

**FACULTY SENATE**

**SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY SENATE BILL 18-A-XX**

Approved by the Faculty Senate  
XXXXXX

**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 12-A-34 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 or where an integrated set of courses may best be evaluated by a single administration of the evaluation instrument. 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 utilized must be approved by a 2/3 vote of the faculty of that department. The instrument(s) should recognize the diversity of

23 subject matter, instructional styles, and student groups across and within disciplines. Faculty  
24 may add additional questions to the instrument(s) to ensure that all appropriate data needed for  
25 instructional improvement are provided.

26  
27

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

39

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

51

52 The dean, in consultation with the department chair and faculty member, may also  
53 suggest further classroom evaluation by peers, attendance at instructional development  
54 activities provided by the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, or attendance at  
55 other instructional development workshops or programs relevant to the appropriate discipline.  
56 It is expressly understood that the department chair and dean of the college will use the results  
57 only for encouraging teaching improvement, and not for any other personnel decisions. Any  
58 other use of the results requires the approval of the faculty member, except in cases where the  
59 aggregate data are used for specific institutional reporting purposes. It is also understood that  
60 evaluations with response rates that are too low to be reliable (fewer than 5 responses) will not  
61 be forwarded to the dean of the college. The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning  
62 will receive a copy of the results from the university-wide instrument and may receive a copy  
63 of the department assessment if the faculty member so desires.

64

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

69  
70 As part of its commitment to improving and assuring quality instruction, the University shall  
71 provide professional development resources and assistance to improve teaching  
72 effectiveness. The Director of the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will be  
73 responsible for coordinating effective mentoring systems, seminars, workshops, instructional  
74 materials, and other professional development activities and for ensuring that faculty  
75 development is suggested and professional development resources provided to support  
76 improvement of instructional 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,*  
83 *Posted for 15 Day Review December 14, 2014*

84  
85  
86  
87

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

89

90 Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report numerical results from the university-wide  
91 instrument and/or the specific department assessment form(s) for evidence of teaching  
92 effectiveness in personnel decisions (such as promotion, tenure, merit pay, termination, etc.).  
93 Faculty members may not be compelled to submit student evaluation results for these  
94 purposes (see "Prohibited Use" below). If faculty choose to include results, the results should  
95 be presented comprehensively, rather than selecting only some semesters or isolated  
96 comments. However, faculty members may instead describe their responses to the numerical  
97 results and/or students' written comments. They may describe the content or teaching  
98 techniques that contribute to their success or describe changes in content or teaching  
99 techniques they have made or will make, or innovations they have made or planned that might  
100 enhance teaching effectiveness. They may describe how more recent results reflect a previous  
101 change in teaching activities. They can reflect on what the results reveal or confirm. They may  
102 explain the assistance they sought from their colleagues, the Center for Scholarship in  
103 Teaching and Learning, and/or professional organizations. The narrative thus developed  
104 would be reflective and explain how faculty members used the results of student evaluation of  
105 instruction to improve teaching. Narratives would be included in the faculty member's record  
106 of service as evidence of the implementation and response to student evaluation of instruction.  
107 Developing a response to student evaluations rather than merely reporting the summary

108 numbers is more consistent with the formative intent of student evaluations at the individual  
109 faculty member level. It would allow faculty to avoid focusing on maximizing numbers, but  
110 rather concentrate on explaining their response to the numbers and students' written  
111 comments.

112

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

- 117 • peer evaluations
- 118 • portfolios
- 119 • course improvement activities
- 120 • curriculum improvement activities
- 121 • team teaching activities
- 122 • faculty self-evaluation statements concerning philosophy and teaching techniques
- 123 • pre-test/post-test measures designed to assess gains in student knowledge
- 124 • other "value added" outcomes measures
- 125 • documented informal or formal mid-semester student evaluations of instruction
- 126 accompanied by reflections thereon
- 127 • other measures of effectiveness prescribed by departmentally-approved criteria

128

129 Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report the numerical summary results of student  
130 evaluation of instruction with or without a narrative such as that described above. It is,  
131 however, improper for individuals or committees to draw inferences about the presence or  
132 absence of such data, as explained below. Such individuals or committees should also be  
133 aware that, because of the necessity of a transition period to this policy from the preceding  
134 one, faculty members could be submitting mixed evidence of teaching effectiveness for a  
135 period of several years. This is acceptable, and no adverse inferences may be drawn in such  
136 cases.

137

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

139

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

147 Demonstrating teaching effectiveness, however, is the responsibility of faculty members and  
148 may be achieved in a variety of ways, such as those listed in the preceding section. It is  
149 important to reiterate that student evaluation of instruction is just a part of the teaching  
150 effectiveness. Ratings and written comments from students should be viewed as ongoing

151 components of the overall process of professional growth and teaching improvement. Relying  
152 solely on student evaluations to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning is  
153 inappropriate.

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

156 \*\*\*

157 Please use the following table for Procedures:

<b>Action</b>	<b>Date</b>
Introduced to Senate	2/7/18
Second Senate Meeting	2/21/18
Faculty Senate Vote	
President's Review	
15 Day Review	
Posted to Faculty Handbook	

158

159 **Notes:**

160 **Original language in lines 5-14 has been moved forward from 97-108.**

161 **The sentence beginning on line 63 with the text “Any other use...” is original language that**  
162 **has been moved forward from lines 76-78.**