To: Dr. Chayo, Academic Committee Chairperson

From: Mr. Manuel F. Negron, Doctoral Candidate

Date: August 10, 2017

Re: Recommendation for Professional Development Stipend

In a recent meeting you announced a new lecturer development program that would provide lecturers with a stipend to improve their teaching skills and professional knowledge. In order to the assess the effectiveness of teaching, all instructors have been required to provide a questionnaire to all students at the end of the semester. If an instructor receives a mean rating that exceeds the group mean on at least 7 of the 10 items, that instructor is automatically approved for the stipend.

On table 1 below, I have analyzed the data based off of the questionnaire that was given to the students. This table shows the responses to each question asked (item number) and breaks down the total sum of the responses to the 10 questions for Mr. Kwanta’s classes (Group 1) and for all of the instructors in the department (Group 2). I have identified the sums of both groups by multiplying the number of students that provided a response in each specific rating 1-5 and adding them up. I then divided the sum by the total number of students to identify the mean rating for both groups.

When comparing the mean rating for each question asked to Mr. Kwanta’s classes and to group 2, it clearly shows that Mr. Kwanta exceeded the group mean on at least 7 of the 10 items, therefore I recommend that he automatically be approved for the stipend. Items 3, 4, and 9 highlighted in red show the areas in which he did not exceed the group mean.

Based on the data in the table in regards to the student’s responses to the questionnaire I have identified areas of strength and areas in need of improvement that can be recommended to Mr. Kwanta to think about when creating his professional development plan. These areas were determined by looking at the highest and lowest ratings for each response. The majority of the student’s responses with the highest ratings determined the strengths, while the lowest or neutral ratings determined the areas in need of improvement. The areas are as follows:

**Areas of Strength**

* Course syllabus was clear and students are fully aware of the requirements.
* Instructor answers students’ questions clearly and thoroughly.
* Instructor makes the class interesting.

**Areas in Need of Improvement**

* Students do not have a clear understanding on what they are expected to learn.
* Instructor did not appear to be prepared for each class.
* Instructor did not return graded tests/homework within a reasonable time frame.

Table 1

*Teaching Effectiveness Questionnaire Summary*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Distribution of Responses  |  |  | Mean  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | Group 1 Sum  | Group 2 Sum  | Kwanta (1) | Group (2) |
| 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 23 | 19 | 59 | 229 | 218.3 | 3.88 | 3.7 |
| 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 32 | 59 | 249 | 243.67 | 4.22 | 4.13 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 16 | 59 | 221 | 227.15 | 3.75 | 3.85 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 21 | 21 | 59 | 234 | 237.77 | 3.97 | 4.03 |
| 5 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 28 | 20 | 59 | 239 | 237.18 | 4.05 | 4.02 |
| 6 | 2 | 2 | 40 | 10 | 5 | 59 | 191 | 165.79 | 3.24 | 2.81 |
| 7 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 22 | 22 | 59 | 237 | 231.28 | 4.02 | 3.92 |
| 8 | 2 | 6 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 59 | 218 | 211.81 | 3.69 | 3.59 |
| 9 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 24 | 18 | 59 | 229 | 254.88 | 3.88 | 4.32 |
| 10 | 3 | 2 | 15 | 24 | 15 | 59 | 223 | 207.68 | 3.78 | 3.52 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: Group (1) represents Mr. Kwanta’s class and Group (2) represents the sum and the mean for all instructors in the department.