The usefulness of structured mid-term feedback as a catalyst for change in higher education classes

MIRIAM ROSALYN DIAMOND   *Northeastern University, USA*

ABSTRACT Structured mid-term feedback allows teaching staff to evaluate their effectiveness from the student perspective while the term is in session. Why do lecturers participate in these programs? What do they feel they learn as a result? How do they use the information gathered? Do these programs promote change in the way classes are conducted? At one university, a study was conducted to find out. Over two years, 82 Small Group Instructional Diagnoses (SGIDs) were conducted for staff in a range of disciplines. End-of-term surveys of participating lecturers revealed that this procedure increased their understanding of how students respond to their instructional methods. As a result, lecturers refined grading procedures, implemented new approaches to conducting classes, clarified their expectations of students, and refocused content emphasis. They also indicated that they intended to amend the way they teach future courses in an effort to increase effectiveness.

KEYWORDS: *change, effective teaching, evaluation, feedback, improvement*

Introduction

In this era of increased accountability, teaching staff are showing greater interest in determining and documenting efforts to improve the effectiveness of their instructional methods, curriculum, and techniques. End-of-term surveys are helpful in communicating students' perspectives and experiences in the class. However, the information gleaned from these is

217

only helpful in planning for subsequent renditions of the course, as results arrive too late for lecturers to make changes while that particular class is in session. Furthermore, this format rarely allows lecturers the opportunity to clarify comments and suggestions with the same group of students who submit them. In contrast, mid-term feedback allows lecturers to evaluate their work by discovering the way students respond to their class while it is still in session. It allows them to discuss the results with students in an effort to better understand learning needs and concerns. In addition, the findings from this process are confidential and intended to be used by staff in a constructive manner, as opposed to external assessment designed to determine employment status, promotion or salary increases. Why do lecturers volunteer to participate in mid-term feedback programs? What do they feel they learn as a result? Do these programs promote change in the way they conduct classes? At one university, a study was conducted to find out.

SGID – definition and history

The Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID) process was developed in 1974 at the University of Washington. The initial objective of this tool was to provide feedback to lecturers on different aspects of course structure, material, and instruction while the semester was still in session. This would allow for concerns to be addressed promptly and alterations made that can take place during that same term (Clark and Redmond, 1982a). Lecturers could benefit by increasing their effectiveness and therefore receiving stronger evaluations by both students and peer reviewers. Although it could be difficult to alter some aspects of a class (such as the way grades are calculated and the scheduling of examinations) mid-stream, the technique was introduced with the hope that lecturers might consider introducing and refining instructional techniques during the term, while maintaining the integrity of the course. Since its inception, the tool has been adopted at many universities across the United States.

Most prior research on the SGID focused on student and staff perceptions of and reactions to it. Clark and Redmond (1982a, 1982b) found students enthusiastic about this process, and that it had a positive impact on their motivation in the classes for which it was conducted. This impression was echoed in corresponding academic surveys. In addition, most participants indicated an interest in running this program in future classes, and felt it useful to get feedback in time to make adjustments to their current classes (Clark and Redmond, 1982b). Some lecturers seemed to be under the impression that the SGID was only necessary when there was a problem with the course. Also, those who participated appeared to be the

218

most motivated and accomplished lecturers in the first place, leaving researchers to wonder how to get more academic staff involved (Clark and Redmond, 1982a). At one university, new academic staff were asked to evaluate the program at the end of their first semester of teaching (Black, 1998). All 16 respondents found the process useful, and indicated that they would encourage others to participate in it. Diamond (1988) cites several studies (Kyger, 1984; Wulff et al., 1984; Diamond and Smock, 1985) that show academics are more likely to buy into the information provided as a result of the SGIDs than the typical end-of-term written forms. They also appreciated the fact that resulting reports were tailored to the specifics of their course, and thus more useful and pragmatic. Researchers provided some case studies, following selected lecturers and departments who had gone through this process (Black, 1998; Diamond, 1988).

