

Chapter XI: STUDENT INTERVIEW PROJECT

Who takes it?

Volunteers from a random sample of students complete the Interview Project. The University Assessment Committee selects one or two class levels (e.g., first year students, seniors) from which the sample is drawn.

When is it administered?

The Interview Project is administered during roughly the first half of the spring semester.

How long does it take for the student to complete the interview?

The interview plus accompanying questionnaires require about 30 minutes.

What office administers it?

The Interview Project is administered by the University Assessment Committee and the Chair of the Student Interview Project, plus additional volunteers, including students, faculty, and University administrators. Interviews are conducted by a faculty member or administrator plus a student co-interviewer.

Who originates the questions?

The University Assessment Committee and the Chair of the Student Interview Project write and assemble the project materials.

When are results typically available?

Results are usually available at the end of the summer following data collection.

What type of information is sought?

The University Assessment Committee selects questions based on current curricular or co-curricular topics of interest to the University. In 2007 participants reported about their engagement as students at Truman State University.

From whom are the results available?

Results of the Interview Project are available from the Vice President for Academic Affairs Office and the Chair of the Interview Project.

To whom are the results typically available?

Results are available to the Assessment Committee and the University community through University-wide conferences and this *Almanac*.

Are the results available by department or discipline?

Results are not broken down by department or discipline.

Are the results comparable to data of other universities?

The results are not directly comparable with other institutions.

Executive Summary

The 2007 Student Interview Project (1) described students' reports of faculty and staff members' behaviors that influence their engagement, and (2) tested a value-added model of changes in engagement as a function of faculty and staff members' behaviors. Participants ($N = 112$) were Truman State University undergraduates volunteering from a randomly selected pool of students who had completed the College Student Engagement Questionnaire (used to measure engagement and satisfaction) during the previous academic year. Participants completed semi-structured interviews and questionnaires assessing current engagement and satisfaction.

Interviewees described faculty and staff behaviors in the classroom, outside of the classroom, and during academic advising as influencing their engagement. Interviewees said frequently that their engagement was increased by faculty and staff interacting in a warm and friendly manner (all three contexts), promoting the value of education (classroom), encouraging student participation (classroom), being available to students (outside classroom), participating in the campus community (outside classroom), responding to students' interests (advising), and conveying expertise (advising). Conversely, interviewees suggested that their engagement was decreased by faculty and staff being unresponsive to students' interests (all three contexts), interacting unpleasantly (classroom and outside classroom), being disorganized (classroom), being unavailable to students (outside classroom and advising), and appearing unknowledgeable (advising). Participants mentioned additional behaviors less frequently.

Interviewees reported more behaviors increasing than decreasing their engagement, on average, and on standardized questionnaires, their average engagement and satisfaction were similar to available national norms. Contrary to expectations, however, participants' interview reports did not predict their current engagement or changes in engagement, as measured by questionnaires. Interview responses did predict current satisfaction with college. Consequently, interview responses may have more strongly reflected satisfaction than engagement.

Nonetheless, the results of the 2007 Student Interview Project provide insights into students' experiences of faculty and staff members' behaviors in the classroom, in the university community, and during academic advising. Faculty and staff members may wish to consider how participants' descriptions of behavior apply to their functioning in these contexts and amplify, maintain, or discontinue particular behaviors in light of students' views.

Background and Rationale

Truman State University's annual Student Interview Project addresses issues relevant to students' experiences and the University's functioning. For example, the 2005 and 2006 Projects examined costs and benefits of students' leadership and service learning experiences (Vittengl, Brooks, & Pickett, 2005; Vittengl, Wessel, & Wooldridge, 2006). The 2007 Student Interview Project focused on the relations between faculty and staff members' behaviors and students' engagement. For this Project, engagement was as the degree to which students are deeply and enthusiastically involved in their college education (see Appendix A for examples of behaviors marking high and low engagement). Research at other institutions links engagement to a range positive learning and personal outcomes (e.g., Astin, 2001; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005) and suggests that faculty members' behaviors influence students' engagement (e.g., Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005).

