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ABSTRACT Essential to the improvement of teaching effectiveness is evaluation. Evaluation can take many forms, but any process directly involves the teacher. Self-evaluation is a process whereby teachers collect the data on their own teaching effectiveness and analyse the
information to consider improvement to that teaching. This process can be undertaken in a number of ways. However, the unique benefit of self-evaluation is the close involvement of teachers in the consideration of the effectiveness of their own teaching. This article considers different methods of self-evaluation and suggests a technique that has been found to be successful.

It is inherent in the role of professional teachers to strive to improve their teaching effectiveness. To achieve this goal it is necessary to assess and re-evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching methods.

**Types of Evaluation**

Such evaluation can occur at a number of levels:

-- course evaluation (Ramsden & Dodds, 1989; Mathias, 1981);

-- evaluation of teaching in a subject;

-- individual teaching performance.

There are a variety of ways to evaluate teaching (Centra, 1980) such as:

-- self-evaluation;

-- self reports;

-- student ratings;

-- colleague (peer) ratings;

-- alumni ratings;

-- videotapes;

-- student achievement.

There are a number of aspects of teaching that may be evaluated such as:

-- classroom presentation skills;

-- preparation of materials;

-- competency in the subject-matter;

-- the availability of a teacher for students;
-- the willingness and desire to work, share knowledge and skills, with colleagues both within and outside one's own teaching institution (Shirley & Earl, 1986).

However, in any evaluation process at any level it is imperative that the primary role of the teacher be remembered. It is the teacher who must decide the value of the evaluations. It is the teacher who decides to act on or ignore this vital information. It is the teacher who is the final arbiter of the effectiveness of his/her teaching. Despite the obvious importance of the teacher's role in the evaluation process, little has been written on the worth of self-evaluation. This paper will focus on what self-evaluation is, and its benefits, and give practical examples of how teachers can use this furtive source of information.

Self-evaluation

Self-evaluation can be undertaken for a variety of reasons. It can be done to determine the effectiveness of certain teaching practices. Alternatively, the results can be used to provide concrete evidence of good teaching and a commitment to its improvement.

Self-evaluation comes under a number of different guises. Terms such as self-assessment, self-ratings, self-reports or self-evaluation are used. The variety of terms reflects the different perspectives of self-evaluation.

Self-assessment

'Self-assessment' should be contrasted with the concept of 'self-reports'. Self-assessment (used interchangeably with self-ratings) might be considered to be of limited value by a promotions committee as teachers have a tendency to overrate themselves (Clark & Blackburn, 1975; O'Hanlon & Mortensen, 1980). Centra (1973) found that between a third and a quarter of teachers rated themselves better than students did. However, 15% rated themselves more poorly. Teachers tend to give themselves better ratings particularly in areas such as student-teacher interaction and openness to other points of view.

Doyle and Crichton (1978) found no teacher characteristic that would bias self-ratings and found that teachers who described themselves as better teachers reported success in getting students interested in the subject material and personally enjoyed teaching.

A number of studies have in fact found substantial agreement between student and teacher ratings (Marsh & Overall, 1979; Webb & Nolan, 1955). In particular, there was a great similarity in the aspects that students and teachers considered to be related to teacher effectiveness (Tribe et al., 1989. Doyle, op. cit.) found similarities between student, peer and self-ratings, but found that none of the ratings significantly correlated with student achievement as measured by residualized achievement.

Whether students and teachers agree in the numerical ratings of teachers, there appears to be general agreement as to the characteristics of a 'good teacher'. The difficulty is that unless there are objective performance indicators against which one can rate oneself, there is an inherent lack
of credibility to self-assessments (Roe, 1982). A self-report provides an objective method to provide information about a teacher's performance.

**Content of Self-reports**

For the purposes of providing evidence of good teaching practices, the self-report (also called a teaching profile or portfolio) is of value. The self-report should include a description of responsibilities and performance in teaching together with illustrative materials and evidence (O'Hanlon & Mortensen, op. cit.). Johnstone (1990) suggests that the self-report should include items such as the objectives and syllabus of a course and the methods used in teaching and marking. A self-report gives teachers an opportunity to describe their teaching commitments and accomplishments. This should include 'student advising, research and scholarship, community service, college service and whatever other areas may be appropriate' (Centra, 1973). Other items that could be included are evidence of student learning or student accomplishments such as course projects or term papers.

