

ED 023 365

By Hussain, K.M., Leestamper, Robert

Survey on Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness at New Mexico State University.

New Mexico State Univ., Las Cruces.

Pub Date Jun 68

Note -53p.

EDRS Price MF \$0.25 HC \$2.75

Descriptors -Administrator Attitudes, Community Responsibility, *Effective Teaching, *Evaluation, *Faculty, *Higher Education, Research Criteria, *Teaching

Identifiers -Las Cruces, New Mexico State University

In a questionnaire survey designed at the University of Toledo to determine the ranking of criteria of effective teaching, faculty, students and alumni at New Mexico State University agreed that "being well prepared for class" was the most important criterion. This ranking was upheld by 10 subgroups of faculty (faculty by years of service, teaching or administrative, and faculty by colleges), except for the College of Education which ranked "motivating students to do their best" as the most important criterion. The 3 groups all gave low rankings to research-related criteria and criteria concerned with off-campus community relations. The criterion of "making appearances which assist programs of community organization" was ranked as LEAST important. When criteria used in the faculty merit rating was compared to criteria used in the questionnaire, it was found that 4 criteria ranked in the top 10 in the survey do not appear in the Merit Rating Form, whereas 4 listed in the bottom 10 of the survey do, suggesting that the Form should be redesigned. The same pattern of discrepancy and implied need for change was evident when the questionnaire was compared with the University's most widely used student evaluation form. Patterns of rankings suggest that teaching faculty are being evaluated according to a different scale by administrative faculty. Rankings by subgroups of faculty, student and alumni indicate interesting divergencies. In identifying attitudes concerning teacher effectiveness, this study should provide a basis for discussion by administrators and faculty on how to devise more equitable and satisfactory evaluation procedures. (JS)

SURVEY ON CRITERIA OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
AT
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

BY
K.M. Hussain
Robert Leestamper

ED023365

New Mexico State University
June, 1968

HE 000 068

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Research Design
 - 2.1 Questionnaire Design
 - 2.2 Sample Design
 - 2.3 Computation
3. Presentation of Findings
 - 3.1 Tables Presented
 - 3.2 Symbols Used
4. Findings of Study
 - 4.1 Correlations
 - 4.2 Tables
5. Summary and Conclusions
6. Acknowledgement

APPENDICES

1. Questionnaire
- B. Student Evaluation Form

List of Tables(Abbreviated tables)

These tables show the rankings of teaching criteria by different subgroups.

- Table 1. Top ten criteria rankings.
- Table 2. Selected criteria(lowest 50 for faculty)rankings.
- Table 3. Criteria used in faculty evaluation.
- Table 4. Top ten criteria ranked by administrative and non-administrative faculty.
- Table 5. Top ten criteria ranked by faculty with varying yrs. of service at N.M.S.U.
- Table 6. Top ten criteria ranked by students of varying grade point average.
- Table 7. Top ten criteria ranked by various "types" of students.
- Table 8. Top ten criteria ranked by faculty in each college.
- Table 9. Top ten criteria ranked by students in different colleges.
- Table 10. Top ten criteria ranked by alumni for each college.
- Table 11. Top ten criteria ranked by College of Arts and Sciences.
- Table 12. Ranking of top ten criteria by College of Agric. and Home Economics.
- Table 13. Ranking of top ten criteria by College of Business Admin. & Economics.
- Table 14. Ranking of top ten criteria by College of Education.
- Table 15. Ranking of top ten criteria by College of Engineering.
- Table 16. Ranking of top ten criteria by Graduate School.
- 16B. Summary of rank correlation coefficients displayed in tables 8a, 9a, 10a, 11a, 12a, 13a, 14a, 15a, 16a(between all N.M.S.U. and various subgroups in colleges) and sample sizes.
- Table 17. Ranking of criteria used in student evaluation.

Note: There are tables with a suffix "A" for tables 2, and 4-16. These tables show the rank correlation coefficients for subgroups examined in the previous tables.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Fall 1967, New Mexico State University participated in a survey to determine the ranking of criteria of teaching effectiveness. Other institutions that participated in this survey were the Universities of Northern Illinois and Western Kentucky. The University of Toledo conceived and developed the original design and implemented the earlier phase of the study. This was done under the direction of Richard R. Perry, Director of Institutional Research, University of Toledo.

The research design of this survey is described below followed by the results.

There are plans to extend this survey to other institutions in the United States and Canada. The data for New Mexico State University survey will then be correlated with these other institutions. The results will be distributed to all those interested. It is expected that this phase of the study will be completed by early next year.

Since this report is rather long, some readers may wish to turn to the "Summary and Conclusions" chapter at the end of the report.

2. RESEARCH DESIGN

2.1 Questionnaire Design

A questionnaire was designed by the Office of Institutional Studies at the University of Toledo. It was field-tested at Toledo and then used in the survey in which New Mexico State University participated.

2.2 Sample Design

This survey sampled three main groups in the university community: faculty (teaching and administrative), students, and alumni. Of the faculty, all were sent questionnaires. One hundred and eighty-six out of 387 responded (48%). From among the student body in the Fall of 1967, a random sample of 1,400 students were sent questionnaires, of which two hundred and eighty-three responded (20.2%). From the alumni, a random sample of 700 were sent questionnaires, of which one hundred and eighty-five responded (26.4%).

The number of responses by each subgroup of the population was examined for its adequacy. The responses of some subgroups were considered unrepresentative and hence excluded from the analysis. The graduate faculty is such a case. The poor response here resulted from an inadequate questionnaire design which did not allow faculty to indicate more than one college. Consequently, faculty that are not exclusively in the Graduate School did identify themselves with an undergraduate college and hence the response from the Graduate School in the sample was inadequate.

2.3 Computations

The questionnaire listed 60 criteria of teaching effectiveness. Each of the three groups of the university's community (faculty, students and alumni) were asked to indicate their judgement of the criteria as being "critical", "above average," "average," "below average," or of "no importance." These criteria were each given a weight of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. The sum of the product of the frequency of occurrence of a criteria and its weight gave a raw score total. This provided the basis of ranking of the criteria. Such rankings for various groups and subgroups were computed along with rank order correlation coefficients between various groups and subgroups. Most of this data is presented below.

In cases of ties between the raw scores, the ranking was averaged. For example, if three raw scores tied for ranks 6, 7, and 8, then each was given a rank of seven. If two raw scores tied for the ranks one and two, then they were each ranked as 1.5.

3. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

3.1 Tables Presented

For the samples in each group (faculty, students, and alumni) the ranking is presented for all the criteria listed in the questionnaire. Also, the rank correlation coefficients for these three groups is presented. For subgroups (administrative and non-administrative faculty, faculty by years of service, students by grade point average, by location of home, by status of transference to N.M.S.U., and faculty, staff, and students by college), the ranking is shown for at least the top ten criteria as perceived by each of the three groups (faculty, students, and alumni). The ranking of the other criteria and the rank correlation coefficients for different combinations of subgroups are not presented in this study in order to save space. is available and can be studied by persons interested.

Rank correlation coefficients are shown for all subgroups with all N.M.S.U. (faculty, students, and alumni). They have been rounded to three significant digits. The detailed computations have been made correct to six significant digits and are available to interested persons.

The questions as entered in the tables are sometime abbreviated in order to economize typing and space. For the detailed wording of the criteria in the questionnaire, see Appendix A.

The sum of subtotals do not always equal the totals in groups because some codes for subgroups are missing.

3.2 SYMBOLS USED

| | |
|----------------|--|
| A&S. | .College of Arts & Sciences |
| BA&E | .College of Bus. Admin. & Economics |
| AGRIC. | .College of Agric. & Home Economics |
| EDUC | .College of Education |
| ENGR | .College of Engineering |
| GRAD | .Graduate School |
| GPA | .Grade Point Average |
| NMSU. | .New Mexico State University |
| < | less than -i.e.<2 means less than 2 |
| > | greater than-i.e.>3 means greater than 3 |

4. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

4.1 Correlations

The correlations between different groups and subgroups at New Mexico State University were all found to be significant at the 0.01 level .

The correlation between all the institutions surveyed (in both the original survey at the University of Toledo and the latter study in which New Mexico State University participated) was found to be well above the correlation required for significance. The rank correlation coefficients between the entire academic community (faculty, students, and alumni) of the four institutions in the survey are as follows:

| | |
|--|--------|
| N. M. S. U. with University of Toledo | =0.982 |
| N.M. S. U. with Northern Illinois University | =0.977 |
| N. M. S. U. with Western Kentucky University | =0.952 |

The rank correlation coefficient between the subgroups for each university are not shown here but the computations are available for interested persons.

Table 1

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI.

| <u>CRITERIA</u> | Faculty | Students | Alumni | N.M.S.U.* |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Motivating students to do their best | 3.0 | 13.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 4.0 | 12.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 5.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 | 7.0 |
| Treating students with respect | 6.0 | 11.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 |
| Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve | 7.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures. | 8.0 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 3.0 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 9.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability | 10.0 | 5.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 11.0 | 5.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | 12.0 | 9.5 | 13.0 | 12.0 |
| Being able to show practical applications of subject matter. | 21.0 | 9.5 | 12.0 | 13.0 |
| Sample Size | 186 | 283 | 185 | 654 |

*This includes all faculty, students, and alumni in the sample.

COMMENTS ON TABLE 1

1. There are only 13 criteria that are listed in the top ten most important criteria by at least one of the three groups.
2. The only criteria on which all three groups of faculty, student, and alumni agree is that of "being well prepared for class." This was ranked by all groups as the most important criteria of effective teaching.

TABLE 2

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED CRITERIA (LOWEST 50 FOR FACULTY)
FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI.

| CRITERIA | FACULTY | STUDENTS | ALUMNI | N. M. S. U. |
|---|---------|----------|--------|-------------|
| Setting high standards of achievement for stud. | 13.0 | 21.5 | 20.0 | 18.0 |
| Raising the aspirational level of students | 14.0 | 26.0 | 15.5 | 19.0 |
| Being able to show practical appl. of subj. matter | 15.0 | 9.5 | 12.0 | 13.0 |
| Rewriting and updating tests | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.5 | 15.0 |
| Establishing good rapport with stud. in classroom | 16.5 | 20.0 | 19.0 | 17.0 |
| Being readily avail. for consultation with stud. | 16.5 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Patiently assisting stud. with their problems | 18.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 16.0 |
| Accepting justified constructive criticism by qualified persons | 19.0 | 21.5 | 23.0 | 22.0 |
| Recognize the responsibility for the acad. success of students | 20.0 | 19.0 | 25.0 | 21.0 |
| Encouraging student participation in class | 22.0 | 29.5 | 24.0 | 25.0 |
| Iden. his comments which are personal opinion | 23.0 | 29.5 | 31.0 | 28.0 |
| Providing sev. test opportunities for students | 24.0 | 25.0 | 34.0 | 27.0 |
| Having practical experience in his field | 25.0 | 16.0 | 18.0 | 20.0 |
| Evidencing better than average speech qualities | 26.0 | 23.0 | 29.0 | 26.0 |
| Seldom using sarcasm with students | 27.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 34.0 |
| Encouraging moral responsibility in stud. by his ex. | 28.0 | 38.0 | 30.0 | 32.0 |
| Engaging in cont. formal study in his field | 29.0 | 24.0 | 22.0 | 12.0 |
| Making written comments on corrected returned assig. | 30.0 | 18.0 | 21.0 | 22.5 |
| Returning graded assignments promptly | 31.0 | 32.0 | 26.0 | 30.0 |

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

| CRITERIA | FACULTY | STUDENTS | ALUMNI | N.M.S.U. |
|--|---------|----------|--------|----------|
| Relating course material to that of other courses | 32.0 | 33.0 | 28.0 | 31.0 |
| Using more than 1 type of evaluation device | 33.0 | 28.0 | 27.0 | 29.0 |
| Making an effort to know stud. as individuals | 34.0 | 40.0 | 39.0 | 36.0 |
| Exhibiting a genuine sense of humor | 35.0 | 41.0 | 47.0 | 42.0 |
| Explaining grading standards | 36.0 | 39.0 | 43.5 | 40.0 |
| Displaying broad intellectual interests | 37.0 | 42.0 | 38.0 | 41.0 |
| Indication that the scope & demands of each assign. have been considered carefully | 38.0 | 31.0 | 35.0 | 33.0 |
| Exhibiting an intelligent personal phil. of life | 39.0 | 49.0 | 43.5 | 46.0 |
| Explaining grading procedures | 40.0 | 34.0 | 41.5 | 37.0 |
| Presenting organized supp. course material to stud. | 41.0 | 45.0 | 36.0 | 43.0 |
| Challenging students convictions | 42.0 | 43.0 | 40.0 | 44.0 |
| Demonstrating a stable level-headed personality | 43.0 | 36.0 | 33.0 | 35.0 |
| Earning the respect of his colleagues | 44.0 | 47.0 | 41.5 | 45.0 |
| Announcing tests and quizzes in advance | 45.0 | 27.0 | 48.0 | 39.0 |
| Inspiring stud. to continue to graduate study | 46.0 | 52.0 | 51.0 | 52.0 |
| Taking measures to prevent cheating by students | 47.0 | 35.0 | 32.0 | 38.0 |
| Utilizing visual aids to assist in creating subj. matter achievement with students | 48.0 | 48.0 | 46.0 | 47.0 |
| Sharing departmental duties with his colleagues | 48.0 | 50.0 | 52.0 | 50.0 |
| Beginning and ending classes on time | 50.0 | 46.0 | 49.0 | 48.0 |
| Being neatly dressed | 51.0 | 51.0 | 50.0 | 51.0 |