The goals of the 2007 Student Interview Project were to (1) describe students' reports of Truman State University faculty and staff members' behaviors that influence their engagement, and (2) test a value-added model of changes in engagement as a function of faculty and staff members' behaviors. Engagement and satisfaction with college were measured with standardized questionnaires in the academic year before the interviews and again at the time of the interview. The interview queried students' experiences of faculty and staff members' behaviors inside and outside of the classroom, including during academic advising. The interview prompted students to identify behaviors that had increased and decreased their engagement. To test value-added models, current engagement and satisfaction were predicted from last year's engagement and satisfaction, respectively, plus faculty and staff members' behaviors coded from interview responses.

Method

Participants

Participants ($N = 112$) were undergraduates at Truman State University who completed the CSEQ during their Junior Interdisciplinary Seminar course the previous academic year. By earned credit hours, 92% of participants were seniors (90-133 credit hours) and 8% were juniors (74-89 credit hours). Most participants (63%) were women and 37% were men; 2% were African American or black; 3% Asian American, Asian, or Pacific Islanders; 92% Caucasian or white

non-Hispanic; 2% Hispanic or Latina/o; 2% reported multiple or mixed ethnicities. Most participants were of traditional college age (mean = 21.6 years, range 20-44).

Participants were recruited from a random sample of 300 prospective participants with introductory letters from the University President's Office, and telephone (primary) and email (secondary) contacts by student co-coordinators of the Project. Letters and follow-up contacts emphasized the value of all students' participation. Students were informed that their participation was voluntary and that their responses would be identified with arbitrary participant numbers, rather than with names or student identification numbers. The participation rate was 37% (112/300).

Procedure

Participants completed a 30-minute assessment session. Participants first completed a short battery of questionnaires (roughly 10-15 minutes). Participants then completed an interview (roughly 10-20 minutes) conducted jointly by a volunteer faculty or staff member ($N = 35$) paired with a volunteer student co-interviewer ($N = 45$).

Measures

Interview. The semi-structured interview contained six questions about faculty and staff members' behaviors in three contexts (in the classroom, outside of the classroom, advising) that increased and decreased students' engagement (see Appendix A). Interviewers were instructed to ask the questions as written and to avoid follow-up questions and prompts unless an interviewee clearly misunderstood a question. Co-interviewers recorded responses independently as key words and phrases. At the conclusion of the interview, the co-interviewers compared their notes and made corrections to a designated master copy, as needed. The master copies were transcribed verbatim into a computer spreadsheet for coding. Project co-coordinators together rationally developed and coded ordered response categories (absent = 0; response present = 1; two or more distinct responses present = 2) for each question with a subsample of 56 participants. A total of 8-9 response categories were developed for each question (see Appendix C for category definitions and example responses). Using these categories, the co-coordinators independently coded a second subsample of 56 participants for each question to check the reliability of their category ratings. In a multilevel model, inter-rater reliability of the pooled ratings (participant-category unit of analysis) was moderately high (intraclass correlation = .81). Discrepancies in the co-coordinators' codes were discussed and resolved before further response coding and analysis.

College Satisfaction. Current satisfaction with Truman State University was measured with a 6-item, rationally constructed questionnaire (Vittengl, Brooks, & Pickett, 2005). Participants rated items such as, “I feel like I belong at Truman State University,” and “I would recommend Truman State University to a friend or relative,” on a 6-point scale of agreement. A total score was derived by averaging the item ratings. Higher scores indicate greater satisfaction. Alpha internal consistency reliability for the satisfaction scale was moderately high (.82) in the current sample.

College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ; Pace & Kuh, 1998). Engagement was operationalized as the sum of 109 quality of effort items. Satisfaction with college was measured as the sum of two items concerning liking college and willingness to choose the same college again. Higher scores indicate greater engagement and satisfaction. Both the CSEQ engagement (.95) and satisfaction (.76) scales demonstrated adequate alpha internal consistency reliability in the current sample.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE; Kuh, 2004). Current engagement was operationalized as the average of the 22 items in the first section of The College Student Report. Higher scores indicate greater engagement. Alpha internal consistency reliability for the current engagement scale was moderately high (.82) in the current sample.