Centra suggests that the self-report should be the first step in an evaluation process and can provide concrete material for a promotions committee to consider the teacher's teaching accomplishments. Another purpose for the self-report is as a form of self-analysis for instructional improvement. This report can also form the basis for advice by a senior faculty member. This aspect of a self-report is closer to a form of self-evaluation.

**Self-evaluation**

**Teacher Motivation to Self-evaluate**

Central to the use of self-evaluation as a means of improving a teacher's performance is the concept that one must want to improve or change for an improvement or change to occur. This is one of the values of self-evaluation in that the teachers are most likely to act on data that they collect (O'Hanlon & Mortensen, op. cit.). However, teachers must be open to criticism and be aware of their strengths and weaknesses to effect a real change in their teaching performance (Moses, 1986). One view as to why assessment of teaching leads to improvement is cognitive dissonance (Centra, op. cit.). The basis of this is that the evaluation produces dissatisfaction with the teacher's performance which results in a desire to change. Student ratings have been shown to produce only a small improvement in teaching effectiveness (Murray, 1984). Student evaluations per se may not induce change but they can be used as a source of primary information. Self-ratings mismatched with student ratings are more likely to lead to an improvement in teaching effectiveness as self-evaluation will have greater credibility with the teacher. Training workshops aimed at helping staff reflect and monitor their own teaching have also resulted in an improvement in teaching performance (Moses, op. cit).

An interesting study was conducted by Warner (1980). He designed a program for trainee teachers to learn teaching skills by increasing the students' awareness of their teaching potential and to help the students develop self-analysis skills to evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching. The students had the support of a supervisor throughout the program. Most students preferred feedback from a supervisor, ideally with video playback and peer involvement at the
same time. The focus, however, was on encouraging the students to look at themselves and determine their strengths and weaknesses. Warner comments that the students appeared to become more discriminating about their self-perceptions and whether they had identifiable teacher characteristics. In rating themselves on five micro teaching skills before and after undertaking the program, 80% altered their ratings on one scale or more. Warner concluded that the use of the expounded training model was of value for two reasons, these being that it (1) increased student awareness of researched qualities and characteristics of good teaching and (2) assisted them in looking for those qualities in themselves. Students generally rated the awareness program more favourably than the straight skills programs.

On balance, it is apparent that self-evaluation is integral in an effective evaluation process. However, when used with other evaluation methods the desired improvement might be more pronounced.

**Self-evaluation as Part of an Overall Evaluation Process**

Inherent in the program designed by Warner was supervisor and peer interaction in addition to self-evaluation. It is important to place the role of self-evaluation in context. It can serve as a form of evaluation in itself and it is also the way in which other forms of evaluation are correlated in order sensibly to address all evidence as to the teacher's effectiveness (Ramsden & Dodds, op. cit). The latter aspect would occur innately when a teacher received student surveys or peer reviews. The effectiveness of the assimilation of this valuable information might be improved if a structured approach was taken by the teacher. Ramsden & Dodds suggest that the information be tabulated listing the evaluation findings, with possible actions appearing opposite. Undertaking this exercise forces the teacher to focus on the methods that are working well and aspects of the teaching process that need reviewing. Ramsden and Dodds consider that "reflective and honest self-evaluation of this kind is a demonstration of one's dedication to excellence in teaching". This information can then form part of the teacher's self-report for appraisal purposes.

**How to Self-evaluate**

The more usual understanding of self-evaluation is when teachers engage in a process to review the effectiveness of their own teaching. When assessing teaching performance, the teacher should interact with both peers and superiors and reflect on the information provided. Elton (1984) lists a number of methods that can assist self-evaluation:

-- checklists such as questions on a student feedback form;

-- audio and visual feedback;

-- co-operation with colleagues;

-- observation of others;

-- annual retrospective and prospective reports.
For self-evaluation to be accepted and respected it must be systematic. There are a number of ways to engage in systematic self-evaluation.

**Checklists**

Johnstone (op. cit.) suggests items that could be included in a checklist:

-- Are the aims of the course explicit?

-- Is the content accurate and up to date?

-- Are students being given an opportunity to develop relevant skills?