Studies were also conducted comparing academic staff who participated in follow-up meetings upon receiving their feedback with those who were simply given written summaries of students' comments. Although all of those who conducted mid-term feedback showed some improvement in their end-of-term teaching evaluations, those who were granted individual consultations made noticeably greater gains than their counterparts (Kulik, 2001). Recent studies have looked at the SGID's value in classes utilizing new educational technologies. Sherry et al. (1998) investigated its reception in distance education classes. End-of-term surveys indicated that 52 percent of responding students enrolled in these classes indicated that they found the process helpful in addressing issues related to both course material and teaching methodologies. The limited time allotted to carrying out the program was described as its largest obstacle. Robinson (1995) projected the SGID's usefulness for gathering feedback on audioconference classes as well.

These investigations provided helpful information – particularly on perceptions of the SGID by those who are most directly affected by it – yet they did not report how lecturers actually interpreted and utilized the data received. Specifically, they did not focus on whether use of the SGID actually leads to change in the classroom across the board, and if so, in what ways. There are many models of how instructional change occurs among lecturers in higher education. Most include the steps of increasing staff awareness about the effects of their current style as well as other options available; motivation, guidance, and support to try out new or different techniques; and the provision of continued feedback in order to reinforce as well as sustain the new approaches (Paulsen and Felman, 1995). Given its structure, the SGID has the potential to facilitate all of these conditions. Therefore, it may serve as a catalyst for lecturers to make informed changes in the ways they conduct their classes. To explore if this is indeed the case, a

219

longitudinal inquiry was established. Its purpose was to look at why lecturers volunteered to participate in this program, what specific information they reported gaining from the process, how that information was put to use, and whether this led to changes in the way classes – both current and future – were conducted.

The study

Through small group discussion and a 'whole-class interviewing technique' (Diamond, 1990: 90), students were directed by a trained facilitator from the university's office of staff development through a series of steps designed to generate formative comments on the class. The lecturer was excused from the class during this exercise. The advantages of this system over end-of-term standard course evaluations were its immediacy in reporting the data and – consequently – eliciting quick responses on the part of academic staff, as well as its flexibility which allowed it to be tailored to address a variety of course details and a range of class formats (Clark and Redmond, 1982b). The process involved asking students to respond to three questions:

1. What aspects of this course/instruction enhance your learning?
2. What aspects of this course/instruction could be improved?
3. What could *you* – as a student – do to make the course better for yourself, your classmates, and the lecturer?

For the first step, students responded to these questions by completing worksheets individually (see Appendix 1). They then met in small groups (of three to six), where each student revealed their responses to the other group members (see Appendix 2). For each item, the group chose the three most significant responses. These were then shared with the entire class. The facilitator listed on the blackboard or flipchart each group's top responses. Through discussion, the entire class decided which three or four items they felt best answered each question. Finally, each individual student was given a ranking sheet where they stated how strongly (on a scale of 1–9) they felt this item answered the question (see Appendix 3). This yielded both qualitative and quantitative data. The resulting reports included each question, highlighting the top three or four responses and the percent of students who strongly agreed, agreed somewhat or disagreed with the statement. All student responses from the initial worksheets were listed under the top three responses, so the lecturer could see individual replies as well as group statements. These reports were typed, to maintain respondent confidentiality.

These reports were returned in individual meetings between the

220

teaching center staff developer and each lecturer. The facilitator described what occurred in the session; whether there was much dissent or agreement, whether students seemed focused on the task or distracted, and other issues that may have been raised. They guided the lecturer to further investigate the effect of specific teaching approaches, as well as provided resources to address concerns (such as books on grading rubrics and notices about upcoming workshops on learning styles). The lecturer was advised to speak directly with the students about their perceptions and requests, to clarify student concerns, and to indicate which changes could be made to the course at this point (and why). This entire process was voluntary and the resulting information kept private from anyone outside of the class and teaching center. This rather simple process yielded interesting outcomes.

Setting and participants

The site for this investigation was a private multiversity on the quarter system serving nearly 14,000 full-time undergraduates and over 2,000 graduate students in the professions as well as arts and sciences. The university employed approximately 775 full-time lecturers. The opportunity to register for this process was publicized through flyers, campus-wide electronic mail announcements, and in meetings between teaching center professionals and academics. From autumn 2000 through to winter 2003 (a period of eight academic quarters), 82 lecturers took advantage of this opportunity, responding to announcements on university-wide emails, flyers sent around campus, postings on the teaching center website and via the quarterly newsletter. (There were requests from about a dozen additional people through this time period. Limitations of personnel available and timing concerns led to the restriction of participation on a first-come, first-served basis.) Lecturers who signed up represented a scope of disciplines across campus, including Biology, Business, Criminology, Economics, Education, Engineering, Health Sciences, Mathematics, Music, Philosophy, Political Science, and Psychology. Nearly half were new to the university. A range of class levels was included, from first-year through postgraduate. Class sizes varied, from six students to 125.