Results

Description of Students' Engagement and Satisfaction with College

Descriptive statistics for participants' engagement and satisfaction with college are shown in Table 1. The scale means should not be compared directly because they are derived from different instruments with different scaling and norms. However, it is possible to compare the means with other samples using the same instruments. Based on national norms (Gonyea et al., 2003; National Survey of Student Engagement, 2006), interview participants' engagement during the prior and current years was slightly higher than average (about 0.1 *SD* higher both years). Similarly, participants' satisfaction with college last year was very nearly average (within rounding error) based on national norms (Gonyea et al.). National norms were not available for the current engagement scale. However, the current average (5.15) was close to that in the 2005 and 2006 Student Interview Projects (Vittengl, Brooks, & Pickett, 2005; Vittengl, Wessel, &

Wooldridge, 2006) and represents high satisfaction rated on a scale of 1 to 6. Overall, the current sample appeared similar to other groups of students in engagement and satisfaction with college.

Correlations among the engagement and college satisfaction scales also appear in Table 1. Two conclusions are evident. First, both engagement and satisfaction showed moderate stability over the retest interval (roughly one year). Second, participants' reports of engagement and satisfaction did not correlate significantly within or across assessment years.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Engagement and Satisfaction Scales

Scale	Source	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	Correlations Among Scales		
			1	2	3
1. Last Year's Engagement	CSEQ	267.65 (38.76)	---		
2. Current Engagement	NSSE	57.85 (8.54)	.56	---	
3. Last Year's Satisfaction with College	CSEQ	6.26 (1.38)	.03	-.07	---
4. Current Satisfaction with College	Local Scale	5.15 (0.70)	.00	.02	.58

Note. $N = 112$. CSEQ = College Student Experiences Questionnaire. NSSE = National Survey of Student Engagement. Scale means should not be compared directly because they are derived from different instruments with varying scaling and norms. Pearson correlations in bold $p < .05$, two-tailed.

Description of Faculty and Staff Members' Behaviors Influencing Engagement

The total number of behaviors that interviewees named as increasing their engagement ($M = 8.61$, $SD = 3.29$) outnumbered behaviors named as decreasing engagement at Truman State University ($M = 5.76$, $SD = 2.68$), $t(111) = 10.51$, $p < .01$. Table 2 summarizes interviewees' reports of faculty and staff members' behaviors in the classroom, outside of the classroom, and during academic advising that increased and decreased their engagement.

In the classroom, interviewees identified an average of three behaviors increasing and three behaviors decreasing their engagement. Interviewees often said that instructors who encouraged student participation (e.g., "hands on" teaching methods, discussion, group work), interact personally (e.g., display enthusiasm, energy, warmth toward students), and promote the value of education (e.g., giving "real world" examples and applications, discussing importance of course material) increased their engagement at Truman State University. Participants also said frequently that instructors who were unresponsive to their interests (e.g., repetitive, scripted,

Table 2: Proportions of Interviewees Reporting Behaviors that Influenced Their Engagement

Faculty and Staff Behavior Category	Setting in which Behavior Occurred		
	In Classroom	Outside Classroom	Advising
Behaviors that Increased Engagement			
Responsive to Students' Interests	16%	38%	61%
Promotes Value of Education	31%	20%	30%
Behaves in an Organized Manner	29%	6%	13%
Conveys Expertise	14%	7%	37%
Interacts Personably	44%	61%	34%
Available to Students	29%	41%	22%
Encourages Student Participation	59%	26%	10%
Participates in Campus Community	---	45%	---
Other	3%	3%	4%
Behaviors Per Interviewee: <i>M (SD)</i>	3.01 (1.42)	3.02 (1.59)	2.58 (1.46)
Behaviors that Decreased Engagement			
Unresponsive to Students' Interests	66%	21%	38%
Devalues Education	21%	8%	9%
Behaves in a Disorganized Manner	26%	6%	13%
Appears Unknowledgeable	7%	2%	34%
Unavailable to Students	21%	31%	27%
Interacts Unpleasantly	38%	31%	25%
Communicates Poorly	23%	---	6%
Acts Unprofessionally	17%	7%	1%
Other	3%	3%	4%
Behaviors Per Interviewee: <i>M (SD)</i>	2.71 (1.40)	1.29 (1.11)	1.75 (1.40)

Note. $N = 112$. Percentages reflect the proportion of interviewees mentioning at least 1 behavior in a category. For each setting, the three most frequently reported categories are bolded. --- indicates that the category did not emerge during the coding process. Behaviors per interviewee reflect the total number of distinct behaviors described across categories, with scores of 0-2 possible for each category.

appearing not to care about students' opinions), unpleasant (e.g., showing little enthusiasm for course material or interest in students, "talking down" to students), and disorganized (e.g., arriving late, seeming unprepared for class, testing on topics unrelated to course material) decreased their level of engagement.

