Teaching in Review Files

AP Contacts Meeting 4/30/15

The purpose of today

- Address the current methods of evaluating our faculty teaching,
- Discuss ways to more effectively utilize tools we currently have,
- Determine potentially new methods of evaluation,
- Work towards a culture shift were we emphasize the value of contributions to teaching in addition to research.

Who do we evaluate for teaching and what do we expect?

- LRF Professors/In Residence
- Adjunct Professors
- Visiting Professors
- L(P)SOE's
- Continuing Lecturers
- Temporary Lecturers

We will focus to today on the top four bullet points.

What must be submitted with each file

- It is our expectation that a CAPE or other Evaluation Report* will be submitted for each course taught in the review period.
- Student comments received for each course.

*Evaluations may be department focused/designed evaluations.

Additional options

- CAPE scatter plots (just need one)
- Classroom observation by colleagues (provided the department takes steps to ensure their objectivity, e.g. using a consistent set of evaluation criteria).
- Observation and feedback by Center for Teaching Development staff
- Letters from students and mentees (provided the department takes steps to ensure their objectivity).
- Internal evaluation forms.
- Faculty-self survey using a vetted form (e.g., the [Teaching Practices Inventory](#)) – Advice in use available from Center for Teaching Development)
- Evidence of actively engaging in improving teaching (i.e. Center for Teaching Development report, faculty teaching development projects).

Analyzing performance
Moving away from instructor approval %

- Suggestions:
  - Department focuses on a select number of questions (4-5) and discusses their implications (instead of *only* instructor approval)
    - CSE is already doing this
    - Can we agree as a group on the important metrics? Or do we need to be department specific? Who should be involved in that discussion?
  - Student Comments
  - Compare instructor with others teaching the same course
  - Discuss implications of class size
  - Discuss issues in a particular course (i.e. preparation of students, did cheating occur?, is this a one-time problem or pervasive?)
    - *Example: A professor we currently have teaches a core course that is mandatory for two different programs – 1 JSOE, 1 outside JSOE. He receives low evaluations in this course, but his other courses receive excellent evaluations.*

Analyzing performance (cont)

- Is there a difference in graduate teaching vs. undergraduate teaching? Why is this important?
- Have steps been taken to improve and has improvement been seen?
- Is this the first time teaching the course?
- Has the course be revamped in the review period?
- Where their logistical problems in course (i.e. equipment failure or administrative mistakes)?
- What's the response rate? If 3 or less evals the response will be unreliable.
- Was there an emergency?
- Are there other contributions to teaching that might fulfill this requirement (i.e. ABET, Course Development, Committee work, Training Grant)?

Analyzing Performance Using Approval Ratings – Example 1

- Individual is being considered for above scale

- Overall career approval rating: 76% (range from 44% to 100%) with graduate and undergraduate almost equal.

- Immediate review period overall rating is 73%

- Is this good enough for above scale?

SMITH, SANDY - CAPE RESULT COMPARISON DATA

JSOE 100

Instructor	Course	Term	Enroll	Evals Made	Rcmnd Class	Rcmnd Instr
Professor A	JSOE 100 - Sample Course (A)	WI14	135	36	60.00%	34.30%
SMITH, SANDY	JSOE 100 - Sample Course (A)	WI14	134	35	71.90%	**78.10%**
SMITH, SANDY	JSOE 100 - Sample Course (A)	WI13	137	45	51.10%	**66.70%**
Professor B	JSOE 100 - Sample Course (A)	WI13	137	45	48.90%	60.00%
Professor B	JSOE 100 - Sample Course (A)	WI12	116	56	58.90%	35.70%
Professor B	JSOE 100 - Sample Course (A)	WI11	143	74	64.40%	54.80%
Professor B	JSOE 100 - Sample Course (A)	WI10	109	53	58.80%	42.30%
Professor B	JSOE 100 - Sample Course (A)	WI09	83	56	40.00%	36.40%
Professor B	JSOE 100 - Sample Course (A)	WI08	84	52	44.20%	57.70%
					Average	51.78%

JSOE 101

Instructor	Course	Term	Enroll	Evals Made	Rcmnd Class	Rcmnd Instr
Professor A	JSOE 101 - Sample Course (A)	WI14	11	4	75.00%	100.00%
Professor A	JSOE 101 - Sample Course (A)	WI13	9	5	80.00%	100.00%
SMITH, SANDY	JSOE 101 - Sample Course (A)	WI12	15	9	100.00%	87.50%
Professor B	JSOE 101 - Sample Course (A)	WI11	8	4	100.00%	100.00%
Professor B	JSOE 101 - Sample Course (A)	WI10	7	3	100.00%	100.00%
Professor A	JSOE 101 - Sample Course (A)	WI09	8	12	83.30%	83.30%
Professor C	JSOE 101 - Sample Course (A)	WI08	10	6	100.00%	100.00%
					Average	95.83%

