

The University of Toledo

Report of the University Teaching

Evaluation Committee

June 1995

Executive Summary

The Functional Mission Statement of the University asserts, “We are committed to maintaining the tradition of quality teaching and to placing a high value on faculty performance and involvement with undergraduates in the learning environment.” The goal cannot possibly be met without procedures in place to evaluate the quality of teaching. The University Teaching Evaluation Committee (UTEC), jointly appointed by the University administration and the UT-AAUP, has been charged with providing recommendations as to how the evaluation of teaching can be improved.

The Committee has determined that the present structure of teaching evaluation relies almost exclusively on one instrument, a student evaluation that is used to provide input into the tenure and promotion decisions and merit salary ratings. This is an example of *summative* evaluation, which is designed to measure the merit of a teacher’s performance. *Formative* teaching evaluation, which seeks to assist faculty in becoming better teachers, is rare at UT.

The Committee sees the almost exclusive reliance on a student evaluation instrument, used for summative evaluation, and the lack of any formative evaluation, in particular, to be major weaknesses. The Committee recommends that:

- Each department or college should develop policies for formative *and* summative evaluation of teaching. These policies should apply to all individuals involved in instruction.
- All departments should use some form of student evaluation in the process. Each department or college is encouraged to evaluate and redesign its student evaluation form and process, ensuring that:
 - a) The student evaluation forms include spaces for written comments.
 - b) The evaluation process protects the anonymity of the student.
- All departments/colleges should use more than one method to evaluate teaching. The additional methods/approaches can be modeled after those described in this document (e.g., peer evaluation, teaching portfolios, student observer, faculty mentoring) or any other vehicle/format a department or college finds useful. The evaluation policies should be made available to University of Toledo students.
- The University should enable and provide financial support for these increased efforts in evaluation and improvement in teaching.

- A standing University committee should be constituted to assist with implementation of these recommendations.
- Departments/colleges should develop plans for evaluation of teaching during the 1995-1996 academic year, with implementation during the 1996-1997 academic year.

I. Background and Motivation for this Report

The impetus for evaluation of teaching is based in the continuing call for accountability for teaching quality nationally, in Ohio, and at the University of Toledo. More specifically, the current collective bargaining agreement between the University administration and the UT-AAUP contains a letter of agreement that stipulates the critical role of teaching and the evaluation of teaching. Both parties direct their attention to “...improve the methods by which teaching is evaluated,” to “...offer opportunity to improve teaching practices at the University.” The letter culminates in an agreement to “...work together to determine methods by which evaluation of teaching is to be done,” no later than fall 1995. The University Teaching Evaluation Committee (UTEC), jointly appointed by the administration and UT-AAUP, has prepared the document you are reading. The document should be considered as a basis of a major policy statement by the University.

Evaluation and improvement of teaching practices at the university level is not a new idea on our campus. In 1990 the Teaching and Learning Subcommittee of the Council of Student Retention noted that rhetoric in support of quality instruction at the University is not backed up by deeds in that there is an absence of serious evaluation of instruction. The report of that committee goes on to say, “*In other words, it is not credible to claim that teaching is a significant factor in merit and promotion decisions when procedures are not in place to determine which faculty are effective teachers and which are not.*” These words clearly identify the issue that is addressed here.

The Functional Mission Statement of the University, approved by the Board of Trustees in 1993, states, “We are committed to maintaining the tradition of quality teaching and to placing a high value on faculty performance and involvement with undergraduates in the learning environment.” The goal cannot possibly be met without procedures in place to evaluate the quality of teaching.

The 1994 report on faculty workload by the Board of Regents’ Advisory Committee speaks at length on the need for improving evaluation of faculty teaching. The report makes clear that evaluation serves the important purpose of enhancing the overall development of a faculty member (a *formative* purpose). This purpose differs from that often seen at UT where evaluation has been routinely linked to award of tenure, to promotion, or to merit pay increases (a *summative* purpose).

The Advisory Committee adopted as a key assumption the broader definition of scholarship suggested by Ernest Boyer. Boyer (1990) has argued that scholarship includes not only research, but also the integration, application, and teaching of knowledge.

Despite this interest in the evaluation of teaching, any view of teaching evaluation as a simple task must be questioned. Both teaching and its evaluation are complex processes, particularly at a major university with its diversity of colleges, departments, students, and faculty. The potential interaction of teaching style across students' characteristics (e.g., upper-level Pharmacy students vs. students enrolled in entry-level math), as well as across disciplines (e.g., Contemporary British Drama vs. Psychobiology) suggests that a casual approach to teacher evaluation is not only simplistic but potentially harmful. Boyer (1990) tells us evaluation is difficult, but also warns us of the consequences of not doing it, "The question of how to evaluate teaching remains a mare's nest of controversy...Consequently, excellence in the classroom all too often is undervalued."

