

... ..
... ..
... ..

... .. * &
... .. B
California State University, Northridge, USA

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

Introduction

... ..
... ..
... .. ()
... .. ()
... .. ()

Problems with the traditional method of faculty evaluation

√
... ..
... ..
... ..

* B
... ..
... .. () ()
... .. &
... ..

B *et al.* () *et al.* ()

B ()
()

,

(*et al.*) % ()
et al. () &
et al. () *et al.* ()
()

(%)

B

Experimental design

The treatments and the randomized incomplete block design

Gathering faculty teaching evaluations

Gathering faculty teaching evaluations

Other design considerations

Consider the following questions when designing your evaluation instrument:

- How many items will you use?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?

Consider the following questions when designing your evaluation instrument:

- How many items will you use?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?

Research questions

Consider the following questions when designing your evaluation instrument:

- How many items will you use?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?

- ()
- ()
- ()
- ()

Consider the following questions when designing your evaluation instrument:

- How many items will you use?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?

- ()
- ()

The response rates

Consider the following questions when designing your evaluation instrument:

- How many items will you use?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?
- How many items will you use for each dimension?

Table 1. Mean (SD) scores on the 10-item subscale of the GAD-7 for each group.

Group	Time point	Anxiety		Depression		F(1, 117)	p
		Mean (SD)	95% CI	Mean (SD)	95% CI		
B	Baseline	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24
	3 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24
	6 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24
	9 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24
	12 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24
	15 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24
	18 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24
	21 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24
	24 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24
	27 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24
30 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
33 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
36 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
39 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
42 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
45 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
48 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
51 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
54 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
57 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
60 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
63 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
66 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
69 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
72 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
75 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
78 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
81 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
84 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
87 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
90 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
93 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
96 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
99 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
102 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
105 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
108 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
111 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
114 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	
117 months	1.4 (1.1)	1.0–1.8	1.0 (1.0)	0.0–2.0	1.4	.24	

... (SD) scores on the 10-item subscale of the GAD-7 for each group.

The method effect

... () .

... % (P =) .

et al. ()

The method/treatment effect

...

Gathering faculty teaching evaluations

Faculty	Mean	SD
Dr. Smith	4.5	0.2
Dr. Jones	4.2	0.3
Dr. Brown	4.8	0.1
Dr. White	4.6	0.2

The following table shows the mean and standard deviation for each faculty member's teaching evaluations. The mean is calculated as the sum of all evaluations divided by the number of evaluations. The standard deviation is calculated as the square root of the variance, which is the average of the squared deviations from the mean.

Faculty Mean SD
 Dr. Smith 4.5 0.2
 Dr. Jones 4.2 0.3
 Dr. Brown 4.8 0.1
 Dr. White 4.6 0.2

The online treatment effect

The online treatment effect is measured by the difference in the mean scores between the online and face-to-face groups. This difference is statistically significant if the p-value is less than 0.05. The p-value is calculated using the F-test, which is the ratio of the mean square between groups to the mean square within groups.

$$F = \frac{MS_{\text{between}}}{MS_{\text{within}}}$$

The p-value is then determined by comparing the calculated F-value to the critical F-value from the F-distribution table.

Faculty	Mean	SD	F	p
Dr. Smith	4.5	0.2	1.5	0.2
Dr. Jones	4.2	0.3	2.1	0.1
Dr. Brown	4.8	0.1	0.8	0.4
Dr. White	4.6	0.2	1.2	0.3

...

Mean item scores

...

F

...

Discussion and conclusions

...

References

- Barnett, T. & Bransford, J. (1999). *Improving teaching and learning in higher education*. *Social Science Computer Review*, (17), 1-10.
- Bransford, J. (1999). *Reflective faculty evaluation: enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness* (1999). **B**
- Bransford, J. & Barnett, T. (1999). **B**

