



Teaching Effectiveness Committee

Status Report

Teaching Effectiveness Committee

2004-2006

Members in 2004-2005

Gisela Buschle-Diller (Polymer & Fiber Eng., Chair)
John Heilman (Provost)
Howard Clayton (Management)
Al Fromhold (Physics)
Sareen Gropper (Human Sciences)
Raymond Kessler (Horticulture)
Marcus Kieltyka (Library)
David LaBand (Forestry)
Jill Salisbury-Glennon (Educational FLT)
Saralyn Smith-Carr (Vet. Medicine)
Carole Johnson (Communication Disorders)
Kem Krueger (Pharmacy)
Scott Kramer (Building Science)
Hakan Balci (graduate student)
Marianne Clancy (undergraduate student)
James Groccia (Biggio Center)

New members in 2005-2006

Peter Livant (Chemistry)
Juliet Rumble (Library)
David Weaver (Agronomy & Soils)
William Boulton (Management)
Kristen Helms (Pharmacy)
Mert Serkan (graduate student)
Virginia Planz (undergrad. student)

New members in 2006-2007

Linda Ruth (Building Science)
Peggy Shippen (Rehab. Spec. Ed.)
Jan Kavookjian (Pharmacy)
Selda Tarkin (grad. student)
Amanda Cummings (undergrad. student)

[The Faculty Handbook Mandate to the Teaching Effectiveness Committee]

- The committee shall review what is currently in place in the University with respect to appropriate and reasonable teaching assignments. The committee shall establish policy for the Teaching Grant-in-Aid program and review and recommend proposals for funding. *It shall also evaluate existing resources for teaching, provide systematic approaches to faculty evaluation, offer formal faculty development programs, and recognize excellence in teaching.*
- Current focus/concern:
 - Student evaluation forms
 - External/internal review
 - Teaching portfolios
 - Changes of mandate after the establishment of the Biggio Center for Enhancement of Teaching

[A brief history of previous activities...]

- Recognized concerns regarding validity, reliability and use of current evaluation of teaching questionnaire
- Surveyed teaching faculty
- Presented results of survey to the Senate
- Senate formulated a charge for the TE Committee

[TE Committee charge]

1. Design an instrument for the end-of-semester evaluation of teaching with proven validity and reliability
2. Develop standardized administration procedures to insure that all departments/schools/colleges follow these procedures to increase reliability and validity of comparisons
3. Develop suggested guidelines and procedures to assist with the interpretation and formative & summative use of evaluation results by individual faculty members, department chairs, deans and T&P committees

Recent TE Committee activities...

- Completed a broad survey of instruments used by peer institutions
- Held an Open Forum on Teaching Evaluations on April 7, 2006
 - Included presentations by representatives from two institutions considered cornerstones in student evaluations:
 - Carnegie Mellon University
 - University of Washington

Criteria for selection of TE forms

- Adaptable to diversity of AU campus
- Easy to use, yet reliable
- Flexible
- Separate sections for evaluation
 - Formative – towards improvement of instruction
 - Summative – personnel decisions (tenure and promotion, awards, etc.)

[Instructional Assessment System of the University of Washington]

Main features:

- 13 standardized forms for faculty to select the form that fits their instructional needs
- Accommodation of additional questions, created by the instructor or department to assess unique course components or support program accreditation
- Individual course reports
- Summary reports for departments, divisions, or instructors

www.washington.edu/oea/services/course_eval/index.html

Form A is designed for **small lecture/discussion courses**. Items emphasize the clarity and quality of information transmitted, as well as the nature of the interaction between instructor and student.

Form B is designed for **large lecture classes**, with little or no in-class interaction between instructor and student. Items strongly emphasize the quality of course organization and information transmitted.

Form C is designed for **seminar discussion classes** which include a minimal amount of formal lecturing by the instructor. The items emphasize quality of discussion as well as course organization and interest level.

Form D is designed for those classes whose purpose is the **teaching of problem-solving** or heuristic methods. Clear explanations, dealing with student difficulties and quality of problems are emphasized.