The University Teaching Evaluation Committee believes that:

- Traditional evaluation activity has not always provided information that genuinely improves teaching,
- Student evaluation of courses may be valuable but improvement of teaching likely requires more than students' evaluations,
- On issues of tenure, promotion, and merit pay the general belief of faculty is that the University has valued research considerably above teaching,
- Effective ways to evaluate faculty teaching performance must be found that equal the effectiveness of peer review of other scholarly endeavors,
- Our mission and the current emphasis for accountability, both externally and internally, require action now,
- As professionals we are obliged to reflect upon the quality of our teaching.

Weighing teaching more equitably depends on the development of more effective ways of evaluating teaching performance. This document suggests how evaluation of teaching might be accomplished. One faculty comment on a draft version of this document was, “Evaluation needs to be viewed as a constant process of feedback-adaptation-feedback-adaptation...that occurs constantly and consistently throughout the educational process.” The Committee believes that the process of improving evaluation will begin a transformation in our institutional culture, which will truly expand quality teaching and benefit our students.

The University Teaching Evaluation Committee:

Bernard W. Bopp, Center for Teaching Excellence, Chair

Elizabeth Cole, College of Arts & Sciences

Charles Creutz, College of Arts & Sciences

John K. Estell, College of Engineering

Susan R. Martyn, College of Law

William McInerney, College of Education & Allied Professions

Karen Miller, University Community and Technical College

Philip Rusche, College of Education & Allied Professions

Tim Sullivan, College of Pharmacy

The reward of one duty is the power to fulfill another.

- George Eliot

II. Present Practices

What is the present state of evaluation of teaching at the University of Toledo? In an attempt to determine this, UTEC sent a memo to deans of the Colleges of Arts & Sciences, Education & Allied Professions, Business Administration, Engineering, Pharmacy, Law, and the Community and Technical College during the spring quarter of 1994, which requested information regarding the current policies and methods of teaching evaluation that are in place at the University. Three specific questions were posed:

- 1) What *policies* are in place regarding the process of evaluation of faculty teaching and the frequency of these evaluations?
- 2) What *methods* of evaluation are used? Are classroom visits by peers part of the evaluation process? If student questionnaires are part of the evaluation process, then the Committee would like to have a copy of the questionnaire.
- 3) What is the *purpose* of the evaluation? Is this information used for tenure and promotion decisions, merit pay, or as a process aimed to improve teaching?

Responses were received from all colleges. In the case of the Colleges of Arts & Sciences, Education Allied Professions, and Business Administration, individual departments (18 in Arts & Sciences, five in Business Administration, seven in Education & Allied Professions) submitted replies. The Colleges of Law, Pharmacy, Engineering, and the Community & Technical College have evaluation instruments and policies that were established at the college level, and a single response was provided. All departments/colleges responded to questions 1 and 2 by providing a copy of the student questionnaire and stating how frequently it is used, but a number of responses did not address question 3.

On the basis of these responses, the state of teaching evaluation at the University of Toledo may be summarized as follows:

- We perform student evaluation for *most* of our courses. University-wide, probably two-thirds to three-fourths of classes are evaluated in this fashion, though some colleges (e.g., Law, Engineering, Pharmacy) evaluate all courses.
- Other forms of teaching evaluation are *extremely limited*, especially for tenured professors. Peer evaluation of teaching via classroom visitation is, in the vast majority of cases, confined to non-tenured Assistant Professors or to individuals up for promotion. A handful of departments in Arts & Sciences require their faculty to maintain teaching portfolios. Exit interviews at the College of Engineering often

ask about the quality of teaching. Department chairs in the College of Pharmacy and a few other departments may visit classes on occasion.

- The stated purpose of teaching evaluation is for tenure, promotion, and merit pay. “Improvement of teaching” is frequently not even mentioned, or when it is, no process is described as to how this might take place. In their responses, more than one person stated “. . .we do not have a formal plan in which the evaluation becomes a process aimed to improve teaching.”

In summary, the present structure of teaching evaluation at the University of Toledo relies almost exclusively on one instrument, a student evaluation that is used for a summative purpose:

to provide input into the tenure and promotion decisions, and for merit ratings.