TABE 2 continued

| CRITERIA | FACULTY | STUDENTS | ALUMNI | N. M. S. U. |
|---|---------|----------|--------|-------------|
| Having irritating personal mannerisms | 52.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 53.0 |
| Holding membership in scholarly organization | 53.0 | 57.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 |
| Publishing material related to his subject field | 54.0 | 59.0 | 58.0 | 57.0 |
| Presenting an ext. lucid syl. of the course to stud. | 55.0 | 44.0 | 45.0 | 3.0 |
| Being consistently involved in research projects | 56.0 | 55.0 | 57.0 | 56.0 |
| Being knowledgeable about the community in which he lives | 57.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 | 54.0 |
| Devoting time to student activities on campus | 58.0 | 58.0 | 59.0 | 59.0 |
| Involving himself in appropriate univ. comm. | 59.0 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 58.0 |
| Making appearances which assist programs of community organizations | 60.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 |

NOTES ON TABLE 2

1. Table 2 is a continuation of Table 1 and shows the ranking of criteria not included in Table 1.

COMMENTS ON TABLE 2

1. The criterion of "publishing material related to his subject" was ranked as 54, 59, and 58 of the most important (out of 60 criteria) by faculty, students, and alumni respectively.
2. The criterion of "making appearances which assist programs of community organizations" was ranked as the least important criteria of effective teaching by all three groups of faculty, students, and alumni.

RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR GROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 1 & 2.

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Faculty with alumni | =0.952 |
| Faculty with students | =0.935 |
| Students with alumni | =0.965 |
| Faculty with all N.M.S.U.* | =0.972 |
| Students with all N.M.S.U.* | =0.985 |
| Alumni with all N.M.S.U.* | =0.986 |

*Includes all three groups in the sample-faculty, students and alumni.

TABLE 3

**PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE
TEACHING USED IN FACULTY EVALUATION* AS PERCEIVED BY
FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI.**

| | | Faculty | Students | Alumni |
|--|-------|---------|----------|--------|
| Teaching | | | | |
| Attitude toward student | | | | |
| | Q. 19 | 46.0 | 52.0 | 51.0 |
| | Q. 22 | 22.0 | 29.5 | 24.0 |
| | Q. 33 | 18.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 |
| | Q. 39 | 16.5 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| | Q. 47 | 4.0 | 12.0 | 4.0 |
| | Q. 54 | 38.0 | 31.0 | 35.0 |
| Knowledge of Subject matter | | | | |
| | Q. 20 | 9.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Organization of Material | | | | |
| | Q. 44 | 11.0 | 29.5 | 8.0 |
| | Q. 35 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Presentation of Material | | | | |
| | Q. 10 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 |
| | Q. 17 | 16.5 | 20.0 | 19.0 |
| Attitude towards teaching | | | | |
| | Q. 16 | 41.0 | 45.0 | 36.0 |
| | Q. 48 | 7.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 |
| Research for Creative Scholarship Preparation(Academic) | | | | |
| | Q. 9 | 25.0 | 16.0 | 18.0 |
| | Q. 4 | 29.0 | 24.0 | 22.0 |
| Planning and execution | | | | |
| | Q 24. | 19.0 | 21.5 | 23.0 |
| Results(Publication) | | | | |
| | Q. 8 | 54.0 | 59.0 | 58.0 |
| Direction of Graduate Students Professional Service | | | | |
| | Q. 30 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 59.0 |
| | Q. 25 | 49.0 | 50.0 | 52.0 |
| | Q. 37 | 59.0 | 56.0 | 56.0 |
| Off-campus Professional Work | | | | |

*See Manual, Explanation of Merit Rating System, New Mexico State University,
Dated September 1, 1967

Notes on Table 3

1. The criteria used in the survey questionnaire are not the same as used in the Merit Rating at New Mexico State University. The criteria in the questionnaire that seem most related to the Merit Rating items are identified by the number of the question on the questionnaire for each item used in Merit Rating.
2. The criteria of "Direction of Graduate Study" and "Off-Campus Professional Work" on the Merit Rating Form are not listed on the questionnaire and hence appear blank in the ranking table.

TABLE 4

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY ADMINISTRATIVE, NON-ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY.

| CRITERIA | ADMIN. | NON ADMIN |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught | 5.0 | 2.0 |
| Motivating students to do their best | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 2.0 | 7.0 |
| Treating students with respect | 6.0 | 5.0 |
| Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve | 9.0 | 6.0 |
| Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures. | 7.0 | 8.0 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 8.0 | 9.0 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | | |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | | |
| Being able to show practical applications of subject matter. | | |
| Sample Size | 50 | 149 |

RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 4

| | |
|--|--------|
| Administrative faculty with non-administrative faculty | =0.928 |
| Administrative faculty with all New Mexico State Univ. | =0.915 |
| Non-administrative faculty with all New Mexico State Univ. | =0.974 |

COMMENTS ON TABLE 4A

The non-administrative faculty (i.e. teaching faculty) has a higher rank correlation coefficient with the New Mexico State University community than does the administrative faculty.