The type of feedback received varied, based on the structure and components of the course. Information gathered included Political Science students who felt they learned a great deal from in-class debates and suggested improving the exercise by having smaller debate teams. In a Mathematics class, students indicated that the use of practice examinations helped them focus on learning important operations, and recommended that the lecturer introduce new concepts prior to assigning problem sets. A Communications lecturer who drew upon stories in literature to demonstrate concepts and assigned group projects was informed that students

221

found these techniques beneficial. Students in a Management class thought real-world cases useful to their understanding of the topic, while requesting more opportunities to work in groups. In a few cases, the students were hard-pressed to think of significant changes their lecturer could make, and they seemed satisfied with the class as it was. In an effort to understand what specific information lecturers felt they learned from the process, as well as how they used this information (if at all), follow-up surveys were conducted.

Procedure

Academics who participated in the SGID were surveyed at the end of the quarter in which the SGID was conducted in their class (approximately four weeks after their follow-up meeting). They were asked why they volunteered to participate in this program, what they learned as a result of participating, what changes they made to the class they were teaching as a consequence of the feedback they received, and how they intended to modify subsequent renditions of this class (or other classes they taught), as a result. This is the complete list of questions asked:

1. Why did you volunteer to participate in the mid-term feedback program?
2. What did you learn as a result of this process?
3. What changes did you make to the class you were teaching when the SGID was conducted, as a result?
4. What changes will you make/have you made in subsequent renditions of this class (or other classes you teach) as a result?
5. How can we improve the scheduling, information gathering, and reporting of data to participants?
6. Other comments.

Results

Nearly two-thirds (60%, or 49 out of 82) of those surveyed responded. The most common reason given for participating in the SGID process (39%) was to get general feedback on teaching, as responses to Question 1 show:

Question 1: Why did you volunteer to participate in the mid-term feedback program?

Get feedback, teaching evaluations (39%)
Improve teaching (25%)
To make changes during term (20%)
Evaluate revisions/new content/format (10%)

222

Something specific about this group of students (4%)
Other/No response (2%)

Typical comments were: 'I am a new professor [lecturer] with limited teaching experience, wanted feedback' and 'I am always looking for new approaches to evaluation . . .'. The next most frequent response was from staff who simply wanted to improve their teaching (25%). For example, one staff member articulated a 'Desire to be a better lecturer, always looking to improve class outcomes, student learning, and student experiences . . .'. Another group stated that their goal was to make changes during the current term, rather than waiting for the next time they would be teaching the subject (20%). As one person put it: '[I wanted] to acquire an earlier sense of how the students thought the course was going so I could adjust my approach or style to improve the learning experience.' Several people wanted to evaluate newly-introduced course features, such as innovative assignments (10%). A couple of respondents had specific concerns about teaching this year's group of students, stating that '. . . the particular class was quiet' and 'I also sensed some discontent of the students . . .' (4%). There were several unique answers, such as the lecturer who articulated an interest in seeing the effects that this process would have on the class.

As a result of the procedure, over one-third of the people who replied (45%) stated that they gained insight into the student perspective on the class. For instance, one participant learned that 'students are not always following my stated intentions'. Another discovered that 'students know they are not prepared for class and acknowledge resistance to change, including [using] technology'. The second most common area of learning included both affirmations on what techniques and approaches were successful in class, as well as general suggestions for ways the course could be improved (31%). Among these were the team lecturers who found that: 'We were able to achieve our goals. The current content and its organiz-ation were being well received. Additionally, there were few complaints about our teaching skills.' Another group (22%) said they learned about some specific instructional techniques as a result of this process. For example, one staff member said they understood from the process that they should 'Use group discussion. Give outline at beginning of class. [Use] more visuals. [Provide] more review time for quizzes.' Responses to Question 2 illustrate the frequency of this category of comments:

Question 2: What did you learn as a result of this process?

