

## **Two of the same kind? Summative course evaluation and formative teaching analysis poll.**

Higher education institutions (HEI) implement different measures to monitor and develop quality on micro-, meso-, and macro level (Brahm, Jenert & Euler, 2011). Also at the micro level, the use of multiple measures is required considering the complexity of enhancing teaching quality, among others. However, there is still a lack of knowledge how different measures such as formative lecture feedback and summative course evaluations can be effectively aligned with each other, thereby improving both the formative and the summative value of such measures.

Our project researches how summative standardized course evaluations (SCE) and formative feedback on the course level, using the “teaching analysis polls” (TAP, (structured group discussions, Frank et al., 2011), can inform each other and thereby create an effective quality development approach. Applying qualitative content analysis (Mayring, 2014), we analyze students’ open-ended questions (Hamilton et al., 1997) from the SCEs of 150 courses and 70 documented TAPs. We compare results in terms of derivation and reflection of category schemata. For the qualitative content analysis, we started to work with the categories proposed by Hawelka (2017).

The pilot analysis of the TAP data indicate the existence of patterns with regard to frequencies and principles in the classification. Especially aspects like the structure and sequence of the course, alignment of course elements, transparency of assessment and the quality of teaching material are frequently discussed aspects.

Linking the open-ended data from SCE to TAP, we aim to identify different areas for further development of the SCE standardized questions. Furthermore, we derive consequences for the faculty-training program at our HEI. We critically reflect on the use and comparison of data gained in the two different quality improvement measures and their potential to use as research data in Higher Education Development.

Brahm T., Jenert T., Euler D. (eds.). (2016). *Pädagogische Hochschulentwicklung: Von der Programmatik zur Implementierung* (1st ed.). Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-658-12067-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12067-2).

Frank A., Fröhlich M., Lahm S. (2011). “Zwischenauswertung im Semester: Lehrveranstaltungen gemeinsam verändern”, *Zeitschrift für Hochschulentwicklung* 6(3): 310–318.

Hamilton J. B. III, Smith M., Heady R .B., Carson P. (1997). “Using open-ended questions on senior exit surveys to evaluate and improve faculty performance: Results from a school of business administration”, *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* 8(1): 23–48.

Hawelka B. (2017). *Handreichung zur Kodierung qualitativer Evaluationsdaten aus Teaching Analysis Poll* (revised edition; Schriftenreihe Nr. 5). Universität Regensburg: Zentrum für Hochschul- und Wissenschaftsdidaktik.

Mayring P. (2014). *Qualitative content analysis: theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution*. Klagenfurt. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-395173>