SRM UNIVERSITY – *AP*, ANDHRA PRADESH

SRMAP / Reg. Off / Policies / 04 / 2023–24   31st July 2023

POLICY ON FEEDBACK MECHANISMS FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

A. Introduction:

The main aim of academic rigor is to ensure effective learning in the classrooms, for example,

- How much students have learned?
- Were students engaged?
- Were students motivated?
- Were the students excited?
- Did students remain focused?
- Did students enjoy?

Therefore, feedback and surveys are conducted to ensure that classroom, student, and teacher are in alignment. Both formative as well as summative feedback are vital to assess the teaching/learning processes and delivery. The formative feedback is about the course and its delivery, and the teacher, which can be taken before, during and at the end of the semester. It may also be obtained from the recruiters from time to time. The formative feedback can be measured both qualitatively and quantitatively at a scale of 0 to 5 or 10 followed with a statistical analysis. The summative feedback encompasses Student, Alumni, Parents and Employers' satisfaction surveys consisting of all aspects of student experience such as academic quality, infrastructure, outside classroom activities and graduate outcomes, etc. The summative feedback can be conducted at the end of an Academic Year and can be measured through NPS and a CSAT scores on various parameters.

This policy describes formative feedback mechanisms for assessing teaching effectiveness and can be used as a guide to implement the processes of obtaining feedback at different stages of course design, delivery, management, and assessment.

B. Approach:

The formative feedback to assess teaching/learning processes and delivery involves collecting data from students, peers, and leadership team,

i)   Students' perceptions and reactions to various aspects of the instructor's delivery, course design, and assessment methods

ii)   Opinions from peers, and perhaps informed experts, on the quality of the instructor's course design, delivery, and assessment.

1

iii)   Views from the leadership team (e.g., VC, Deans, HODs and Coordinators) on content expertise (primarily in terms of the level, currency, and appropriateness of the material in the course design and supporting materials) and course management.

C. Feedback Mechanisms:

a. Before the Semester

Peer Course Preparation Feedback:

Good course preparation is the key. A **one-day course preparation session,** in the presence of peers and the HOD (who will be the moderator), will be organized within each department/programme to review the instructor's course design, course objectives, outcomes and assessment skills. This will be organized before the end of the previous semester. The evaluation may include the following,

- The content of the course is current.
- The design includes experiences that will advance students' learning.
- The delivery mechanism (e.g., classroom lectures, slides, videos, online material, etc.) that is more experiential and well executed.
- The assessment tools and procedures that focus more on continuous learning are valid and reliable.

The session will be held towards the end of the previous semester.

As a guide the course preparation work may be quantified by defining some indicators, as given below.

- Class Preparation time = developments in the field + frequency of teaching + motivation time + engagement scenario + core knowledge
- Technology infusion = (blended + LMS)/traditional
- Industry alignment in courses = number of case study analyses per course x time allocated per analysis/total course teaching hours in an academic term
- Interaction with practitioners in a course = number of Interactions per course per academic term
- Research works used in a course= number of research works delivered per major
- Research work depth discussed in a course= number of student works published in peer-reviewed conferences
- Engagement in the class= documented discussions/total number of 90-min lectures per course
- Skillset used in the course = number of intended skills per course/average class grade per course
- Interdisciplinary character of the course = number of disciplines involved in teaching material of course

A typical Peer Course Preparation Review form is given in **Annexure I.**

b. During the Semester

i) Course Coordination Committee Reviews: Qualitative

A course coordination committee will be formed for each course or a set of courses, as the case may be. The members of the committee will be faculty teaching that course(s) with lead faculty as the coordinator. The committee will also have student representatives. A fortnightly meeting of about one hour will be scheduled in the timetables of faculty. Questions such as, what happened in the class? What is helping you learn in this class? What is impeding your learning in this class? What changes could an instructor make to enhance your learning experience in this class? What could you do differently to improve your learning experience in this class? etc., can be asked.

A typical Course Coordination Committee Review form is given in **Annexure II**.

ii) Mid Term Review: Qualitative

The mid-term review is very helpful in taking midcourse corrections. A separate slot will be given in the academic calendar. A combined meeting of all the teachers and the student representatives of a department will be held. It is more of a listening, open and informal platform leading to healthy conversation and discussion. One of the faculty members can act as a moderator and another as the rapporteur. The report can be shared with the respective Deans. This feedback mechanism is quite effective and results in improvement in learning in the second half of the semester.

iii) Student Interactive Sessions with Deans/VC: Qualitative

Deans and/or VC will organize meetings with students to get general feedback about the course as well as the faculty. Once trust is built, students generally open and give good feedback in such meetings.

A typical proforma for the students' session is given in **Annexure III**.

c. End of Semester

i) Student Feedback Form: Quantitative

The end of semester course feedback provides insights into the course management and its delivery and helps in the improvement of the course and the instructor. This assessment will generally be based on learning and course outcomes. A course specific feedback form will be covering course outcomes, the course delivery, course organization management and course instructions by the instructor, consisting of different sets of questions will be designed.

