

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

I. TO: Thomas Johnson, Chair of the Faculty
FROM: Phil Adler, Chair
DATE: May 5, 1982

II. Membership of the Committee

Ex officio: Acting Chencellor Howell; Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Maier (Myra Cain attended as his appointed representative); Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences Angelo Volpe (Marie Farr attended as his appointed representative); Dean of the School of Music Charles F. Schwartz; Chairman of the Faculty Thomas Johnson.

Phil Adler, History	1983
Thomas F. Eamon, Political Science	1984
Robert B. Graham, Psychology	1983
Belinda T. Lee, Nursing	1984
John Longhill, Marketing and Management	1982
Madge McGrath, Allied Health	1984
Pat Pertalion, Drama & Speech	1982
Connie Tindel, Education	1983
Kenneth Wilson, Sociology & Anthropology	1983

Students: Lou Etta Morgan
Guy Dixon
J. Page Stout

III. Committee Meetings (dates and members absent)

September 1, 1981	McGrath (exc.), Wilson, Cain
September 15, 1981	Longhill, Lee, Cain (exc.)
October 6, 1981	Lee (exc.)
October 27, 1981	Pertalion
November 3, 1981	Cain (exc.)
November 17, 1981	Longhill (exc.)
December 1, 1981	Tindel
December 8, 1981	
January 20, 1982	Farr and Lee (exc.), Wilson
February 3, 1982	Wilson
February 20, 1982	McGrath, Longhill (exc.)
March 24, 1982	Eamon (exc.), McGrath
March 31, 1982	Graham, Cain, Eamon, Longhill (exc.), Pertalion
April 7, 1982	
April 21, 1982	Longhill (exc.), McGrath

Dean Schwartz, School of Music, was unable to attend the committee meetings throughout the year due to other duties.

IV. Reports to Faculty Senate

1. To November, 1981, meeting of the Faculty Senate in re the proposed questionnaire to the faculty concerning the use of the student questionnaire on teaching. The CTE chair explained the genesis and development of the student questionnaire.
2. To the February, 1982, meeting, CTE member Farr reported the Committee's recommendations for a change in the Alumni Awards selection procedure.

V. Specific Instructions to the Committee by the Faculty Senate

1. At its October, 1981, meeting, the Faculty Senate adopted a motion to institute a poll of the faculty on the use of the student questionnaire on teaching, and instructed the CTE to devise its format. At the November meeting, the CTE presented its draft, which was adopted with minor alterations. The poll was conducted in December, and its results made known to the Senate at its January, 1982, meeting (see attached).
2. A new charge was given the CTE by Faculty Senate Resolution 81-53, October, 1981 (see attached).
3. At the Senate's February, 1982, meeting, the CTE was empowered to discontinue the former poll for the Alumni Awards and begin a new procedure using the results of the student questionnaire on teaching conducted in December, 1981.

VI. Committee Activity and Organization

The CTE met in plenary sessions with its chair presiding. One subcommittee was appointed (Farr, McGrath, Tindel) to research the operations of a proposed Faculty Development Office and make recommendations for same. Its report was received April 7 and adopted as the basis for further report to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in May, 1982.

Research in the evaluation and improvement of teaching was carried on throughout the year by individual members; Pertalion, Tindel, and Longhill attended workshops or short courses in Raleigh and Memphis, Tennessee. At the April 21, 1982, meeting an official of the Instructional Development Center at Old Dominion University presented an overview of that facility's experiences and its relevance to this campus.

VII. Committee Accomplishments and Recommendations

1. A recommendation (Fall, 1980) to the Faculty Senate to divide the CTE's present charge was favorably acted on in November, 1981,

(FS 81-65) with the formation of the new University Teaching Grants Committee.

2. A recommendation for new selection procedures for the Alumni Awards for teaching was favorably acted upon by the Senate at its February, 1982, meeting.
3. The CTE made recommendation to the administration with regard to the conducting of the student evaluation of teaching questionnaire administered in November, 1981, and the preliminary use made of same to date.
4. The CTE put forth two calls for grant applications (Fall, 1981, Spring, 1982), resulting in 37 applications and recommendation made to the administration for the awarding of full or partial funding to 22 faculty.
5. The grants budget was restructured to reflect more closely faculty needs.
6. A proposal for the staffing, functions and budget of a new Faculty Development Office will be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs this summer.