Student concerns/perspectives (45%)
Affirmations of what is going well and general ideas for improvements (31%)

223

Specific suggestions on teaching technique (22%)
Other/No response (2%)

Responses to Question 3 (below) indicate that the most common changes made to courses as a result of the SGID were changes in or introduction of new in-class instructional methods (35%). One such lecturer reported providing handouts and lecture notes to the students on a regular basis, integrating homework assignments into lectures, and leaving more time for students to ask questions.

Question 3: What changes did you make to the class you were teaching when the SGID was conducted, as a result?

In-class teaching/techniques (35%)
Tests, assignments, grading (31%)
Changes in class material/content and how it's covered (16%)
Clarification with students (10%)
Too late to implement changes this quarter (4%)
Other/No response (4%)

This was followed closely by the number of staff who modified assignments, tests administered, and grading considerations (31%). One such lecturer 'made my instructions clearer and made up better case questions'. Some (16%) made revisions to course material and how it was addressed in class. For example, one lecturer made an effort to articulate applications of the subject matter to the students' career fields. Others used this as an opportunity to explain course objectives and rationales to students (10%). A couple (4%) felt the feedback was received too late to make changes for the current term.

In future terms, participants indicated they still would be mostly likely to change in-class teaching techniques (27%). One such lecturer stated that they intended to be more creative and put greater emphasis on active learning. This type of response was again followed in frequency by modifications in assignments and grading (21%), such as 'incorporate more student choice in assignments, as by offering choice between a final exam and a project'. A number of respondents (16%) mentioned that they were interested in conducting mid-term feedback in future classes, as a result of participating in the SGID.

Others revised the material introduced and how it is addressed in class (14%). An example of this is the lecturer who planned to find ways to introduce new undergraduates to the case study method, as well as re-evaluate overall course objectives. Some (8%) stated that they would spend more time clarifying their expectations on course assignments and in preparation for examinations, as responses to Question 4 demonstrate:

224

Question 4: What changes will you make in subsequent renditions of this class (or other classes you teach) as a result?

In-class teaching /techniques (27%)
Tests, assignments, grading (21%)
Changes in class material/content and how it's covered (14%)
Spend more time clarifying expectations (8%)
Continue collecting student mid-term feedback (16%)
Other/No response (14%)

In reply to the question about the overall process, staff saw the program as helpful and were pleased with its utility. This echoes findings from earlier studies. There were few suggestions for improvement, most of them referring to the scheduling of the class visit and follow-up consultation during the term. (The nine-week quarter yielded a very short window for the timely gathering and reporting of information.) A couple of lecturers commented that students found the process rushed, as there were only 30 minutes allotted to run the multistep procedure in classes containing as many as 100 students. Several lecturers participated in this process more than one term for the same course. They were interested in learning whether a different set of students would react the same way to their innovations. They also were curious about how the changes they implemented as a result of SGID feedback were received by the next group. Others modified the process and continued to administer the questions independently (as questionnaires) in future renditions of the class.

Question 5: How can we improve the scheduling, information gathering and reporting of data to participants?

Of the 49 survey respondents, 36 answered the fifth question about how the SGID process could be improved. Of these, the majority (67%) indicated that they were satisfied with the procedure as it was. When suggestions were given, the most common ones were to change the timing of the process to enable receiving feedback earlier in the quarter (8%) and to provide this service to all university classes each term (8%). Other comments addressed refining the scheduling process and encouraging students to be more specific in their remarks.

From this study, it is apparent that an instrument asking broad questions could easily yield specific information on classes, which in turn increased lecturer awareness of the effectiveness of and ways to improve particular teaching methods. This often resulted in change as well as movement toward enhancing the expertise of lecturers, as staff acted upon many

225

recommendations either in the current class or in future renditions. Although they tended to cite general reasons for participating in the SGID program, the modifications made and techniques retained as a result addressed very specific aspects of the course. Additionally, this process opened up discussions of instructional approaches with both students and teaching consultants. Finally, some were engaged in this process and continued to use it to investigate the effectiveness of new approaches they carried out in future classes.

