

FACULTY SENATE

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE BILL 19-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 18-A-5 begins here.*

Selection and Administration of University-wide Course Evaluation Instruments

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

The university-wide instrument used for course evaluations will be examined at least every five years to determine if it is adequately addressing the needs of the university. In the event that a change to the instrument is warranted, the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee and additional representatives selected by a designee from the Office of the Provost will coordinate the implementation of changes and new procedures regarding the evaluation and reporting process.

The course/instructor evaluation instrument(s) used within a department during the semesters when a university-wide evaluation instrument is not mandated must be approved by a 2/3 vote of the faculty of that department. The instrument(s) should recognize the diversity of

25 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.

28

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

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

42

43 The results will be returned to the faculty member and the department chair. In semesters
44 when a university-wide instrument is required, if a summary measure of teaching effectiveness
45 indicates a significant level of dissatisfaction on two or more classes, then evaluations for all
46 courses from that instructor that semester will be forwarded by the department chair to the
47 dean of the college. Departments should determine thresholds for reports being forwarded to
48 the dean. In cases when evaluations are forwarded to the dean, the faculty member should be
49 given the opportunity to submit narrative with the evaluation results describing circumstances
50 that may have contributed to negative scores and plans to modify the course or instruction
51 techniques for future semesters.

52

53 The dean, in consultation with the department chair and faculty member, may also
54 suggest further classroom evaluation by peers, attendance at instructional development
55 activities provided by the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, or attendance at
56 other instructional development workshops or programs relevant to the appropriate discipline.
57 It is expressly understood that the department chair and dean of the college will use the results
58 only for encouraging teaching improvement. Any other use of the results requires the approval
59 of the faculty member, except in cases where the aggregate data are used for specific
60 institutional reporting purposes. Evaluations with response rates that are too low to be reliable
61 (either fewer than 5 responses or below a 25% response rate, whichever is greater) will not be
62 forwarded to the dean of the college.

63

64 The results of course evaluations of the department chair will be distributed to the chair
65 and the dean of the college. If information regarding a discipline-specific matter is needed, the
66 dean may consult with a faculty member of the department's choosing. In such instances,
67 confidentiality must be maintained.

68
69 As part of its commitment to improving and assuring quality instruction, the University shall
70 provide professional development resources and assistance to improve teaching
71 effectiveness. Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness will be responsible for
72 coordinating effective mentoring systems, seminars, workshops, instructional materials, and
73 other professional development activities and for ensuring that faculty development is
74 suggested, and professional development resources provided to support improvement of
75 instructional quality.

76
77 In summary, student evaluation of instruction may be viewed as part of a continuous,
78 formative process of assessment used to measure the effectiveness of classroom instruction by
79 faculty members. This process should culminate in an overall view of the instructional and
80 content effectiveness of the courses being examined.

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

83 84 **Appropriate Use of Results in Personnel Decisions**

85
86 Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report numerical results from the university-wide
87 instrument and/or the specific department assessment form(s) for evidence of teaching
88 effectiveness in personnel decisions (such as promotion, tenure, merit pay, termination, etc.).
89 Faculty members may not be compelled to submit student evaluation results for these
90 purposes. If faculty choose to include course evaluation results, the information presented
91 should reflect a fair representation of all the results collected. Faculty members are
92 encouraged to respond to the numerical results and/or students' written comments. For
93 example:

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

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

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

- 110
- peer evaluations

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

121

122 Individuals and bodies involved in such personnel decisions are expressly directed not to
123 draw any inferences whatsoever about the absence of these results from any faculty member’s
124 dossier. Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report the numerical summary results of
125 student evaluation of instruction with or without a narrative such as that described above
126 Demonstrating teaching effectiveness is the responsibility of faculty members and may be
127 achieved in a variety of ways, such as those listed in the preceding section. It is important to
128 reiterate that student evaluation of instruction is a part of the teaching effectiveness. Ratings
129 and written comments from students should be viewed as ongoing components of the overall
130 process of professional growth and teaching improvement. The use of the results of these
131 evaluations may not be the sole factor in any kind of decision regarding promotion, tenure,
132 merit pay, termination, etc.

133

134 Relying solely on student evaluations to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning is
135 inappropriate.

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

137 *Approved by the Faculty Senate Bill 18-A-5, Reviewed by President [DATE], Posted for 15 Day Review*

138 *[DATE]*

139

140 ***

141

Action	Date
Introduced to Senate	3/27/19
Second Senate Meeting	
Faculty Senate Vote	
President's Review	
15 Day Review	
Posted to Faculty Handbook	

142

143