-- Are the teaching methods appropriate, supporting the aims and objectives of the course?

-- Are students given sufficient feedback about their performance?

-- Do the students believe that the teacher is accessible for assistance out of class? -- Is the course too demanding or not demanding enough?

Ramsden and Dodds (op. cit.) provide a Lecture Self-evaluation Checklist. This is a valuable tool which provides objective criteria to consider. Both the Johnstone and the Ramsden and Dodds models focus on micro-teaching skills and ask for a reflective response, to be styled as open questions. Not all items will be relevant for every class and teachers should select the issues that they wish to focus on. This means that the checklist could change from subject to subject, and from semester to semester.

When compiling a checklist it is important to keep in mind that the goal is to improve teaching. To this end, the qualities of a good teacher should be considered. A comprehensive description by Ramsden (1991) appears as Appendix 1.

Elton cites a study by Brown (1978) which elicited characteristics of a good teacher from discussions with university teachers (see also Sarros, 1986):

-- well organised

-- well prepared

-- interested in the subject

-- friendly

-- flexible

-- helpful
-- creative
-- clear
-- enthusiastic
-- interested in the students
-- open
-- systematic
-- committed

Elton comments that, like a good cook, each teacher would mix a certain individual blend. However, the value lies in considering the effect of these factors on the teacher's own performance.

Another form of checklist has been propounded by Fox (1984). Fox considers that self-evaluation can form the basis of discussions with a consultant or observer and suggests that the first step is to identify how much time teachers think they spend on teaching. One suggested method is the use of a table to determine the amount of time allocated to different teaching functions.

Self-evaluation checklists can have added value by including them as part of a teacher's self-report for appraisal purposes.

**Video Playback**

The value in using a video playback is that teachers can study the video in private any number of times. It is important in an evaluation process that teachers do not get more information than they can assimilate. One of the key values in the video playback method is that teachers can view segments at any time and replay sections that they wish to focus on.

Tribe and Fletcher (1984) undertook a study to consider the reactions of teachers to videos of their classes. The premise of the research was that the nature of teachers' reactions was important in using television to assist teachers to improve their teaching effectiveness. Generally, teachers experienced some anxiety about being recorded. On reviewing the tape, the primary response was related to the teachers' personal appearance or voice quality. Only two teachers out of 21 made comments about their teaching strategy. Tribe and Fletcher conclude that the teachers may have, therefore, learnt little about their teaching and ways to improve their teaching skills. However, a study in the USA was cited which found that student teachers trained in analysing their performance by video focused more on the act of teaching. Ideally, prior to engaging in a 'self-confrontation' session, teachers should consider means of analysing their teaching.
The teacher reaction to video playback highlights one of the key difficulties in ensuring teaching improvement through the use of self-evaluation. The teacher must be willing to assess critically and consider the results of the undertaking. The course log method of self-evaluation might force this consideration to be made.

Course Log

Johnstone (op. cit.) suggests a method of recording the process of self-evaluation by means of a course log book. He suggests the matters that could be recorded include:

-- the good things in the teaching of the course;
-- any problems that have emerged and how they are to be resolved;
-- evaluations conducted;
-- results of student work.

This has formed the basis of preparation for classes in the teaching profession for a long time. It is noteworthy that a lesson plan has, as part of its design, evaluation of each class (also called post-test lesson objectives). The value of the lesson plan is that it focuses attention on the objectives to be achieved in each class, the ways to achieve the objectives and the effectiveness of the teaching undertaken. These are the key elements required for a structured training programme under the Training Guarantee (Administration) Act 1990. The lesson plan also anticipates that a number of methods will be used in each class and considers how long each step will take.

Self-evaluation: a Case Study

One of the main criticisms of self-evaluation is that it takes too much time. Ramsden and Dodds (op. cit.) counter this argument by pointing out that with practice the technique takes only a short time. After a time, it may also be necessary only when introducing new material or new methods. The writer's own experience after undertaking the process systematically for half a semester is that this is indeed true. Like all skills one becomes proficient at it the more it is practised.