The questions will generally be formative. For example: How much of learning outcome has been achieved. How well was the lecture delivered? How good was the instructor in terms of preparation? How good was the instructor in delivering the course? Am I more clear on the concepts? Was the process of learning engaging? Did

3

I learn something new? Questions like the use of technology etc. and other such questions which are summative in nature, for example, how good was the instructor, how good was the course, may be avoided. The questions may be answered on a scale of 1 to 5 or 1 to 10. The mode of obtaining feedback can be offline or online, which may be taken 2 weeks before the end of semester as per the dates given in the academic calendar.

The format of the Course Feedback Form is given **Annexure IV**.

ii) Teacher's Self-Assessment Report:

The instructor will maintain a portfolio of evidence and/or informal or qualitative evidence on all aspects of teaching performance. This portfolio may contain course design, management & delivery, and the teacher's reflection about the course. **The format of the report is annexed as Annexure V.**

D. Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation:

The information from above feedbacks/reviews about the teaching effectiveness will be captured formally into the Faculty Appraisals system by giving weightages to different components and weighted rating on a scale of 1 to 5 can be obtained. Thus, the instructors' evaluation will not only be based on Student feedback but weighted feedback providing overall teaching effectiveness of the course. A typical framework is given in Table 1. X denotes rating at a scale from 1 to 5. Blank is 'not applicable'. The value in the bracket shows the weights.

Table 1: Framework to evaluate Teaching Effectiveness

Component	Sources of Data			
	Students (40%)	Peers (30%)	VC/Dean (20%)	Self (10%)
Course Content		X		X
Instructional design	X	X		X
Instructional delivery	X	X		X
Instructional	X	X	X	X
Course management			X	X

E. Key performance Indicators:

- Student feedback and weighted feedback scores on a scale of 5.
- Quartile scores
- Customer Satisfaction (CSAT) and Net Promoter Score (NPS)

F. Communicating the Feedback

- Feedback scores will be communicated to teachers on a one-on-one basis by the respective Dean.

- The quartile summary of feedback scores in the courses will be shared with all the faculty.
- Deans will discuss the quartile scores, CSAT and NPS in respective faculty meetings as regular practice and give recommendations for future as a 360-degree process.

Peer Review of Course Feedback Plan

Course No:

Title:

Instructor's Name: Academic Year and Semester:

Committee Members:

Format of course plan

- **Course objectives and outcomes (COs):** These will generally capture the learning objectives of the course and will be about "understanding" and "skills/capabilities", "critical thinking abilities" students will develop post the course. These may not change much for core courses. Around 4-5 conditions may be good enough.
- **Instruction plan:** This will include a week-wise session plan supporting the COs also.
- **Assignment/Laboratory/Case Studies/Simulation plans (as applicable):** This will involve suitable approximately 6-7 hours of work per week from students. This will largely be outside the class effort. Besides supporting COs, this may also include general ones such as problem solving, self-learning, working with insufficient/redundant information, etc. It will also include feedback to students on their submission with a proper timeline. Also indicating clearly, the percentage of experiential learning to be used in the course.
- **Course project (if applicable):** Besides supporting COs, this may include i) whether the projects are relevant? Are these industry-linked? Are these Practice School linked? Are these research projects? etc.
- **Plans for active learning during the lecture hours:** This may include, for example, giving short problems done in small groups or pairs, 5 minutes quiz, group discussions, etc. (e.g., think-pair-share, short problems done in pairs, etc.)
- **Plans for use of technology:** This may include tools such as Google Platform, Maitri, EDX/Coursera/Swayam courses, flip-classroom etc. Also indicating clearly, the percentage of online learning to be used in the course.
- **Plans for experiential learning component.**
- **Plans for involving industry and other academic experts.**
- **Plans for integrating popular MOOCs in the course.**
- **Plan for providing help/support to slow-paced learners** and for additional work for advanced learners.
- **Plans for unfairness means prevention** like use of tools to check code/reports, special instruction etc.

- **Course information on ERP/University Website:** This may include information on i) course organization ii) lecture/tutorial/lab timings iii) office hours for the instructor iv) policies for plagiarism, cheating, grading, etc. v) assessment and grading plan.
- **A note on innovative methods/approaches** to be used in the course.

Course Coordination Committee Review

Course No:

Title:

Academic Year and Semester: Meeting Schedule: Date: Time:

Committee Members:

Suggested topics for discussion,

1. Course Syllabus coverage including breadth and depth.
2. Experiential Learning component in the course
3. Quality of experiments and projects, and their delivery
4. Quality of tutorials/case studies etc.
5. Student attendance in the course
6. Course delivery
7. Instructor effectiveness in terms of engagement, strictness, and punctuality
8. Appropriate use of teaching tools
9. Appropriate use of technology
10. Provision of relevant reference material
11. Quality of infrastructural support
12. Course assessment and grading
13. Overall satisfaction level

Comments and Suggestions from the committee members:

Discussion Points for Deans/VC Meeting with Students

Date and Time:

Sr. No.	Discussion Point	Student response	Suggested Action(s)
1	How has been the learning experience till now?		
2	How is the course delivery? Does the instructor keep the class engaged? How good was the instructor in course preparation?		
3	Is there enough hands-on learning?		
4	Are you attentive in the class? Are you clear on the concepts?		
5	Is the content relevant or do you suggest some changes?		
6	Are the assessments, evaluations and grading held regularly?		
7	Is relevant reference material shared in advance and discussed in the class?		
8	Are there any concerns with regard to infrastructure?		
9	Do the mentoring sessions happen?		
10	How is the teaching of skill and perspective courses?		
11	How effective is the Visiting faculty?		
12	Are industry experts coming to the classes? What is your experience with them?		
13	Is the use of technology in terms of online learning effective?		

