

Student Evaluation of Educational Quality Questionnaire (SEEQ)

Coffey, M., & Gibbs, G. (2001). The evaluation of the Student Evaluation of Educational Quality Questionnaire (SEEQ) in UK higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 26(1), 89-93.

Marsh, H. W. (1982). SEEQ: A RELIABLE, VALID, AND USEFUL INSTRUMENT FOR COLLECTING STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS OF UNIVERSITY TEACHING. *British journal of educational psychology*, 52(1), 77-95.

36 Items

9 Dimensions

Learning Value:

1. I have found the course intellectually challenging and stimulating.
2. I have learned something which I consider valuable.
3. My interest in the subject has increased as a consequence of this course.
4. I have learned and understood the subject materials of this course.

Overall Evaluation

11. ____ Compared with other courses I have had, I would say this course is:
12. ____ Compared with other instructors I have had, I would say this instructor is:
13. ____ As an overall rating, I would say this instructor is

Enthusiasm:

5. Instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the course.
6. Instructor was dynamic and energetic in conducting the course.
7. Instructor enhanced presentations with the use of humor.
8. Instructor's style of presentation held my interest during class.

Organization:

9. Instructor's explanations were clear.
10. Course materials were well prepared and carefully explained.
11. Proposed objectives agreed with those actually taught so I knew where course was going.
12. Instructor gave lectures that facilitated taking notes.

Group Interaction:

13. Students were encouraged to participate in class discussions.
14. Students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge.
15. Students were encouraged to ask questions and were given meaningful answers.
16. Students were encouraged to express their own ideas and/or question the instructor.

Individual Rapport:

17. Instructor was friendly towards individual students.
18. Instructor made students feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class.
19. Instructor had a genuine interest in individual students.
20. Instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class.

Breadth of Coverage:

21. Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories.
22. Instructor presented the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class.
23. Instructor presented points of view other than his/her own when appropriate.
24. Instructor adequately discussed current developments in the field.

Examinations/Grading:

25. Feedback on examinations/graded materials was valuable.
26. Methods of evaluating student work were fair and appropriate.
27. Examinations/graded materials tested course content as emphasized by the instructor.

Assignments:

28. Required readings/texts were valuable.
29. Readings, homework, laboratories contributed to appreciation and understanding of subject.

Workload/Difficulty

30. Course difficulty (Easy-Hard)
31. Course workload (Light-Heavy)
32. Course pace (Too slow-Too Fast)
33. Hours/week outside of class

5-Point Likertscale (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree) & Not Applicable

Cronbachs α = na