

Evaluation of Teaching



Recommendations of the Teaching
Effectiveness Committee

University Senate Meeting May 1, 2007

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)

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**

Approach

- General recommended guidelines
- Selection of suitable forms
- Implementation guidelines

Recommended guidelines

- ❑ **Standard procedures for administering teaching evaluations will be applied campus wide**
- ❑ **Student evaluations of teaching will be conducted for every class and section assigned**
- ❑ **Teaching evaluations will not be administered by the instructor of the course**
- ❑ **Student identities must remain anonymous**
- ❑ **Results of the evaluations will not be provided to instructors until after grades are submitted**

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

Specifics of UW TE forms

- ❑ Items 1-4: general course assessment (all forms)
- ❑ Items 5-15: specific to form selected
- ❑ Items 16-22: perception of course requirements
- ❑ Items 23-30: student perception of intellectual challenge, workload and expected grade (all forms)
- ❑ Back of form: additional scannable items (optional)

Recommendations of the TE Committee

- ▣ Auburn University will adopt the teaching evaluation forms and processing supplied by the University of Washington
- ▣ The Provost's Office will provide funding of TE forms, processing, and reports
- ▣ The University Senate will review TE policies and procedures every 3 years
- ▣ Implementation will begin as soon as possible (Fall 2007?)

Supplementary procedural guidelines

- ❑ 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
- ❑ Biggio Center to provide an annual report on workshops and implementation issues to the Senate, including feedback from administrators and instructors