Teaching Evaluation: Panther180 Examples

In the Spring of 2023, KF-SCIS approved new Guidlines for Evaluation of Teaching. These **Guidelines** can be found on the Faculty Policies page, available here: https://www.cs.fiu.edu/about/policies/faculty-policies.

A key component of the new Guidelines is now the inclusion of additional sources of feedback, from three sources: Student, Peer, and Self. The degree to which a KF-SCIS faculty takes into account these sources of feedback (positive or negative) and uses them to improve their course(s) now composes 30% of the KF-SCIS teaching evaluation (10% for each component).

On the same Faculty Policies page, there is a **Repository of Resources** available with pedagogically documented options for collecting this feedback, as well as a **Handbook** that includes a step-by-step guide (with visuals) documenting how to submit this information on Panther 180.

Note that as of this release, the rubric used for each of these components is as follows:

	Unsatisfactory (1)	**Fair (2)**	**Good (3)**	**Very Good (4)**	**Outstanding (5)***
Student, Peer, Self Feedback	No feedback collected.	Feedback collected.	Feedback collected, taken into account.	Feedback collected, taken into account, developed a plan for next academic year.	Feedback collected, taken into account, developed a plan for next academic year, provided evidence that prior year plan was followed through

Between all of these resources, KF-SCIS faculty can understand what to submit (the repository), how to submit (the handbook), and how they will be evaluated (the guidelines). With this document, the intent is to provide one additional resource: an example.

Following is an example of what the Teaching Evaluation Committee considers as a submission that would earn a “5” on all three components (student, peer, and self). We have subsequently broken down the key components of this submission that ensure all attributes of the above rubric are covered. Faculty are not required to follow this same format, but they are encouraged to use any elements they find useful when composing their own Annual Evaluations in Panther180.

Sources have been color-coded: Student, Peer, Self. This coding will not be available in Panther180, it is only used for clarity in the example.

Activity(ies) to collect evidence from students: (maximum 500 character limit including spaces)	Activity(ies) to collect evidence from peers: (maximum 500 character limit including spaces)	Activity(ies) to collect evidence from self: (maximum 500 character limit including spaces)	Teaching Narrative (maximum 1500 character limit equaling approximately 750 words)
Activity: SPOTS **Results**: Comments indicated a need for better Apple software support, fast pace, and unnecessary Zybook sections. **Activity**: Gateway Survey **Results**: 50% felt unprepared, 37.5% could not make office hours. 87.5% said Las were helpful. 37.5% interacted with LAs fewer than half of the classes.	**Activity**: NSF CUE-T (Syllabus Exchange) **Results**: My CDA3102 course has lost some of its conductivity with an LA model.	**Activity**: Self-Reflection **Results**: Students were most overwhelmed (1) in the beginning, particularly those who registered late; (2) at the end, where material gets complex quickly. Missing sessions is difficult to recover.	**Source: Student** **Last Year's Plan:** Build a portal of resources for Quartus/ModelSim for CDA3102. **Status**. Done, the link is attached*. **This Year's Interpretation:** SPOTS indicated the software support I provided for CDA3102 was not sufficient (not enough Apple support)^, students needed more time to learn software/VMs, and the ZyBook is too inflated. Gateway Survey tells me I have a strong but underutilized LA team. **Next Year's Plan:** Budget more time for interactive sessions and software training. Review ZyBook carefully, condense to essentials. **Source: Peer** **Last Year's Plan:** Discuss with faculty the possibility of teaching CDA3102 online live. **Status**. Done, e-mail exchanges attached*. I decided against this, as I could not find a pedagogically effective way to administer laboratories with physical silicon and copper wiring with the resources at my disposal+. **This Year's Interpretation:** The merger of CDA3103 and CDA4101 into a single CDA3102 course caused packed content with less interaction time. **Next Year's Plan**: Same as Student#. **Source: Self** **Last Year's Plan:** The last two CDA3102 units were rushed, condense into one. **Status**. Done, the modified syllabus is attached*. **This Year's Interpretation:** Attendance is critical in CDA3102, and later sections need to emphasize fundamentals. **Plan**: Require attendance. Remove multi-cycle CPU (not in course outcomes), use additional time to focus on fundamentals and tracing.

Notes on this submission:

1. The answers are concise and to the point. This is a very key component. Faculty must remember, KF-SCIS administration will be reviewing these for every faculty, and the longer the paragraphs, the more challenging it will be to uncover key points. Please be direct in your responses and include only what is necessary.
2. All of the information is included in Panther180. Faculty should not submit this information in an attachment. KF-SCIS administration will first query Panther180 to obtain the results of this table, then download attachments that are referenced in the table. *Note*: As a side-benefit, this will help ensure (1), as the table in Panther180 imposes character limits on each column. All of the responses above fit within these limits.
3. The answers have a structure. Although you are not required to supply a structure like this example (i.e. Activity, Results, Interpretation, Plans) – providing it makes it much easier for the administration to ensure all components of the rubric have been addressed.
4. When it comes to providing evidence for last year's plan being followed, the faculty attached evidence (marked with a *). Panther180 does allow you to attach files, and we encourage faculty to attach for the purposes of providing evidence for following their prior year plan. Note all attachments will appear in the first column (this is an uncontrollable attribute of P180); KF-SCIS administration understands this.
5. For one of the prior year plans (marked with a +), this faculty member decided against following through. This is perfectly acceptable, as they documented with a reason why.
6. For one of the next year plans (marked with a #), this faculty member said that the plan was the same for peer feedback as for student. This is also acceptable, as the connection is clear between less interaction time (peer) and budgeting more time for interactive sessions and software training (student next year plan). You may very well find that multiple sources of feedback point to the same type of intervention.
7. When interpreting results, the feedback source was always provided (i.e. "SPOTS indicated", "Gateway Survey tells me"). We encourage faculty to do this, as it completes a bridge for the administration between the feedback source and the proposed intervention.
8. For one of the feedback sources (marked with a ^), this example was able to draw a conclusion regarding the effectiveness of last year's plan, and build on the intervention for the next year. Faculty are encouraged to reflect on their prior year plan and take advantage of every opportunity to improve it based on the current year feedback, as this is in line with one of the core values of the KF-SCIS Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching, which is to encourage faculty to view development as a continuous (not discrete) process.