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Assessment Data

- Knowledge Survey
- Classroom Assessment (minute paper)
- Mid-Term Review
- Student Management Team
- SGID & Peer Review
Knowledge Survey

• Example from MOT 8221, Management of Technology (MS) Project and Knowledge Management

• What would you like to know about the students in your courses?
Participant Information
MOT 8221, Project and Knowledge Management, Spring 2007

Name ____________________________

Current Title and Job Description: (Please append a recent resume)

Work Experience (describe briefly): (use additional space if necessary).

Previous Coursework/Experience in Project Management, Knowledge Management, Leadership, Engineering Systems, Industrial Engineering/Operations Research (IE/OR), Management Science, and Quality Management (Six Sigma/TQM):
For the following areas, please rank your level of understanding according to the following scale:

1 = Little or no coursework/self study/experience in this area.
2 = (Between 1 & 3).
3 = Moderate coursework/self study/experience in this area
4 = (Between 3 & 5).
5 = A great deal of coursework/self study/experience in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Specific Packages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI-PMBOK</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Systems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE/OR</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling/Simulation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Adaptive Systems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Science</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Sigma/ TQM</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computing Experience:
For each of the following, rate your proficiency and list any computer software:

1 = Never have used it.
2 = Know a little about it.
3 = Have used it some.
4 = Am very comfortable using it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Specific Packages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spreadsheet</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling/simulation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data base</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming language</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Map/Expert System</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expectations from the course (use additional space if necessary):
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- **Spread**
- **PM**
- **Stat**
- **Mod/Sim**

- **Q1**
- **Q2**
- **Q3**
- **Q4**
- **Q5**
- **Q6**
- **Q7**

- **Q1**
- **Q2**
- **Q3**
- **Q4**
- **Q5**
- **Q6**
- **Q7**

Legend:
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
Knowledge Survey

What would you like to know about the background knowledge of students in your courses?
Assessment Data

- Knowledge Survey
- Classroom Assessment (minute paper)
- Mid-Term Review
- Student Management Team
- Peer Review
Minute Paper

• What was the most useful or meaningful thing you learned during this session?
• What question(s) remain uppermost in your mind as we end this session?
• What was the “muddiest” point in this session?
• Give an example or application
• Explain in your own words . . .

Session Summary
(Minute Paper)

Reflect on the session:

1. Most interesting, valuable, useful thing you learned.
2. Things that helped you learn.
3. Comments, suggestions, etc
4. Pace: Too slow 1 . . . . 5 Too fast
5. Relevance: Little 1 . . . 5 Lots
6. Instructional Format: Ugh 1 . . . 5 Ah
Q4 – Pace: Too slow 1 . . . 5 Too fast (3.1)
Q5 – Relevance: Little 1 . . . 5 Lots (3.9)
Q6 – Format: Ugh 1 . . . 5 Ah (4.2)
Assessment Data

- Knowledge Survey
- Classroom Assessment (minute paper)
- Mid-Term Review
- Student Management Team
- Peer Review
# Mid-Term Review

## University Course Evaluations

**Sample Form**

### Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) - Early Semester Form B

The purpose of this survey is to provide the instructor with information that may help to improve this class. The results will be reported only to the instructor: they will not be used in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions. Your thoughtful written comments are especially requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Fairly Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Your understanding of what is expected of you in this course.
- The instructor's clarity in presenting or discussing course material.
- The instructor's use of examples or illustrations.
- The instructor's encouragement of students to think about course material.
- The instructor's ability to speak clearly and audibly.
- The instructor's success in getting you interested or involved.
- The instructor's availability to answer questions or provide help.
- The instructor's respect and concern for students.
- Your comfort in asking questions or expressing an opinion in class.
- Helpfulness of feedback on assignments or class work.
- Degree to which evaluation procedures (e.g. exams, quizzes) measure your knowledge and understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Much more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much does the amount of work required in this class compare with that in similar classes you have taken?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload</th>
<th>Q12 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FG</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1 Your understanding of what is expected of you in this course
Q5 The instructor's ability to speak clearly and audibly
Q6 The instructor's success in getting you interested or involved
Q7 The instructor's availability to answer questions or provide help
Q10 Helpfulness of feedback on assignments or class work
Q11 Degree to which evaluation procedures (e.g., exams, quizzes) measure your knowledge and understanding
Assessment Data

- Knowledge Survey
- Classroom Assessment (minute paper)
- Mid-Term Review
- Student Management Team
- Peer Review
Student Management Team

A student management team will be used in this course to operationalize Total Quality Management principles. The attributes of student management teams are described below, and the operation of the team is based on shared responsibility:

*Students, in conjunction with their instructor, are responsible for the success of any course. As student managers, your special responsibility is to monitor this course through your own experience, to receive comments from other students, to work as a team with your instructor on a regular basis, and to make recommendations to the instructor about how this course can be improved.* (Nuhfer, 1990-1995).
Attributes of Student Management Teams

- 3 - 4 students plus teaching team.
- Students have a managerial role and assume responsibility for the success of the class.
- Students meet weekly; professor attends every other week. Meetings generally last about one hour.
- Meet away from classroom and professor's office.
- Maintain log or journal of suggestions, actions and progress.
- May focus on the professor or on the content.
- Utilize group dynamics approach of TQM.
Chapter 8: Student Management Teams: The Heretic’s Path to Teaching Success by Edward B. Nuhfer

Students as Co-Designers

- Graduate TAs participating as members of the teaching team
- Undergraduate TAs (near peers) as members of the teaching team
WebCT Peer Review & Feedback

• Students work in Base Groups
• WebCT provides private message areas for each group
• Opportunity to use the Model-Practice Feedback Loop
• Feedback to whole group rather than individuals
  – More information
  – More models and feedback to help students
Model-Practice-Feedback Loop

- Cooper and Robinson [18] surveyed the literature in higher education and found that “...the model-practice-feedback loop is among the most powerful instructional strategies available to teachers at all levels.”
  - teacher modeling
  - student practice with multiple opportunities
  - descriptive feedback on the quality of their performance
Successes & Challenges

- Incorporating formal cooperative groups with the peer review process offered the students:
  - access to more examples of writing
  - access to comments on both their own papers and those of their group members

- Students need more explicit connections between the writing for class and the writing they will be doing in the workplace.
  - Summer 2004 we incorporated an interview assignment to help students make this connection
Assessment Data

- Knowledge Survey
- Classroom Assessment (minute paper)
- Mid-Term Review
- Student Management Team
- SGID & Peer Review
SGID: Small Group Instructional Diagnosis

A consensus approach to student feedback

What is an SGID?

Small Group Instructional Diagnosis, SGID, is a technique that uses guided discussion and consensus to generate clear, prioritized, and confidential student feedback on classroom instruction or curriculum. When you request an SGID, a consultant from the Center for Teaching and Learning Services guides your students through a two-step consensus-generating process.

First, students work in small groups to agree upon answers to the questions:

- "What are the strengths of this course that help you learn?"
- "What changes would improve your learning?"
- "How should these changes be implemented?"

Next, as groups share their ideas with the class, the consultant clarifies and facilitates group discussion on each point before conducting a class-wide vote to determine extent of agreement. When changes are suggested, the consultant probes for specifics on how the changes could best be implemented.

Why request an SGID?

For course improvement, request an SGID in the third or fourth week of the semester.

By finding out early in the semester what helps students...
PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

Introduction

Peer review of teaching is a form of evaluation designed to provide feedback to instructors about teaching and learning in their courses. Peer review may be used either as a way to help instructors improve teaching and learning in their courses, known as a formative review, or it may be part of a formal review system used in hiring and pay decisions, known as a summative review.

In general, peer review is a collaborative process in which the instructor under review works closely with a colleague or group of colleagues to discuss his or her teaching. The format of a peer review will vary depending on its purpose. In some cases, colleagues may evaluate and discuss teaching materials and curricula; in other cases, they may visit a class session to observe the teacher in action.

The peer review process yields important information that can be combined with other sources to provide a comprehensive view of an individual's teaching. Other materials that can be used in consort with peer review are student evaluations, administrative assessment, feedback on student work, or self-assessment documentation such as a teaching portfolio.

The University of Minnesota has adopted a formal policy on peer review. To read the policy, visit the Protocols for Student Evaluation and Peer Review of Faculty Teaching Contributions.

The Purpose of This Site

This Web site is intended to:

- help departments establish and implement a peer review process;
- help departments improve their current peer review process;
- prepare individuals to participate in the peer review process by helping them document their teaching, gather appropriate materials, etc.
- prepare individuals to carry out a peer review of their colleagues;
- provide examples of peer review systems currently in use at the University of Minnesota (forthcoming).

CTLS Can Help

The Center for Teaching and Learning Services is committed to improving the quality of teaching at the University of Minnesota. Staff members are available to assist individuals, departments, or programs in developing and implementing a peer review process. The Center offers consultation services, specialized workshops, forms for peer observation and review, and a variety of online resources. For more information, or to speak with a consultant, contact the Center at (612) 625-3043.
The biggest and most long-lasting reforms of undergraduate education will come when individual faculty or small groups of instructors adopt the view of themselves as reformers within their immediate sphere of influence, the classes they teach every day.

K. Patricia Cross