Outside of the classroom, interviewees identified an average of about three behaviors increasing and one behavior decreasing their engagement. Interviewees often said that faculty and staff members who interact personably, participate in the campus community (e.g., advise student organizations, attend campus and athletic events), and are available to students (e.g., for informal interactions, encourage students to visit with them) increase their engagement. Participants also said relatively frequently that faculty and staff who are unavailable to students, interact unpleasantly, and are less responsive to students' interests decreased their engagement.

During academic advising, interviewees identified an average of about three behaviors increasing and two behaviors decreasing their engagement. Interviewees often said that advisors who are responsive to students' interest, convey expertise (e.g., advise confidently across Divisions, understand requirements, discuss academic issues clearly) and interact personably increase their engagement. Participants also reported that advisors who are unresponsive to students' interests, appear unknowledgeable (e.g., provide incorrect information, unfamiliar with graduation requirements, can't answer students' questions), and are unavailable to students decreased their engagement. Participants mentioned additional behaviors somewhat less frequently (see Table 2 and Appendix B).

Prediction of Student Engagement and Satisfaction from Faculty and Staff Behaviors

Ordinary least squares multiple regression was used to predict students' current engagement, and changes in engagement, from faculty and staff behaviors identified during interview. "Other" category interview responses were excluded from these analyses because they contained uncommon and heterogeneous behaviors, leaving 45 categories of behavior coded from interview as predictors (see Table 2). In the first regression model, faculty and staff behaviors did not predict students' current engagement significantly, $F(45,66) = 1.34, p = .14$. To examine changes in engagement, a second regression model predicted current engagement from last year's engagement plus faculty and staff behaviors. Although the overall model was significant, $F(46,65) = 2.41, p < .01$, faculty and staff member behavior did not contribute

significantly to the prediction, $F(45,65) = 0.67, p = .92$. Consequently, questionnaire data failed to validate students' assertions during interview that faculty and staff behaviors changed their level of engagement.

Parallel regression models predicted students' current satisfaction with college, and changes in satisfaction, from faculty and staff behaviors identified during interview. Behaviors coded from interview predicted current satisfaction with college significantly, $F(45,66) = 1.63, p = .03$. To follow-up on this omnibus result, bivariate correlations were computed between specific faculty and staff behaviors and current satisfaction. Three correlations were significant at $p < .05$. Conveying expertise during academic advising was associated with higher satisfaction ($r = .19$), whereas being unresponsive to students' interests outside of the classroom ($r = -.40$) and communicating poorly during academic advising ($r = -.30$) were associated with lower current satisfaction.

To examine changes in satisfaction, a second regression model predicted current satisfaction from last year's satisfaction plus faculty and staff behaviors. Although the overall model was significant, $F(46,65) = 2.98, p < .01$, faculty and staff member behavior did not contribute significantly to the prediction, $F(45,65) = 0.75, p = .85$.

Summary and Conclusions

Participants in the 2007 Student Interview Project described faculty and staff members' behaviors in the classroom, outside of the classroom, and during academic advising as increasing and decreasing their engagement as students at Truman State University. Interview responses were recorded as key words and phrases by interview teams and coded reliably into 51 behavioral categories. Overall, participants identified more behaviors putatively increasing than decreasing their engagement.

Participants identified several behaviors as increasing their engagement frequently. Participants said that warm and friendly behavior from faculty and staff in and outside of the classroom, as well as during academic advising, increased their engagement. In addition, participants reported that faculty and staff promoting the value of education and encouraging student participation in the classroom, being available to students outside of the classroom and participating in the campus community, and responding to students' interests and conveying expertise during advising increased their engagement.

