

## APPENDIX F.

### Course Data Questionnaire to Course Instructors Brief

*Prepared by:*

*Erin R. Sanders and Tracy Teel*

*Center for Education Innovation & Learning in the Sciences*

#### Overview

The Course Data Questionnaire (CDQ) was used in a campus-wide data collection effort conducted during the 2015 Winter Quarter. Administered alongside the Department Chair Questionnaire (**Appendix E**), the CDQ was designed to gather information on the range of instructional practices taking place in undergraduate classrooms throughout the UCLA campus with the aim of identifying opportunities to improve the learning experience for all students. Departments were asked to provide information about undergraduate courses from the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 academic years. The questionnaire collected information about instructor accessibility, curriculum design, teaching assistant responsibilities, and course grading strategies. Average scores for midterm and final examinations and course grade distribution cut-offs were requested. This effort was led by Victoria Sork and Sylvia Hurtado and carried out by staff in the Center for Education Innovation and Learning in the Sciences (CEILS). Victoria Sork responded to questions from faculty and administrators about the questionnaire during its administration.

#### Data Collection

##### Questionnaire Administration

CEILS administered the CDQ in February 2015. Fifty-four academic departments were emailed an invitation to participate in data collection efforts. Department chairs were encouraged to work with departmental staff and course instructors to gather the requested information, complete the questionnaire, and return the data by mid-March. This opportunity was also used to invite department chairs to provide supplementary, related information through the Department Chair Questionnaire (**Appendix E**).

The questionnaire included eight close-ended items about curriculum design, teaching assistants, instructor support of students, and grading practices. Average scores for midterm and final examinations were requested, and instructors were asked to provide the distribution of cut-off points for final course letter grades. Raw points and percentages were requested. An open-ended response field was provided to allow instructors to comment about their approach to final course grade distribution. (See Supporting Document F-1 on p. 28 for questionnaire items.)

The course data questionnaire was administered via electronic spreadsheet, to be completed by department staff and returned to CEILS via email. Data organization, cleaning, and analysis was

performed by CEILS research staff using Microsoft Excel, SPSS, and Tableau. In response to errors on the initial instrument, Dr. Sanders sent out a second, amended version during the first week of March. The spreadsheet format had various limitations including multiple responses provided when only one was desired (Items 1-8), novel response options, unanswered items, qualitative explanations, and requested numeric data expressed non-numerically. For those items where several respondents provided similar answers not found among the original options, those new options were coded and added during data cleaning. Additional challenges to the data cleaning and analysis process were introduced when respondents reformatted, rearranged, and otherwise edited the spreadsheet. Optional qualitative comments were compiled by the CEILS researcher and analyzed for themes.

### Sampling

Institutional data was used to compile a list of undergraduate courses offered from the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 academic years. Enrollment and student records information were used to build a dataset pairing course-level information (e.g., catalog and instructor information, enrollments, overall grade information, etc.) with student-level information (e.g., demographics, student grades, enrollment status). All undergraduate courses with enrollments of 50 students or more were considered, and special attention was given to gateway courses, or those required for students to enter into their undergraduate major or program of study, and large lower-division survey courses commonly used to meet General Education (GE) requirements. Courses with separate lab and discussion sections led by Teaching Assistants (TAs) were also of interest. Courses exhibiting higher no-pass (D/F/NP/U) rates than a comparison group and/or grade distribution disparities between underrepresented minority students (URMs) and non-URM peers and/or between male and female students were designated “courses of concern”. The comparison group was comprised of courses from the same departments and majors and having similar enrollment sizes, TA utilization practices, and demographic distributions within the student pool. The final number of individual courses included in the study questionnaire was 1,478, spanning 9 academic divisions/schools and 54 academic programs. There were no identifiers in the questionnaires specifying which courses were in the comparison group versus those identified as “courses of concern”.

### Participant Response

Most departments responded to the questionnaire; however, some departments explicitly chose to opt-out of participating in the data request altogether. Others did not acknowledge the request and did not correspond with CEILS (Departments denoted by carrot, ^, in Table F-1). Aside from those departments asked to provide data for only a few courses, most questionnaires were returned with incomplete information. There were two non-response patterns: 1) a complete lack of data for courses taught by specific instructors, and 2) *partial* course data provided by instructors. Many departments reported that course-level non-responses resulted from not being able to contact instructors because of sabbaticals, travel, or non-employment. The second pattern consisted of missing (or “partial”) information for at least one out of three questionnaire sub-

sections. It was most common for instructors to not provide data about course grade distribution cut-offs. Table F-1 presents response rates at the course-level and distinguishes between those cases with complete information and those with partial data. In a comments field on the questionnaire, some instructors explained why providing requested data presented a challenge. Several departments and faculty members expressed general reservations about the data collection project, methodology, and the end-use intent of the findings. This feedback is included in the brief.

## Summary of Findings

### Questionnaire Response

As indicated in Table F-1, of the 1,478 individual courses included in the course data questionnaire, departments returned data for 689 (47%). Approximately one-quarter (26%) of the returned records featured incomplete data for at least one sub-section of the questionnaire. The final tally of complete returned courses was 511, yielding a response rate of 35%.

Response patterns varied by division/school and by department. At the division-level, Life Sciences submitted the most complete set of requested records (64%), followed by the School of Engineering and Applied Science (59%). The Anderson School of Management was the least responsive, submitting zero records due to non-participation. This was followed by the Graduate School of Education, with data submitted for one of ten (10%) requested records. Eight of thirteen (62%) departments in the Division of Humanities did not participate in the project and submitted no records; this resulted in a divisional response rate of 30%. Due to department-level non-participation by Mathematics, Physics and Astronomy, and Statistics, the division with the highest number of requested courses (n=542), Physical Sciences, had a low response rate of 23%. The Division of Social Sciences yielded a higher response rate of 36%.

### Instructional Practices

The first set of questions asked of instructors covered common instructional policies and practices regarding curriculum design, teaching assistants, instructor availability, and grading strategies. Each item offered respondents a choice of pre-determined response options; there was no write-in or “other” option available. However, due to unintentional ambiguities in the instructions, some instructors responded with more than one option, some wrote in “not applicable,” and others wrote in other options. This resulted in more challenging data cleaning, re-coding, and the addition of new response options to be presented in findings reports.

