

**FACULTY SENATE**

**SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY SENATE BILL 20-A-XX**

Approved by the Faculty Senate  
XXXXXXXXXX

**BRIEF SUMMARY:** This bill revises the existing procedures portion of the *Faculty Handbook* section on *Student Evaluation of Instruction* (Chapter 3, Section C10).

**ACTION OF BILL REVISING THE PROCEDURE SECTION OF “STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION”**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** Subject to the passage and approval of this bill and its companion policy bill, the procedures portion of the Student Evaluation of Instruction section of the faculty handbook (Chapter 3, Section C10) will be replaced by this bill.

**Student Evaluation of Instruction**

**Procedures** *Faculty Senate Bill 20-A-X begins here.*

**Selection and Administration of University-wide Course Evaluation Instruments**

~~—The course/instructor evaluation instrument(s) used within a department during the semesters when a nationally normed, university wide evaluation instrument is not utilized must be approved by a 2/3 vote of the 175 faculty of that department. The instrument(s) should recognize the diversity of subject matter, instructional styles, and student groups across and within disciplines. Faculty may add additional questions to the instrument(s) to ensure that all appropriate data needed for instructional improvement are provided.~~

~~—The student evaluation is to be administered by the departmental chair or designate. Appropriate procedures will be developed by the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning and/or department chairs to require timely administration and processing of the evaluations and to ensure the integrity of the entire student evaluation process. Instructions for completing the instrument and adequate time for the completion in class will be provided. Students will be informed (a) that the data and written comments on the evaluation form are confidential, (b) that the data will be an important part of the information considered in improving instruction at Southeast Missouri State, and (c) that the instructor will not have access to the data until final grades have been processed. The faculty member will not be present during the evaluation, and the results will not be available until after final grades have been processed.~~

~~—The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will assist in the processing of the evaluations. The results will be returned to the faculty member. Evaluations will also be~~

25 ~~forwarded by the department chair to the dean of the college for all courses in a semester when a~~  
26 ~~summary measure of teaching effectiveness selected by Faculty Senate is below the nationally~~  
27 ~~normed 20th percentile for at least two courses in the same semester. The dean, in consultation~~  
28 ~~with the department chair and faculty member, may then suggest further classroom evaluation by~~  
29 ~~peers, attendance at instructional development activities provided by the Center for Scholarship~~  
30 ~~in Teaching and Learning, or attendance at other instructional development workshops or~~  
31 ~~programs relevant to the appropriate discipline. It is expressly understood that the department~~  
32 ~~chair and dean of the college will use the results only for encouraging teaching improvement,~~  
33 ~~and not for any other personnel decisions. It is also understood that evaluations with response~~  
34 ~~rates that are too low to be reliable will not be forwarded to the dean of the college. The Center~~  
35 ~~for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will receive a copy of the results from the nationally-~~  
36 ~~normed instrument and may receive a copy of the department assessment if the faculty member~~  
37 ~~so desires. The results of the evaluation of the department chair will be distributed to the dean~~  
38 ~~and a faculty member designated by the department. Confidentiality among these individuals~~  
39 ~~must be maintained. Any other use of the results requires the approval of the faculty member,~~  
40 ~~except in cases where the aggregate data are used for specific institutional reporting purposes.~~

41  
42 ~~—As part of its commitment to improving and assuring quality instruction, the University shall~~  
43 ~~provide professional development resources and assistance to improve teaching effectiveness.~~  
44 ~~The Director of the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will be responsible for~~  
45 ~~coordinating effective mentoring systems, seminars, workshops, instructional materials, and~~  
46 ~~other professional development activities and for ensuring that faculty development is suggested~~  
47 ~~and professional development resources provided to support improvement of instructional~~  
48 ~~quality.~~

49  
50 ~~—In summary, student evaluation of instruction may be viewed as part of a continuous,~~  
51 ~~formative process of assessment used to measure the effectiveness of classroom instruction by~~  
52 ~~faculty members. This process should culminate in an overall view of the instructional and~~  
53 ~~content effectiveness of the courses being examined.~~

### 54 55 ~~Student Evaluation for Comparing and Contrasting Southeast with Other Universities~~

56  
57 ~~A nationally normed student rating course student evaluation of instruction form will be~~  
58 ~~selected by a method recommended by the Faculty Senate and will be designated for this~~  
59 ~~institution-wide purpose. This student rating form will be administered campus-wide, every~~  
60 ~~spring semester, in every section of every class taught, except where the use of the instrument is~~  
61 ~~deemed invalid such as individual instruction sections, inapplicable, by the developer or where~~  
62 ~~an integrated set of courses may best be evaluated by a single administration of the evaluation~~  
63 ~~instrument. Courses to be exempted from using the campus-wide instrument should be~~  
64 ~~determined by the department in consultation with the college dean. The costs of administration~~  
65 ~~of this form shall be borne by the Office of the Provost. The data collected from this~~  
66 ~~administration will be used to compare and contrast Southeast to other universities. The~~  
67 ~~nationally normed instrument will be administered campus-wide during specified semesters as~~

