

FACULTY SENATE

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE BILL 18-A-5

Approved by the Faculty Senate
XXXXXXXX

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 **Procedures** *Faculty Senate Bill 18-A-5 begins here.*

2
3 **Selection and Administration of University-wide Course Evaluation Instruments**

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

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

22
23 The course/instructor evaluation instrument(s) used within a department during the
24 semesters when a university-wide evaluation instrument is not ~~utilized~~ mandated must be

25 approved by a 2/3 vote of the faculty of that department. The instrument(s) should recognize
26 the diversity of subject matter, instructional styles, and student groups across and within
27 disciplines. Faculty may add additional questions to the instrument(s) to ensure that all
28 appropriate data needed for instructional improvement are provided.

29

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

39 Students will be informed:

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

45

46 ~~The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will assist in the processing of the~~
47 ~~evaluations.~~ The results will be returned to the faculty member and the department chair. In
48 semesters when a university-wide instrument is required, if a summary measure of teaching
49 effectiveness indicates a significant level of dissatisfaction ~~(for instance, a course 60% or~~
50 ~~greater level of dissatisfaction or a course average of 2 or lower on a Likert scale)~~ on two or
51 more classes, then evaluations for all courses from that instructor that semester will be
52 forwarded by the department chair to the dean of the college. Departments should determine
53 ~~an equivalent~~ thresholds for reports being forwarded to the dean. ~~for semesters when a~~
54 ~~department-approved instrument is used for course evaluations.~~ In cases when evaluations are
55 forwarded to the dean, the faculty member should be given the opportunity to submit narrative
56 with the evaluation results describing circumstances that may have contributed to negative
57 scores and plans to modify the course or instruction techniques for future semesters.

58

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

63

64 It is expressly understood that the department chair and dean of the college will use the
65 results only for encouraging teaching improvement. Any other use of the results requires the
66 approval of the faculty member, except in cases where the aggregate data are used for specific
67 institutional reporting purposes. ~~It is also understood that E~~evaluations with response rates that

68 are too low to be reliable (either fewer than 5 responses or below a 25% response rate,
69 whichever is greater) will not be forwarded to the dean of the college. ~~The Center for~~
70 ~~Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will receive a copy of the results from the university-~~
71 ~~wide instrument and may receive a copy of the department assessment if the faculty member~~
72 ~~so desires.~~

73
74 The results of course evaluations of the department chair will be distributed to the chair
75 and the dean of the college. If information regarding a discipline-specific matter is needed, the
76 dean may consult with a faculty member of the department's choosing. In such instances,
77 confidentiality must be maintained.

78
79 As part of its commitment to improving and assuring quality instruction, the University shall
80 provide professional development resources and assistance to improve teaching
81 effectiveness. ~~The Director of the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning~~
82 ~~Associate~~ Provost for Academic Effectiveness g will be responsible for coordinating effective
83 mentoring systems, seminars, workshops, instructional materials, and other professional
84 development activities and for ensuring that faculty development is suggested and
85 professional development resources provided to support improvement of instructional
86 quality.

87
88 In summary, student evaluation of instruction may be viewed as part of a continuous,
89 formative process of assessment used to measure the effectiveness of classroom instruction by
90 faculty members. This process should culminate in an overall view of the instructional and
91 content effectiveness of the courses being examined.

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

94 95 **Appropriate Use of Results in Personnel Decisions**

96
97 Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report numerical results from the university-wide
98 instrument and/or the specific department assessment form(s) for evidence of teaching
99 effectiveness in personnel decisions (such as promotion, tenure, merit pay, termination, etc.).

100 Faculty members may not be compelled to submit student evaluation results for these
101 purposes ~~(see "Prohibited Use" below)~~. If faculty choose to include course evaluation results,
102 the information presented should reflect a fair representation of all the results collected.

103 ~~However, faculty~~ Faculty members ~~may instead are encouraged to describe their~~
104 ~~responses~~ respond to the numerical results and/or students' written comments. For example:

- 105 —They may describe the content or teaching techniques that contribute to their success, ~~or or~~
- 106 • They may describe changes in content, ~~or~~ teaching techniques, ~~they have made or will~~
107 ~~make,~~ or innovations they have made or planned that might enhance teaching effectiveness.
- 108 • They may describe how more recent results reflect a previous change in teaching activities.
- 109 • They may reflect on what the results reveal or confirm.
- 110 • They may explain the assistance they sought from their colleagues, the Center for
111 Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, and/or professional organizations.

