From the 2013 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement — 2667 (35%) first-year students and 4,856 (65%) seniors

**Student Data Source and Sample**
- From the 2013 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement
- 2,735 faculty members

**Student Characteristics**
- 55% male; 45% female
- 64.16% enrolled full-time; 35.84% enrolled part-time
- 77.5% Asian; 22.5% non-Asian
- 11.33% Hispanic/Latino; 88.67% non-Hispanic/Latino
- 49.56% White; 50.44% Non-White
- 10.95% Other/Multiracial; 5% navy student, 92.05% other/multiracial
- 8.98% Multiracial; 91% non-Multiracial
- 3.91% Male; 95.88% female
- 1.05% Diagnosed learning disability; 98.95% no disabilities

**Instructor Characteristics**
- 30.75% female; 69.25% male
- 75.56% assistant professor; 19.28% associate professor
- 9.05% full professor

**Student Results**

**Research Question 1:** How do perceptions of students and faculty differ regarding what influences student responses to end-of-course evaluations?

Means scores for student-reported factors influencing evaluations were rank-ordered to see the top and bottom influences.

- **Most influential:**
  - How clearly the instructor explained difficult material
  - Instructor knowledge of course content
  - How the instructor interacted with students

- **Least influential:**
  - How much assignments interested you
  - The extent you felt the course was required or an elective

**Research Question 2:** Are there demographic differences in how much faculty use results to improve courses and teaching?

T-tests, Cohen’s d effect size, and ANOVAs were computed to examine differences in how much faculty use course outcome results by various faculty characteristics. Faculty characteristics include gender, race/ethnicity, age, international student status, earned doctorate, years spent teaching, rank, tenure status, discipline, division taught (upper/lower), and teaching a general education requirement.

- **Most notable difference** was for international status—international faculty used results more often to improve their courses (p < .001, d = .53) and to improve their teaching (p < .001, d = .56). Another noticeable difference was that non tenure faculty used results more often to improve their courses (p < .001, d = .24) and to improve their teaching (p < .001, d = .28).

**Research Question 3:** Are faculty concerns with institutional emphasis on campus support related to their use of course evaluations?

A series of OLS regressions were used to examine the relationship between the importance faculty members placed on increasing campus support and their use of course evaluation results. To further explore these relationships, the importance faculty members placed on increasing campus support (ISE) were divided into quartiles. We then compared actual faculty use between faculty members in the top and bottom quartiles of ISE and faculty members in the top and bottom quartiles of SE using t-tests and Cohen’s d effect size.