Similarly, participants frequently identified several behaviors as decreasing their engagement. Participants said that their engagement was decreased when faculty and staff members were unresponsive to their interests in and outside of the classroom, as well as during academic advising. In addition, participants reported that faculty and staff interacting unpleasantly in the classroom and in the community, being disorganized in the classroom, being unavailable to students outside of the classroom and during advising, and appearing unknowledgeable during advising decreased their engagement. Participants mentioned additional behaviors less frequently.

Despite interviewees' assertions and the reliability of interview response coding, interview reports did not significantly predict participants' engagement measured with standardized questionnaires. Reasons for the lack of correspondence between interview and questionnaire reports are unclear. It is possible, for example, that participants named behaviors with only minimal impact on their engagement to satisfy situational demands (e.g., interviewers expected to receive answers to questions). Another possibility is that variables other than faculty and staff members' behaviors are dominant influences on engagement. For example, students' personalities (e.g., varying levels of extraversion or achievement-striving) and peer social networks (e.g., friends set norms and examples for students' engagement) may be more influential than faculty and staff members' behaviors.

In partial contrast, participants' interview reports predicted their current satisfaction with college significantly, as measured by questionnaire. Conveying expertise during academic advising was associated with higher satisfaction, whereas being unresponsive to students' interests outside of the classroom and communicating poorly during academic advising were associated with lower current satisfaction. This pattern of results suggests that participants' interview responses may have more strongly reflected their satisfaction than engagement.

Nonetheless, the results of the 2007 Student Interview Project provide insights into students' experiences of faculty and staff members' behaviors. The accuracy of students' descriptions of faculty and staff members' behavior are, of course, unknown. Faculty and staff members may wish to consider if participants' descriptions of behavior apply to their functioning in the classroom, in the university community, and during academic advising. Faculty and staff members may choose to amplify, continue, or discontinue particular behaviors in light of students' characterizations of these behaviors.

References

- Astin, A. W. (2001). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gonyea, R. M., Kish, K. A., Kuh, G. D., Muthiah, R. N., Thomas, A. D. (2003). *College Student Experiences Questionnaire: Norms for the Fourth Edition*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, Policy, and Planning.
- Kuh, G. D. (2004). *The National Survey of Student Engagement: Conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, Policy, and Planning.
- National Survey of Student Engagement (2006). *Truman State University Benchmark Comparisons*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, Policy, and Planning.
- Pace, C. R., & Kuh, G. D. (1998). *College Student Experiences Questionnaire* (4th ed.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Umbach, P. D., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 46, 153-184.
- Vittengl, J. R., Brooks, E., & Pickett, K. (2005). Student interview project. In *Assessment Almanac* (chapter XIV). Kirksville, MO: Truman State University. Available at <http://assessment.truman.edu/almanac/2005/CH14.pdf>
- Vittengl, J. R., Wessel, A., & Wooldridge, C. (2006). Student interview project. In *Assessment Almanac* (chapter XIV). Kirksville, MO: Truman State University. Available at <http://assessment.truman.edu/almanac/2006/CH14.pdf>

Appendix A

Interview Instructions and Questions

Instructions Read by Interviewers to Interviewees

[Co-interviewers alternate reading the paragraphs below.]

We would like to know more about your engagement at Truman State University. We define engagement as the degree to which students are deeply and enthusiastically involved in their college education. Students express engagement in many ways. Highly engaged students may participate frequently in class discussions, talk freely with faculty members outside of class, participate actively in campus organizations, attend campus events often, work on research and other creative projects with faculty members or other students, and frequently discuss ideas from class with friends and family. Less engaged students, in contrast, focus more time and energy on activities apart from their college education.

Differences among students and their environments may produce varying levels of engagement. For example, students' personalities, experiences in high school, and current priorities may contribute to their levels of engagement. For this project, we want to know more about how the environment created by Truman State University's faculty and staff influences engagement.

We are interested in the things that faculty and staff members do and say that influence students' engagement. We are interested in faculty and staff members' specific behaviors because specific behaviors can be reinforced or changed, as needed. For example, a faculty member who frequently misses posted office hours may act to decrease some students' engagement. Knowing about the specific behavior of missing office hours is more useful than broader descriptions of some faculty members as "disorganized" or "bad teachers." Similarly, an advisor who frequently invites students' questions during meetings may act to increase some students' engagement. Knowing about the specific behavior of inviting questions is more useful than broader descriptions of some staff members as "nice" or "good advisors."