III. Aspects of Good Teaching Practices

Teaching, like learning, is a distinctive activity, unique to each individual, and varying between disciplines. As a result, the literature of education does not, and indeed cannot, provide a discrete definition of “good teaching.” Perceptions of good or bad, right or wrong, are actually somewhat relative with respect to teaching since it is viewed better in terms of “varying degrees of effectiveness.” Most descriptions of quality instruction generally are derived from the cause and effect relationship between teaching and learning and the extent to which instructional practices have been helpful in promoting student acquisition of knowledge. Teaching and learning are complex; however, the methodological “best practices” that have evolved are well-grounded in research and application. “Good teaching” may be difficult to define, but “best practices” in teaching are well documented, and such information is available to anyone interested in improving teaching and learning. Learning itself can occur with or without the teacher, inside or outside the classroom but is greatly facilitated by an instructional mentor who knows both the content of the field as well as the pedagogy of the discipline.

Most university professors are trained as subject matter experts, not as teachers, and they usually develop their teaching skills by tradition and by trial and error. Often, the best teaching approach is presumed to be that with which the instructor is most comfortable even though some other pedagogy might have resulted in more learning. Obviously, university teaching can be enhanced when the professor increases pedagogical knowledge about the content being considered and can draw from an array of instructional strategies. Techniques like lecture, role playing, case analysis, gaming, discussion, and questioning can enrich subject matter presentation. Computers, films, tapes, transparencies, filmstrips, and other media are just a few of the technologies that assist in the transmission of information. Also, there are books, magazines, monographs, manipulatives, and a variety of materials available in libraries and learning resource centers to further support the instructional process.

In addition to these techniques and aids, the professor may further promote learning by helping the student develop experiences outside the classroom ranging from reading and writing to projects and internships. All of these methodologies, and more, are available to the professor who seeks to increase effectiveness in motivating the student to inquire and reflect, assimilate and create. Appropriate instructional strategies can result in a student who is active, not passive, and one who recognizes and takes advantage of these many learning opportunities. Such a perspective suggests that “effective teaching” is characterized by “best practices” that enable students to actively pursue their own education.

To assist the teacher, a range of attributes of effective teaching have been identified. Common characteristics among these are:

1. A commitment to students and their learning,
2. Knowledge and enthusiasm for the subject matter and for teaching,
3. Understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline,
4. Knowing a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student learning,
5. Organizing skills,
6. Good communication skills,
7. Being responsible for arranging and assessing student learning,
8. Having respect for students,
9. Evaluating the effects of instructional techniques on student learning,
10. Understanding fair and equitable assessment strategies for evaluating student progress,
11. Ability to adjust to diverse students and situations,
12. Knowledge about current instructional technologies and methodologies,
13. Viewing oneself as a professional.

In addition to these characteristics of effective teaching, researchers have identified important indicators of “best practice” in teaching. These generally include:

1. Being current in the content, literature and pedagogy of the subject matter,
2. Effectively organizing and planning the scope and sequence of the course and daily lessons,
3. Providing a precise syllabus with clearly stated purposes, goals and objectives (see Appendix A),
4. Using a current bibliography with readily available sources,
5. Being prepared for each class session,
6. Giving fair examinations that reflect course expectations and material covered,
7. Being available to students between class sessions,
8. Identifying and arranging enrichment experiences outside of class,
9. Maintaining an enthusiastic approach to teaching,
10. Allowing students to assume responsibility for their own learning.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1991) challenges each of us in education to model ourselves after proficient teachers who “...are models of educated persons. Character and competence contribute equally to their educative manner. They exemplify the virtues they seek to impart to students: curiosity and a love of learning; tolerance and open-mindedness; fairness and justice; appreciation for our cultural and intellectual heritages; respect for human diversity and dignity; and such intellectual capacities as careful reasoning, the ability to take multiple perspectives, to question received wisdom, to be creative, to take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation.”

As each of us in higher education move forward to improve our understanding of and approach to teaching, we can draw on a wealth of materials about teaching and learning. At the same time we can develop a plan for instructional assessment to determine if we are achieving our instructional goals. Properly constructed, teaching evaluation can be a powerful tool in helping us recognize what does or does not work in our teaching activities and in providing us with direction for our professional growth and development. The better we can teach, the better we can share our gift of knowledge with others and fulfill the responsibilities of our profession.