Conclusion and recommendations

In recent years, there has been an increased expectation that lecturers monitor, reflect upon, and demonstrate efforts to improve their effectiveness. The Small Group Instructional Diagnosis was created to facilitate this process mid-term so lecturers can get feedback while the class is still in session. Previous research tended to focus on reactions to and perceptions of the SGID, as well as case studies of single classes. This study was unique in that it surveyed all participating lecturers at the end of the term to explore specifically how they interpreted student comments, what information they reported gaining from the process, as well as if and how they applied this information to their teaching. Overall, it investigated whether the SGID can lead to change in teaching.

Results showed that the SGID expanded lecturer awareness of how their educational techniques and approaches are perceived by students. Understanding the experience of the class – from the student perspective – helped staff identify the concerns, misunderstandings, and apprehensions that may have been barriers to learning. Alternately, it assisted lecturers in gaining confidence regarding the appropriateness of their approaches and new methodology they were introducing into their classes. The instrument also promoted two-way communication with learners on instructional design and decision making. In addition to allowing lecturers to further comprehend student concerns, it made students more aware of the considerations and constraints that go into course planning and delivery. It also facilitated open discussions about course goals and the teaching–learning process.

Finally, lecturers who participated in this process came away with increased knowledge of alternative instructional tools and methods to meet their educational goals. They also gained motivation to implement new approaches and/or modify existing techniques. Most often, they refined the way they conducted their classes or amended assignments and means used to evaluate student work. Some reviewed subject matter emphases and spent more class time clarifying their expectations of students. The effects of the SGID reached beyond the current class, however. The vast majority of

226

lecturers who participated in this decided to carry the changes they initiated – as well as introduce some additional modifications – into future classes. A number also articulated a commitment to continue using formal means of checking in with their students during the term and getting feedback on how they are running the class. Therefore, it appears to be a useful tool in motivating, creating, and maintaining change among staff in efforts to strengthen their teaching.

Suggestions for further research

Future investigations should look at the long-term effects of this instrument on teaching. One approach would be to compare mid-term feedback received by the same staff member over the course of several years, to see how student comments change over time as the lecturer responds to comments and implements changes. Another approach would be to triangulate this information with end-of-term assessment forms, comparing ratings received in terms prior to participating in SGIDs with those received following the program. Do student appraisals of teaching improve if lecturers respond to their concerns and suggestions? It would also be useful to compare staff who returned the surveys with those who did not. By numbering questionnaires and connecting them to the type of feedback received, it may be possible to see whether there is a trend. For instance, is there greater likelihood that staff who receive more constructive criticism will complete the surveys than those whose students are more satisfied with their class? Are they less likely to do so? Do members of some disciplines complete the forms at a higher rate than others? Does rank influence who responds?

It was a challenge to conduct a complete SGID with very large classes (100 students or more). In these cases, only the first two steps (collecting individual and small group responses) were used. The facilitator later analyzed trends and common responses to emphasize in the final report. Future investigations could compare the usefulness of information gleaned from this approach with those of smaller classes that engaged in the full process.

In summary, responses from lecturers in this study reveal that the Small Group Instructional Diagnosis is a valuable tool in helping them monitor their teaching by identifying their strengths and understanding student concerns, as well as noting areas to address. It promotes change by lecturers, and increases their awareness of options available for instruction. This study shows that staff made changes and applied what they learned in both current and future classes in an effort to become better lecturers.

227

Acknowledgement

References

ANGELO T. A. & CROSS, K. P. (1993) *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Lecturers* (2nd edn). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

BLACK, B. (1998) 'Using the SGID Method for a Variety of Purposes', in M. Kaplan (ed.) *To Improve the Academy: Resources for Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development*, pp. 245–262. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

CLARK, D. J. & REDMOND, M. V. (1982a) 'A Practical Approach to Improving Teaching', *AAHE Bulletin* (February): 8–10, 34.

CLARK, D. J. & REDMOND, M. V. (1982b) *Small Group Instructional Diagnosis: Final Report* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 217954).

DIAMOND, N. A. (1988) 'S. G. I. D. (Small Group Instructional Diagnosis): Tapping Student Perceptions of Teaching', in E. C. Wadsworth (ed.) *POD: A Handbook for New Practitioners*, pp. 89–93. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

DIAMOND, N. & SMOCK, R. (1985) 'Description and Evaluation of the Senior Clinical Interview Process'. Paper presented at the Tenth National Conference of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education.