The writer has conducted a style of course log on tax seminars. The approach taken was similar in design to the lesson plan model. The main purpose was to assess the value of certain new teaching methods that were introduced, rather than course content. The students were asked in the first class what they wanted out of the classes. The most striking factor in this exercise was that it was apparent that most students had never given any thought as to what they wanted from their learning environment and that they had never been asked. There was also a reluctance to give 'unacceptable' answers. But, after the initial reticence, the common answers were 'how to pass exams' and 'spoon feeding'. There was a clear lack of any innate desire to learn the subject material for its own sake.
The next step in the process was to keep an ongoing record of the teaching methods used and a commentary on their success. The headings considered were:

-- method;
-- objectives;
-- comment;
-- success.

This was done for each teaching method (of which there would be a number) intended to be used in the class hour. The main intention was to consider the purpose for each teaching component and then to reflect on its effectiveness. The headings 'method' and 'objectives' were completed before each class. The headings 'comment' and 'success' were completed immediately after the teaching sessions. The distinction was made between 'comment' and 'success' to force a consideration of the overall effectiveness of the teaching method. Included under comment were the writer's own observations and any student comment made about the teaching sessions. Examples of completed reviews appear in Appendix 2.

The next step in this process was to ask the students what they thought and correlate this with the writer's own views. It is clear that this step is fundamental in engaging effectively in a self-evaluation process. One of the key global questions the writer had posed about the teaching style adopted was whether it was indeed a form of spoon feeding and whether that was 'educationally sound'. The mid-semester seminar evaluation offered four statements:

-- what I like most about these classes is...
-- one thing I would like done differently is...
-- the most important thing I have learned in the last six weeks is...
-- what I want to do/learn is...

The key response was that students liked the handouts (34 out of 61). The interesting point to note about the 'handouts' was that all but two were not handouts in the traditional sense. There were incomplete handouts, checklists, categorising activities and question sheets which all required student input to be meaningful (examples appear in Appendix 3). The other recurrent themes were clear explanations/focusing/structure (24 out of 61), enthusiasm (11 out of 61) and the interactive style of the classes (8 out of 61). These four key items clearly sit with the findings of Brown and Ramsden (discussed earlier).

The primary purpose of evaluation is to make a decision as to whether to modify, cancel or continue with a particular form of training. The main result of the writer's self-evaluations, supported by the results of the mid-semester student evaluation, was the decision to continue with the style of teaching. This was an introductory discussion of the topic by the use of buzz
groups focusing on an incomplete handout or checklist, to encourage interactive and co-operative learning, followed by a summary before applying the law to the seminar problem. In considering whether 'spoon feeding' was educationally sound (by use of handouts), the writer formed the view that it certainly aids student learning. Having that base understanding might give the students an interest and give them time to engage in deep learning. Certain seminars were also specifically aimed at deep learning (e.g. Seminar 5 cited in Appendix 3). A student survey (of 41 students) conducted at the end of the semester supported this opinion. Statements addressed specifically whether the students considered that the classes were aimed at optimal learning. The students ranked statements on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest). The statements 'class sessions are organised to ensure maximum learning' and 'the lecturer develops a class atmosphere conducive to learning' both rated at 4.6.

However, the writer did amend the method of self-evaluation used. It became apparent after a number of weeks that the same objectives were coming up time and again. This led to the creation of a global list of objectives (listed in Appendix 4). Then, each time the objectives were outlined, numbers only had to be allocated consistent with the global list. Any additional objectives unique to the method were naturally also identified. This approach saved time in undertaking the evaluation process. In retrospect, ideally the global objectives should have been verbalised at the beginning, rather than simply being assumed, to focus the teaching. Clearly, the objectives might change according to the subject-matter or the teacher's perspective.

**Conclusion**

As professional teachers, it behoves academics to monitor continually the effectiveness of their teaching. Regardless of the type of evaluation used, the prime determinant of the value of the information is the teacher. Self-evaluation is a means of involving the teacher more directly in the assessment process as well as in the analysis of the data obtained. Self-evaluation can be a valuable process from both the perspective of providing 'objective' evidence of 'good teaching' practices and for developmental purposes.

The primary focus of self-evaluation is reflection. The teacher must reflect on the effectiveness of his/her teaching to gather the information. A reconsideration is then undertaken when analysing the information collected. The integrity of the data is difficult to criticise, which makes the outcomes of the analysis more compelling. This process takes more time than other forms of evaluation. The potential bias in teachers' own self-ratings should also be noted. However, teachers who are so committed to their teaching that they are willing to undertake such a 'soul searching' exercise can only find their efforts rewarded.