***Teaching Assistant supervision.*** Data summary Table F-2.1 indicates that the personnel most likely to be responsible for supervising Teaching Assistants (TAs) were course instructors; this was the case for 84% of courses across the 9 participating divisions/schools. It was very rare for TAs to be self-supervised and for non-instructors to bear the sole responsibility for their job performance.

***Frequency of instructor-TA meetings.*** Slightly more than half of responding instructors (56%) indicated that they met with their TAs at least weekly during the term (Table F-2.2). Just over one-third (36%) reported that they met on an “as-needed” or “upon request” basis. It was very uncommon to hold meetings solely at the beginning and/or end of the quarter or not at all.

***Course curriculum design.*** In terms of curriculum design, findings show that it was most common for faculty to develop the content and structure of the courses they taught (70%; Table F-2.3). Only 26% of surveyed courses used a uniform curriculum developed at the department-level across all course offerings. Engineering and Applied Science (48 %), Social Sciences (30%), and Physical Science (28%) were the divisions/schools with the highest percentages of courses taught using standardized curriculum design.

***Laboratory/discussion section curriculum design.*** Responses to the item about curriculum design for laboratory and discussion sections were varied (Table F-2.4). Nearly half of the responses (49%) indicated that curriculum was uniform across sections and designed by the course instructor. One-fifth of surveyed courses (21%) had section curriculum designed by individual TAs and unique to their respective section(s). Although it was not a response option provided in the questionnaire, write-in responses for 88 courses (13%) indicated that lab/discussion section curriculum was a collaborative effort between course instructors and TAs; as a result, those responses were included as a new option in final analysis.

***Teaching Assistant attendance at lectures and primary sections.*** Similar to the previous item, there was a wide range of responses and a substantial number of write-in answers. The most common requirement for TA attendance at primary sections and lectures was mandatory participation at all course sessions (36%; Table F-2.5). This was not an option on the original questionnaire, but it was added after being written in as the response for 241 courses. The second most common pattern was “required upon instructor request” (33%). Optional attendance (9.8%) and non-attendance (7%) requirements were not widely observed. It was also uncommon for TAs to only have to attend the first time they assisted with the course (11%).

***Departmental policies for instructor office hours.*** For half of the courses polled (50%), departments had policies requiring instructors to hold a set minimum number of hours per week and to post that information on the syllabus and the course website (Table F-2.6). In the questionnaire, this response option was specific in stating two hours per week, but respondents wrote in other replies indicating that they were required to hold anywhere from one to three weekly hours. As a result, this option was expanded and rephrased to “a set minimum number of hours per week.” Most Humanities courses represented in the CDQ (85%) observed this pattern. One-third of CDQ courses (33%) operated under less specific policies that did not prescribe the number of weekly hours or posting location requirements. For responding departments the Division of Physical Science, this was the most common response (76%). A smaller percentage of courses surveyed (16%) have no formal requirements for instructor office hours; instead, they are encouraged by departments to hold them. One course was reported to use a “by appointment with instructor” policy.

***Departmental policies for TA office hours.*** A significant percentage of courses (85%) had associated departmental policies that required TAs to hold a set number of weekly office hours and post the information on the syllabus and course website (Table F-2.7). It was uncommon to permit TAs to determine the extent of their hourly availability to students on their own (6%) or to decide themselves whether they wanted to participate in holding office hours at all (3%).

***Approaches to course grade distribution.*** The CDQ collected information about the strategies and approaches that instructors use to determine the final distribution of students' course grades (Table F-2.8). Three response options were used to collect data about norm-referenced grading (referred to in the questionnaire as using a "curve" with a predetermined number of grades A-F awarded), criterion-referenced grading (referred to as straight-scale or competency-based grading in the questionnaire), and other instructor-defined practices. Slightly more than half of the courses polled (52%) reported using a criterion-referenced grading system where cut-offs for different grades are independent of the percentage of students receiving the grade. Twenty-seven percent of courses (27%) were delivered by instructors who took their own approaches to assigning grades that were neither strictly criterion-referenced nor norm-referenced. The remaining 21% followed a practice described in the questionnaire as using a "curve," a term that the research team subsequently discontinued using in favor of the term norm-referenced grading (Brookhart 2009, Reese 2012, Schinske and Tanner 2014).

Comparing those divisions/schools that provided data for 20 or more unique courses, the Division of Social Sciences appears to have used norm-reference grading strategies the most (45%), followed by Life Sciences (19%). At the department level, instructors' most common approach to course grading was a criterion-referenced system, as evidenced by data from Humanities (74%), Life Sciences (53%), and Physical Sciences (53%). Based on the questionnaire design, it is not possible to determine what instructors meant by using other self-designed grading systems, but the results do indicate that there is not consensus among about how to best approach student evaluation and course grading.

### **Student Evaluation Score Averages**

The course average scores for the first midterm examination and the final examination were requested in raw point values. Although this data was generally not difficult for STEM instructors to provide, some respondents from disciplines that use alternate forms of student evaluation encountered problems with the question as it was written. As a result, CEILS staff reformulated the prompt and re-administered the questionnaire with a more inclusive approach that included significant written, oral, or visual assignments in addition to tests. Some instructors were not able to provide raw point values, stating that their assignments were graded on percentage scales and weighted using course-specific formulas to determine the contribution to the final grade. As a result, all data were converted to percentages. It should be noted that it is not possible to infer final course grades from this data. The cleaned data were then provided to Kelly Wahl, Director of Statistical Analysis at the Academic Planning and Budget office to be used in grade cluster analyses (**Appendix D**).

The summary results by division/school are shown in Table F-3.1. An overall average was not calculated due to significant differences across disciplinary areas for assessing student learning and evaluating student academic success. Tables F-3.2 through F-3.9 summarize department-level data by division/school. The following course-level statistics are provided for both the midterm and final examinations: percentage of requested data provided, mean test scores, standard distribution of the mean, and the low, median, and high range values.