VIII. Resolution numbers that originated with the Committee:

81-51, -52, -53, -55, -56, -57, -58

IX. Unfinished Business

1. Recommendations to the administration on revision of the student questionnaire; its composition, frequency, and coverage.
2. Devising means to include virtually all teaching faculty within the competition for Alumni Awards for Teaching, and expansion of these awards.
3. Introduction of formal and informal counseling procedures for faculty desirous of improving their classroom performance.

X. Evaluation of Committee:

Structure: has worked well, with adequate representation of all disciplines except the physical sciences. Standing subcommittees may be deemed advisable in the committee's new role.

Duties: Too numerous until now, but this should be solved next year when the University Teaching Grants Committee begins its work.

Annual Report of the Committee for Teaching Effectiveness

Page 4

May 5, 1982

Functions: have suffered somewhat from unclear status of CTE in conducting student questionnaire in collaboration with University administration. This question should be resolved with new administration's entry.

Personnel: willing and dedicated in every respect. The continuing lack of student participation may indicate advisability of FS action.

XI. Suggestions for improving effectiveness of the committee:

See above.

Phil Adler
Chair

John Longhill
Secretary

All figures shown are percentages.

FACULTY SENATE QUESTIONNAIRE ON FACULTY EVALUATION

In the continuing attempt to ensure that evaluation of individual faculty performance will be conducted on a valid and reliable basis, the Faculty Senate has decided to assess the current state of opinion on these matters. Of the several criteria proposed for evaluation of faculty members we would like to know which you feel should actually be employed. Please give us your reaction on each of the first seven questions by circling the appropriate letter drawn from the following scale.

- a. strongly agree
- b. agree
- c. neutral
- d. disagree
- e. strongly disagree

1. Teaching effectiveness should always be included when individual faculty are evaluated.

68	26	3	2	2
a	b	c	d	e

2. Research and creative activity should always be included when I am being evaluated.

47	27	11	10	5
a	b	c	d	e

3. Service to the University should always be included.

38	39	14	6	3
a	b	c	d	e

4. Service to government, industry or the community should always be included.

21	28	26	13	11
a	b	c	d	e

5. Participation in professional organizations should always be included.

33	40	16	7	4
a	b	c	d	e

6. Peer evaluation of teaching should always be included.

16	30	24	15	16
a	b	c	d	e

7. Data from surveys of student opinion of teaching should always be included.

22	32	20	14	13
a	b	c	d	e

The following items refer specifically to the student opinion survey administered to all students during classes in the third week of November, 1981. It should be noted that this questionnaire can and will be revised on a continuing basis (pending adoption by the faculty) in order to improve its validity and effectiveness.

8. If personnel decisions were to be based in part on student opinion data, should a single survey questionnaire be applied uniformly to the entire University (as was the case in fall, 1981) or should each unit devise and apply its own instrument?

36% a) University questionnaire
57% b) unit questionnaire
7% c) no opinion

9. If personnel decisions were to be based in part on a student opinion questionnaire, the Faculty Senate should guide the development of the instrument?

33 31 13 10 14
strongly agree a b c d e strongly disagree

10. If a University questionnaire were used, the data could be stored in a vault on tapes with access carefully controlled. Instructors could then periodically be given information on trends in their data if they requested it and the CTE would have a data base for research on the survey instrument. Should this be done?

15 23 18 14 30
strongly agree a b c d e strongly disagree

11. Data from a mandatory, campus-wide survey affecting personnel decisions should be destroyed?

24 15 22 20 19
strongly agree a b c d e strongly disagree

12. A number of instructors have suggested that certain courses may never yield unbiased opinion data and thus, should never be considered when the instructor is evaluated.

It would be an improvement in the procedure for use of the opinion survey data in personnel actions if each instructor were allowed to exclude certain courses from consideration?

19 15 24 19 23
strongly agree a b c d e strongly disagree

13. Should the student opinion survey be used solely for self-improvement with the results being given only to the individual instructor (i.e., no administrative record is kept) or should it be used as a partial basis for personnel decisions (tenure, promotion and salary)?

51% a) self-improvement only
49% b) included in personnel decisions