

Teaching Evaluations for SDU's Engineering Pro- grammes



Introduction

All teaching activities at the Faculty of Engineering (TEK) are continuously evaluated.

The primary goals of teaching evaluations are matching expectations, development and overview.

Furthermore, the evaluation of teaching activities are to ensure and support a continuous and quality focused dialogue between students, teachers, administration and management to ensure the best possible environment for teaching and learning.

Evaluation of teaching activities at TEK takes a starting point in the faculty's educational model [The Engineering Education Model for the University of Southern Denmark](#) (DSMI), [SDU's policy for quality in education](#) (indicator 6.3.2.3) and [SDU's principles for the Evaluation of Programme Elements](#), as well as [The University Act](#) § 8a, stk. 3 and § 18, stk. 4 and [The Act on Transparency](#) § 2.

All teaching activities at the faculty are evaluated as described in this handbook, where both qualitative and quantitative methods are applied.

Organisational anchoring

- It is the responsibility of the individual teacher to carry out both the qualitative midterm evaluation and the qualitative end evaluation of the teaching.
- TEK Education facilitates the quantitative evaluations.
- The programme management (head of programme and programme coordinator) are responsible to the programme's education committee as well as faculty management for the quantitative evaluation of all teaching activities within the programme. Furthermore that the teaching evaluations are treated in the programme's education committee.
- TEK Education (TEK Quality Coordinator) is responsible for the quantitative teaching evaluations being treated in the Academic Study Board for the Engineering Programmes as well as on the individual programmes' status meetings between programme and faculty management.
- The director of studies has the overall responsibility for teaching evaluations and educational quality at the faculty.

System for teaching evaluations at the Faculty of Engineering

All teaching activities are evaluated at the Faculty of Engineering.

For a course with one teacher, the quantitative evaluation is carried once, whereas a course with several teachers carries out the quantitative end evaluation once for each teacher (who teaches a minimum of three lessons).

Moreover, all teaching activities are evaluated qualitatively. In cases where a teacher has less than six lessons with a class, the qualitative evaluation may be skipped if it is deemed irrelevant.

All teaching at the Faculty of Engineering is evaluated as follows:

Purpose	Evaluation	Method	Elaborated purpose	Timing
Matching of expectations	Midterm evaluation	Qualitative – methods described in this handbook may be used for inspiration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Development → Voice for students → Students' reflection on own effort 	Approx. 1/3 through the course
Course development	End of term evaluation	Qualitative – methods described in this handbook may be used for inspiration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Developing the teaching in the course → Feedback for teacher → Students' reflection on own effort 	Last lesson
Overview and focus	Questionnaire	Quantitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Overview of experienced outcome of teaching activities at TEK → May provide input for the oral end of term evaluation → Information for management 	Date is chosen by the head of programme. Evaluations are carried out in May and November, so any comments may be included in the end of term qualitative evaluation.

The qualitative midterm and end of term evaluation

It is up to the individual teacher to take the initiative for both the qualitative mid-term evaluation and the qualitative final evaluation. However, in cases where a teacher has less than six lessons with a class of students (e.g. in case of multiple teachers in a course), qualitative mid-term evaluations may be omitted if deemed irrelevant.

The teacher has methodological freedom and may choose the form and method that the teacher, in collaboration with the students, finds most productive in relation to supporting a productive dialogue and mutual feedback regarding the course. Several qualitative methods are described in this handbook (Appendix 1). Other methods may also be used, although an actual oral dialogue between the teacher and the students (or student representatives) must be ensured.

The teacher should be able to explain the content of the qualitative mid-term and final evaluation at the request of programme management (including members of the education committee, study board, quality coordinator and faculty management). This can be ensured by the preparation of a brief report. The report is not published – however, relevant students have the right to view any follow-ups to the qualitative mid-term and end of term evaluations.

The Faculty of Engineering does not support any distribution of the quantitative mid-term and final evaluations and it is requested that quantitative methods only are used during mid-term and final evaluations.

The quantitative evaluations

Each teaching activity at the Faculty of Engineering is evaluated quantitatively by means of a brief questionnaire. A teaching activity is defined as an activity where a teacher is associated and which runs over a minimum of three lessons (of 45 minutes). The purpose of the evaluation is to identify the students' experiences of the course's academic development as well as to form an overall impression of the student's work in relation to the subject. In relation to the latter, this may also serve as an opportunity for self-reflection by the individual student.

#sdu.dk

The quantitative evaluation consists of two questions and a comment field:

Dispatch	Spørgsmål	Svarskala
Questions are sent out once per course (regardless of how many teachers are in the course)	<i>I am satisfied with my own efforts in this course</i>	Agree Partly agree Partly disagree Disagree
Questions are sent out once per teacher who has taught a minimum of three lessons in the course	<i>I have enjoyed good academic benefit from the teaching in [name of discipline] with [name of teacher]</i>	Agree (4 point) Partly agree (3 point) Partly disagree (2 point) Disagree (1 point)
Comment field sent out once per teacher who has taught a minimum of three lessons in the course	Dynamic comment field which asks the following question, depending on the answer to the question above: Agree: <i>Any further comments?</i> Partly agree: <i>What has worked well, and what could be improved?</i> Partly disagree: <i>What can be improved, and what has worked well?</i> Disagree: <i>Why has the course not worked for you?</i>	The student can write an optional comment

The quantitative evaluation is carried out digitally via the eval.sdu.dk system and the evaluations may be accessed on both computer and mobile devices, as well as via the itslearning e-learning platform.