### **Course Grade Distribution Cut-Off Points**

As the project team was interested in possible relationships between grading strategies and student success disparities, detailed course-level data about actual grade distributions were requested. The questionnaire directed respondents to supply the raw point values defining the lower limits of each letter grade (i.e., A+, A, A-, B+...). The total points possible for the course were also requested. As with the requests for average examination scores, instructors not operating on points-based systems found it difficult to provide this information. Some said they awarded 100 points for each assignment and test as well as for the course total; instead of summing points for each piece of graded work and determining how to assign letter grades to totals well above 100 points, these instructors instead assigned different weights to student work so that the final point total would fall on a 100-point scale. Write-in responses and the cut-off data values that were provided suggested that many of these instructors were using criterion-based approaches when assigning letter grades. This pattern was more common among the HASS disciplines, but there was still no uniformity in the data within or across departments in terms of grade cut-off points.

Instructors in STEM departments more readily supplied requested cut-off information in raw point values, but considerable inconsistencies in participation at the instructor and departmental levels ultimately compromised the analysis. This exercise did reveal to the study team the extent to which grading practices differ across instructors, departments, and disciplinary areas. In addition, early department chair and instructor feedback regarding the data collection efforts was taken into account as the project evolved, and a summary of their comments is provided in the next section.

### **General Responses to Questionnaire**

Some department chairs expressed reservations about the data collection project, resulting in a few choosing to opt out altogether. These faculty sent detailed written explanations to CEILS Director Sanders and Dean Sork by email, and others spoke with them in-person and by phone. Individual instructors sent questions, comments, and objections to their department chairs and SAOs, and some took advantage of the questionnaire's open comments field to share their opinions.

Some department chairs and instructors commented about the quality and/or appropriateness of the questionnaire items, and there were members of HASS departments who noted a distinct STEM-bias in the phrasing of questions. These critiques were taken seriously and good-faith

efforts were subsequently made to amend the questionnaire and address oversights committed during the initial data request. Although not originally intended to be included with the report, the responses provided important insights into teaching practices, approaches to grading, and faculty perspectives on instruction. A few department chairs expressed a positive and pro-active response to data collection, with one person indicating that the effort had raised much-needed awareness about TA preparation and evaluation.

Even those departments who expressed major concerns about the questionnaire ultimately ended up contributing to the study by raising important questions regarding the methods used to evaluate students. Although CEILS received relatively few requests to opt-out of participation, there were some at the department-level and the instructor-level who explained why they chose to not participate. Some non-participation was due to logistical constraints. The following were reasons given for declining:

- One instructor believed that the requested information was not capable of accurately gauging student experiences in his/her course;
- There was a perception of STEM-bias in the question design (e.g., quantitative scoring of midterms and final examinations) and an insensitivity to differences in teaching and evaluation strategies in HASS disciplines (e.g., multiple qualitative assignments involving writing);
- Some faculty expressed concern that the types of data being collected could potentially be used punitively;
- The timeframe for data collection was too short and not convenient for some departments that received data requests for large numbers of courses;
- Instructor-level data was unavailable for courses because instructors were no longer employed by UCLA and thus could not be contacted.

### **Conclusions from Course Data Questionnaire Responses**

Despite the limitations of the CDQ, they provide several insights that warrant further exploration. First, the utilization of teaching assistants in discussion and laboratory sections needs significant improvement. These sections are an opportunity to enhance the pedagogy of the lecture, conduct active learning, and engage students in an inclusive way that makes all students feel like they can succeed. Second, the grading practices across campus vary highly and the motivation for using one approach or another is not fully understood. Given the impact of grading practices on student success and the achievement gap among students, they deserve more attention. Third, policies around office hours for faculty and TAs are not consistent, which can sometimes discourage students from seeking help.

**References**

Brookhart SM (2009) *Grading*, 2nd Ed. Pearson/Merrill/Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Reese MJ (2013) To Curve or Not to Curve. *The Innovative Instructor*. Accessed 6 June 2015. <http://www.cer.jhu.edu/ii/>

Schinske J and Tanner K (2014) Teaching More by Grading Less (or Differently). *CBE-Life Sciences Educ.* 13: 159-166.

**Table and Supporting Document Index**

Response Rates by Division/School and Department ..... F-9

Responses: Instructional Practices ..... F-11

Responses: Student Evaluation Score Averages ..... F-19

Questionnaire Items ..... F-28

**Course Data Questionnaire Participation**

Table F-1

Course Data Questionnaire: Response Rates by Division/School and Department

Division/School	Department	Course Data Requests	Course Data Requests Received	Partial Course Data Provided	Complete Course Data Provided
		n	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Arts & Architecture	Art	4	4 (100.0)	4 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
	Design I Media Arts	2	2 (100.0)	2 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
	Ethnomusicology^	12	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Music	1	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)
	World Arts & Cultures/Dance	6	6 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	6 (100.0)
Education	Education	10	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (10.0)
Engineering & Applied Science	Bioengineering	4	4 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (100.0)
	Chemical & Bio-molecular Engineering	8	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Civil & Environmental Engineering	3	3 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (100.0)
	Computer Science	43	41 (95.3)	0 (0.0)	41 (95.3)
	Electrical Engineering	35	3 (8.6)	0 (0.0)	3 (8.6)
	Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	16	16 (100.0)	3 (18.8)	13 (81.3)
Humanities	Art History	8	8 (100.0)	2 (25.0)	6 (75.0)
	Asian Languages & Cultures	5	3 (60.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (60.0)
	Classics*	17	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Comparative Literature^	5	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	English	20	18 (90.0)	5 (25.0)	13 (65.0)
	Germanic Languages^	2	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Linguistics	15	10 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	10 (66.7)
	Musicology^	8	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Near Eastern Languages & Cultures^	12	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Philosophy^	15	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Scandinavian Section	8	8 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (100.0)
	Spanish & Portuguese^	15	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Study of Religion^	3	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Life Sciences	Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	14	5 (35.7)	0 (0.0)	5 (35.7)
	Institute for Society & Genetics	4	18 (450.0)	18 (450.0)	0 (0.0)
	Integrative Biology & Physiology	12	10 (83.3)	0 (0.0)	10 (83.3)