IV. Some Concepts and Approaches to Teaching Evaluation

Use of Evaluation

Teaching evaluation has two distinct purposes and occurs in at least two distinct ways. The most common form is a *summative* evaluation, which is designed to measure the merit of a teacher's performance. Summative evaluations purport to measure how well a professor teaches. They generally result in a written document that determines whether the observed teaching meets certain criteria for the purpose of a specific outcome such as tenure, promotion or merit pay. Less common and less public are *formative* evaluations. Formative evaluation seeks to assist faculty in becoming better teachers. Such formative evaluations help faculty improve teaching whether or not a summative goal is met or desired.

Who Evaluates

We may classify different teaching evaluation tools by noting who performs the evaluation: students, fellow faculty members (peers), one's self, an administrator, or an external evaluator.

1. *Student evaluation* would include the familiar course evaluation forms used in most courses, but might also include formative feedback from trained students via a program such as the College of Arts & Sciences Student Observer Program, described below. Student evaluations could also be obtained by interviews of graduating seniors or by surveys of alumni.

2. *Peer evaluation* usually occurs as part of an in-person classroom visit or review of a video-taped classroom session. First-hand observation allows the evaluator(s) to assess intellectual, interpersonal and motivation skills of the teacher. First-hand evaluation of teaching can be enhanced by examination of teaching materials, including syllabi, assignments, examinations, and by interviews with students.

3. *Self evaluation* is usually part of a personally-motivated improvement process. This might occur in response to student comments, discussion among faculty peers, or as a result of an insightful experience at a workshop or conference on teaching.

4. *Administrator evaluation* would likely resemble the peer evaluation process, or would include examination of student responses. This form of evaluation would likely be (or at least be perceived as) summative in nature.

5. *External evaluation* would employ instructors from other universities (or departments/colleges) in the evaluation process, probably using a peer-evaluation approach. External evaluators would presumably have considerable teaching skills and experience in evaluation.

Methods of Evaluation

There are many methods of teaching evaluation. The following are some examples of evaluation approaches and instruments:

1) Student Evaluation Instruments

The ubiquitous student evaluation form, used to obtain some feedback on an estimated 75% of the University's courses, is an important component of teaching evaluation. However, student evaluation should not be the *only* form of teaching evaluation.

Unfortunately, student evaluation suffers from a pervasive sense of cynicism among faculty and students. One national survey indicated that 70% of undergraduates felt student course evaluation surveys had little or no effect upon teaching. At the University of Toledo, informal surveys of undergraduate classes by UTEC members indicate only half the students believe their input via course evaluation plays any role in tenure/promotion decisions or in teaching improvement. Many UT faculty view student evaluation results as measures of "popularity" rather than teaching ability, with far too much emphasis placed on a "raw number," often simply derived from an average rating from one or two key questions, with other questions essentially ignored. Other faculty are uncomfortable with the anonymous aspect of student evaluation, which is seen as promoting a climate of harsh and hurtful criticism.

The Committee devoted considerable time to discussion of anonymous student evaluation, as well as interviewing undergraduates on this issue and posting requests for comment on this issue on a national list-server for faculty developers (e.g., directors of campus-based centers analogous to the Center for Teaching Excellence). *It is the unanimous opinion of the Committee that anonymous student evaluation must be retained.* Issues of power and status loom large here: without the protection of anonymity, students might not give an honest evaluation. Further, attempts to require signed evaluation, even for good reason, would likely be misinterpreted by students as an attempt to stifle criticism of teaching.

The diversity of departments and courses at the University suggests that the search for a *universal* student evaluation form is probably futile. The Committee believes, however, that there are aspects of the student evaluation form and process that might serve as standards of best practice for the entire University. The attributes of good student evaluation should include the following:

- *Every course should be evaluated by students on a regular basis.* This includes courses or sections of courses that are taught by non-faculty members such as teaching assistants, part-time instructors, and adjunct faculty. This would not necessarily include such areas as independent study. In team-taught

courses, each instructor should be evaluated separately.

- *All evaluation forms should include space(s) for written student comments.*
- *For multiple-choice questions, a “no comment” option should be included which is not counted towards any processing of the scaled evaluation information save for enumeration. This would allow better questions to be asked in that the question would be fairer than those where one is asked to agree or disagree with a biased/slanted statement.*
- *All student evaluation instruments should give clear instructions regarding how to use and complete the form.*
- *The evaluation should be performed with the instructor outside of the room, outside of both visual and aural contact with the room, and away from the entrance(s) to the room.*
- *Evaluation forms should be collected by someone other than the instructor.*
- *Forms should not ask for personal information that could be used to identify the student; this would include such items as gender or class status.*

Some examples of student evaluation instruments at the University of Toledo that the Committee felt to be well-constructed are included as Appendix B.