Self-evaluation is inherent in teaching, whether conscious or subconscious. Like many worthy talents a catalyst may be needed to bring the innate to the conscious surface. Schon (1991) in arguing for reflective practice, calls conscious behaviour 'knowing in action'. These are things that we do without 'thinking about it'. This knowing in action usually 'gets us through the day', but on occasion something surprising happens that requires us to think about our actions. Schon argues that we must reflect on our knowing in action to enhance our conscious skills. In fact, he considers that this is one of the key skills necessary to be a professional, as such persons are constantly placed in unfamiliar situations where they are required to, for example, 'think like a
lawyer'. This involves a reflective skill to apply the rules in a new way, which demonstrates the value of self-evaluation. By reflecting on the obvious, we, as professional teachers, may discover the link between 'good teaching' and 'effective learning'. Each teacher is individual. Each teacher has a different style. Each teacher has something unique to offer to students. Only individual teachers, by reviewing their own teaching, can discover how to bring their talents to the surface and develop their special skills to be a 'good teacher'.
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Appendix 1. The Qualities of a Good Teacher

Figure 1

What is Good Teaching in Higher Education?

- Wanting to share your love of the subject
- Making the material stimulating
- Working at the student's level
- Using clear explanations
- Making it clear what has to be understood and why
- Showing concern and respect for students
- Encouraging student independence
- Using teaching methods that require students to learn actively and cooperatively
• Using appropriate assessment
• Giving high quality feedback
• Learning from students about the effects of teaching

Taken from Ramsden (1991)

Appendix 2. The Course Log
Seminar 1

Method

Pyramiding. On the facts of the seminar problem, individually consider four factors which are relevant. In groups of four decide if John was a resident or non-resident and determine the three weightiest factors. Write up the answer on an overhead transparency and one member to present the case to the class. The group answers are written on the whiteboard. Dissenting decisions are allowed.

Objectives

1. Individual analysis of facts and applying law
2. Discussion with group--group learning
3. Presenting argument to a group
4. Determining weight of factors

Comment

1. Groups of 4 probably too large.
2. Were a number of dissenting judgments.
3. Putting answers on whiteboard helped indicate common views/factors.
4. Most students participated actively.

Success

Look slightly longer than class discussion, but participation by more people.

Seminar 2

Method

Ballot on policy questions asked to consider between classes.

Objectives

1. To show that work which is set for homework is used.
2. Lead in to discussion about policy behind tax and concept of permanent place of abode.
3. To get students to consider yes/no answers, i.e. to realise there are grey areas and that black-and-white answers are not always possible.

Comment

1. Ballot not possible with large class, done by show of hands.
2. Not effective as a lead in because it lacked structure.
3. Students gave results from cases, not a critical perspective.

Success

Limited, except got students to consider answers from cases.

Seminar 3

Method

Three most important things about Sections 38-43.

Objective

1. To ensure they noted three most important things.
2. Catch their attention.
3. Structure the information.

Comment

1. Most wrote down three important things.
2. Did catch their attention.

Success

Yes. If all the goal is, is to pass on information. Does not challenge the student to think.

Method

Class broken up into teams on the previous week; 5 minutes each by each spokesperson for the taxpayer and Commissioner counsel and 5 minutes for the bench's decision. Arguments and bench's decision on the whiteboard.

Objective

1. Encourage group/co-operative learning.
2. Summarise arguments for class and 'decision' for class.
3. Show how decisions can be split, i.e. Law is not black and white.
Comment

1. Students should have prepared because given advance notice.
2. Not all students actively participated, some (half to third) chose to opt out. This could be owing to class size.
3. Created lively class discussion.
4. Most copied down whiteboard.
5. Most class members were interested and listening if not contributing,
6. Limited discussion on actual cases (factual), more on legal reasoning. Therefore, assumes some prior learning.

Success

Yes. Brought out ideas I hadn't thought of. Got down the `whys' instead of the `rules'.

Student comments

1. It motivates me to work. The class goes too quickly. I can't keep up without working, but the class goes so fast, I enjoy it.
2. I think rather than write.
3. I think it is the best seminar I've had because of the enthusiasm.