BENG 200

Instructor	Course	Term	Enroll	Evals Made	Rcmnd Class	Rcmnd Instr
Professor A	JSOE 200 -Sample Course	WI 12	22	17	47%	76%
SMITH, SANDY	JSOE 200 -Sample Course	WI 13	59	49	31%	55%
SMITH, SANDY	JSOE 200 -Sample Course	WI 12	22	17	47%	76%
SMITH, SANDY	JSOE 200 -Sample Course	WI 11	46	43	42%	72%
SMITH, SANDY	JSOE 200 -Sample Course	WI 10	?	26	58%	73%
SMITH, SANDY	JSOE 200 -Sample Course	SP 09	39	11	58%	76%
					Average	71%

SMITH, SANDY - BY COURSE

All

Course	Quarter	Approval
JSOE 100	WI 13	67
JSOE 100	WI 07	88
JSOE 100	WI 06	70
JSOE 100	WI 04	57
JSOE 100	WI 03	53
JSOE 100	WI 02	90
JSOE 100	SP 01	72
JSOE 100	SP 00	95
	Average	**74**
JSOE 101	WI 12	88
	Average	**88**
JSOE 200	WI 12	76 (co-Taught)
JSOE 200	WI 11	72
JSOE 200	WI 10	73
JSOE 200	SP 09	76
JSOE 200	WI 13	55
JSOE 200	SP 09	76
	Average	**71**

Course	Quarter	Approval	
JSOE 201	FA 07	60	co-Taught
JSOE 201	FA 06	74	co-Taught
JSOE 201	FA 05	87	co-Taught
	Average	**74**	
JSOE 202	WI 08	80	
JSOE 202	WI 05	70	co-Taught 50%
JSOE 202	WI 04	44	cross-listed
JSOE 202	WI 03	91	co-Taught 50%
JSOE 202	WI 02	86	co-Taught 25%
JSOE 202	WI 01	83	co-Taught 50%
	Average	**76**	
JSOE 203	FA 03	100	
JSOE 203	FA 02	100	
JSOE 203	FA 00	82	
	Average	**94**	
JSOE 204	WI 04	71	co-Taught (25%)
JSOE 204	WI 03	72	co-Taught (25%)
JSOE 204	WI 02	71	co-Taught (25%)
	Average	**71**	

Outlier removed

Course	Quarter	Approval	
JSOE 202	WI 08	80	
JSOE 202	WI 05	70	co-Taught 50%
JSOE 202	WI 03	91	co-Taught 50%
JSOE 202	WI 02	86	co-Taught 25%
JSOE 202	WI 01	83	co-Taught 50%
	Average	**82**	

Course	Quarter	Approval
Seminar course - with guest lecturers		
JSOE 205	SP 09	60
JSOE 205	WI 07	62
	Average	**61**
Research Conference		
JSOE 206	WI 09	92
	Average	**92**

This person ultimately was advanced to above scale

Analyzing Performance Using Approval Ratings – Example 2

Course No. and Title	Quarter	No. of enrollment	% of Recommended
JSOE 100	FA13	49	82.40%
JSOE 200	FA13	60	75.00%
JSOE 101	FA13		
JSOE 201	S13		78.26%
JSOE 103	W13	137	60.00%
JSOE 202	W13		64.52%
JSOE 104	W13		90.00%
JSOE 105	W13	13	50.00%
JSOE 106	W13	12	100.00%
JSOE 200	F12		
JSOE 107	F12	12	100.00%
JSOE 203	W12	25	75.00%
JSOE 205	W12		90.00%
JSOE 108	W12	18	100.00%
JSOe 103	W12	116	36.00%
JSOE 203	S11		73.33%
JSOE 204	W11	20	79.00%
JSOE 103	FA11	19	100.00%
JSOE 104	W11	143	55.00%
JOSE 109	W-10	6	100.00%
JOSE 140	W-10	110	42.00%
JSOE 203	W-10	38	91.18%
JSOE 110	F-09	6	100.00%
JSOE 110	S-09	9	100.00%
JOSE 204	S-09	23	100.00%
JOSE 103	W-09	83	36.00%
JSOE 204	W-09	8	100.00%
JOSE 206	W-09	6	66.67%
JOSE 111	F-08	8	100.00%
			79.42%

No change previous review due to teaching. Recommended for merit. Range from 36% to 100%. Up for merit. Should they get it?   What do you notice?

Analyzing Performance Using Approval Ratings – Example 3

A candidate is up for normal merit and bonus due to outstanding research. The individual received a no-change in the previous review period due to poor teaching. The candidate then worked with the Center for Teaching Development employing numerous techniques.