TABLE 5

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY WITH VARYING YEARS OF SERVICE AT NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY.

| CRITERIA | YEARS OF SERVICE | | |
|---|------------------|--------|------|
| | 1-10 | >10-20 | >20 |
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.5 |
| Motivating students to do their best | 3.0 | 2.5 | 5.5 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 4.0 | 2.5 | 9.0 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 5.0 | 8.5 | 5.5 |
| Treating students with respect | 7.0 | 5.5 | 11.0 |
| Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve | 6.0 | 8.5 | 12.5 |
| Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures. | 8.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 9.0 | 5.5 | 10.0 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability | 12.0 | 7.0 | 5.5 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 11.0 | 12.0 | 2.5 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | 10.0 | 14.5 | 15.5 |
| Being able to show practical applications of subject matter. | | | |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by students | 4.0 | 2.5 | 9.0 |
| Setting high standards of achievement for students | 16.0 | 13.0 | 5.5 |
| Sample Size | 111 | 52 | 27 |

COMMENTS ON TABLE 5

The criteria ranking by faculty varies as the years of service change . The consistent changes are that the importance of "using teaching methods which enable students to achieve objective of the course" is less important to the older groups. Also, the importance of "constructive tests and "setting high standards" increases with years of service.(Generation gap?)

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 5

| | |
|---|--------|
| Faculty with 1-10 years of service and all N.M.S.U. | =0.969 |
| Faculty with 10-20 years of service and all N.M.S.U. | =0.959 |
| Faculty with more than 20 years of service and all N.M.S.U. | =0.894 |

TABLE 6

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS OF VARYING G.P.A.

| CRITERIA | GPA=0-2 | GPA>2-3 | GPA>3 |
|---|---------|---------|-------|
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught | 5.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 |
| Motivating students to do their best | | | |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | | | 8.5 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 9.5 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Treating students with respect | 9.5 | | 7.0 |
| Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve | | 7.0 | 8.5 |
| Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures. | 2.0 | 2.0 | 6.0 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 7.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability | 8.0 | 8.5 | 2.0 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 5.5 | 10.0 | 3.0 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | 4.0 | 8.5 | |
| Being able to show practical applications of subject matter. | 3.0 | 5.5 | |
| Sample Size | 42 | 120 | 115 |

NOTES ON TABLE 6

1. Only the criteria ranked as top ten by each group of faculty, students, and alumni are shown in Table 6. The blanks can be filled in by the interested reader by referring to Tables 1 and 2.

This method has been adopted (in these tables and some other tables that follow) in an attempt not to clutter the table with less important rankings.

TABLE 6A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 6

| | |
|---|--------|
| Student with 0-2 GPA and all N.M.S.U. | =0.927 |
| Student with > 2-3 GPA and all N.M.S.U. | =0.960 |
| Student with > 3 GPA and all N.M.S.U. | =0.981 |

TABLE 7

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING FOR VARIOUS "TYPES" OF STUDENTS

| CRITERIA | Live in Dorm | Commuter | Original at NMSU | Transfer |
|---|-----------------|----------|---------------------|----------|
| Being well prepared for class | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 |
| Motivating students to do their best | | | | |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 10.5 | 10.0 | | 10.0 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 7.0 | 6.5 | 8.0 | 2.0 |
| Treating students with respect | 8.0 | | | 9.0 |
| Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve | | 8.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 |
| Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures. | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 4.0 | 6.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability | 9.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 5.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | 10.5 | 9.0 | 8.0 | |
| Being able to show practical applications of subject matter. | 6.0 | | 8.0 | |
| Sample Size | 86 | 194 | 162 | 117 |

COMMENTS ON TABLE 7

"Motivating students to do their best" was ranked third by all faculty but is not ranked in the top ten by any student group(those who live in dorms, are commuters, are registered originally at New Mexico State University, or those who transferred to New Mexico State University.)

TABLE 7A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 7

| | |
|--|--------|
| Commuter student with dormitory student | =0.960 |
| Student starting at N.M.S.U. with transfer student | =0.948 |

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY IN EACH COLLEGE.

| CRITERIA | Colleges | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | A&S | A&HE | BA&E | EDUC | ENGR |
| Seldom using sarcasm with students | | | | 6.5 | |
| Rewriting and updating tests | | | | | 7.0 |
| Raising the aspirational level of students | | | | | 10.0 |
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 6.5 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in subj. taught | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.5 | 6.5 | 2.5 |
| Motivating students to do their best | 4.0 | 2.0 | 5.5 | 1.0 | 5.0 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 2.0 | 6.5 | | 4.0 | 10.0 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 5.0 | 6.5 | | 2.5 | 7.0 |
| Treating students with respect | 9.0 | 5.0 | 2.5 | 9.5 | 2.5 |
| Using teaching methods which enable stud. to achieve objectives of the course | 6.5 | 4.0 | 5.5 | | |
| Being fair and reasonable to stud. in evaluation procedures | 11.5 | 8.5 | 2.5 | 6.5 | 4.0 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 8.0 | | | 2.5 | |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability. | 6.5 | | 9.5 | 9.5 | |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | | 8.5 | 5.5 | | 7.0 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability. | | 10.0 | | | |
| Being able to show practical appl. of subj. matter. | | | | | 10.0 |
| Identifying his comments which are personal opinion | | | 9.5 | | |
| Establishing good rapport with stud. in classroom | | | 9.5 | | |
| Setting high standards of achievement for stud. | | | 9.5 | | |
| Sample Size | 88 | 38 | 7 | 17 | 26 |

COMMENTS ON TABLE 8

All faculty subgroups in the colleges, except the College of Education, ranked the criterion "being well prepared for class" as the most important criterion. The faculty in the College of Education ranked this criterion as 6.5 and ranked "motivating students to do their best" as the most important criterion.

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 8

| | |
|---|--------|
| Faculty in College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U. | =0.949 |
| Faculty in College of Agric. & Home Econ. with all N.M.S.U. | =0.936 |
| Faculty in College of Bus. Admin. & Econ. with all N.M.S.U. | =0.810 |
| Faculty in College of Education with all N.M.S.U. | =0.833 |
| Faculty in College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U. | =0.910 |

TABLE 9

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP PRIORITY CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS IN DIFFERENT COLLEGES.

| CRITERIA | A&S | A&HE | BA&E | EDUC | ENGR | GRAD |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 4.0 | 7.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in subj. taught | 5.5 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 4.0 |
| Motivating students to do their best | | | 15.0 | 4.0 | | 4.0 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 5.5 | 7.5 | | | 12.0 | 10.5 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate. | 9.5 | 5.0 | 9.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 8.0 |
| Treating students with respect | | 6.0 | 10.5 | 2.0 | | 2.0 |
| Using teaching methods which enable stud. to achieve objectives of the course | | | 7.0 | | 6.0 | 10.5 |
| Being fair and reasonable to stud. in evaluation procedures | 2.0 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 7.0 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 3.0 | 7.5 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 4.5 | 9.0 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability. | 4.0 | 13.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 8.0 | 4.0 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 8.0 | | 1.5 | 9.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability. | 7.0 | 10.0 | 10.5 | 9.0 | 10.0 | |
| Being able to show practical appl. of subj. matter. | 9.5 | 2.0 | 7.0 | | 4.5 | |
| Identifying his comments which are personal opinion | | | | | | |
| Establishing good rapport with stud. in classroom | | | | | | |
| Setting high standards of achievement for stud. | | | | | | |
| Rewriting and updating tests | | 9.0 | | | | |
| Sample Size | 50 | 38 | 48 | 37 | 57 | 52 |