Division/School	Department	Course Data Requests	Course Data Requests Received	Partial Course Data Provided	Complete Course Data Provided
		n	n (%)	n n	n (%)
Life Sciences	Life Sciences Core Curriculum	60	60 (100.0)	18 (30.0)	42 (70.0)
	Microbiology, Immunology, & Molecular Genetics	13	13 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (100.0)
	Molecular, Cell & Developmental Biology	24	24 (100.0)	2 (8.3)	22 (91.7)
	Neuroscience	6	5 (83.3)	0 (0.0)	5 (83.3)
	Psychology	86	51 (59.3)	7 (8.1)	44 (51.2)
Management	Management <sup>^</sup>	59	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Physical Sciences	Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences	24	15 (62.5)	4 (16.7)	11 (45.8)
	Chemistry & Biochemistry	161	94 (58.4)	10 (6.2)	84 (52.2)
	Earth, Planetary, & Space Sciences	22	16 (72.7)	1 (4.5)	15 (68.2)
	Mathematics*	159	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Physics & Astronomy <sup>^</sup>	106	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Program in Computing	21	15 (71.4)	3 (14.3)	12 (57.1)
	Statistics <sup>^</sup>	49	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Social Sciences	Anthropology	53	32 (60.4)	4 (7.5)	28 (52.8)
	Asian American Studies	9	6 (66.7)	5 (55.6)	1 (11.1)
	Communication Studies	14	6 (42.9)	0 (0.0)	6 (42.9)
	Economics	86	73 (84.9)	30 (34.9)	43 (50.0)
	Gender Studies	8	8 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (100.0)
	Geography	52	52 (100.0)	52 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
	History	23	11 (47.8)	4 (17.4)	7 (30.4)
	Political Science <sup>^</sup>	60	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Sociology	50	37 (74.0)	3 (6.0)	34 (68.0)
Undergraduate Education	Educational Initiatives	26	10 (38.5)	1 (3.8)	9 (34.6)
	Honors Collegium <sup>∞</sup>	N/A	N/A --	N/A --	N/A --
All Division & Schools	All Courses	1478	689 (46.6)	178 (12.0)	511 (34.6)

Notes: "Partial Course Data" indicates that instructor(s) did not provide data for at least one of the following sub-sections: *Instructional Practices*, *Average Examination Grades*, and/or *Course Grade Distribution Cut-Offs*.

\* - These departments opted out of participation and did not submit data.

<sup>^</sup> - These departments did not provide requested data.

<sup>∞</sup> - Data for this program resides within instructors' academic departments; therefore, the requested information was not available to the program director or staff.

**Instructional Practices**

Table F-2.1

Course Data Questionnaire Item: *Who is responsible for supervision of Teaching Assistants (TAs) for this course?*

Division/School	Instructor Responses	Response Options			
		Course instructor	Course coordinator	Self-supervision	Course instructor, with assistance from others
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Arts & Architecture (n = 25)	13 (52.0)	11 (84.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (15.4)
Education (n = 10)	1 (10.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Engineering & Applied Science (n = 109)	65 (59.6)	65 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Humanities (n = 133)	42 (31.6)	42 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Life Sciences (n = 219)	181 (82.6)	173 (95.6)	5 (2.8)	0 (0.0)	3 (1.7)
Physical Sciences (n = 542)	45 (8.3)	43 (95.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.4)
Social Sciences (n = 355)	186 (52.6)	116 (62.4)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.1)	68 (36.6)
Undergraduate Education (n = 26)	10 (38.5)	5 (50.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (40.0)
All Divisions/Schools (n = 1478)	543 (36.7)	456 (84.0)	6 (1.1)	2 (0.4)	79 (14.5)

Notes: Data not displayed include n=0 for “Lead TA” and n=42 (7.2%) for “Not applicable/no TA.”

Table F-2.2

Course Data Questionnaire Item: *How frequently does the instructor meet with the TAs for this course during the term?*

Division/School	Instructor Responses n (%)	Response Options			
		Once per week, at minimum n (%)	As needed or upon request n (%)	Only at the beginning and/or end of the quarter n (%)	Instructor does not meet with TAs n (%)
Arts & Architecture (n = 25)	13 (52.0)	7 (53.8)	6 (46.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Education (n = 10)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Engineering & Applied Science (n = 109)	67 (61.5)	31 (46.3)	34 (50.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Humanities (n = 133)	47 (35.3)	35 (74.5)	7 (14.9)	1 (2.1)	0 (0.0)
Life Sciences (n = 219)	180 (82.2)	112 (62.2)	56 (31.1)	7 (3.9)	0 (0.0)
Physical Sciences (n = 542)	132 (24.4)	92 (69.7)	40 (30.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Social Sciences (n = 355)	217 (61.1)	93 (42.9)	91 (41.9)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.9)
Undergraduate Education (n = 26)	10 (38.5)	6 (60.0)	4 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
All Divisions/Schools (n = 1478)	667 (45.1)	376 (56.4)	239 (35.8)	8 (1.2)	2 (0.3)

*Note:* Data not displayed include n=42 (7.2%) for “Not applicable/no TA.”

Table F-2.3

Course Data Questionnaire Item: *Who designed the curriculum for this course?*

Division/School	Instructor Responses n (%)	Response Options		
		Department-developed, uniform across course offerings n (%)	Faculty-developed, unique to each instructor's course n (%)	Standardized course offerings, with individual instructor customizations n (%)
Arts & Architecture (n = 25)	13 (52.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
Education (n = 10)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
Engineering & Applied Science (n = 109)	67 (61.5)	32 (47.8)	35 (52.2)	0 (0.0)
Humanities (n = 133)	47 (35.3)	3 (6.4)	43 (91.5)	1 (2.1)
Life Sciences (n = 219)	186 (84.9)	37 (19.9)	145 (78.0)	4 (2.2)
Physical Sciences (n = 542)	135 (24.9)	38 (28.1)	80 (59.3)	17 (12.6)
Social Sciences (n = 355)	220 (62.0)	66 (30.0)	151 (68.6)	3 (1.4)
Undergraduate Education (n = 26)	10 (38.5)	0 (0.0)	10 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
All Divisions/Schools (n = 1478)	679 (45.9)	176 (25.9)	478 (70.4)	25 (3.7)

Table F-2.4

Course Data Questionnaire Item: *Who designs the curriculum for lab or discussion sections for this course?*

