollment	Response Rate	Number of Classes Evaluated	Number of Instructors Evaluated
EXPL 10 1003	15	24	62.5%	1	1
Department	748	1,187	63.0%	16	18
College	11,613	20,035	58.0%	634	643
Marquette University	22,964	38,713	59.3%	1,231	1,266

¹ E(6)=Excellent, VG(5)=Very Good, G(4)=Good, F(3)=Fair, P(2)=Poor, VP(1)=Very Poor

² Benchmark stats represent department, college, and university means and standard deviations (sd) calculated over class medians

³ The MOCES course evaluation median is based on a 1-6 scale whereas the IAS median is based on a 0-5 scale

⁴ SA(6)=Strongly Agree, A(5)=Agree, OA(4)=Somewhat Agree, OD(3)=Somewhat Disagree, D(2)=Disagree, SD(1)=Strongly Disagree