TABLE 9A

SELECTED* RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 9

| | |
|--|---------|
| Students in College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.971 |
| Students in College of Ag. & Home Econ. with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.948 |
| Students in College of Bus. Admin. & Econ. with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.935 |
| Students in College of Education with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.931 |
| Students in College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.934 |
| Students in Graduate School with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.951 |

*Rank correlations between the students of the different colleges and other subgroups in the university have not been shown because of space limitations. All correlation coefficients are available to those interested.

TABLE 10

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE
TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY ALUMNI FOR EACH COLLEGE.

| CRITERIA | A&S | A&HE | BA&E | EDUC | ENGR | GRAD |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Patently assisting stud. with their problems | | | | 9.5 | | |
| Being readily available for consultation with students | | 9.0 | | | | |
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in subj. taught | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 7.0 | 7.5 | 5.0 |
| Motivating students to do their best | | 7.5 | | | | 3.0 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 3.5 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 9.5 | 7.5 | 3.0 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 8.0 | | | 3.0 | 10.5 | 9.5 |
| Treating students with respect | 5.5 | 4.5 | 9.5 | 6.0 | | |
| Using teaching methods which enable stud. to achieve objectives of the course | | | 9.5 | 3.0 | 10.5 | 6.0 |
| Being fair and reasonable to stud. in evaluation procedures | 8.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 9.5 | 5.5 | 9.5 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 5.5 | | 4.5 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 8.0 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability. | 3.5 | 4.5 | | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 8.0 | | 7.0 | | 5.5 | 7.0 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability. | 10.0 | | | 9.5 | 9.0 | |
| Being able to show practical appl. of subj. matter. | | 4.5 | 2.5 | | 4.0 | |
| Identifying his comments which are personal opinion | | | | | | |
| Establishing good rapport with stud. in classroom | | | | | | |
| Setting high standards of achievement for stud. | | | | | | |
| Rewriting and updating tests | | | 7.0 | | | |
| Sample Size | 39 | 23 | 15 | 22 | 58 | 27 |

TABLE 10A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 10

| | |
|--|---------|
| Alumni from College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.951 |
| Alumni from College of Ag. & Home Econ. with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.907 |
| Alumni from College of Bus. Admin. & Econ. with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.935 |
| Alumni from College of Education with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.946 |
| Alumni from College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.961 |
| Alumni from Graduate School with all N.M.S.U. | = 0.942 |

TABLE 11

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS AND ALUMNI IN COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES.

| CRITERIA | Faculty | Students | Alumni |
|---|---------|----------|--------|
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught | 3.0 | 5.5 | 2.0 |
| Motivating students to do their best | 4.0 | 13.5 | 11.0 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 2.0 | 5.5 | 3.5 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 5.0 | 9.5 | 8.0 |
| Treating students with respect | 9.0 | 12.0 | 5.5 |
| Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve | 6.5 | 11.0 | 16.5 |
| Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures. | 11.5 | 2.0 | 8.0 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 8.0 | 3.0 | 5.5 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability | 6.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 11.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | 10.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 |
| Being able to show practical applications of subject matter. | | | |
| Sample Size | 88 | 50 | 39 |

TABLE 11A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 11

Faculty in College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U. = 0.949

Students in College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U. = 0.971

Alumni in College of Arts & Sciences with all N.M.S.U. = 0.951

TABLE 12

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI IN THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE & HOME ECONOMICS.

| CRITERIA | FACULTY | STUDENTS | ALUMNI |
|---|----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 4.0 | 1.5 |
| Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught | 3.0 | 3.0 | 1.5 |
| Motivating students to do their best | 2.0 | 18.5 | 7.5 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 6.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 6.5 | 5.0 | 15.0 |
| Treating students with respect | 5.0 | 6.0 | 4.5 |
| Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve | 4.0 | 11.5 | 12.0 |
| Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures. | 8.5 | 1.0 | 4.5 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 12.0 | 7.5 | 20.5 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability | 18.0 | 13.0 | 4.5 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 8.5 | 11.5 | 12.0 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | 18.0 | 10.0 | 29.0 |
| Being able to show practical applications of subject matter. | 15.5 | 2.0 | 4.5 |
| Rewriting and updating tests | 12.0 | 9.0 | 20.5 |
| Being readily available for consultation with students | 12.0 | 15.0 | 9.0 |
| Sample Size | 38 | 38 | 23 |

TABLE 12A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS WITH ALL N.M.S.U. AND SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 12

Faculty in College of Agriculture & Home Economics =0.936

Students in College of Agriculture & Home Economics =0.948

Alumni in College of Agriculture & Home Economics =0.907

TABLE 13

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE
TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI
IN THE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION & ECONOMICS.

| <u>CRITERIA</u> | FACULTY | STUDENT | ALUMNI |
|---|---------|---------|--------|
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 7.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught | 5.5 | 1.5 | 2.5 |
| Motivating students to do their best | 5.5 | 15.0 | 15.5 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 15.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 15.0 | 9.0 | 15.5 |
| Treating students with respect | 2.5 | 10.5 | 9.5 |
| Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve | 5.5 | 7.0 | 9.5 |
| Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures. | 2.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 15.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability | 9.5 | 3.5 | 11.0 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 5.5 | 1.5 | 7.0 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | 24.5 | 10.5 | 18.0 |
| Being able to show practical applications of subject matter. | 20.5 | 7.0 | 2.5 |
| Rewriting and updating tests | 15.0 | 18.0 | 7.0 |
| Sample Size | 7 | 48 | 15 |

TABLE 13A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR ALL N.M.S.U. AND SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 13

| | |
|--|--------|
| Faculty in College of Business Administration & Economics | =0.810 |
| Students in College of Business Administration & Economics | =0.935 |
| Alumni in College of Business Administration & Economics | =0.935 |