Division/School	Instructor Responses	Response Options				
		Department-developed, uniform across sections	Instructor-developed, uniform across sections	TA-developed, unique to section(s)	No formal curriculum	Instructor and TA, jointly developed
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Arts & Architecture (n = 25)	13 (52.0)	0 (0.0)	6 (46.2)	1 (7.7)	0 (0.0)	6 (46.2)
Education (n = 10)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
Engineering & Applied Science (n = 109)	67 (61.5)	9 (13.4)	26 (38.8)	23 (34.3)	1 (1.5)	0 (0.0)
Humanities (n = 133)	47 (35.3)	2 (4.3)	8 (17.0)	16 (34.0)	3 (6.4)	14 (29.8)
Life Sciences (n = 219)	184 (84.0)	19 (10.3)	87 (47.3)	29 (15.8)	2 (1.1)	22 (12.0)
Physical Sciences (n = 542)	139 (25.6)	21 (15.1)	39 (28.1)	33 (23.7)	5 (3.6)	38 (27.3)
Social Sciences (n = 355)	218 (61.4)	0 (0.0)	158 (72.5)	38 (17.4)	1 (0.5)	8 (3.7)
Undergraduate Education (n = 26)	10 (38.5)	0 (0.0)	9 (90.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
All Divisions/Schools (n = 1478)	679 (45.9)	51 (7.5)	333 (49.0)	141 (20.8)	13 (1.9)	88 (13.0)

*Note:* Data not displayed include n=53 (7.8%) for “Not applicable/no TA.”

Table F-2.5

Course Data Questionnaire Item: *What is the requirement for TA attendance at lectures or primary sections of this course?*

Division/School	Instructor Responses	Response Options				
		Neither required nor encouraged	Required only the first time TA'ing course	Required upon instructor request	Optional, at TA's discretion	Required at all course sessions
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Arts & Architecture (n = 25)	13 (52.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (23.1)	0 (0.0)	10 (76.9)
Education (n = 10)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Engineering & Applied Science (n = 109)	67 (61.5)	10 (14.9)	2 (3.0)	30 (44.8)	23 (34.3)	0 (0.0)
Humanities (n = 133)	46 (34.6)	0 (0.0)	4 (8.7)	27 (58.7)	0 (0.0)	11 (23.9)
Life Sciences (n = 219)	186 (84.9)	1 (0.5)	3 (1.6)	56 (30.1)	11 (5.9)	110 (59.1)
Physical Sciences (n = 542)	135 (24.9)	33 (24.4)	46 (34.1)	9 (6.7)	20 (14.8)	26 (19.3)
Social Sciences (n = 355)	215 (60.6)	6 (2.8)	17 (7.9)	94 (43.7)	12 (5.6)	80 (37.2)
Undergraduate Education (n = 26)	10 (38.5)	0 (0.0)	2 (20.0)	4 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (40.0)
All Divisions/Schools (n = 1478)	673 (45.5)	50 (7.4)	74 (11.0)	224 (33.3)	66 (9.8)	241 (35.8)

*Note:* Data not displayed include n=18 (2.7%) for "Not applicable/no TA."

Table F-2.6

Course Data Questionnaire Item: *What departmental policies for instructor office hours apply to this course?*

Division/School	Instructor Responses	Response Options			
		Set number of weekly hours required, to be posted on syllabus and course website	Required weekly, but number of hours and posting details up to instructor	Not formally required, but encouraged	By appointment with instructor
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Arts & Architecture (n = 25)	13 (52.0)	3 (23.1)	6 (46.2)	4 (30.8)	0 (0.0)
Education (n = 10)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Engineering & Applied Science (n = 109)	67 (61.5)	37 (55.2)	2 (3.0)	27 (40.3)	1 (1.5)
Humanities (n = 133)	46 (34.6)	39 (84.8)	7 (15.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Life Sciences (n = 219)	186 (84.9)	89 (47.8)	35 (18.8)	62 (33.3)	0 (0.0)
Physical Sciences (n = 542)	139 (25.6)	26 (18.7)	106 (76.3)	7 (5.0)	0 (0.0)
Social Sciences (n = 355)	220 (62.0)	139 (63.2)	71 (32.2)	10 (4.5)	0 (0.0)
Undergraduate Education (n = 26)	10 (38.5)	9 (90.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)
All Divisions/Schools (n = 1478)	682 (46.1)	342 (50.1)	228 (33.4)	111 (16.3)	1 (0.1)

Table F-2.7

Course Data Questionnaire Item: *What departmental policies for Teaching Assistant (TA) office hours apply to this course?*

Division/School	Instructor Responses n (%)	Response Options		
		Set number of weekly hours required, to be posted on syllabus and course website n (%)	Required weekly, but number of hours and posting details up to TA n (%)	Not formally required, but encouraged n (%)
Arts & Architecture (n = 25)	13 (52.0)	6 (46.2)	3 (23.1)	4 (30.8)
Education (n = 10)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
Engineering & Applied Science (n = 109)	67 (61.5)	56 (83.6)	2 (3.0)	7 (10.4)
Humanities (n = 133)	46 (34.6)	40 (87.0)	3 (6.5)	0 (0.0)
Life Sciences (n = 219)	186 (84.9)	165 (88.7)	19 (10.2)	0 (0.0)
Physical Sciences (n = 542)	139 (25.6)	129 (92.8)	4 (2.9)	6 (4.3)
Social Sciences (n = 355)	218 (61.4)	172 (78.9)	10 (4.6)	1 (0.5)
Undergraduate Education (n = 26)	10 (38.5)	10 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
All Divisions/Schools (n = 1478)	680 (46.0)	578 (85.0)	42 (6.2)	18 (2.6)

*Note:* Data not displayed include n=42 (6.2%) for “Not applicable/no TA.”