2) Teaching Portfolios

The Teaching Portfolio is aimed at selectively documenting what is unique about an individual's approach to teaching.

There is no fixed formulation of what a teaching portfolio should be. Instead, it serves as a reservoir of many perspectives about an individual's approach to teaching. It should contain samples of teaching performance - artifacts and examples that support the scope of what is actually done. The portfolio should reveal not only what is done, but also the *thinking* behind teaching. Finally, the portfolio should be selective, a careful choice of evidence organized around agreed-upon categories that represent key dimensions of the scholarship of teaching.

What purposes can the teaching portfolio serve?

- Portfolios can capture the complexities of teaching. Faculty can present concrete examples of their practice (syllabi, samples of student work, videotapes of lessons, goals and objectives [Appendix A]) which can be arranged and annotated in ways that document an overall approach to teaching.
- Portfolios place responsibility for evaluation in the hands of individual faculty. Evaluation of teaching is most often done *to* teachers rather than *by* teachers. Through the portfolio process there is a shift in initiative since the teacher is directly involved in the monitoring and evaluating of her/his own work.
- Portfolios can prompt more reflective practice and improvement. There are many routes to the improvement of teaching, but teaching portfolios can have a special power to involve faculty in reflection on their own practice and how to improve it. This potential for improvement is the single most-cited benefit of portfolio use to date.
- Portfolios can foster a culture that values teaching and produces a new discourse about it. Teaching portfolios can introduce more compelling, authentic evidence about teaching whether it is for diagnosis and improvement, instructional development, or personnel decisions.

3) Classroom Visitation

a) Peer Visitation

At the University of Toledo peer review of teaching currently exists only as summative review, which serves as a small part of pre-tenure evaluation. Many departments neglect colleague review entirely, placing near-total reliance on student evaluation of teaching. At the other end of the spectrum a few departments require multiple classroom visits by colleagues that result in annual written reports prior to tenure consideration.

Whether formative or summative in intent, most peer review occurs after personal classroom visits or review of video-taped classroom sessions. First-hand observation allows the evaluator to assess intellectual, interpersonal and motivational skills of the teacher and can be enhanced by examination of teaching materials, including syllabi, assignments, examinations and by interviews with students.

Faculty involved in formative evaluation usually share a subject matter discipline. Those teaching introductory courses, however, can gain fresh understanding about the difficulty of learning new ideas from colleagues in entirely different disciplines. Institutional programs in other universities have encouraged this process by pairing or grouping faculty as part of a term or year-long project designed to improve overall departmental or college teaching.

Summative peer evaluations occur more commonly yet are fraught with problems of bias. To obviate this problem, *each summative evaluation activity should involve at least three colleagues, and more than one class should be observed*. Untenured faculty should receive summative evaluation at least annually so that they have an opportunity to improve. Semi-annual evaluations should be preferred. A face-to-face meeting between teacher and colleague can add formative content to a summative evaluation and provide an opportunity to correct errors in judgment or fact.

b) Student Observer Program

A Student Observer Program offers a distinctive opportunity for faculty to receive feedback on various aspects of their teaching from trained student observers who are not enrolled in their courses. As impartial classroom researchers, student observers may assist interested faculty in the discovery of instructional behaviors that encourage or detract from effective learning.

Student observers are selected from a pool of faculty-recommended candidates, based on high academic achievement and interest. These students receive a 10-week training and probationary program before they can assume the full responsibilities of faculty-assigned observation. Although student observers are paid a small fee

for their service, most participate because they want to have a positive influence on the quality of their education. A pilot student observer program was initiated in the College of Arts & Sciences in fall 1994. Training for the 10 student observers took place during the winter 1995 quarter, with formal implementation of the program during spring 1995.

Faculty participation in the Student Observer Program is strictly voluntary. It is within the discretion of the participating faculty member whether or not the evaluation is to be used for personal reflection or is to be shared with other colleagues. Student observers are bound to strict confidentiality as in any professional consultation setting.

In order to provide faculty with feedback suitable to their individual needs, the program allows professors to choose from a variety of feedback options. A minimum of three observations per course is recommended. Faculty may also request other forms of observation/consultation if they have ideas of their own. Additional documentation of the A&S Student Observer Program may be found in Appendix

4) Mentoring

Mentoring programs pair novice instructors with veterans in the hope that the veteran instructor may pass his/her accumulated experience to the novice. Such programs usually extend beyond the mere passage of information and support a synergistic relationship between the mentor and mentee. The role of the mentors has been identified as that of: 1) friend (offering emotional support and help), 2) career guide (promoting professional visibility, advising about research opportunities), 3) information source (providing information about university policies and procedures, including promotion and tenure), and 4) intellectual guide (Centra 1993). Note that the mentoring system provides mostly formative evaluation: the goal is to improve teaching.

