

---

**FACULTY SENATE**

**SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY SENATE BILL 20-A-7**

Approved by the Faculty Senate  
October 14, 2020

**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**

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

**2 Procedures** *Faculty Senate bill 20-A-7 begins here.*

3  
4 A student evaluation of instruction form selected by the Faculty Senate will be administered  
5 campus-wide, every spring semester, in every section of every class taught, except where the  
6 use of the instrument is deemed invalid such as individual instruction sections, inapplicable, or  
7 where an integrated set of courses may best be evaluated by a single administration of the  
8 evaluation instrument. Courses to be exempted from using the campus-wide instrument should  
9 be determined by the department in consultation with the college dean. The costs of  
10 administration of this form shall be borne by the Office of the Provost. Separate departmental  
11 evaluation instruments, if approved by the department as described below, may be  
12 administered during these same semesters if so desired by the department and/or the individual  
13 faculty member.

14  
15 The university-wide student evaluation of instruction form will be examined at least every  
16 five years to determine if it is adequately addressing the needs of the university. In the event  
17 that a change to the instrument is warranted, the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee  
18 and additional representatives selected by a designee from the Office of the Provost will  
19 coordinate the implementation of changes and new procedures regarding the evaluation and  
20 reporting process.

21  
22 The student evaluation of instruction form(s) used within a department during the semesters  
23 when a university-wide evaluation instrument is not mandated must be approved by a two-  
24 thirds vote of the faculty of that department. The instrument(s) should recognize the diversity

25 of subject matter, instructional styles, and student groups across and within disciplines. Faculty  
26 may add additional questions to the instrument(s) to ensure that all appropriate data needed for  
27 instructional improvement are provided. Any additional questions added to the student  
28 evaluations of instruction should be reviewed by the appropriate department committee.  
29

30 Student evaluations of instruction may be administered by the faculty member, the  
31 department chair, or a department designee. If administered by the faculty member, the  
32 instructor should not be in the room while students are completing the evaluation. If the  
33 evaluation is in written form, a designate should return the completed evaluations to the  
34 departmental office. Appropriate procedures will be developed by the Office of Information  
35 Technology and/or department chairs to require timely administration and processing of the  
36 evaluations and to ensure the integrity of the entire student evaluation process. Instructions for  
37 completing the instrument and adequate time for completion must be provided in class when  
38 possible. Students will be informed:  
39

- 40 a) that the data and written comments on the evaluation form are confidential,
- 41 b) that the data will be an important part of the information considered in improving  
42 instruction at Southeast Missouri State, and
- 43 c) that the instructor will not have access to the data until final grades have been  
44 processed.  
45

46 The results of the student evaluations of instruction will be returned to the faculty  
47 member and the department chair. When results indicate significant evidence of dissatisfactory  
48 performance on 50% or more of classes during one calendar year (spring and fall semesters),  
49 then evaluations for all courses from that instructor that year will be forwarded by the  
50 department chair to the dean of the college. The threshold of dissatisfactory performance on  
51 student evaluations of instruction is a course average of 2.0 or lower on a 5-point Likert scale  
52 (or equivalent) where lower values indicate lower satisfaction. In cases when evaluations are  
53 forwarded to the dean by the department chair, the faculty member must be given the  
54 opportunity to submit narrative with the evaluation results within 10 business days of the  
55 unsatisfactory report being sent to the dean. The results of student evaluations of instruction of  
56 the department chair will be distributed to the chair and the dean of the college.  
57

58 The department chair, in consultation with the dean and faculty member, may also  
59 suggest further classroom evaluation by peers, attendance at instructional development  
60 activities provided by the Center for Teaching and Learning, or attendance at other  
61 instructional development workshops or programs relevant to the appropriate discipline.  
62

63 It is expressly understood that the department chair and dean of the college will use the  
64 results only to improve teaching. Any other use of the results requires the approval of the  
65 faculty member, except in cases where the aggregate data are used for specific institutional  
66 reporting purposes. Evaluations with response rates that are too low to be reliable (either fewer

67 than 5 responses or below a 50% response rate, whichever is greater) will not be forwarded to  
68 the dean of the college.

69

70 As part of its commitment to improving and assuring quality instruction, the University  
71 shall provide professional development resources and assistance to improve teaching  
72 effectiveness. The Office of the Provost will be responsible for coordinating effective  
73 mentoring systems, seminars, workshops, instructional materials, and other professional  
74 development activities and for ensuring that faculty development is suggested, and  
75 professional development resources provided to support improvement of instructional  
76 quality.

77

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

82 *Approved by the Faculty Senate Bill 12-A-34, Reviewed by President December 7, 2014, Posted for 15 Day*  
83 *Review December 14, 2014*

84

### 85 **Appropriate Use of Results in Personnel Decisions**

86

87 Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report numerical results from the university-  
88 wide instrument and/or the specific department assessment form(s) for evidence of teaching  
89 effectiveness in personnel decisions (such as promotion, tenure, merit pay, or termination).  
90 Faculty members may not be compelled to submit student evaluation of instruction results for  
91 these purposes. If faculty choose to include student evaluation of instruction results, then all  
92 evaluations for all courses taught must be included. Faculty members are encouraged to  
93 respond to the numerical results and/or students' written comments. For example:

- 94 • They may describe the content or teaching techniques that contribute to their success, or  
95 describe changes in content, teaching techniques, or innovations they have made or planned  
96 that might enhance teaching effectiveness.
- 97 • They may describe how more recent results reflect a previous change in teaching activities.
- 98 • They can reflect on what the results reveal or confirm.
- 99 • They may explain the assistance they sought from their colleagues, the Center for Teaching  
100 and Learning, and/or professional organizations.

101

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

104

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

- 109 • peer evaluations

- 110 • portfolios
- 111 • course improvement activities
- 112 • curriculum improvement activities
- 113 • team teaching activities
- 114 • faculty self-evaluation statements concerning philosophy and teaching techniques
- 115 • pre-test/post-test measures designed to assess gains in student knowledge
- 116 • other “value added” outcomes measures
- 117 • documented informal or formal mid-semester student evaluations of instruction
- 118 accompanied by reflections thereon
- 119 • other measures of effectiveness prescribed by departmentally-approved criteria

120

121 Individuals and bodies involved in such personnel decisions are expressly directed not to  
122 draw any inferences whatsoever about the absence of these results from any faculty member’s  
123 dossier. Demonstrating teaching effectiveness is the responsibility of faculty members and may  
124 be achieved in a variety of ways, such as those listed in the preceding section. The use of the  
125 results of these evaluations may not be the sole factor in any kind of decision regarding  
126 promotion, tenure, merit pay, or termination.

127

128 Relying solely on student evaluations of instruction to assess the effectiveness of teaching  
129 and learning is inappropriate.

130

131

132 *Approved by Faculty Senate 3-24-99. Amended Faculty Senate Bill 98-A-05. Amended Faculty Senate Bill 99-A-03.*

133 *Approved by the Faculty Senate 10/14/20, Reviewed by President [DATE], Posted for 15 Day Review*

134 *[DATE]*

135

136 \*\*\*

137

<b>Action</b>	<b>Date</b>
Introduced to Senate	1/29/20
Second Senate Meeting	2/12/20
Faculty Senate Vote	10/14/20
President's Review	
15 Day Review	
Posted to Faculty Handbook	

138

139