Table F-2.8

Course Data Questionnaire Item: *How is the grade distribution determined for this course?*

Division/School	Instructor Responses n (%)	Response Options		
		Course grades are based on a curve with a certain percentage decided beforehand on the distribution of grades A through F n (%)	Straight scale, or competency-based scale, where the cut-offs for different grades are independent of the percentage of students receiving that grade n (%)	Neither, but instructor describes his/her own grade distribution n (%)
Arts & Architecture (n = 25)	13 (52.0)	2 (15.4)	7 (53.8)	4 (30.8)
Education (n = 10)	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
Engineering & Applied Science (n = 109)	67 (61.5)	6 (9.0)	28 (41.8)	33 (49.3)
Humanities (n = 133)	46 (34.6)	1 (2.2)	34 (73.9)	11 (23.9)
Life Sciences (n = 219)	184 (84.9)	35 (19.0)	97 (52.7)	52 (28.3)
Physical Sciences (n = 542)	124 (25.6)	10 (8.1)	66 (53.2)	48 (38.7)
Social Sciences (n = 355)	169 (61.4)	76 (45.0)	75 (44.4)	18 (10.7)
Undergraduate Education (n = 26)	10 (38.5)	0 (0.0)	10 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
All Divisions/Schools (n = 1478)	614 (46.0)	130 (21.2)	318 (51.8)	166 (27.0)

**Student Evaluation Score Averages**

Table F-3.1  
 Course Data Questionnaire: Student Evaluation Score Averages, by Division/School

Division/School	Course Data Requested	Midterm Scores						Final Examination Scores					
		Midterm Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)	Final Examination Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)
Arts & Architecture	25	5 (20.0)	(82.0)	0.04	(78.7)	(81.8)	(85.5)	2 (8.0)	(88.5)	0.04	(86.0)	(88.5)	(91.0)
Education	10	1 (10.0)	(96.0)	--	(96.0)	(96.0)	(96.0)	1 (10.0)	(96.5)	--	(96.5)	(96.5)	(96.5)
Engineering & Applied Science	109	62 (56.9)	(68.9)	0.13	(28.0)	(70.0)	(95.0)	60 (55.0)	(66.4)	0.14	(38.3)	(69.5)	(95.0)
Humanities	133	21 (15.8)	(85.9)	0.07	(67.3)	(86.0)	(92.5)	30 (22.6)	(83.0)	0.12	(50.7)	(85.8)	(100.0)
Life Sciences	219	152 (69.4)	(74.2)	0.10	(40.0)	(76.0)	(91.5)	155 (70.8)	(74.2)	0.08	(49.4)	(74.0)	(93.3)
Physical Sciences	542	126 (23.2)	(68.8)	0.11	(25.0)	(70.0)	(85.7)	131 (24.2)	(68.6)	0.09	(40.0)	(69.0)	(94.4)
Social Sciences	355	106 (29.9)	(76.8)	0.15	(20.0)	(80.8)	(97.0)	109 (30.7)	(73.7)	0.15	(30.0)	(79.0)	(91.1)
Undergraduate Education	26	5 (19.2)	(78.4)	0.08	(66.4)	(80.8)	(88.0)	3 (11.5)	(80.3)	0.04	(76.5)	(80.0)	(84.4)

*Note:* The School of Management (n=59) did not submit requested course data.

Table F-3.2

Course Data Questionnaire: Student Evaluation Score Averages, School of Arts &amp; Architecture

Department	Course Data Requested n	Midterm Scores						Final Examination Scores					
		Midterm Data Provided n(%)	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)	Final Examination Data Provided n(%)	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)
Art	4	1 (25.0)	(85.5)	--	(85.5)	(85.5)	(85.5)	0--	--	--	--	--	--
Design I Media Arts	2	1 (50.0)	(85.5)	--	(85.5)	(85.5)	(85.5)	1 (50.0)	(86.0)	--	(86.0)	(86.0)	(86.0)
Music	1	1 (100.0)	(79.0)	--	(79.0)	(79.0)	(79.0)	1 (100.0)	(91.0)	--	(91.0)	(91.0)	(91.0)
World Arts & Cultures/Dance	6	2 (33.3)	(81.7)	0.04	(78.7)	(81.7)	(84.7)	0--	--	--	--	--	--
School of Arts & Architecture (total)	25	5 (20.0)	(82.0)	0.04	(78.7)	(81.8)	(85.5)	2 (8.0)	(88.5)	0.04	(86.0)	(88.5)	(91.0)

*Note:* The Department of Ethnomusicology (n=12) did not submit requested course data.

Table F-3.3

Course Data Questionnaire: Student Evaluation Score Averages, Department of Education in GSE&IS

	Midterm Scores						Final Examination Scores						
	Course Data Requested	Midterm Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)	Final Examination Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)
Department	n	n(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)	n(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)
Education	10	1 (10.0)	(96.0)	--	(96.0)	(96.0)	(96.0)	1 (10.0)	(96.5)	--	(96.5)	(96.5)	(96.5)
Department of Education in GSE&IS (total)	10	1 (10.0)	(96.0)	--	(96.0)	(96.0)	(96.0)	1 (10.0)	(96.5)	--	(96.5)	(96.5)	(96.5)

Table F-3.4

Course Data Questionnaire: Student Evaluation Score Averages, School of Engineering &amp; Applied Science

	Course Data Requested	Midterm Scores						Final Examination Scores					
		Midterm Data Provided	Mean	SD	Low	Median	High	Final Examination Data Provided	Mean	SD	Low	Median	High
Department	n	n(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)	n(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)
Bioengineering	4	2 (50.0)	(63.8)	0.04	(61.0)	(63.8)	(66.6)	2 (50.0)	(54.2)	0.06	(49.9)	(54.2)	(58.4)
Civil & Environmental Engineering	3	3 (100.0)	(86.8)	0.03	(83.5)	(88.0)	(89.0)	1 (33.3)	(95.0)	--	(95.0)	(95.0)	(95.0)
Computer Science	43	41 (95.3)	(68.9)	0.13	(41.3)	(70.0)	(95.0)	41 (95.3)	(65.3)	0.14	(38.4)	(70.0)	(92.0)
Electrical Engineering	35	3 (8.6)	(56.0)	0.24	(28.0)	(70.0)	(70.0)	3 (8.6)	(66.7)	0.06	(60.0)	(70.0)	(70.0)
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	16	13 (81.3)	(68.5)	0.08	(60.0)	(70.0)	(81.0)	13 (81.3)	(69.3)	0.12	(38.3)	(66.0)	(91.0)
School of Engineering & Applied Science (total)	109	62 (56.9)	(68.9)	0.13	(28.0)	(70.0)	(95.0)	60 (55.0)	(66.4)	0.14	(38.3)	(69.5)	(95.0)

*Note:* The Department of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering (n=8) did not submit requested course data.