Mentoring programs traditionally extend beyond instructional activities but serve well to improve instruction. Mentors may advise on all aspects of instruction, including preparation of course syllabi, course policies, instructional and examination methods. Since most novice faculty members have little formal experience in teaching, a mentor can provide a wealth of practical knowledge and perhaps avoid many of the common mistakes made by beginning instructors.

The "Faculty Buddy System" represents another type of synergistic relationship between faculty members. Two or possibly three faculty members collaborate on a set of activities designed to help them increase their knowledge about teaching and how students learn. Activities might include classroom observation, interviews with students, or discussions between colleagues. On a regular basis one faculty member visits the classroom of the other, observing teaching methods and becoming familiar with course

content, assignments and examinations. The faculty member also interviews students from the class emphasizing student learning in the class (e.g. reactions to specific class sessions, topics that may be difficult, student personal motivations). Each member of the pair performs these activities for the other and they meet frequently to discuss their observations and find ways to improve instruction. This technique is designed to encourage the instructor to reflect on his teaching methods.

Graduate students may also serve in the “evaluator” role in the “buddy system.” In this case the graduate student reports his findings to the instructor and helps to find solutions. The graduate student also learns something about teaching.

Mentoring may also take place among junior/senior instructors in different departments. In the UT College of Arts & Sciences, the 10 Master Teachers in the College are assigned two or three first-year faculty to mentor. Mentoring sessions are informal luncheons, held every two or three weeks, and are simply opportunities to talk about teaching experiences, successes, and problems.

These and other approaches are available to the professor who is serious about instructional improvement. Many sources of information are available to assist in this effort.

V. Committee Recommendations

- 1) Each department or college should develop policies for formative *and* summative evaluation of teaching. These policies should apply to all individuals involved in instruction.

- 2) All departments should use some form of student evaluation in the process. Each department or college is encouraged to evaluate and redesign its student evaluation form and process, ensuring that:
 - a) The student evaluation forms include spaces for written comments.
 - b) This evaluation process protects the anonymity of the student.

- 3) All departments should use more than one method to evaluate teaching. The additional methods/approaches can be modeled after those described in this document or on any other basis a department finds useful. Department/college policies should be made available to University of Toledo students.

- 4) The University should provide the necessary enabling and financial support for these increased efforts in evaluation and improvement in teaching.

- 5) A standing University committee should be established to assist with implementation of these recommendations.

VI. Timetable for Implementation

Departments/colleges will develop plans for evaluation of teaching during the 1995-1996 academic year, with implementation to take place during the 1996-1997 academic year.

Selected Bibliography

Alexander W. Astin, Assessment for Excellence: The Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education (Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1993)

Ernest L. Boyer, Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

Larry A. Braskamp and John C. Ory, Assessing Faculty Work (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. 1994) pp. 200-209.

John A. Centra, Reflective Faculty Evaluation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. 1993) pp. 94-134.

Grace French-Lazouck, Peer Review in Jason Miliman, ed. Handbook of Teaching Evaluation, (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications Inc. 1981). pp. 73-89

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Toward High and Rigorous Standards for the Teaching Profession, 3rd edition (Detroit: 1991).

Appendix A

Goal and Objective Setting

Management by Objectives has become a useful tool in shaping organizational behavior. Adapted to education, assessment by objectives becomes a variation on Management by Objectives. In such a process, measurable objectives are set between a professor and chair, or two professors, or between departmental members and a professor. Realization of these objectives demonstrates that specific departmental goals have been achieved since the assessment is based on either learning or teaching outcomes and provides a pre-agreed upon set of directions for the instructor. Assessment results can be used to determine the extent to which the professor has caused learning to occur and provides direction for change of instructional strategies and techniques.

An example of this approach in American History might pertain to students knowing factors leading to the Civil War (goal). Objectives might include such outcomes as: (1) All students will explain the Dred Scott Decision; (2) All students will be able to discuss provisions of the Compromise of 1850; (3) All students will be able to give five economic differences between Northern and Southern state economies. Outcome Objectives will enable the instructor to shape classroom discussions, student activities, and outside assignments. Any content area can generate objectives like these that are appropriate to the curricular goals of the department.