We will ask you questions about faculty and staff members' behavior in 3 contexts: (1) in the classroom, (2) outside of the classroom, and (3) during academic advising. In each of these contexts, we would like to know about specific behaviors that you believe have increased your engagement, and about specific behaviors that have decreased your engagement, as a student at Truman State University. *[Show participants the Interview Map to help orient them.]*

Some students may be apprehensive about discussing faculty and staff members' behavior. Please feel free to omit information that would identify individual faculty or staff members, such as names and the titles of classes and organizations. If you choose to give identifying information, the Interview Project Team will remove it from final interview transcripts and reports. In addition, the Interview Project Team always removes interviewees' names from final transcripts and reports.

What questions do you have before we begin? *[Offer clarification and reassurance, as needed.]*

Interview Map: Answer Questions with Examples of Specific Behaviors

ENGAGEMENT = The degree to which students are deeply and enthusiastically involved in their college education.

Faculty and/or Staff Did and Said Things...	These Specific Behaviors Made Me...	
	More Engaged	Less Engaged
In the Classroom	<i>Question 1</i>	<i>Question 2</i>
Outside of the Classroom	<i>Question 3</i>	<i>Question 4</i>
During Academic Advising	<i>Question 5</i>	<i>Question 6</i>

2007 Interview Questions

- (1) What have faculty and staff members done and said in the classroom that made you more engaged in your college education? Please describe specific behaviors that you have experienced.

- (2) What have faculty and staff members done and said in the classroom that made you less engaged in your college education? Please describe specific behaviors that you have experienced.

- (3) What have faculty and staff members done and said outside of the classroom that made you more engaged in your college education? By “outside of the classroom,” I mean in student organizations, residence halls, administrative offices, around campus, in the community, and so on. Please describe specific behaviors that you have experienced.

- (4) What have faculty and staff members done and said outside of the classroom that made you less engaged in your college education? By “outside of the classroom,” I mean in student organizations, residence halls, administrative offices, around campus, in the community, and so on. Please describe specific behaviors that you have experienced.

- (5) What have faculty and staff members done and said during academic advising that made you more engaged in your college education? Please describe specific behaviors that you have experienced.

- (6) What have faculty and staff members done and said during academic advising that made you less engaged in your college education? Please describe specific behaviors that you have experienced.

Appendix B

Interview Question Coding Categories and Examples

Questions 1, 3, 5—More Engaged	Questions 2, 4, 6—Less Engaged
<p>Responsive to Students’ Interests: Tailors information to students’ interests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tailors information to an individual (e.g., talking about personal life, teaching about something someone likes) ○ Does helpful things for a student (i.e. writing letters of recommendation, seeking outside information, networking) ○ Willing to be flexible with ideas, to accept students’ ideas ○ “genuinely interested in what you will need for future” ○ “interested in what you have to say” 	<p>Unresponsive to Students’ Interests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Appears uncaring ○ Seems unwilling to go above and beyond job description ○ Does not take initiative to seek out additional information ○ Requires students to take extensive notes, assigns “busy work,” requires participation in group work, repeats information ○ “Straight lectures with no divergence from notes” ○ “didn’t help” ○ “doesn’t discuss [student’s] future plans”
<p>Promotes Value of Education: Demonstrates or explains the value of information and activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Explaining importance of particular courses, course material, getting involved in activities, future planning, etc. ○ Giving students advice, sharing their perspective on information to demonstrate importance ○ Applies information to “real world” examples ○ General encouragement ○ “include real world examples” ○ “reinforces importance of material” 	<p>Devalues Education: Displays a negative outlook to invoke student participation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stating unimportance of courses or assignments, overemphasizing difficulty ○ “letting class out early b/c doesn’t care” ○ “just lecturing without tying into real life examples” ○ “made the student feel like he was wasting his time and questioned his major”