Table F-3.5

Course Data Questionnaire: Student Evaluation Score Averages, Division of Humanities

	Course Data Requested	Midterm Scores						Final Examination Scores					
		Midterm Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)	Final Examination Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)
Department	n	n (%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)	n (%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)
Art History	8	6 (75.0)	(86.9)	0.03	(81.0)	(87.3)	(90.0)	6 (75.0)	(87.3)	0.03	(82.5)	(88.0)	(90.0)
Asian Languages & Cultures	5	3 (60.0)	(88.5)	0.04	(86.0)	(87.0)	(92.5)	3 (60.0)	(88.8)	0.03	(86.0)	(88.0)	(92.5)
English	20	4 (20.0)	(84.5)	0.01	(84.0)	(84.0)	(85.9)	9 (45.0)	(85.8)	0.04	(78.0)	(85.0)	(92.0)
Linguistics	15	4 (26.7)	(77.4)	0.09	(67.3)	(78.1)	(86.0)	8 (53.3)	(66.1)	0.08	(50.7)	(66.4)	(79.0)
Scandinavian Section	8	4 (50.0)	(92.5)	0.00	(92.5)	(92.5)	(92.5)	4 (50.0)	(100.0)	0.00	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)
Division of Humanities (total)	133	21 (15.8)	(85.9)	0.07	(67.3)	(86.0)	(92.5)	30 (22.6)	(83.0)	0.12	(50.7)	(85.8)	(100.0)

Notes: The Departments of Comparative Literature (n=5), Germanic Languages (n=2), Musicology (n=8), Near Eastern Languages & Cultures (n=12), Philosophy (n=15), Spanish and Portuguese (n=15), and Study of Religion (n=3) did not submit requested course data. The Department of Classics (n=17) opted out of participation.

Table F-3.6

Course Data Questionnaire: Student Evaluation Score Averages, by Division of Life Sciences

	Course Data Requested	Midterm Scores					Final Examination Scores						
		Midterm Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)	Final Examination Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)
Department	n	n(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)	n(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)
Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	14	5(35.7)	(75.6)	0.08	(65.0)	(73.8)	(87.2)	4(28.6)	(77.0)	0.07	(67.2)	(78.5)	(84.0)
Integrative Biology & Physiology	12	10(83.3)	(75.4)	0.04	(69.4)	(76.0)	(80.0)	10(83.3)	(70.9)	0.04	(63.3)	(70.5)	(80.0)
Life Sciences Core Curriculum	60	53(88.3)	(73.4)	0.08	(53.3)	(74.6)	(86.7)	59(98.3)	(72.3)	0.07	(57.4)	(70.9)	(86.8)
Microbiology, Immunology, & Molecular Genetics	13	13(100.0)	(67.4)	0.14	(46.7)	(69.0)	(85.4)	13(100.0)	(69.2)	0.08	(58.3)	(69.6)	(81.3)
Molecular, Cell & Developmental Biology	24	22(91.7)	(71.7)	0.08	(55.8)	(73.1)	(85.0)	22(91.7)	(75.3)	0.06	(66.5)	(74.3)	(86.3)
Neuroscience	6	5(83.3)	(70.3)	0.12	(52.8)	(69.6)	(83.3)	4(66.7)	(73.4)	0.04	(68.0)	(73.7)	(78.4)
Psychology	86	44(51.2)	(78.5)	0.10	(40.0)	(79.4)	(91.5)	43(50.0)	(78.5)	0.08	(49.4)	(79.1)	(93.3)
Division of Life Sciences (total)	219	152(69.4)	(74.2)	0.10	(40.0)	(76.0)	(91.5)	155(70.8)	(74.2)	0.08	(49.4)	(74.0)	(93.3)

Note: The Institute for Society & Genetics (n=4) did not submit requested grade data.

Table F-3.7

Course Data Questionnaire: Student Evaluation Score Averages, by Division of Physical Sciences

	Course Data Requested	Midterm Scores						Final Examination Scores					
		Midterm Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)	Final Examination Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)
Department	n	n (%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)	n (%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)
Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences	24	11 (45.8)	(75.8)	0.04	(65.6)	(76.6)	(82.1)	11 (45.8)	(71.4)	0.06	(62.9)	(70.6)	(86.7)
Chemistry & Biochemistry	161	88 (54.7)	(65.8)	0.11	(25.0)	(68.0)	(83.0)	93 (57.8)	(65.6)	0.08	(40.0)	(66.0)	(78.0)
Earth, Planetary, & Space Sciences	22	15 (68.2)	(75.5)	0.07	(64.3)	(76.7)	(85.7)	15 (68.2)	(80.9)	0.08	(65.0)	(81.3)	(94.4)
Program in Computing	21	12 (57.1)	(75.9)	0.04	(69.2)	(75.9)	(84.3)	12 (57.1)	(74.4)	0.04	(67.2)	(73.6)	(81.0)
Division of Physical Sciences (total)	542	126 (23.2)	(68.8)	0.11	(25.0)	(70.0)	(85.7)	131 (24.2)	(68.6)	0.09	(40.0)	(69.0)	(94.4)

Notes: The Department of Physics & Astronomy (n=106) and the Department of Statistics (n=49) did not provide requested course data. The Department of Mathematics (n=159) opted out of participation.

Table F-3.8

Course Data Questionnaire: Student Evaluation Score Averages, by Division of Social Sciences

	Course Data Requested	Midterm Scores					Final Examination Scores						
		Midterm Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)	Final Examination Data Provided	Mean (%)	SD	Low (%)	Median (%)	High (%)
Department	n	n (%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)	n (%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)
Anthropology	53	24 (45.3)	(73.2)	0.15	(40.0)	(75.5)	(92.7)	25 (47.2)	(71.5)	0.15	(40.0)	(76.7)	(91.1)
Asian American Studies	9	2 (22.2)	(54.1)	0.41	(25.0)	(54.1)	(83.2)	2 (22.2)	(58.0)	0.40	(30.0)	(58.0)	(86.0)
Communication Studies	14	6 (42.9)	(70.2)	0.13	(60.0)	(63.0)	(87.0)	6 (42.9)	(68.9)	0.15	(56.7)	(60.8)	(89.0)
Economics	86	46 (53.5)	(80.2)	0.12	(54.3)	(80.6)	(97.0)	46 (53.5)	(75.3)	0.11	(55.0)	(77.7)	(91.0)
Gender Studies	8	2 (25.0)	(85.0)	0.00	(85.0)	(85.0)	(85.0)	2 (25.0)	(85.0)	0.00	(85.0)	(85.0)	(85.0)
History	23	4 (17.4)	(69.4)	0.33	(20.0)	(85.3)	(87.0)	4 (17.4)	(73.4)	0.26	(35.0)	(85.3)	(88.0)
Sociology	50	22 (44.0)	(78.0)	0.12	(30.0)	(81.5)	(87.8)	24 (48.0)	(74.7)	0.18	(30.0)	(81.2)	(88.1)
Division of Social Sciences (total)	355	106 (29.9)	(76.8)	0.15	(20.0)	(80.8)	(97.0)	109 (30.7)	(73.7)	0.15	(30.0)	(79.0)	(91.1)

Notes: The Department of Geography (n=52) did not submit grade data, and the Department of Political Science (n=60) did not submit requested course data.