Management (or Assessment) by Objectives has proven to be a valuable method of instructional improvement. It also is useful to other departmental processes and provides everyone with a clear understanding of how they can contribute meaningfully to the teaching activities of the total faculty.

Appendix B

Examples of Student Evaluation Instruments Currently in Use at the University of Toledo:

Department of Biology

Department of Physics & Astronomy

Department of Accounting

Department of Curriculum & Educational Technology

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Department of Biology The University of Toledo

Course _____ Yr/Qtr. _____ Instructor _____

Objectives: To provide a record of student opinion of teaching performance for use in establishing and maintaining quality instruction.

Directions: Please provide answers to the following questions. Your evaluation should be based upon your individual thoughts and your answers as objective as possible. Consider your responses carefully before answering. You are urged to check the appropriate multiple choice response and to make written comments.

The biology faculty pledges that your responses to these questions will have no effect on the grade you receive in this or any subsequent course. Your responses are confidential and will be viewed by only the instructor and possibly his or her immediate supervisors after grades for this course are submitted.

Name (Optional) _____ Major _____

Grade expected in this course _____ Class Rank: SR JR SO FR GR UWD

1. The instructor was well prepared for lecture.
 a. definitely agree
 b. tend to agree
 c. tend to disagree
 d. definitely disagree

Comments:

2. The Instructor was able to effectively communicate the subject matter.
 a. definitely agree
 b. tend to agree
 c. tend to disagree
 d. definitely disagree

Comments:

3. The Instructor was aware of student comprehension of the material.
 a. definitely agree
 b. tend to agree
 c. tend to disagree
 d. definitely disagree

Comments:

4. The Instructor was concerned whether or not you learned something from the course.

- a. definitely agree
- b. tend to agree
- c. tend to disagree
- d. definitely disagree

Comments:

5. The Instructor increased your interest in the subject matter of the course.

- a. definitely agree
- b. tend to agree
- c. tend to disagree
- d. definitely disagree

Comments:

6. The Instructor's testing and grading system measured what you learned in this course.

- a. definitely agree
- b. tend to agree
- c. tend to disagree
- d. definitely disagree

Comments:

7. Give the Instructor an overall rating.

- a. superior
- b. good
- c. adequate
- d. unsatisfactory

Comments:

8. For what reason are you taking this course?

- a. major requirement
- b. related course
- c. science option
- d. personal interest

Course Evaluation Questionnaire – Department of Physics & Astronomy

On Side Two of the Answer Sheet, in the area marked “Identification Number,” please fill in COURSE NUMBER, beginning at the left.

On Items 1 through 15, mark your responses according to the following code:

- a. strongly yes** **b. yes** **c. neutral or no opinion**
d. no **e. strongly no**

1. Do you like science in general?
 2. This course is basically irrelevant for my professional and/or personal development.
 3. This course should be a required course for my degree program.
 4. Did the instructor make himself readily available for consultation?
 5. Were the lectures audible?
 6. Was the instructor punctual in starting class?
 7. If demonstrations or visual aids such as slides were used, were they helpful?
 8. Was enough time allotted in class to discuss questions?
 9. Was the instructor adequately prepared for each class?
 10. Were graded exams and assignments returned promptly?
 11. Did the exams cover course material adequately and fairly for the level of difficulty of the course?
 12. Was the method of arriving at the course grade satisfactory?
 13. The lectures were presented in a clear and understandable manner.
 14. The instructor showed enthusiasm for the course material.
 15. I would recommend this course by this instructor to others.
16. In general, the pace of classroom presentation was:
- a) too slow
 - b) slightly slow
 - c) about right
 - d) slightly fast
 - e) too fast
17. Did you ask questions or seek help from the instructor in or out of class?
- a) very often
 - b) often
 - c) occasionally
 - d) rarely
 - e) never
18. The feeling between the instructor and the students was
- a) friendly
 - b) neutral
 - d) antagonistic
19. Compared to other similar science courses, how do you rate this course (not instructor)?
- a) very good
 - b) good
 - c) neutral
 - d) poor
 - e) very poor
20. Compared to other science lecturers, how do you rate this instructor?
- a) very good
 - b) good
 - c) neutral
 - d) poor
 - e) very poor

Course Evaluation Questionnaire – Department of Physics & Astronomy

21. Please use this space for specific comments (positive as well as negative) about the course and/or instructor. These comments are often very helpful to the instructor and the department in improving the course. These comments will be re-typed by a secretary before they are transmitted to the instructor. [All questionnaire results are delivered only after all course grades are turned in.]