TABLE 14

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI IN THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION.

| CRITERIA | FACULTY | STUDENTS | ALUMNI |
|---|---------|----------|--------|
| Being well prepared for class | 6.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught | 6.5 | 9.0 | 7.0 |
| Motivating students to do their best | 1.0 | 4.0 | 12.5 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 4.0 | 13.5 | 9.5 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Treating students with respect | 9.5 | 2.0 | 6.0 |
| Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve | 11.5 | 11.5 | 3.0 |
| Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures. | 6.5 | 6.0 | 9.5 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 2.5 | 7.0 | 3.0 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability | 9.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 26.5 | 9.0 | 15.0 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | 26.5 | 9.0 | 9.5 |
| Being able to show practical applications of subject matter. | 26.5 | 13.5 | 20.0 |
| Rewriting and updating tests | 17.0 | 17.0 | 15.0 |
| Patiently assisting stud. with their problems | 33.5 | 18.0 | 9.5 |
| Seldom using sarcasm with students | 6.5 | 29.0 | 47.0 |
| Sample Size | 17 | 37 | 22 |

TABLE 14A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS WITH ALL N.M.S.U. AND SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 14

| | |
|--|--------|
| Faculty in College of Education with all N.M.S.U. | =0.833 |
| Students in College of Education with all N.M.S.U. | =0.931 |
| Alumni in College of Education with all N.M.S.U. | =0.940 |

TABLE 15

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI IN THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING.

| CRITERIA | FACULTY | STUDENTS | ALUMNI |
|---|---------|----------|--------|
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught | 2.5 | 9.0 | 7.5 |
| Motivating students to do their best | 5.0 | 20.0 | 12.5 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 10.0 | 12.0 | 7.5 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 7.0 | 7.0 | 10.5 |
| Treating students with respect | 2.5 | 19.0 | 12.5 |
| Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve | 13.0 | 6.0 | 10.5 |
| Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures. | 4.0 | 2.0 | 5.5 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 13.0 | 4.5 | 2.0 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability | 15.0 | 8.0 | 3.0 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 7.0 | 3.0 | 5.5 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | 18.5 | 10.0 | 9.0 |
| Being able to show practical applications of subject matter. | 10.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 |
| Rewriting and updating tests | 7.0 | 11.0 | 14.0 |
| Sample Size | 26 | 57 | 58 |

TABLE 15A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 15

Faculty in College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U. = 0.910

Student in College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U. = 0.934

Alumni in College of Engineering with all N.M.S.U. = 0.961

TABLE 16

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF TOP TEN CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE
TEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS AND ALUMNI IN THE
GRADUATE SCHOOL.

| CRITERIA | STUDENTS | ALUMNI |
|---|----------|--------|
| Being well prepared for class | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Establishing sincere interest in the subj. taught | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Motivating students to do their best | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| Encouraging intelligent independent thought by stud. | 10.5 | 3.0 |
| Communicating effectively at levels appropriate | 8.0 | 9.5 |
| Treating students with respect | 2.0 | 11.0 |
| Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve | 10.5 | 6.0 |
| Being fair & reasonable to students in evaluation procedures. | 7.0 | 9.5 |
| Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subj. | 9.0 | 8.0 |
| Constructing test which search for understanding on the part of the stud. rather than rote memory ability | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| Organizing the course in logical fashion | 6.0 | 7.0 |
| Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | 12.0 | 15.0 |
| Being able to show practical applications of subject matter. | 16.0 | 20.5 |
| Sample Size | 52 | 27 |

TABLE 16A

SELECTED RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBGROUPS EXAMINED IN TABLE 16

Students in Graduate College with all N.M.S.U. = 0.951

Alumni in Graduate College with all N.M.S.U. = 0.942

TABLE 16B

SUMMARY OF RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS DISPLAYED IN TABLES 8A, 9A, 10A, 11A, 12A, 13A, 14A, 15A, and 16A. (BETWEEN ALL N.M.S.U. AND VARIOUS SUBGROUPS IN COLLEGES) AND SAMPLE SIZES

| <u>GROUP</u> | <u>A&S</u> | <u>A&HE</u> | <u>BA&E</u> | <u>EDUC</u> | <u>ENGR</u> | <u>GRAD</u> |
|--------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| FACULTY | 0.949 (88) | 0.936 (38) | 0.810 (7) | 0.833 (17) | 0.910 (26) | |
| STUDENTS | 0.971 (50) | 0.948 (38) | 0.935 (48) | 0.931 (37) | 0.934 (57) | 0.951 (52) |
| ALUMNI | 0.951 (39) | 0.907 (23) | 0.935 (15) | 0.940 (22) | 0.961 (58) | 0.942 (27) |

Note: Sample Size is shown in parenthesis.

COMMENTS ON TABLE 16B

1. Among the colleges, two groups in the College of Arts & Sciences (faculty and students) have the highest rank correlation coefficient with all New Mexico State University. The alumni of the College of Arts & Sciences has the second highest rank correlation coefficient among the colleges. (Engineering has the highest).
2. Amongst the faculty, the College of Business Administration and Economics has the lowest rank correlation coefficient with all New Mexico State University.
3. Amongst the students, the College of Education has the lowest rank correlation coefficient with all New Mexico State University.
4. Amongst the alumni, the College of Agriculture & Home Economics has the lowest rank correlation coefficient with all New Mexico State University.

TABLE 17

PRIORITY OF IMPORTANCE OF CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING
USED IN STUDENT EVALUATION*AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, STUDENTS,
AND ALUMNI

| | FACULTY | STUDENT | ALUMNI |
|--|---------|---------|--------|
| Teachers apparent familiarity with subject Q. 20 | 9.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Teachers ability to convey his know. of sub Q. 10 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 |
| Teachers ability to stimulate interest Q. 6 | 3.0 | 13.0 | 11.0 |
| Teachers apparent attitude toward subject Q.27 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 |
| Teachers apparent attitude towards stud. Q. 18 | 34.0 | 57.0 | 39.0 |
| Q. 33 | 18.0 | 40.0 | 17.0 |
| Q. 39 | 16.5 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Q. 41 | 6.0 | 11.0 | 7.0 |
| Teachers impartiality in grading Q. 55 | 8.0 | 2.0 | 6.0 |
| Annoying mannerisms in the teacher Q. 26 | 52.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 |
| Organization of the course Q. 44 | 11.0 | 5.5 | 8.0 |

* See appendix B. for copy of Student Evaluation Sheet most often used at N.M.S.U.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There is considerable variation among the ranking of the criteria of effective teaching by faculty, students, and alumni at New Mexico State University. There is, however, unanimity amongst all three groups that the most important criterion is "being well prepared for class." This ranking was upheld by the ten subgroups of faculty (faculty by years of service, teaching or administrative, and faculty by colleges) except for the faculty of the College of Education. The faculty in the College of Education ranked "motivating students to do their best" as the most important criterion.

