



TACO Mission efforts since 2021-22

**Hosting website?
Communication w/faculty?**

Restructuring and redesigning eSEIs

Process and committees involved:

Committee	Tasks	Milestones
TACO ((includes 1 TLC member)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect and compare best practices of students' feedback found on literature and peer and higher-ranking institutions. • Identify the components that need to be measured in the students' survey. (ex. Chose top words...,rather than ranking) • <u>Culture shift</u> for students and faculty: new process, new expectations. It is measuring students' experiences as a communication tool. • Develop tools on how to present the tool to students and faculty. 	
TLC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support/work with TACO • Support faculty by providing consultation to faculty wishing to explore course instructional design and delivery changes based on feedback. 	
Provost Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide feedback on new tool designed by TACO to make sure it meets the accreditation standards. 	

STEPS to develop a new instrument

- Performed literature evaluation:
 - Inner bias for end-of the year instructor evaluation*.
 - Peer/aspirational institutions -> focus on students' learning and classroom vs. instructor-focus.
 - Promote mid-semester feedback to seek educational tools that are working in class vs. does not.
- Dommeyer, C.J., Baum, P., Hanna, R.W., Chapman, K.S., (2004) Gathering Faculty Teaching Evaluations by In-Class and Online Surveys: Their effects on response rates and evaluations, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(5), 611-623.
- Murray, H. (1997). Does evaluation of teaching lead to improvement of teaching? *International Journal of Academic Development*, 2(1), 8-23.
- McGowan, W.R. & Graham, C.R. (2009) Factors contributing to improved teaching performance. *Innovative Higher Education*, 34, 161-171.
- Nulty, D.D., (2008) The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301-314.

STEPS to develop a new instrument- cont

1. One size does not fit it all. Each school/department should produce a list of instruments/artifacts (the ones on this list are examples).
2. Identify some core artifacts that address: Student learning, student experience, accessibility, course design, and programming.
3. Encourage faculty to document their quality of teaching and provide **"Evidence of a commitment to continuous improvement"** by using these guiding questions – power of reflection/TLC could be a resource:
 - How do you ensure that your course is well designed?
 - How am I using assessment to improve my course over time?
 - How do I know if my students are (actively) learning?

Exploration of universities assessment of teaching

- OSU
- California
- U Oklahoma
- U Oregon
- Oregon State
- Baylor
- TCU
- Iowa State
- Kansas U
- Kansas State
- Texas
- Texas Tech
- Virginia Tech
- Ohio State
- Michigan
- Wisconsin

Common theme across institutions

1. Students provide feedback on whether or not educational tools were helpful on their learning (not Likert-scale).
2. Students did not evaluate the professor but providing feedback (key on wording).
3. Students accountability for non-professional behavior.
4. Shifting types of questions decreases bias.

Instrument

- **Sections:**
- Faculty will have the choice to select among the listed options. The top one is mandatory

- **Teaching/Learning of Relationships and Concepts**
- **Discussion**
- **Instructional Technology**
- **Adapting to Individual Differences**
- **Providing feedback to Students:**

- **Laboratory courses:**
- **Clinical Courses**
- **Service Learning**
- **Online Learning**
- **Performing and Studio Arts**