CONFIDENTIAL COURSE EVALUATION

The University of Toledo
College of Business Administration
Department of Accounting

Your responses to the following questions will be summarized and used for constructive purposes to help maintain quality instruction in University of Toledo accounting courses.

Please mark your response on this form and then transfer these responses to the computer readable form. Use the response keys given for each question.

Demographic Data:

1. If you are enrolled in the College of Business, please answer the following question. I plan to major in:
a. Accounting b. Finance c. ISOM d. Marketing or Management e. Undecided at this time
2. If you are enrolled in any other college, please answer the following question. I am a student in:
a. Arts & Sciences or Education b. Univ. College c. Engineering d. Pharmacy e. Law
3. My class rank is:
a. Sophomore b. Junior c. Senior d. graduate student e. other
4. My approximate GPA at the beginning of the quarter was:
a. below 2.0 b. 2.0 - 2.79 c. 2.8 - 3.19 d. 3.2 - 3.5 e. over 3.5
5. In an average week, I spent the following number of hours on this course preparing for class, studying for exams, and completing homework.
a. less than 4 b. 4 - 6 c. 7 - 9 d. 10 - 12 e. over 12
6. I expect to receive the following grade in this course:
a. F or D b. D or C c. C d. C or B e. B or A

Evaluation:

7. Success in this course requires an understanding of concepts.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
8. Course requirements, instructor expectations, and methods of performance evaluation were clearly explained at the beginning of the course.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
9. The textbook was helpful in understanding the subject matter.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
10. Assignments were helpful in learning the topics covered in this course.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
11. The instructor's expectations of my performance in this course were reasonable.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree

PLEASE TURN THIS PAGE OVER FOR ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

Course Evaluation – Side 2

12. Graded materials fairly assessed my overall knowledge of the course content.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
 13. Examinations were evaluated fairly.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
 14. I had the opportunity to received adequate, timely feedback on my examination performance.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
 15. The instructor was well organized for class.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
 16. The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject matter.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
 17. The instructor demonstrated a comprehensive knowledge of the subject matter.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
 18. The instructor was able to clarify complex material.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
 19. The instructor was helpful during scheduled office hours.
a. strongly agree b. agree c. neither agree or disagree d. disagree e. strongly disagree
 20. My overall evaluation of my instructor's performance in this course is:
a. excellent b. above average c. average d. below average e. poor
-

Please list the one teaching technique used by your instructor which was most helpful to you in learning the subject matter in this course.

In the space below, please add any suggestions you have as to how the instructor might improve the course content and/or course instruction.

Student Perception Form
The Department of Curriculum and Education Technology
The College of Education and Allied Professions

The Department of Curriculum and Educational Technology would like to obtain information concerning the course you have just taken. You are asked to complete this survey by answering all of the questions. All of the information will be held confidential. You are not to sign this evaluation. The instructor will not receive the results of this survey until *after* grades have been submitted.

Please express your views on the following items in a fair and objective manner. Fill in the appropriate bubble on the green answer sheet. **DO NOT WRITE ON THIS SHEET.**

You are to mark the extent of your agreement or disagreement. **A** = Strongly Agree; **B** = Agree; **C** = Undecided or no opinion; **D** = Disagree; and **E** = Strongly Disagree.

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. For me, the course was well paced. | SA A U D SD |
| 2. The instructor had a thorough knowledge of course material. | SA A U D SD |
| 3. The instructor was prompt in returning assignments and exams. | SA A U D SD |
| 4. The instructor explained the course content well. | SA A U D SD |
| 5. The instructor showed enthusiasm for the course. | SA A U D SD |
| 6. The instructor showed respect and concern for me. | SA A U D SD |
| 7. The instructor responded to my questions without demeaning me. | SA A U D SD |
| 8. I was informed of course goals and objectives. | SA A U D SD |
| 9. The course goals and objectives were achieved. | SA A U D SD |
| 10. The class sessions were well organized. | SA A U D SD |
| 11. The instructor encouraged me to be creative. | SA A U D SD |
| 12. The instructor encouraged me to think critically. | SA A U D SD |
| 13. The grading system was fair. | SA A U D SD |
| 14. The course requirements were reasonable. | SA A U D SD |
| 15. The instructor was available for consultation. | SA A U D SD |
| 16. I was well served by the instructor in this course. | SA A U D SD |

Student Perception Form
The Department of Curriculum and Education Technology
The College of Education and Allied Professions

COMMENT SHEET

17. What were the best parts of the course for you?

18. What were the worst parts of the course for you?

19. What changes do you think should be made in this course?

20. What additional comments would you like to make concerning this course?