68 ~~described above.~~ Separate departmental evaluation instruments, if approved by the department as  
69 ~~previously~~ described below, may be administered during these same semesters if so desired by  
70 the department and/or the individual faculty member. Any additional questions added to the  
71 student evaluations of instruction should be reviewed by the appropriate department committee.  
72

73 The university-wide instrument student evaluation of instruction form will be examined at  
74 least every five years to determine if it is adequately addressing the needs of the university. In  
75 the event that a change to the instrument is warranted, the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs  
76 Committee and additional representatives selected by a designee from the Office of the  
77 Provost will coordinate the implementation of changes and new procedures regarding the  
78 evaluation and reporting process.  
79

80 The student evaluation of instruction form(s) used within a department during the semesters  
81 when a university-wide evaluation instrument is not mandated must be approved by a two-  
82 thirds vote of the faculty of that department. The instrument(s) should recognize the diversity  
83 of subject matter, instructional styles, and student groups across and within disciplines. Faculty  
84 may add additional questions to the instrument(s) to ensure that all appropriate data needed for  
85 instructional improvement are provided.  
86

87 Student evaluations of instruction may be administered by the faculty member, the  
88 department chair, or a department designee. If administered by the faculty member, the  
89 instructor should not be in the room while students are completing the evaluation. If the  
90 evaluation is in written form, a designate should return the completed evaluations to the  
91 departmental office. Appropriate procedures will be developed by the Office of Information  
92 Technology and/or department chairs to require timely administration and processing of the  
93 evaluations and to ensure the integrity of the entire student evaluation process. Instructions for  
94 completing the instrument and adequate time for the completion in class will be provided.  
95 Students will be informed:

- 96 a) that the data and written comments on the evaluation form are confidential,  
97 b) that the data will be an important part of the information considered in improving  
98 instruction at Southeast Missouri State, and  
99 c) that the instructor will not have access to the data until final grades have been  
100 processed.  
101

102 The results of the student evaluations of instruction will be returned to the faculty  
103 member and the department chair. When a university-wide instrument is required and the  
104 results indicate significant evidence of dissatisfactory performance on 50% or more of classes  
105 during one calendar year (spring and fall semesters), then evaluations for all courses from that  
106 instructor that year will be forwarded by the department chair to the dean of the college. The  
107 threshold of dissatisfactory performance on student evaluations of instruction is a course  
108 average of 2.0 or lower on a 5-point Likert scale (or equivalent) where lower values indicate  
109 lower satisfaction. In cases when evaluations are forwarded to the dean by the department  
110 chair, the faculty member must be given the opportunity to submit narrative with the

111 evaluation results within 10 business days of the unsatisfactory report being sent to the dean.  
112 The results of student evaluations of instruction of the department chair will be distributed to  
113 the chair and the dean of the college.

114  
115 The department chair, in consultation with the dean and faculty member, may also  
116 suggest further classroom evaluation by peers, attendance at instructional development  
117 activities provided by the Center for Teaching and Learning, or attendance at other  
118 instructional development workshops or programs relevant to the appropriate discipline.

119  
120 It is expressly understood that the department chair and dean of the college will use the  
121 results only to improve teaching. Any other use of the results requires the approval of the  
122 faculty member, except in cases where the aggregate data are used for specific institutional  
123 reporting purposes. Evaluations with response rates that are too low to be reliable (either fewer  
124 than 5 responses or below a 25% response rate, whichever is greater) will not be forwarded to  
125 the dean of the college.

126  
127 As part of its commitment to improving and assuring quality instruction, the University  
128 shall provide professional development resources and assistance to improve teaching  
129 effectiveness. Vice Provost will be responsible for coordinating effective mentoring systems,  
130 seminars, workshops, instructional materials, and other professional development activities  
131 and for ensuring that faculty development is suggested, and professional development  
132 resources provided to support improvement of instructional quality.

133  
134 In summary, student evaluation of instruction may be viewed as part of a continuous,  
135 formative process of assessment used to measure the effectiveness of classroom instruction by  
136 faculty members. This process should culminate in an overall view of the instructional and  
137 content effectiveness of the courses being examined.

### 138 139 **Appropriate Use of Student Evaluation of Instruction Information in Personnel Decisions**

140  
141 Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report numerical results from the ~~nationally-~~  
142 ~~normed university-wide~~ instrument and/or the specific department assessment form(s) for  
143 evidence of teaching effectiveness in personnel decisions (such as promotion, tenure, merit  
144 pay, or termination.). Faculty members may not be compelled to submit student evaluation of  
145 instruction results for these purposes. ~~(see “Prohibited Use” below). Instead, however, faculty~~  
146 ~~members should describe their responses to the numerical results and/or students’ written~~  
147 ~~comments. They may describe the content or teaching techniques that contribute to their~~  
148 ~~success or describe changes in content or teaching techniques they have made or will make, or~~  
149 ~~innovations they have made or planned that might enhance teaching effectiveness. They may~~  
150 ~~describe how more recent results reflect a previous change in teaching activities. They can~~  
151 ~~reflect on what the results reveal or confirm. They may explain the assistance they sought~~  
152 ~~from their colleagues, the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, and/or~~  
153 ~~professional organizations. The narrative thus developed would be reflective and explain how~~

