

Report of the UK Senate Teaching & Course Evaluation Implementation Ad-Hoc Committee

March 2016

Members approving report:

- Dr. Alan Brown (Department of Hispanic Studies, College of Arts & Sciences)
- Dr. Roger Brown (Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture)
- Dr. David Fardo (Department of Biostatistics, College of Public Health)
- Dr. Jonathan Golding (Department of Psychology, College of Arts & Sciences), Chair
- Dr. Andrew Hippisley (Department of Linguistics, College of Arts & Sciences)
- Mr. Brett McDaniel (Planning and Assessment Technology Manager, UKAT)
- Dr. Peter Mirabito (Department of Biology, College of Arts & Sciences)
- Dr. Lisa O'Connor (Department of Library and Information Sciences, College of College of  
Communication and Information)
- Dr. Christopher Rice (Enterprise Architect, UKAT)
- Dr. Terry Stratton (Department of Medical Education, College of Medicine)

## Report of the UK Senate Teaching & Course Evaluation Implementation Ad-Hoc Committee

March 2016

At the 9 March 2015 meeting of University Senate, senators voted to approve a new version of the Teaching and Course Evaluation (TCE; see Appendix A). The new version allows UK to have a common instrument to assess course and instructional quality, and ensures that all units and faculty members assess the curricular quality within their respective disciplines. In addition to a “standard” set of items, the new version will feature (a) a 5-point rating scale; and (b) summary reports detailing the total course enrollment, response count, mean/median scores, and graphical displays of ratings.

In the Spring of 2016, the UK Senate Council formed the Teacher Course Evaluation Implementation Ad-Hoc Committee (TCE-AIC) with the charge of developing an implementation plan for the entire university. It was expected that the recommendations of this committee would be presented to the Teaching Effectiveness Committee chaired by Dr. Lineberry. After discussion and approval, the recommendations would then be voted on by the University Senate.

The committee discussed and voted on a number of major issues and recommendations, including:

### 1) Availability of TCE results

TCE results shall be made available to students and faculty as follows:

- a) Only numerical ratings shall be made available to students, i.e., no written comments; and
- b) Intramural access to TCE results concerning either course academic content or instructor performance shall continue to be managed in accordance with existing academic policy of the University Senate and administrative faculty personnel policy (AR 2:1), with the recommendation that course instructors with a supervisory role in a course (course directors, course coordinators) and the department chair and the college dean of the unit housing the course have access to both numerical and written comments of instructor performance for all instructors in that course.
  - a. TCE comments from for example PHY 101 should not be made available to for example Engineering Dean or Chair of History.
- c) To safeguard student anonymity and comply with FERPA, any results (numerical ratings and written comments) for classes with < 5 TCE responses shall not be made available to anyone. However, results will contribute to aggregate UK, College, and Departmental TCE means.

### 2) TCE Form

#### a. Number of Common Questions

There will be 15 common questions for all course evaluations with a 5-point scale approved by the University Senate for the TCE.

#### b. Opt-Out Alternative for Questions

It was agreed that each question will provide an “opt-out” option.

**c. Opt-Out Alternative Label**

It was agreed that the “opt-out” option will be “choose not to rate”.

**3) Procedural Issues for Completing TCE**

**a. Location of Filling out TCE**

The TCE-AIC recommends:

Course instructors will decide whether or not to dedicate in-class time to completing TCEs.

**b. Instructor Presence**

The TCE-AIC recommends:

If class time is used to administer TCEs, none of the instructors could be present in the classroom.

**c. Incentives for students**

The TCE-AIC recommends:

Instructors may not offer additional incentives (e.g., food, extra credit) for TCE completion.

**4) Additional TCE Questions**

**a. Institutional Evaluation Questions (Required)**

Any required questions from university units (e.g., UKCore, Distance Learning) to be included in the TCE will adopt the same 5-point scale approved by the University Senate for the TCE.

**b. Supplemental Evaluation Questions (Optional)**

The TCE-AIC recommends that no more than 20 additional questions be allowed from Colleges, Departments, and/or individual instructors; allocation of these items, when necessary, should be determined within each academic unit.

Optional supplemental questions shall be added sparingly and should not replicate existing content; these questions might focus on discipline-specific and course-specific pedagogical innovations.

**c. Submitting Questions**

The TCE-AIC recommends that all supplemental questions must be submitted to UKAT by the first day of each semester.

**d. Ordering of TCE Questions**

The Standard 15 questions approved by the Senate will always appear first on the TCE – prior to any additional items.