A criterion concerning research, that of "publishing material related to his subject field" was ranked low by the three groups. Faculty ranked this criterion as 54, students as 59, and alumni as the 58 most important criterion. Another research related criterion, "being consistently involved in research projects," was ranked 56, 55, and 57 by faculty, students, and alumni.

These rankings clearly means that the N.M.S.U. community feels that publishing in one's field and being involved in research projects is not important for effective teaching. Criteria concerned with off-campus community relations were also ranked low by all three groups of faculty, students, and alumni. The criterion of "being knowledgeable about the community in which he lives" was ranked as 57, 53, and 53 by faculty, students, and alumni respectively. The criterion of "making appearances which assist programs of community organizations," was ranked unanimously as being least important by each group of faculty, staff, and students.

The criteria used in faculty merit rating were compared with the criteria used in the study questionnaire. No criterion was worded

identically, but there were many criteria in the questionnaire that were related to those used in faculty merit rating. The ranking of these criteria (Table 3) indicate that there are four criteria ranked in the top ten by the N.M.S.U. community that do not appear explicitly in the Merit Rating Form (questions 2, 27, 4, and 55 on the questionnaire). On the other hand, four criteria listed in the bottom ten by the N.M.S.U. community do appear on the Merit Rating Form (questions 8, 19, 30, and 37). This suggests that the Merit Rating criteria used for evaluating effective teaching should be redesigned assuming that it is used for evaluating effective teaching. The questionnaire study can help in such a redesign and also in assigning weights to each of the criteria used for merit rating.

The ranking of criteria by the administrative faculty was different from the rankings by the teaching faculty (see Table 4). This implies that teaching faculty are being evaluated (by administrative faculty) according to a ranking scale different from their own. This implication may be important when one considers that the ranking of the teaching faculty has a higher rank order correlation coefficient with the N.M.S.U. community than does the administrative faculty. (See Table 4)

The ranking by subgroups of faculty by years of service, and by subgroups of students do indicate some interesting results but no important pattern emerges. The ranking by subgroups of faculty, students, and alumni within colleges identify some interesting and significant divergencies between colleges and could be of interest for discussions by college faculties.

Comparing the questionnaire criteria with the criteria used on the most commonly used student evaluation form at N.M.S.U., it appears that many of the criteria ranked high by the N.M.S.U. community and

the students themselves do not appear on the Student Evaluation Form. Of the top ten criteria as ranked by students in the survey, five do not appear on the Student Evaluation Form. Of the top ten criteria as ranked by faculty, four do not appear on the Student Evaluation Form. This implies that if the Student Evaluation Form is to reflect the ranking priorities of the students for the faculty (whom it is allegedly designed to help) then the present Student Evaluation Form should be redesigned.

In conclusion, it should be stated that this study does identify attitudes concerning teaching effectiveness. It should provide a basis of discussion which should lead to a design of an instrument that would better identify the variables involved. If this instrument is a questionnaire, then an attempt should be made to take a larger sample and use techniques of factor analysis and discriminant analysis in analysing the results.

Meanwhile, as suggested above, it is hoped that this study would provide a basis of discussion between groups in administration, among faculty, and between the faculty and the administration. The topic of criteria of effective teaching could well be the subject of a one or two day seminar in which resource speakers are followed by group discussions between the teaching faculty and the administration. This dialogue could be useful not only in better articulating the criteria, their significance and how they could be achieved, but it would also improve the communication between faculty and administration. Such a seminar could not only help teaching faculty at N.M.S.U. to be more effective teachers, but could also lead to more equitable and satisfactory procedures of faculty evaluation. A recent study at N.M.S.U. showed that only 57% of the faculty at N.M.S.U. considered the ability of their dean to "evaluate faculty

performance fairly" as being adequate or excellent. Only 46% stated that their dean "lets you know your standing in relation to how your work is evaluated" as adequate or excellent.* This percentage could perhaps be increased by a seminar or some similar discussion. This in turn would lead to a better communication on our organizational goals concerning teaching and a better understanding of the means of achieving them. The seminar could also include student representatives, thereby, improving the communication between students and faculty.

*See Peterson, B.O., A Study of Faculty Attitudes at Two State Supported Universities.
(Doctoral dissertation at N.M.S.U., 1968)

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study for New Mexico State University arose out of a discussion at a professional meeting with Dr. Perry, Director of Institutional Studies, University of Toledo. He kindly paid for the printing of the questionnaire and provided all the computational resources needed. His help and cooperation throughout this study is greatly appreciated.

Dr. McKean, Director of the Statistical Laboratory at New Mexico State University kindly helped in the statistical interpretation of the data.

Miss Celina Chavez typed all draft and final copies. The authors want to express their appreciation for her cheerful assistance.

FOR STUDENTS ONLY

Please respond to each item:

- (6) 1. Indicate your college:
 A.B. Bus.Ad. & Economics.
 Edu. Engr. Grad.
 Ag. - H. E.
- (7) 2. Indicate your class rank:
 Freshman, Sophomore,
 Junior, Senior, Graduate
- (10-11-12) 3. Indicate your Point Average:
 0.0-1.0, 1.0-2.0, 2.0-3.0,
 3.0-4.0
- (14) 4. Indicate whether you:
 Live at Home, and commute
to the University, Live in a
University Dormitory, Live in
other housing and commute to
the University.
- (16) 5. Indicate your Sex.
 Male, Female
CHECK ONLY ONE:
- (18) 6. New Mexico State University
was the first college I attended
I entered New Mexico State
University as a Transfer
Student _____

FOR ALUMNI ONLY

Please respond to each item:

- (5) 1. Indicate the college from which
you graduated:
 A.B. Bus.Ad. & Economics.
 Edu. Engr. Grad. School
 Ag. - H. E.
- (7) 2. Indicate your highest earned
degree at New Mexico State
University, Assoc. Certificate,
 Bachelors, Masters,
 Doctorate
- (9) 3. Did you graduate with Honors?
 Yes, No
- (11) 4. Indicate your Sex.
 Male, Female
- (13-15) 5. How many years has it been
since you received your first
degree? 1-5, 6-10, 10-15,
 15-20, 20-25, 25-30,
 30-35, 35+

