

FACULTY SENATE EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE
ACADEMIC YEAR 2016-2017
Annual Report

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Kathy Baker	Nursing and Health Sciences
David Bedford	AddRan (Hum)
José Carrión	Science and Engineering
Julie Fry – Chair	Science and Engineering
Jill Havens	AddRan (Hum)
Clark Jones	Science and Engineering
Rhiannon Mayne	Science and Engineering
Stathis Michaelides-FSEC Liaison	Science and Engineering
Steve Palko	Education —Did not participate
Samantha Powell	Science and Engineering
Chris Sawyer	Communication

CHARGES

Standing Charges

1. *Represent interests of faculty on issues of teaching quality and support (technology, services, resources/training, classroom).*
2. *Act as a consultative body for the University Evaluation Committee regarding electronic Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) survey policies and practices.*

Special Charges

- A. *Work with department chairs and deans to facilitate the implementation of the “Best Practices” recommendations from the FS on teaching excellence and evaluation.*

ACTIONS

1. Meetings: September 8, 2016, October 13, 2016, November 10, 2016, February 9, 2017, March 9, 2017, plus email communications throughout the year
2. Addressing the second standing charge, the EEC and University Evaluation Committee (UEC) worked together to modify the original eSPOTsurvey in response to suggestions from student focus groups conducted by the Office of Institutional Research. The most common comment was that the survey was too long, especially for courses with multiple instructors, as the “Instructor” questions are listed for each instructor, in addition to the general “Course” questions. The original eSPOT (the current acronym is now SPOT) was modified by eliminating questions that were redundant, as well as removing and rewording a few questions that tended to be misinterpreted by the students. The shorter, more concise survey (see Appendix A) should encourage higher levels of participation, which would increase the statistical reliability of the survey results, which has been a concern of the members of the EEC. The Faculty Senate approved the new version of the SPOT survey on 11/3/2016 for implementation spring 2017.

3. In accordance with the Special Charge stated above, the EEC deliberated on ways to effectively communicate the information contained in the “Best Practices” document endorsed by the Faculty Senate in 2011, and subsequently approved by the Provost (“On the Evaluation of TCU Faculty Teaching: A TCU Faculty Senate Report, May 2011”; found on the faculty senate web page under “Resolutions and Work Accomplished”). There is no uniform set of methods used by all TCU departments/programs to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Many departments/programs have clear evaluative criteria and/or a well-established peer-review system. In order to support faculty who are being evaluated in a less structured environment, the EEC feels a list of methods and criteria that are currently being used by many departments will aid in the communication between Chair/Dean and faculty member. Over a four-month period that involved many discussions and revisions, two documents were created to serve as a hard-copy and electronic reference for Chairs and Deans, as well as for distribution to faculty across campus (refer to Appendices B and C). One document provides guidelines for teaching evaluation, while the second is a concise bullet-point checklist of “best practices” for the evaluation of teaching.

After allowing time for Faculty Senate input, the documents were forwarded to the Provost by the Faculty Senate Chair, Jesús Castro-Balbi. The Provost will be emailing the documents to the entire TCU faculty and Deans/Chairs in the near future.

4. Upon evaluating the current and standing charges for our committee, we feel that they should remain unchanged, and next year we plan to focus attention on the first standing charge.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie A. Fry
Chair, Educational Evaluation Committee, 2015-17
Instructor I
Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
College of Science and Engineering

APPENDIX A
Student Perception of Teaching (S.P.O.T.) Survey

Student Information

[Yes/No]

- This course is a requirement (i.e. part of my major/minor/program/core requirements).
- I am a major in the department offering this course.

[Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Neither Agree nor Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

- I was interested in taking this course.

[Better than expected / same as I expected / worse than I expected]

- My performance in this course is ...

Faculty Questions

[Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Neither Agree nor Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

- The instructor encouraged active involvement in this class.
- The instructor treated students fairly.
- The instructor created and maintained an atmosphere of civility and respect.
- I felt welcome seeking the instructor's help outside of class or online.
- The instructor was well prepared.
- The instructor provided clear explanations during class.
- The instructor provided useful feedback on my work.

Course Questions

[Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Neither Agree nor Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

- The course work helped me learn.

[Open-ended questions]

- What worked well in this class?
- What are your suggestions for improving this class?

APPENDIX B (original document appears on only one page)



- **Teaching is an act of leadership**; leading students to new pathways of thought and to new discoveries is a primary act of leadership. TCU must always recognize and reward this most essential form of leadership.
- **TCU must continue to affirm the Teacher-Scholar model**; research and creative activity illuminate and enhance good teaching; the synergy between these two vital areas is mutually beneficial.
- **There is no one-size-fits-all formula** for assessing faculty performance in the classroom, and each college, department, and program must decide which evaluative practices are best suited to its individual needs.
- Faculty evaluation must be undertaken holistically; that is, **all areas of professional activity must be considered in evaluating faculty performance**. In addition to teaching, and depending on an individual's appointment and designation, these areas may include research and creative activity, service, student interaction, and professional development.
- In the evaluation of teaching, **at least three evaluative practices must be used**; SPOT surveys or other forms of student survey feedback **should not constitute more than one third** of the weight of the evaluation process.
- **All faculty must be individually informed of the specific criteria which will be used to evaluate their teaching before the beginning of the semester or the**

academic year. Deans and chairs must ensure that current faculty, and all new faculty, are made aware of the particular measures for teaching evaluation used by their departments and colleges; all faculty members must be given a written set of departmental policies concerning their evaluation.

- **Stasis and adequacy are insufficient; growth, development, and innovation are essential to effective teaching.** TCU faculty members must make a commitment to teaching excellence and to continual improvement in their teaching practice.



**USE THIS AS A CHECKLIST OF APPLICABLE ITEMS FOR THE EVALUATION OF
TEACHING**

- PEER CLASSROOM OBSERVATION
- TEACHING PORTFOLIOS
- EFFECTIVE TEACHING INNOVATION
- DESIGN / DELIVERY OF SERVICE LEARNING COURSES
- MENTORING / ADVISING
- OVERLOAD TEACHING
- TEACHING AWARDS OR RECOGNITION (NOMINATED OR RECEIVED)
- STUDENT ACHIEVEMENTS UNDER FACULTY'S SUPERVISION
- INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS BEYOND THE CLASSROOM
- TEACHING ANALYSIS POLL (BY KOEHLER CENTER)
- KOEHLER CENTER CLASSROOM OBSERVATION
- SPOT SURVEYS
- SELF-ASSESSMENT
- EXIT INTERVIEW OF STUDENTS

- UNSOLICITED LETTERS FROM CURRENT OR FORMER STUDENTS
- ADDITIONAL COURSE MATERIALS

SOURCE: [ON THE EVALUATION OF TCU FACULTY TEACHING: A TCU FACULTY SENATE REPORT, MAY 2011](#)