### 5) Exemptions to Completing the TCE

The TCE-AIC recommends that certain courses with non-traditional delivery, such as those listed below, be exempt from using the UK Senate-approved TCE (alternative assessments of curricular and instructional quality are presumed):

- Independent Study
- Field-Based Study
- Experiential Education
- Clinical Practicum (e.g., medical clerkships)
- Study Abroad
- Residential courses (e.g., 748, 749, 767, 768)
- Research courses

### 6) Changing the Campus Culture about the TCE

The TCE-AIC was unanimous in its view that these recommendations alone may not achieve the desired results, and that a concomitant change is needed in the campus culture regarding the TCE.

Historically, it appears that students often do not take the TCE seriously and, as a result, do not provide valuable feedback on course and instructional quality. For example, at UK for Fall 2015, there were 1141 reports that were not generated because of less than 5 responses. Of these, 553 reports would have been generated if the number of students invited (this was 5 or more) would have responded. Compounding this problem is prior data from UK and other schools that suggest moving from a paper to an online format typically decreases response rates. A concerted effort should be made to highlight for learners the value of the TCE - both with regard to course design and delivery improvements, and for promotion and tenure decisions.

It is equally important to educate faculty about the TCE and how resulting data are used for administrative purposes. In addition, our committee strongly encourages all UK units to view TCE results as only *one* means of evaluating courses and instructors - and that additional performance metrics be used toward this end, particularly in P&T decisions.

To initiate a campus-wide culture change regarding the TCE process, it will be necessary for a standing University Senate committee, a unit on campus (e.g., Provost's office), or a joint committee to:

- a. spearhead efforts to publicize the importance of the TCE
- b. develop a TCE website with instructions and FAQs for faculty and students
- c. introduce the topic during K-Week informational sessions
- d. offer guidelines for faculty discussions about the TCE to classes
- e. offer informational sessions on stakeholders and uses of TCE data at UK
- f. determine the nature of TCE email reminders to students and faculty

- g. determine the language to be used as a prelude to the TCE itself
- h. strategically imbed positively-worded language concerning the TCE on webpages with high student traffic
- i. coordinate annual reviews of the TCE process and deal with any related problems, issues, or concerns
- j. develop a set of faculty guidelines on the merits of completing the TCE in class versus remotely.

Please note that whichever of the three options option is chosen, representatives from CELT and the Registrar should be included

While we applaud and recognize the complete redesign of the TCE as long overdue, and have tried to reflect deeply on its use and the culture in which any such system is embedded, it must be acknowledged that no perfect set of TCE questions or process of implementation exists. More challenging still is the transformation of the broader campus culture surrounding the TCE.

However, we feel strongly that student learning, curricular improvement, and justifiable P&T decisions are most attainable with the revised TCE and the aforementioned recommendations. Indeed, these recommendations must be considered as a work in progress and should be subject to rigorous, ongoing, and systematic evaluation. We welcome productive suggestions for further improvements to the TCE implementation and future efforts to positively impact the local culture regarding this endeavor. Only in this manner can we hope to make useful changes that will meet the needs of all relevant stakeholders.

## Appendix A

University Senate approved version of the Teaching and Course Evaluation (TCE)

### **Student Items**

**1-S) My classification is \_\_\_\_\_ (year in school as undergrad, year in school as grad)**

**2-S) My main reason(s) for taking this course is that it \_\_\_\_\_.**

**(is required course, is elective, covers a topic I am interested in)**

**Note: students will be able to select more than one answer**

**3-S) My expected grade in the course is a(n) \_\_\_\_\_.**

**4-S) Hours I spent per week on the course (excluding class time)**

### **Common Items**

#### ***Course Organization and Planning***

**1-C) The course was well organized.**

**2-C) The instructor was prepared for class.**

#### ***Clarity, Communication Skills***

**3-C) The instructor presented material clearly.**

**4-C) The instructor responded to questions in a manner that aided my understanding of the material.**

**5-C) The instructor provided material at an appropriate pace.**

#### ***Student-Instructor Interaction, Rapport***

**6-C) The instructor treated students with respect.**

**7-C) Class meetings contributed to my learning of course content.**

**8-C) The instructor asked questions that stimulated deep consideration of the course content.**

#### ***Grading and Examinations, Evaluation***

**9-C) Grading in the course was fair.**

**10-C) Assessments (e.g., tests, quizzes, papers, homework, projects) reflected course material.**

**11-C) I understood why I received my grade in the course**

### **Summary Items**

**12-C) I consider NAME OF COURSE to be a quality course.**

**13-C) INSTRUCTOR NAME provided quality teaching.**

### **Open-Ended Comments**

**1-OEC) Which aspects of the course/instructor were most helpful and why?**

**2-OEC) Which aspects of the course/instructor would you change and why/how?**

**3-OEC) Other comments?**