Specific Comments and Suggestions:

Student Course Feedback – Odd Semester 2023

Course Name: CS-301 Introduction to Artificial Neural Networks

Instructor's Name/Email: XXX, abc@srmap.edu.in

Total Students in the Class: **Total Students Filled:**

Start Date: July 1, 2023, 11 a.m. p.m.   **End Date:** July 5, 2023, 11:59

Part 1: Course Outcomes (Rate on a scale of 5 (with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest)

i. Students are able to understand concepts behind artificial neural networks.
ii. Students are able to understand neural network paradigms, Neural network design and architecture, and Neural Network Development.
iii. Students are able to analyze algorithms to train neural networks and apply them to practical problems.
iv. Students are able to implement such solutions on real life problems and show effectiveness of neural network *vis a vis* other tool.

Average of "Course Outcomes" questions = P

Part 2: Course Organization

i. The course was effectively organized to achieve course objectives & course outcomes.

   1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

ii. The course developed my skills and ability to think critically about the subject.

   1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

iii. Assignments, term papers, projects (as applicable) improved my understanding of the course material.

   1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

iv. The course stimulated my interest in the subject matter and relevant topics.

   1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

Average of "Course Organization" questions = Q

Part 3: Course Instruction

i. Instructor clearly defined and explained course objectives, expectations, and course outcomes.

  1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

ii. The instructor presented the subject matter effectively.

  1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

iii. The instructor was integral to my learning of the subject matter of this course.

  1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

iv. The assessments (of exams, assignments, quizzes, graded labs, projects, etc.) provided allowed me to demonstrate my understanding of the course material.

  1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

v. Instructor provided constructive feedback in an effective manner in his/her evaluations.

  1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

vi. Instructor encouraged to participate in discussion forums and interact with other students by assigning team tasks and projects.

  1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

vii. Instructor provided opportunities for hands-on practice so that students can apply learned knowledge to the real-world

  1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

Average of "Course Instruction" questions = R

Part 4: Instructor's Communication

i.   Instructor spoke audibly and clearly at an appropriate rate and demonstrated interest in the topic.

1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

ii.   Instructor effectively used gesture and bodily movement and maintained eye contact.

1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

iii.   Instructor effectively used presentational software, poster-boards, handouts, white boards, etc.

1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

iv.   Instructor was sufficiently prepared to answer questions and provided clear and useful answers.

1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

v.   The instructor addressed students' questions, difficulties and other concerns with respect to the course.

1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

Average of "Instructor's Communication" questions = S

"Course Instruction and Instructor's Communication" Score = R + S

Overall Score (on a scale of 5) = P + Q + R + S

Part 5: Laboratory/Tutorial/Project work (if applicable)

i.   The labs and hands-on practice helped me in understanding the subject matter better.

1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

ii.   The experiments/assignments/project work helped me in understanding the subject matter better.

1: Strongly disagree 2: Somewhat disagree 3: Neutral 4: Somewhat agree 5: Strongly agree

Comments and Suggestions:

Here also some questions can be asked:

- What helped you learn in this course?
- What changes would improve your learning?
- Comments on labs and tutorials (if any) with respect to the course and your learning.
- Would you recommend this course in future?
- Any other suggestions:

Teacher's Self-Assessment Report

The purpose of this form is to capture a teacher's experience of delivering the course so that it can be included in the annual teaching review.

Name of the faculty:

Name and Code of the course Taught:

Program/Year: No. of students:

Course Delivered from   Start date: End Date:

Please share your experience of delivering the Course in terms of:

<u>STUDENTS' LEARNING:</u>

Looking at the results in assessed submissions, presentations and/or exam marks, how well did all the students achieve the intended learning outcomes? Did the students exceed your expectations in any way during this module?

To what extent did all the students actively engage in the learning activities in and outside of the classroom?

<u>PROPOSED CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS:</u>

What changes, if any, would you like to see adopted in any elements of the module for future iterations of this module–e.g., learning outcomes, curriculum content, delivery techniques, learning activities, learning resources, support and guidance, assessment structure etc. Please draw on your own personal reflections from teaching this course, informal and formal feedback from students, assessment results, feedback and discussions with colleagues, external examiners/moderators, Dean, and any other sources in making your suggestions for developments.

Please include here any additional comments you might want to draw attention to:

Signature: Date:

Dr. R. PREMKUMAR
REGISTRAR
SRM UNIVERSITY - *AP*
Andhra Pradesh - 522240