The subsequent review period showed some improvement but still poor evaluations (37% approval to 100% approval). Do you think CAP supported the merit?

Analyzing Performance Using Approval Ratings – Example 3

CAP said:

In the past, Professor Jones's classroom teaching record had its weaknesses. S/he sought advice from the Center for Teaching Development, and his/her teaching record is on an upward trajectory, although it remains a bit problematic in some undergraduate and graduate courses. Student comments still register complaints about Professor Jones's preparation and explanation, and his/her ability to provide helpful and timely feedback. In contrast, Professor Jones shines as a mentor. S/he advises or co-advises 14 PhD and three MS students, and has brought a large number of undergraduates (and even a few high school students), many of them students from under-represented minority groups, into his/her lab. S/he has published with undergraduates. An impressive seven PhD and three MS students graduated during this review period.

The proposed action was approved.

Analyzing Performance Using Student Comments

- Example 1:

Approval Rating = 59%

Sample students comments "Engaging, responsive and helpful to students," "Good Professor, Have no complaints," "He's funny and genuinely interested in the students".

So what's the issue? This instructor scored low on questions having to do with course organization and audibility. From this I interpreted that he lectures well, he's likeable, but hard to hear and unorganized – issues that are easily addressed by the Department. The letter can point this out and provide information on what steps were taken to correct this.

Analyzing Performance Using Student Comments

- Example 2 Approval Rating = 83%

    Sample students comments "he does not seem to know how to teach," "He assumes everyone has a very strong background, "Overestimates students," "speaks too fast." "Excellent Professor," "Great Professor," "Motivates students to learn."

    What's going on here? It's not level – all were Jrs and Srs. It's not expected grade, most were getting an "A" or "B". It's not different background – 100% were in the major. He scored high on most metrics.
    - Students consistently scored the class as extremely difficult. This Professor needs to work with the students to teach at the level that they can understand.

Analyzing Performance Using Student Comments

- Example 3
    - A faculty member teaches a course in each of 2 quarters. The first quarter she received a 100% approval rating. The second time it was 58%.
        - First time comments: "Fun class." "Professor does a good job in making it entertaining and interesting to her students."

        So what happened?
        - There were still *many* students who gave positive feedback. However issues in the class were clearly documented this time around. Student comments included: "4 weeks to get mid-terms back." "There were a lot mistakes on the homework assignments," "Class time and location were changed."
        - Class enrollment increased from 22 to 82.
        - Self Statement discussed that she didn't revamp the course to teach to larger audience.

What if there is no good explanation?

Not everyone can be good at everything, but they must be adequate.   If some doesn't meet the bar:

- Document evidence at attempts of improvement
- Even when evals are not great, but better than previous review period, this shows effort which is usually rewarded
- Continued poor performance, despite documented efforts to improve will not be rewarded.

Changing the culture

- Myth: Teaching can suffer if research is great.

- Fact: More than ever CAP is issuing no-change actions due to poor teaching even with outstanding research.

Discussion: Why does this myth persist and what can we do to address it and shift expectations?

Changing the culture

- Myth: CAP only cares about the "recommend instructor" number

- Fact: From where CAP stood "The departmental recommendation letter should include a thorough analysis of the evaluations provided. Numerical data should be contextualized and explained. It is the unit's responsibility to provide teaching evaluations as well as an analysis of the candidate's teaching performance based on those evaluations."

Changing the culture

- Myth: Student comments don't make a difference in the file.

- Fact: Student comments are probably the most important piece of evidence provided. Most CAP reports will reference them in how they made their teaching decision. It's important to include them, read and address them in each file.

Discussion

- What do you see as barriers to improving teaching?
- What do you see as options for evaluating teaching that we are not currently using (i.e. mentor evaluations)?
- Should we develop a different teaching metric? And what would that look like?
- Other thoughts?

APPENDIX – WEIGHTED CALCULATION

Calculation of approval rating

Calculation of the weighted average is as follows:

The value of each response is as follows

Excellent = 5 points
Above Average = 4 points
Average = 3 points
Below Average = 2 points
Poor = 1 point

The number of individuals responding will be multiplied by the value of their response to get the total point value. For example, if 3 students respond "Excellent", 1 responds "Above Average", and 1 responds "Average" you would calculate the following total point value:

3 x 5 = 15
1 x 4 = 4
1 x 3 = 3
 22 total points

Then the total *possible* number of points is obtained by multiplying by the total number of responding students by 5. In this case there are 5 responses.

5 x 5 = **25 Total Points**

Then the total point value is divided by the total possible number of points to obtain the approval rating:

22 / 25 = .88 or 88% weighted rating.