Questions 1, 3, 5—More Engaged	Questions 2, 4, 6—Less Engaged
<p>Behaves in an Organized Manner: Is orderly and structured in teaching and other activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prepared for lectures, promptness, clear expectations for students ○ How class is physically and structurally organized (i.e. seating style or work structure) ○ “structure – organization” ○ “clear presentation style” ○ “teach the classes as small group settings” ○ “circular classroom arrangement” 	<p>Behaves in a Disorganized Manner: Not orderly and structured in their behaviors and teaching.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unprepared for class, not prompt, does not stay on task, administers tests that are unrelated to covered material ○ How class is physically and structurally organized (i.e. seating style or work structure) ○ “not caring about the subject matter of the class” ○ “showing up late for meetings” ○ “ill prepared professors-student had to do all research on own”
<p>Conveys Expertise: Shows mastery of information presented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Appears confident in teaching material, know answers to asked questions ○ Advises on information across academic Divisions ○ “really understand material” ○ “knew his material so well it added excitement” ○ “brought outside stuff into classroom” 	<p>Appears Unknowledgeable: Individual does not show mastery of conveyed information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provides incorrect information, does not know material ○ “academic advisor seemed unknowledgeable” ○ “not being familiar with graduation requirements” ○ “people can’t answer questions”
<p>Interacts Personally: Interacts on a personal or social level, behaves warmly toward students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Develops good rapport, enthusiastic about things they care about, polite, shows equality in dealings with students ○ “passion about subject” ○ “treated as equal, not student/subordinate” ○ “personal side of prof” 	<p>Interacts Unpleasantly: Individual does not interact warmly with students; lack of enthusiasm for information or students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reserved, apathetic ○ Does not connect with audience, bad at teaching ○ “not caring about the subject matter of the class” ○ “not knowing my name” ○ “professor talked down to students”
<p>Available to Students: Shows willingness to be accessible to students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Available outside of formal interactions, encourages contact and questions ○ “inviting to students” ○ “willingness to interrupt lectures” ○ “encouragement to agree or disagree” ○ “friendly and open atmosphere of discussion” 	<p>Unavailable to Students: Individual is not available for contact outside of formal situation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Misses office hours, few office hours, lack of one on one contact ○ Not open to other ideas ○ “doesn’t leave time for questions” ○ “rushes me out of his office” ○ “missed office hours frequently”

Questions 1, 3, 5—More Engaged	Questions 2, 4, 6—Less Engaged
<p>Encourages Student Participation: Interacts with students in a way that encourages (or even requires) student participation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hands on approaches to discovering new information ○ Requires participation in the classroom (i.e. assignments that require group work or outside research) ○ Way class is run (i.e. group discussion vs. lecture) ○ “hands on activities” ○ “prompted to give answers” ○ “quizzes that encourage you to keep up” ○ “challenging assignments and high expectations” 	
<p>Participates in Campus Community (only applicable to Question 3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Advisor for organization, attends events in the community ○ “faculty members devoted to organization” ○ “attendance at games/meets” ○ “being on a research team allows student to get to know prof better” 	
	<p>Communicates Poorly (Questions 2 & 6): Unable to adequately convey information effectively to students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information is unclear ○ Facing board when talking, does not give feedback to student. ○ “monotone speaking” ○ “teaching with back to class” ○ “not easy to talk to”
	<p>Acts Unprofessionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Showing favoritism, sharing inappropriate personal information, speaking ill of others. ○ “personal favoring of students” ○ “advisor brought kids to meeting, this was distracting and discouraging” ○ “professor talked bad about student behind back to other students” ○ “sarcastic comment about her religious upbringing”

Questions 1, 3, 5—More Engaged	Questions 2, 4, 6—Less Engaged
<p>Other: Meaningful response that does not fit in any of the above categories.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “repeat/review confusing info even if students don’t ask” ○ “teacher understands students don’t like to ask questions” ○ “clear articulation – not monotonous” ○ “discuss material in passing” ○ “talking outside of class about in-class activities/ideas” 	<p>Other: Meaningful response that does not fit in any of the above categories.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “seeing professors at bars” ○ “ideas that were against his religious views” ○ “computer lab classes-hard to stay focused” ○ “had 4 different academic advisors” ○ “OCD-won’t touch papers that he gives to him”

Note: Categories directly across from one another in the table are opposites (or identical in the case of “Other.”). Categories that have no entry directly across are unique.