Table F-3.9

Course Survey Questionnaire: Student Evaluation Score Averages, by Division of Undergraduate Education

	Course Data Requested	Midterm Scores					Final Examination Scores						
		Midterm Data Provided	Mean	SD	Low	Median	High	Final Examination Data Provided	Mean	SD	Low	Median	High
Division/School	n	n (%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)	n (%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)
Educational Initiatives	26	5 (19.2)	(78.4)	0.08	(66.4)	(80.8)	(88.0)	3 (11.5)	(80.3)	0.04	(76.5)	(80.0)	(84.4)
Division of Undergraduate Education (total)	26	5 (19.2)	(78.4)	0.08	(66.4)	(80.8)	(88.0)	3 (11.5)	(80.3)	0.04	(76.5)	(80.0)	(84.4)

Note: The Honors Collegium did not submit student examination scores; the data reside with faculty in their respective academic departments.

**Supporting Document F-1***Course Data Questionnaire Items*

Q1: Who is responsible for supervision of TA's for this course?

- 1 = Course instructor
- 2 = Course coordinator, not instructor
- 3 = Lead TA
- 4 = Self-supervised

Q2: How frequently does the instructor meet with the TAs for this course during the term?

- 1 = Every week
- 2 = As needed or upon request
- 3 = Only at beginning and/or end of quarter
- 4 = Instructor does not meet with TAs

Q3: Who designed the curriculum for this course?

- 1 = Department-developed curriculum uniform across course offerings
- 2 = Faculty-developed curriculum unique to each instructor

Q4: Who designs the curriculum for lab or discussion sections for this course?

- 1 = Department-developed curriculum uniform across course offerings
- 2 = Faculty-developed curriculum uniform across sections for that course offering
- 3 = TA-developed curriculum for own sections
- 4 = No formal curriculum

Q5: Attendance at lectures or primary sections by the TA's for this course is:

- 1 = Not required
- 2 = Required only the first time teaching the course regardless of course instructor
- 3 = Required only if course instructor requests attendance
- 4 = Optional

Q6: Faculty instructors teaching this course are:

- 1 = Required to hold two office hours per week and post the hours
- 2 = Required to hold office hours, but the number and posting is up to instructor
- 3 = No formal departmental requirement for office hours but instructors are encouraged to hold them

Q7: Teaching Assistants (TA's) for this course are:

- 1 = Required to hold two office hours per week and post the hours
- 2 = Required to hold office hours, but the number and posting is up to them
- 3 = Have no formal requirement for office hours but are encouraged to hold them

Q8: How is the grade distribution determined for this course?

1 = Course grades are based on a curve with a certain percentage decided beforehand on the distribution of grades A through F

2 = Straight scale, or competency-based scale, where the cut-offs for different grades are independent of the percentage of students receiving that grade

3 = None of the above, but instructor describes his/her own grade distribution

Q9: Grading information on first midterm: What was the number of points out of total points possible on this exam that corresponded to the mean score? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., mean was 50 out of 100 pts total)

Q9B: Grading information on first midterm: What was the total number of points possible on this exam?  
*\*\*If modes of assessment other than midterms are used for a course, please provide total points possible for the first test or significant written, oral, or visual assignment.*

Q10: Grading information for final exam: What was the number of points out of total points possible on this exam that corresponded to the mean score? Again, please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., mean was 75 out of 100 pts total)

Q10B: Grading information on final exam: What was the total number of points possible on this exam?  
*\*\*If a mode of assessment other than a final exam is used for a course, please provide the total number of points possible for the first test or significant written, oral, or visual assignment.*

Q11: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the minimum number of points out of total points corresponding to an A+ grade in the course? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., A+ cut-off was 975 out of 1000 pts possible)

Q12: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the minimum number of points out of total points corresponding to an A grade in the course? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., A cut-off was 925 out of 1000 pts possible)

Q13: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the minimum number of points out of total points corresponding to an A- grade in the course? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., A- cut-off was 890 out of 1000 pts possible)

Q14: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the minimum number of points out of total points corresponding to a B+ grade in the course? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., B+ cut-off was 850 out of 1000 pts possible)

Q15: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the minimum number of points out of total points corresponding to a B grade in the course? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., B cut-off was 800 out of 1000 pts possible)

Q16: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the minimum number of points out of total points corresponding to a B- grade in the course? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., B- cut-off was 775 out of 1000 pts possible)

Q17: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the minimum number of points out of total points corresponding to a C+ grade in the course? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., C+ cut-off was 750 out of 1000 pts possible)

Q18: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the minimum number of points out of total points corresponding to a C grade in the course? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., C cut-off was 700 out of 1000 pts possible)

Q19: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the minimum number of points out of total points corresponding to a C- grade in the course? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., C- cut-off was 650 out of 1000 pts possible)

Q20: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the minimum number of points out of total points corresponding to a D grade in the course? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., D cut-off was 600 out of 1000 pts possible)

Q21: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the maximum number of points out of total points corresponding to an F grade in the course? Please provide raw scores, not the percentage-adjusted or normalized score. (e.g., F cut-off was 500 out of 1000 pts possible)

Q22: Grading information for total points possible in the course: What was the total number of points possible in the course?

Q23: COMMENTS: For those courses that do not have midterms and final exams, please include a brief note to explain the modes of assessment used in a course. Please also explain any normalization scheme applied to the final point tally that might shift the entire distribution of grades whether using straight scale or curved grading in a course. Any other notes that clarify answers to the questions may be included here as well.