154 ~~faculty members used the results of student evaluation of instruction to improve teaching.~~  
155 ~~Narratives would be included in the faculty member's record of service as evidence of the~~  
156 ~~implementation and response to student evaluation of instruction. Developing a response to~~  
157 ~~student evaluations rather than merely reporting the summary numbers is more consistent with~~  
158 ~~the formative intent of student evaluations at the individual faculty member level. It would~~  
159 ~~allow faculty to avoid focusing on maximizing numbers, but rather concentrate on explaining~~  
160 ~~their response to the numbers and students' written comments. If faculty choose to include~~  
161 ~~student evaluation of instruction results, then all evaluations for all courses taught must be~~  
162 ~~included. Faculty members are encouraged to respond to the numerical results and/or students'~~  
163 ~~written comments. For example:~~

- 164 • They may describe the content or teaching techniques that contribute to their success, or
- 165 describe changes in content, teaching techniques, or innovations they have made or planned
- 166 that might enhance teaching effectiveness.
- 167 • They may describe how more recent results reflect a previous change in teaching activities.
- 168 • They can reflect on what the results reveal or confirm.
- 169 • They may explain the assistance they sought from their colleagues, the Center for Teaching
- 170 and Learning, and/or professional organizations.

171  
172 The narrative thus developed would be reflective and explain how faculty members used  
173 the results of student evaluation of instruction to improve teaching.

174  
175 When developing recommendations or making decisions on faculty teaching effectiveness,  
176 committees and individuals must take into account other activities presented by the faculty  
177 member consistent with accomplishment in teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to:

- 178 • peer evaluations
- 179 • portfolios
- 180 • course improvement activities
- 181 • curriculum improvement activities
- 182 • team teaching activities
- 183 • faculty self-evaluation statements concerning philosophy and teaching techniques
- 184 • pre-test/post-test measures designed to assess gains in student knowledge
- 185 • other "value added" outcomes measures
- 186 • documented informal or formal mid-semester student evaluations of instruction
- 187 accompanied by reflections thereon
- 188 • other measures of effectiveness prescribed by departmentally approved criteria

189  
190  
191 Individuals and bodies involved in such personnel decisions are expressly directed not to  
192 draw any inferences whatsoever about the absence of these results from any faculty member's  
193 dossier. ~~Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report the numerical summary results of~~  
194 ~~student evaluation of instruction with or without a narrative such as that described above. It is,~~  
195 ~~however, improper for individuals or committees to draw inferences about the presence or~~  
196 ~~absence of such data, as explained below. Such individuals or committees should also be aware~~

197 ~~that, because of the necessity of a transition period to this policy from the preceding one, faculty~~  
198 ~~members could be submitting mixed evidence of teaching effectiveness for a period of several~~  
199 ~~years. This is acceptable, and no adverse inferences may be drawn in such cases.~~

200

### 201 **Prohibited Use of Student Evaluation of Instruction Information in Personnel Decisions**

202

203 ~~—Because standardized rating instruments and department assessments may not~~  
204 ~~adequately capture the nuances and variations across disciplines or between types of courses~~  
205 ~~within a discipline, the use of the results of these evaluations may not be compelled in any kind~~  
206 ~~of personnel decision (such as promotion, tenure, merit pay, termination, etc.) and may only be~~  
207 ~~used if the individual faculty member wishes them to be so used. Individuals and bodies~~  
208 ~~involved in such personnel decisions are expressly directed not to draw any inferences~~  
209 ~~whatsoever about the absence of these results from any faculty member's dossier.~~

210 Demonstrating teaching effectiveness, however, is the responsibility of faculty members and  
211 may be achieved in a variety of ways, such as those listed in the preceding section. ~~It is~~  
212 ~~important to reiterate that student evaluation of instruction is just a part of the teaching~~  
213 ~~effectiveness. Ratings and written comments from students should be viewed as ongoing~~  
214 ~~components of the overall process of professional growth and teaching improvement.~~ The use  
215 of the results of these evaluations may not be the sole factor in any kind of decision regarding  
216 promotion, tenure, merit pay, or termination.

217

218 Relying solely on student evaluations **of instruction** to assess the effectiveness of teaching and  
219 learning is inappropriate.

220

221

222 *Approved by Faculty Senate 3-24-99. Amended Faculty Senate Bill 98-A-05. Amended Faculty Senate Bill 99-A-03.*  
223 *Approved by the Faculty Senate Bill 20-A-XX, Reviewed by President [DATE], Posted for 15 Day Review*  
224 *[DATE]*

225

226

\*\*\*

227

<b>Action</b>	<b>Date</b>
Introduced to Senate	1/29/20
Second Senate Meeting	9/30/20
Faculty Senate Vote	
President's Review	
15 Day Review	
Posted to Faculty Handbook	

228