Employees may access the evaluation results via SDU login so that:

- Faculty management (including quality coordinator) may view all results
- Heads of departments and sections may view the results of the employees that fall under their staff management
- Programme managers and study programme coordinators may view all results of the programmes they are associated with
- Semester coordinators may view all results of the semesters that they are coordinators for
- Teachers may view their own results

For internal use, colour indicators are applied to the question which targets the academic benefits of teaching, and the point scores are addressed as follows:

Point score	Indicator	Consequence
1 – 1,99	●	→ Unsatisfactory score: The course is discussed in the education committee and at the programme's status meeting. The programme fills out a brief report regarding the course based on a pre-defined template.
2 – 2,74	●	→ Less than satisfactory score: Yellow indicator is for information and attention for the education committee and the head of programme.
2,75 – 4	✓	→ Satisfactory score

An education committee must be presented with the teaching evaluations for the semester as a whole to form a basis of a discussion. For teaching activities with a red indicator, the evaluation must be discussed and treated in the education committee and supplemented with a filled out action report (template available at eval.sdu.dk). Actions on the basis of teaching evaluations are documented in meeting notes from the education committee. Moreover, an overview inc. action plan for courses with a red indicator is discussed in the annual status meeting between programme and faculty management. Discussions are documented in meeting notes from the status meeting.

The action plans regarding the education committees treatment of courses with a red indicator are summed up for the Academic Study Board of the Engineering Programmes.

Evaluation results are published in an aggregated form on course level at the Faculty of Engineering's web page www.sdu.dk/tekkval.



Follow-up on teaching evaluations

Follow-up on qualitative evaluations:

- Summary of qualitative midterm and end of term evaluations (obligatory)

Follow-up on quantitative evaluations:

- Summary of discussions in the education committee for previous semester's evaluation results.
- Long-term action plan for teaching activities with red indicators.

The immediate follow-up on quantitative teaching evaluations are the responsibility of each programme's education committee, who carry out the first, programme specific treatment of the teaching evaluations on behalf of the Academic Study Board for Engineering Programmes.

The education committee discusses the results of previous semester's teaching evaluations. This must be documented in meeting notes. Furthermore, it is compulsory to give a written statement for the teaching activities which have received a red indicator in the quantitative evaluation.

The education committees' treatment must have happened for the previous semester's teaching evaluations before deadlines on April 1st and October 1st respectively.

The Academic Study Board for the Engineering programmes discusses teaching evaluations twice yearly. This happens on the basis on reports from the faculty quality coordinator. The Academic Study Board as a minimum focuses on the teaching activities with red indicators as well as the programmes' reports regarding these activities.

Finally, a programme's overall evaluation results are discussed in the annual status meeting between the programme and faculty management.

Appendix 1: Proposal of methods for qualitative mid-term and end of term evaluations**Delphi method**

Description:	Each student (or elected student) makes a note of three good things and three things that should be improved on a piece of paper. The papers are then circulated among approx. 20 students, who indicate the things they agree with by ticking the appropriate box. Teaching is discussed as a group on the basis of the indications made by the students.
Suited for:	Up to 40 students
Advantages:	Students set the agenda and everyone is heard
Weaknesses:	The teacher does not necessarily receive feedback for the desired topics

Interview method

Description:	The students are placed together as pairs. One student interviews the other in relation to good and bad experiences during the course. The interviewer summarises the interview. This may be carried out orally (for small classes) or by means of a 'blackboard newspaper', where the summaries are stuck on the blackboard using Post Its. The teacher and students then hold a group discussion.
Suited for:	Up to 40 students
Advantages:	Gain in terms of reflection
Weaknesses:	Potentially time consuming

Post it method

Description:	Two Post its in different colours are used – one for good things and one for things that could be improved. Each student receives three of each. They are then gathered on the blackboard and form the basis for a group discussion.
Suited for:	Up to 40 students
Advantages:	Students set the agenda and everyone is heard and activated
Weaknesses:	The teacher does not necessarily receive feedback for the desired topics, and many postits may be hard to manage

Reference group method

Description:	A group of students is selected at the start of the course to represent the class. The other students can give their feedback to this group, who meets with the teacher when necessary.
Suited for:	Larger classes

Advantages:	Methods such as Delphi and Post It can be usefully applied in the reference group. Can often lead to a good dialogue.
Weaknesses:	All students are not necessarily heard or receive feedback on their criticism.

Collegial supervision method

Description:	One or more colleagues supervise the teacher. After the teaching, there is a dialogue between the supervisor/s and teacher about how the supervisor/s experienced the teaching. The supervisor/s may provide guidance to the extent desired by the teacher..
Suited for:	All class sizes
Advantages:	Teacher sets the agenda and may receive feedback on topics which the students can't comment on.
Weaknesses:	Time consuming, logistically challenging, and students aren't heard.

Plenum method

Description:	A chairperson and a minute taker are elected from among the students. The class is divided into groups of 3-5 students and each group elects a spokesperson. After an initial discussion, the spokespersons and the chairperson summarise the various inputs on the blackboard. This is concluded by a free debate, in which anyone may participate
Suited for:	All class sizes
Advantages:	Students set the agenda and everyone is heard.
Weaknesses:	The teacher does not necessarily receive feedback for the desired topics

Poll Everywhere method

Description:	SDU's voting system Poll Everywhere is a Student Response System (SRS) that provides students with the opportunity to participate actively in the lessons, i.a., via multiple-choice questions, free-text answers, Q/A sessions and clickable images. The system can be used as a simple voting tool, where the teacher can quickly collect student answers to academic issues and have the answers displayed directly in a slideshow or via the system's web page. Please contact the SDU Centre for Teaching and Learning for more information or use of Poll Everywhere.
Suited for:	All class sizes
Advantages:	Students find the method interesting, and it may be used throughout the semester.
Weaknesses:	Requires setup from teacher.



Syddansk Universitet

Telefon: +45 6550 1000

sdu@sdu.dk

www.sdu.dk