Form E is designed for those classes which are skill oriented and in which students get "hands on" experiences related to future occupational demands. Such classes include **clinical nursing, art studio, social-work field experience**, etc...

Form J is designed to evaluate instruction provided through **clinical experience** rather than traditional academic coursework. Such courses are often found in the health professions or the arts. Items focus on the instructor's ability to provide information, stimulate learning, and demonstrate skills.

The back of all IAS Forms (Forms A-J, and X) are identical and **permit individual instructors to query students** on any subject they think is appropriate to the course.

Forms evaluate

- Course
- Organization
- Instructor Preparedness
- Extra Help
- Grading

- Student Effort

- Required/elective course

Instructional Assessment System		USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY		FORM B			
Fill in bubbles darkly and completely. Erase errors cleanly.							
Instructor _____		Course _____		Section _____ Date _____			
Completion of this questionnaire is voluntary. You are free to leave some or all questions unanswered.							
		Excel- lent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
1. The course as a whole was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. The course content was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. The instructor's contribution to the course was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Course organization was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Sequential presentation of concepts was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Explanations by instructor were:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Instructor's enthusiasm was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Clarity of course objectives was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Interest level of class sessions was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Availability of extra help when needed was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Use of class time was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Amount you learned in the course was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Relevance and usefulness of course content were:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Reasonableness of assigned work was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Relative to other college courses you have taken:		Much Higher	Average			Much Lower	
23. Do you expect your grade in this course to be:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. The intellectual challenge presented was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. The amount of effort you put into this course was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26. The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. Your involvement in this course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28. On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?		<input type="radio"/> Under 2 <input type="radio"/> 2 - 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 - 5	<input type="radio"/> 6 - 7 <input type="radio"/> 8 - 9 <input type="radio"/> 10 - 11	<input type="radio"/> 12 - 13 <input type="radio"/> 14 - 15 <input type="radio"/> 16 - 17	<input type="radio"/> 18 - 19 <input type="radio"/> 20 - 21 <input type="radio"/> 22 or more		
29. From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?		<input type="radio"/> Under 2 <input type="radio"/> 2 - 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 - 5	<input type="radio"/> 6 - 7 <input type="radio"/> 8 - 9 <input type="radio"/> 10 - 11	<input type="radio"/> 12 - 13 <input type="radio"/> 14 - 15 <input type="radio"/> 16 - 17	<input type="radio"/> 18 - 19 <input type="radio"/> 20 - 21 <input type="radio"/> 22 or more		
30. What grade do you expect in this course?		<input type="radio"/> A (3.9-4.0) <input type="radio"/> A- (3.5-3.8) <input type="radio"/> B+ (3.2-3.4)	<input type="radio"/> B (2.9-3.1) <input type="radio"/> B- (2.5-2.8) <input type="radio"/> C+ (2.2-2.4)	<input type="radio"/> C (1.9-2.1) <input type="radio"/> C- (1.5-1.8) <input type="radio"/> D+ (1.2-1.4)	<input type="radio"/> D (0.9-1.1) <input type="radio"/> D- (0.7-0.8) <input type="radio"/> E (0.0)	<input type="radio"/> Pass <input type="radio"/> Credit <input type="radio"/> No Credit	
31. In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:		<input type="radio"/> In your major? <input type="radio"/> In your minor?	<input type="radio"/> A distribution requirement? <input type="radio"/> A program requirement?	<input type="radio"/> An elective? <input type="radio"/> Other?			

Mark Reflex® by NCS MM89763-2 10987 ED06 Printed in U.S.A. ©1995, University of Washington - Office of Educational Assessment

Supplementary procedural guidelines

- Development of guidelines for administration of teaching evaluations across campus
 - Number of evaluations per semester or year
 - Evaluations not to be administered by instructor
 - Complete anonymity of respondent guaranteed
- Biggio Center to develop a campus handbook for TE use by colleges/schools in establishing and implementing procedures
- Annual workshops on teaching evaluation for administrators and faculty organized by the Biggio Center