The above responses provide for some
of the variables in the study

FOR FACULTY ONLY

Please respond to each item:

- (3-4) 1. Indicate your college:
 A.B. Bus.Ad. & Economics.
 Edu. Engr. Grad. School
 Ag. - H. E.
- (8) 2. Indicate your faculty rank.
 Instructor, Asst. Prof.,
 Assoc. Prof., Professor
- (10) 3. Indicate your administrative
position held at the University.
 Dept. Chairman, Asst. Dean,
 Assoc. Dean, Director,
 Dean or higher
- (12-13) 4. Indicate your total years of
teaching experience in higher
education. 1-5, 5-10, 10-20,
 20-30, 30+
- (15-16) 5. Indicate your years of teaching
experience at New Mexico State
University. 1-5, 5-10, 10-20,
 20-30, 30+
- (18) 6. Indicate your sex.
 Male, Female
- (20) 7. My university appointment is
 Full Time, Part Time.

BEHAVIOR CRITERIA

CHECK YOUR JUDGEMENT OF
DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE

| Evaluation of effective teacher behavior in higher education is important to the degree indicated in terms of the teacher: | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Evidencing better than average speech qualities | | | | | |
| 2. Constructing tests which search for understanding on the part of the students rather than rote memory ability | | | | | |
| 3. Providing several test opportunities for students | | | | | |
| 4. Engaging in continued formal study in his field | | | | | |
| 5. Acknowledging all questions to the best of his ability | | | | | |
| 6. Motivating students to do their best | | | | | |
| 7. Explaining grading standards | | | | | |
| 8. Publishing material related to his subject field | | | | | |
| 9. Having practical experience in his field | | | | | |
| 10. Communicating effectively at levels appropriate to the preparedness of students | | | | | |
| 11. Identifying his comments which are personal opinion | | | | | |
| 12. Challenging students' convictions | | | | | |
| 13. Utilizing visual aids to assist in creating subject matter achievement with student | | | | | |
| 14. Announcing tests and quizzes in advance | | | | | |
| 15. Making written comments on corrected returned assignments | | | | | |
| 16. Presenting organized supplementary course material to students | | | | | |
| 17. Establishing good rapport with students in the classroom | | | | | |
| 18. Making an effort to know students as individuals | | | | | |
| 19. Inspiring students to continue for graduate study | | | | | |
| 20. Demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of his subject | | | | | |
| 21. Exhibiting an intelligent personal philosophy of life | | | | | |
| 22. Encouraging student participation in class | | | | | |
| 23. Beginning and ending classes on time | | | | | |
| 24. Accepting justified constructive criticism by qualified persons | | | | | |
| 25. Sharing departmental duties with his colleagues | | | | | |
| 26. Having irritating personal mannerisms | | | | | |
| 27. Establishing sincere interest in the subject being taught | | | | | |
| 28. Taking measures to prevent cheating by students | | | | | |
| 29. Recognizing his responsibility for the academic success of students | | | | | |
| 30. Devoting time to student activities on campus | | | | | |
| 31. Demonstrating a stable level-headed personality | | | | | |
| 32. Returning graded assignments promptly | | | | | |
| 33. Patiently assisting students with their problems | | | | | |
| 34. Holding membership in scholarly organizations | | | | | |
| 35. Being well prepared for class | | | | | |
| 36. Setting high standards of achievement for students | | | | | |
| 37. Involving himself in appropriate university committees | | | | | |
| 38. Being knowledgeable about the community in which he lives | | | | | |
| 39. Being readily available for consultation with students | | | | | |
| 40. Displaying broad intellectual interests | | | | | |
| 41. Treating students with respect | | | | | |
| 42. Raising the aspirational level of students | | | | | |
| 43. Being able to show practical applications of subject matter | | | | | |
| 44. Organizing the course in logical fashion | | | | | |
| 45. Making appearances which assist programs of community organizations | | | | | |
| 46. Earning the respect of his colleagues | | | | | |
| 47. Encouraging intelligent independent thought by students | | | | | |
| 48. Using teaching methods which enable students to achieve objectives of the course | | | | | |
| 49. Rewriting and updating tests | | | | | |
| 50. Presenting an extensive lucid syllabus of the course to students | | | | | |
| 51. Explaining grading procedures | | | | | |
| 52. Being consistently involved in research projects | | | | | |
| 53. Seldom using sarcasm with students | | | | | |
| 54. Indicating that the scope and demands of each assignment have been considered carefully | | | | | |
| 55. Being fair and reasonable to students in evaluation procedures | | | | | |
| 56. Relating course material to that of other courses | | | | | |
| 57. Using more than one type of evaluation device | | | | | |
| 58. Being neatly dressed | | | | | |
| 59. Exhibiting a genuine sense of humor | | | | | |
| 60. Encouraging moral responsibility in students by his example | | | | | |

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT EVALUATION CHART

Course number _____ Course title _____
Semester taken _____ Name of instructor _____

You are asked, by means of this form, to help your instructor improve the course when he offers it again. Both praise and negative criticism are in order. Do not hesitate to give your honest opinion. Please do not sign this form.

PART I. (Check only one item on each line.)

- | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------|----------------|
| 1. Teacher's apparent familiarity with subject. | Extensive | Average | Limited |
| 2. Teacher's ability to convey his knowledge about subject. | Above Average | Average | Below Average |
| 3. Teacher's ability to stimulate interest in the subject. | Above Average | Average | Below Average |
| 4. Teacher's apparent attitude toward the subject. | Enthusiastic | Average | Bored |
| 5. Teacher's apparent attitude toward the students | Sympathetic | Average | Unsympathetic |
| 6. Teacher's impartiality in grading | Fair | Average | Biased |
| 7. Annoying mannerisms in the teacher. | Seldom Exhibits | Average | Often Exhibits |
| 8. Organization of the course | Excellent | Average | Poor |

PART II. In a few words, answer each of the following questions as objectively as you can.

- How could the instructor improve his presentation of the course material?
- What is the instructor's greatest weakness as a teacher of this course?
- What is the instructor's greatest contribution to the course?

CONTRAST THE TEACHING OF THIS COURSE WITH THE TEACHING OF THE OTHER COURSES YOU ARE TAKING THIS SEMESTER

_____ Superior _____ Average _____ Inferior

Remarks: _____

• Please list annoying mannerisms if present: _____