112
113 The narrative thus developed would be reflective and explain how faculty members used
114 the results of student evaluation of instruction to improve teaching. ~~Narratives would be~~
115 ~~included in the faculty member's record of service as evidence of the implementation and~~
116 ~~response to student evaluation of instruction. Developing a response to student evaluations~~
117 ~~rather than merely reporting the summary numbers is more consistent with the formative~~
118 ~~intent of student evaluations at the individual faculty member level. It would allow faculty to~~
119 ~~avoid focusing on maximizing numbers, but rather concentrate on explaining their response to~~
120 ~~the numbers and students' written comments.~~

121
122 When developing recommendations or making decisions on faculty teaching
123 effectiveness, committees and individuals must take into account other activities presented
124 by the faculty member consistent with accomplishment in teaching effectiveness, including
125 but not limited to:

- 126 • peer evaluations
- 127 • portfolios
- 128 • course improvement activities
- 129 • curriculum improvement activities
- 130 • team teaching activities
- 131 • faculty self-evaluation statements concerning philosophy and teaching techniques
- 132 • pre-test/post-test measures designed to assess gains in student knowledge
- 133 • other "value added" outcomes measures
- 134 • documented informal or formal mid-semester student evaluations of instruction
- 135 accompanied by reflections thereon
- 136 • other measures of effectiveness prescribed by departmentally-approved criteria

137
138
139 Individuals and bodies involved in such personnel decisions are expressly directed not to
140 draw any inferences whatsoever about the absence of these results from any faculty member's
141 dossier. Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report the numerical summary results of
142 student evaluation of instruction with or without a narrative such as that described above. ~~It is,~~
143 ~~however, improper for individuals or committees to draw inferences about the presence or~~
144 ~~absence of such data, as explained below. Such individuals or committees should also be aware~~
145 ~~that, because of the necessity of a transition period to this policy from the preceding one,~~
146 ~~faculty members could be submitting mixed evidence of teaching effectiveness for a period of~~
147 ~~several years. This is acceptable, and no adverse inferences may be drawn in such cases.~~
148 Demonstrating teaching effectiveness, however, is the responsibility of faculty members and
149 may be achieved in a variety of ways, such as those listed in the preceding section. It is
150 important to reiterate that student evaluation of instruction is just a part of the teaching
151 effectiveness. Ratings and written comments from students should be viewed as ongoing
152 components of the overall process of professional growth and teaching improvement. The use
153 of the results of these evaluations may not be the sole factor in any kind of decision regarding
154 promotion, tenure, merit pay, termination, etc.

155
156
157
158 **Prohibited Use of Student Evaluation of Instruction Information in Personnel Decisions**
159

160 ~~Because standardized rating instruments and department assessments may not adequately~~
161 ~~capture the nuances and variations across disciplines or between types of courses within a~~
162 ~~discipline, the use of the results of these evaluations may not be compelled in any kind of~~
163 ~~decision regarding promotion, tenure, merit pay, termination, etc., and may only be used if the~~
164 ~~individual faculty member wishes them to be so used. Individuals and bodies involved in such~~
165 ~~personnel decisions are expressly directed not to draw any inferences whatsoever about the~~
166 ~~absence of these results from any faculty member's dossier. Demonstrating teaching~~
167 ~~effectiveness, however, is the responsibility of faculty members and may be achieved in a~~
168 ~~variety of ways, such as those listed in the preceding section. It is important to reiterate that~~
169 ~~student evaluation of instruction is just a part of the teaching effectiveness. Ratings and written~~
170 ~~comments from students should be viewed as ongoing components of the overall process of~~
171 ~~professional growth and teaching improvement.~~ Relying solely on student evaluations to assess
172 the effectiveness of teaching and learning is inappropriate.

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

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

175 *[DATE]*
176

177 ***

178 Please use the following table for Procedures:

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

179
180