Seminar 5

Method

Divide up into groups of four to determine three key issues arising out of Myer on overhead transparency. Answers on whiteboard.

Objective

1. Draw student's attention to the importance of Myer.
2. Group discussion.
3. Get most students involved in discussion.

Comment

1. Generally knew what to do. 2. Answers given not 100% correct, so enabled testing of understanding on difficult concepts.
2. Led to interactive class discussion.
3. Students were given warning to read Myer. Even though basics of case were not discussed, lost few students. Got away from surface reaming to deeper understanding.
4. No time was wasted on pure information. Discussed difficult concepts of law straight off with good interaction.
5. Some students keen to put their cases forward, others reluctant but could be cajoled.
Success

Yes, best way is to use overhead transparency to check understanding. Pleased with base level of understanding. All had obviously done some `thinking'.

Student comment: I think in the class and learn a lot faster.

Appendix 3. Examples of Student Handouts

Taxation Law: Seminar One

Common Law Test of Residency

The factors taken into account are:

1. physical presence in Australia
2. citizenship and nat...
3. frequency, duration and purpose of ...
4. business or ... ties with
5. ownership of ...
6. mode of ...
7. whether a place of abode is maintained ...

Relevant cases are Cooper v. Cadwalder, Levene v. IRC and L........

Taxation Law: Seminar 5

The Myer Emporium Ltd

How long was the loan for?

How much was the loan for?

What was the interest rate?

What was the consideration for the assignment?

What was it an assignment of?

What was the taxpayer's business?

Why did Citicorp agree to the deal? (at p. 207)

Why was this structure used?

Why did Hill Samuel advise this course?
What were the two principal reasons for the decision? at pp. 216 and 218

What did Hill J. in Cooling consider were the two principal 'strands of thought' from the decision (at pp. 4, 482)

**Cooling**

How much was the payment?

Who was it paid to?

Who was the lessee of the premises?

How long was the lease?

When was the lease taken up?

Where were the leased premises?

What was the taxpayer's occupation?

What was the payment for?

What else could the taxpayer have taken instead of the cash?

Tax wise, would the taxpayer have been better off?

(IT 2631) What was the basis of the decision?

**Taxation Law: Seminar Six**

**Self-test Questionnaire**

You should now be able to do all the following with moderate ease. You can write the answers beside the questions or merely check that you can do each item reasonably efficiently. It is recommended that you don't leave all your learning to the end of semester. If you have any difficulties, please come and see me. My 'phone no. is 864-2734.

1. Can you state six factors in applying the common law test of residency?
2. Can you list the three main cases on the common law test of residency?
3. Can you state two main cases on the concept of permanent place of abode?
4. Can you isolate three types of income and the respective sources of income?
5. Do you understand the difference between the receipts and accrual bases of derivation of income and when each is applied?
6. Can you list eight factors that are relevant in determining if a sum is classed as income?
7. Can you state three main cases on determining if a betting receipt is income?
8. Can you apply the factors to determine if a compensation payment is income or capital?
9. Have you categorised the income cases according to the issues?
10. Have you read Whitfords Beach, Myer and Cooling?
11. Can you concisely state the two main principles arising from Myer?
12. Can you discuss why Cooling was a significant decision?

Appendix 4. Global Objectives

1. Co-operative learning
2. Interaction between student-student and student-teacher
3. Learning structure in answering questions such as `review the law and then apply it'
4. Analysis of law and facts
5. How to identify issues
6. Motivate interest in the subject
7. Encourage self-learning
8. Belief that they can `do it'
9. Make them think
10. To develop a critical perspective
11. Make them read cases and legislation
12. Have a summary to take away
13. Explain `how to pass exams'
14. How to prepare for open book exams
15. Advocacy skills

Appendix 5. Glossary of Terms

Peer: A colleague from within the teacher's own faculty or otherwise, but not in the role of a superior or manager

Professional: A person with entry-standard qualifications working in an area of change

Self-assessment: When teachers rate their teaching effectiveness, usually on a scale

Self-evaluation: A process undertaken by teachers to review the effectiveness of their teaching with the goal of improving teaching performance

Self-report: A record kept by a teacher outlining teaching accomplishments

Teacher: An academic in a teaching role
Teaching effectiveness: The indication of a teacher's performance in achieving the goal of ultimate student learning
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