Tompa Scores

Math Faculty Student Teaching Evaluations

The questionnaire

1 Evaluate the organization and coherence of the lectures:
(Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Very poor | No opinion)

2 At what level were the instructor explanations aimed?
(Too High | Somewhat too high | Just right | Somewhat too low | Too low | No opinion)

3 Evaluate the instructors treatment of students questions:
(Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Very poor | No opinion)

4 Evaluate the effectiveness of the instructors visual presentation (blackboard, overheads, etc.)
(Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Very poor | No opinion)

5 Evaluate the effectiveness of the instructors oral presentation
(Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Very poor | No opinion)

6 Was the instructor available for help outside class?
(Always | Most of the time | Often enough | Not often enough | Never | No opinion)

7 Did you find the course interesting?
(Very interesting | Interesting | Not interesting | No opinion)

8 Evaluate the overall effectiveness of the instructor as a teacher.
(Excellent | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Very poor | No opinion)

9 What proportion of the lectures did you attend in this course?
(90-100% | 75-90% | 50-75% | 25-50% | < 25%)

10 Was the assigned work (assignments, project, etc) helpful in learning the course content?
(Very helpful | Helpful | Not helpful | No work assigned | No opinion)

11 Were the printed notes (if any) helpful in learning the course content?
(Very helpful | Helpful | Not helpful | No printed course notes | No opinion)

12 Was the required textbook (if any) helpful in learning the course content?
(Very helpful | Helpful | Not helpful | No text required | No opinion)

13 Did the course introduce an appropriate amount of new material?
(Too much | Somewhat too much | Okay | Somewhat too little | Too little | No opinion)

14 Was the amount of assigned work required for the course appropriate?
(Too much | Somewhat too much | Okay | Somewhat too little | Too little | No opinion)

15 On average, how many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of lectures?
(0-2 hours | 3-6 hours | 7-10 hours | 11-15 hours | > 15 hours)

Overview of scoring the evaluations

The course-by-course report

Format of output lines:

[course (year.t)] <N R L W> P/aP D/aD e/aE [#]

where

t = 1 if Winter, 2 if Spring, 3 if Fall
N = the number of responses
R = the response percentage
L = the avg for Q9 (using lower bounds)
W = the avg for Q15 (using avgs)
P = 80% Q1 + 20% Q10
aP = the 15-term avg P for this course
D = the avg for Q2-Q6
aD = the 15-term avg D for this course
E = 20% Q7 + 80% Q8
aE = the 15-term avg E for this course
# = the number of this course's offerings during the last 15 terms

Notes:

<P> Q1,10 together reflect effort in preparation for teaching (heavily weighted in favour of Q1)
<D> Q2-6 together reflect presentational and interaction techniques
<E> Q7,8 reflect impact made on students (perceived effectiveness) (heavily wgtd in favour of Q8)
values of -1 indicate no data available

e.g.:

[MATH xyz (2001.2)] <28 31.82 80 10> 3.78/3.42 3.87/3.91 3.07/3.37 [18]

shows that 28 persons responded, accounting for 32% of the students; they attended 80% of the lectures on average (N.B. the highest possible value here is 90% since I rate "x-y%" as if it were x%), worked 10 hours per week outside of class, and graded the professor at 3.78 for preparation, 3.87 for delivery, 3.07 for effectiveness (these 3 on a scale of 5=best to 1=worst). In 18 offerings of this course during the last 15 terms (up to last term), the averages were 3.42, 3.91, and 3.37 for preparation, delivery, and effectiveness, respectively.

The summary line gives averages across all the courses listed:

n = the number of courses
@ = the average R value
attend = the average L value
hr/wk = the average W value
prep = the average P value
del = the average D value
eff = the average E value

e.g.:

(n=19 @72%) (attend 85% + 5 hr/wk) prep: 4.57 del: 4.51 eff: 4.55

shows that 19 courses are included with an average response rate of 72%. Students reported attending on average 85% of the lectures and working on average 5 hours per week (both being averages of course

averages). The average course score for preparation is 4.57, for delivery is 4.51, and for effectiveness is 4.55.

Difficulty: When computing course averages, the course designation changes from term to term. For example, all of the following are treated as the same course:

STAT440/840
STAT440/STAT840/CM461
CM/STAT 461/440/840
STAT/CM 440/461/840
STAT/STAT/CM 440/840/461
CM/STAT461/440/840
STAT/CM440/461/840
STAT/STAT/CM440/840/461

Solution: For consistent identification, use underlying Course ID: 008883

CS "Top teachers"

Each term those who have taught a class in which

1. each of P, D, and E are at least 4.1, and
2. at least 25 students or 75% of the class responded

are publicly recognized for their teaching.

CS Annual Evaluations

Each year the teaching component of performance is informed by the faculty member's student evaluations. The weighted score for each course is computed as

$$W = 25\% P + 25\% D + 50\% E$$

Promotion and Tenure Input

Teaching evaluations for each course taught over the most recent 5 years are collected for each Math candidate being considered for promotion and tenure.

Difficulty: When aggregating scores for faculty members, the instructor's name designation changes from term to term. For example, all of the following are treated as the same person:

Pretti JP
Pretti John-Paul
PRETTI John-Paul C
Pretti John-Paul C
Pretti J-P

but *not*

Pretti J
Pretti Judene

Solution: For consistent identification, use names stored in HR records.

Detailed determination of scores

Responses marked as "no opinion" are omitted.

Question #	Example of answers	Property	Weightings
1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8	Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory Very poor	5 answers in decreasing order of preference	5 4 3 2 1
7, 10, 11, 12	Very interesting Interesting Not interesting	3 answers in decreasing order of preference	5 3 2 ←
2, 13, 14	Too High Somewhat too high Just right Somewhat too low Too low	5 answers, middle value is best	2 4 ← 5 3 ← 1
9	90-100% 75-90% 50-75% 25-50% < 25%	% lectures attended	90 75 50 ~~20~~ 25 0
15	0-2 hours 3-6 hours 7-10 hours 11-15 hours > 15 hours	Hours spent outside of class	1 4.5 8.5 13 16
Preparation			80% Q1 + 20% Q10
Delivery			Average(Q2 thru Q6)
Effectiveness			80% Q8 + 20% Q7
5-year course averages			Average of the course scores (unweighted)

Computational Questions

1. Do the individual scores per question make sense?
2. Does the categorization of questions into Preparation, Delivery, and Effectiveness make sense?
3. Should some weighting be applied when computing averages across course offerings (e.g., dependent on recency, class size, response size, or response rate)?
4. Should other statistical measures be used instead of or in addition to means?

Policy Questions

Tampa scores ✓ ✓ on demand for their own

5. Who should have access to the results? Department heads (and designates), deans, students, faculty, other instructors, public
6. Who should have access to the raw data? Math

Implementation Questions

7. Who should be responsible for computing the scores? (CSCF, MFCF, Dean's office)

? grad course evaluation