

# Teaching Effectiveness Committee

---

SENATE UPDATE

JUNE 2016



# Outline

---

- *Review* TEC purpose and composition
- *Report* on ongoing 'charges' and work
- *Project* a tentative continuing agenda for 2016-17

# Charge of the TEC:

---

*“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.**”*

# Composition of the TEC: (n=18)

---

- ✓ Faculty: Thirteen faculty. Each school or college shall be represented by at least one faculty member
- ✓ Continuing/Ex-officio: Provost or designee, one member from the Instructional Technology Council, One member of the Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning
- ✓ Undergraduates: One undergraduate student nominated by the Student Government Association
- ✓ Graduate: One graduate student nominated by the Graduate Student Organization

# Membership of the TEC: (2015-2016)

---

- Chair, Donald Mulvaney, College of Agriculture – 2017
- Constance Relihan, Assoc. Provost for UG Studies – Continuing
- Kathy McClelland, Instructional Technology Council – Continuing
- Diane Boyd, Dir. Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning – Continuing
- Mathew Hall,, College of Architecture, Design, and Construction – 2018
- Lucretia Tripp, College of Education– 2018
- William Pope, School of Nursing – 2018
- Murali Dhanasekaran, School of Pharmacy – 2018
- W. Malczycki, College of Liberal Arts – 2016
- Adit Singh, College of Engineering – 2016
- Todd Steury, School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences – 2016
- Dean Schwartz, College of Vet Med– 2016
- Karla Teel, College of Human Sciences– 2016
- John Gorden, College of Sciences and Mathematics – 2017
- Jaena Alabi, Library – 2017
- DeWayne Searcy (2015) Jennifer Cornnett, College of Business– 2017
- UG Student Representative: Jacqueline Keck – 2016
- Graduate Student Rep: Benjamin Arnberg – 2016

# Charge 1: student evaluation of teaching

---

## Current approach and use has flaws

# Charge 1: student evaluation of teaching

---

Phase I. *The TEC proposes a continual improvement process involving Phases.*

- encourage reinforcement of the fact that course evaluations by students are only one facet of how we evaluate teaching. Any meaningful evaluation should take into account multiple measures of performance.
- continued to examine literature and data

# Charge 1: student evaluation of teaching

---

## Phase I.

leaning toward suggesting **Revision of current University-wide questions** (with faculty and student feedback) to be applicable to a range of teaching methodologies (active learning, online learning, etc.) and in alignment with Gamson and Chickering's 7 Principles Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education.

**Identify questions which provide formative feedback for multiple contexts**



# Charge 1:

## current student evaluation of teaching

---

*Possible global questions on student evaluation of teaching survey with plans for fall TEC to make formal with Faculty Senate approval*

1. I was prompted to think analytically about the course material.
2. I understood how my progress would be measured and evaluated.
3. I took advantage of opportunities to interact with the course instructor.  
(electronically, during office hours, in class).
4. The instructor created an environment conducive to my learning.
5. I acquired new knowledge and practiced new skills.
6. As a result of the instructor's guidance, I am better able to learn on my own.

# Charge 1:

## current student evaluation of teaching

---

Current SET's Global Questions are:

Q1: The instructor encouraged me to think critically.

Q2: The grading techniques were fair.

Q3. The instructor created a conducive atmosphere for learning.

Q4.The instructor explained course material clearly.

# Future phases for improvement of SET's:

---

## Phase II:

- ❖ Work with interested department chairs to pilot a mid-term feedback programs where AUevaluate is administered at mid-term and faculty have access to feedback to make small tweak. Also work on emphasizing Peer Review processes.

## Phase III:

- ❖ Depending on what we find with Phase II, create a “requirement” for AUevaluate completion for students: grades will not be released until students complete the survey.

# Future phases for improvement of SET's:

---

## Other ideas:

- ❖ Use the anonymous survey tool in Canvas to solicit periodic feedback from students for points toward a quiz grade.
- ❖ Using reminder e-mails from instructors and messages posted on online class discussions can significantly increase response rates.
- ❖ Student Concourse presence prior to finals to promote AUEvaluate.
- ❖ Encourage other best practices for improving participation.

## Charge 2:

Review and recommend proposals for funding for the Breeden Teaching Grant-in-Aid program and Departmental Award for Educational Excellence

---

Evaluated proposals in the fall (moved from spring)

- Travel enhancement \$2000
- Research oriented \$4000
- Made various recommendations to Provost for special funding requests & external Professor of the Year Programs
- Recommended funding ~\$30 K of **ten** proposals for the 2016 year

**Charge Category 3:** Faculty Development - provide systematic approaches to faculty evaluation, offer formal faculty development programs, and recognize excellence in teaching

- Evaluated **Departmental Award For Education Excellence** (3<sup>rd</sup> year)
- \$30,000 Grant / Award (three yearly installments of \$10,000)
  - ❖ Proposals collected in March ; Finalists in April
  - ❖ Reviewed OUTSTANDING written proposals and a departmental presentations by Anatomy, Physiology and Pharmacology (CVM), English, Geosciences, and Library
- Geosciences has been recognized as the DAEE recipient during the faculty awards program in the fall

# Charge Category 3:

evaluate existing resources for teaching

---

Regularly reviewed campus teaching activities

- Participated in Conversations in Teaching
- Participated in iTeach program
- Participated in selection processes for Biggio Center
- Participated in ad hoc committees

# *Thanks*

---

to each active committee member  
for their commitment, dedication  
and hard work.



# Chickering, Arthur W.; Gamson, Zelda Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education.

---

- (1) encourages contacts between students and faculty;
- (2) develops reciprocity and cooperation among students;
- (3) uses active learning techniques;
- (4) gives prompt feedback;
- (5) emphasizes time on task;
- (6) communicates high expectations; and
- (7) respects diverse talents and ways of learning.

Examples of approaches that have been used in different kinds of college in the last few years are described. In addition, the implications of these principles for the way states fund and govern higher education and for the way institutions are run are briefly discussed. Examples of good approaches include: freshman seminars on important topics taught by senior faculty; learning groups of five to seven students who meet regularly during class to solve problems set by the instructor; active learning using structured exercises, discussions, team projects, and peer critiques, as well as internships and independent study; and mastery learning, contract learning, and computer-assisted instruction approaches, which required adequate time on learning.