INSTITUTE FOR LEARNING AND TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION, http://www.ilt.ac.uk (accessed 10 April 2003).

KULIK, J. A. (2001) 'Student Ratings: Validity, Utility and Controversy', in M. Theall, P. C. Abrami, and L. A. Mets (eds) *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, pp. 9–25. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

KYGER, B. L. (1984) 'Using a Class Interview as a Formative Evaluation Technique', *Journal of Staff, Program and Organization Development* 11(4): 97–99.

LEWIS, K. G. (1991) 'Gathering Data for the Improvement of Teaching: What Do I Need and How Can I Get It?', in M. Theall and J. Franklin (eds) *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, pp. 65–82. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

NYQUIST, J. D. & WULFF, D. H. (1988) 'Consultation Using a Research Perspective', in E. C. Wadsworth (ed.) *POD: A Handbook for New Practitioners*, pp. 81–88. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

PAULSEN, M. B. & FELDMAN, K. A. (1995) *Taking Teaching Seriously: Meeting the Challenge of Instructional Improvement*, pp. 9–18. Washington, DC: George Washington University Press.

ROBINSON, K. (1995) *Using Small Group Instructional Feedback as a Formative Feedback Strategy for Audioconference Sources: Practical Guidelines for Audio Conference Lecturers and Facilitators* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 420347).

SHERRY, A. C., FULFORD, C. P. & ZHANG, S. (1998) 'Assessing Distance Learners' Satisfaction with Instruction: A Quantitative and a Qualitative Measure', *The American Journal of Distance Education* 12(3): 4–28.

WEIMER, J. (1990) *Improving College Teaching*, pp. 107–108. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

WULFF, D., STATON-SPICE, A., HESS, C. & NYQUIST, J. (1984) 'The Student Perspective on Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness'. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association.

228

Appendix 1

Small Group Instructional Development (SGID)

Directions: Please answer the following questions. For each of these, try to focus on specific behaviors and describe why you like something, or why you think your suggested improvement would be beneficial.

1. What aspects of this course/instruction enhance your learning?

2. What aspects of this course/instruction can be improved?

3. What could *you* – as a student – do to make the course better for you, your class-mates and the instructor?

Appendix 2

SGID group report

Directions: For each of the three topics below, please share and briefly describe your points. Only AFTER all members of the group have spoken should you discuss the points raised. You should come up with 2–3 main points for each topic, with the group reaching consensus on the points. Please choose a reporter and recorder for your group.

1. What aspects of this course/instruction enhance your learning?

2. What aspects of this course/instruction can be improved?

3. What could *you* – as a student – do to make the course better for you, your class-mates and the instructor?

Appendix 3

SGID final rating

Directions: Please rate on a scale of 1–9, your degree of agreement with the overall class rating.

What aspects of this course/instruction enhance your learning?

1. _____
    ——1——2——3——4——5——6——7——8——9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

2. _____
    ——1——2——3——4——5——6——7——8——9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

229

3. _____
——1———2———3———4———5———6———7———8———9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

4. _____
——1———2———3———4———5———6———7———8———9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

What aspects of this course/instruction could be improved?

1. _____
——1———2———3———4———5———6———7———8———9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

2. _____
——1———2———3———4———5———6———7———8———9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

3. _____
——1———2———3———4———5———6———7———8———9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

4. _____
——1———2———3———4———5———6———7———8———9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

What could *you* – as a student – do to make the course better for you, your classmates and the instructor?

1. _____
——1———2———3———4———5———6———7———8———9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

2. _____
——1———2———3———4———5———6———7———8———9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

3. _____
——1———2———3———4———5———6———7———8———9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

4. _____
——1———2———3———4———5———6———7———8———9——
strongly disagree   strongly agree

Biographical note

MIRIAM ROSALYN DIAMOND is Associate Director of Northeastern University's Center for Effective University Teaching in Boston, Massachusetts. She has conducted orientation programs, workshops, mid-term feedback and courses for academic staff

and future lecturers worldwide. She holds a PhD in Educational Processes, as well as an MA in Counseling Psychology, and has taught in both disciplines.

Address: Center for Effective University Teaching, 225 Hayden Hall, Northeastern University, 360 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115–5000, USA. [email: M.Diamond@neu.edu]

231