

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 ~~by the developer~~ 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. ~~The data collected from this administration may be used to compare and contrast Southeast to other universities. The nationally normed instrument will be administered campus wide during specified semesters as described above.~~ Separate departmental evaluation instruments, if approved by the department as ~~previously~~ 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.

23 The course/instructor evaluation instrument(s) used within a department during the  
24 semesters when a ~~nationally-normed~~-university-wide evaluation instrument is not utilized  
25 must be approved by a 2/3 vote of the faculty of that department. The instrument(s) should  
26 recognize the diversity of subject matter, instructional styles, and student groups across and  
27 within 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  
31 The student evaluation is to be administered by the departmental chair or designate.  
32 Appropriate procedures will be developed by the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and  
33 Learning and/or department chairs to require timely administration and processing of the  
34 evaluations and to ensure the integrity of the entire student evaluation process. Instructions for  
35 completing the instrument and adequate time for the completion in class will be provided.  
36 Students will be informed (a) that the data and written comments on the evaluation form are  
37 confidential, (b) that the data will be an important part of the information considered in  
38 improving instruction at Southeast Missouri State, and (c) that the instructor will not have  
39 access to the data until final grades have been processed. The faculty member will not be  
40 present during the evaluation, and the results will not be available until after final grades have  
41 been processed.

42  
43 The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will assist in the processing of the  
44 evaluations. The results will be returned to the faculty member and the department chair. In  
45 semesters when a university-wide instrument is required, if a summary measure of teaching  
46 effectiveness indicates a 60% or greater level of dissatisfaction (for instance, a course average  
47 of 2 or lower on a Likert scale), then Evaluations for all courses from that semester will also  
48 be forwarded by the department chair to the dean of the college~~for all courses in a semester~~  
49 ~~when a summary measure of teaching effectiveness selected by Faculty Senate is below the~~  
50 ~~nationally-normed 20th percentile for at least two courses in the same semester. Departments~~  
51 ~~should determine an equivalent threshold for reports being forwarded to the dean for semesters~~  
52 ~~when a department-approved instrument is used for course evaluations. In cases when~~  
53 ~~evaluations are forwarded to the dean, the faculty member should have the opportunity to~~  
54 ~~submitting narrative with the evaluation results describing circumstances that may have~~  
55 ~~contributed to the negative scores or plans to modify the course or instruction techniques for~~  
56 ~~future semesters.~~

57  
58 The dean, in consultation with the department chair and faculty member, may ~~then also~~  
59 suggest further classroom evaluation by peers, attendance at instructional development  
60 activities provided by the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, or attendance at  
61 other instructional development workshops or programs relevant to the appropriate discipline.  
62 It is expressly understood that the department chair and dean of the college will use the results  
63 only for encouraging teaching improvement, and not for any other personnel decisions. Any  
64 other use of the results requires the approval of the faculty member, except in cases where the  
65 aggregate data are used for specific institutional reporting purposes. It is also understood that

66 evaluations with response rates that are too low to be reliable (fewer than 5 responses) will not  
67 be forwarded to the dean of the college. The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning  
68 will receive a copy of the results from the ~~nationally-normed~~ university-wide instrument and  
69 may receive a copy of the department assessment if the faculty member so desires.  
70

71 The results of ~~the course~~ evaluations of the department chair will be distributed to the  
72 ~~chair and the dean of the college and a faculty member designated by the department. If~~  
73 ~~information regarding a discipline-specific matter is needed, the dean may consult with a~~  
74 ~~faculty member of the chair's choosing. In such instances, Confidentiality among these~~  
75 ~~individuals must be maintained. Any other use of the results requires the approval of the~~  
76 ~~faculty member, except in cases where the aggregate data are used for specific institutional~~  
77 ~~reporting purposes.~~  
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 will be  
82 responsible for coordinating effective mentoring systems, seminars, workshops, instructional  
83 materials, and other professional development activities and for ensuring that faculty  
84 development is suggested and professional development resources provided to support  
85 improvement of instructional quality.  
86

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

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

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

95

96 ~~A nationally-normed student rating form will be selected by a method recommended by the~~  
97 ~~Faculty Senate and will be designated for this institution-wide purpose. This student rating~~  
98 ~~form will be administered campus-wide, every spring semester, in every section of every class~~  
99 ~~taught, except where the use of the instrument is deemed invalid by the developer or where an~~  
100 ~~integrated set of courses may best be evaluated by a single administration of the evaluation~~  
101 ~~instrument. The costs of administration of this form shall be borne by the Office of the~~  
102 ~~Provost. The data collected from this administration will be used to compare and contrast~~  
103 ~~Southeast to other universities. The nationally-normed instrument will be administered~~  
104 ~~campus-wide during specified semesters as described above. Separate departmental evaluation~~  
105 ~~instruments, if approved by the department as previously described, may be administered~~  
106 ~~during these same semesters if so desired by the department and/or the individual faculty~~  
107 ~~member.~~  
108

109 **Appropriate Use of ~~Results Student Evaluation of Instruction Information in~~**  
110 **Personnel Decisions**

111  
112 Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report numerical results from the ~~nationally–~~  
113 ~~normed-university-wide~~ instrument and/or the specific department assessment form(s) for  
114 evidence of teaching effectiveness in personnel decisions (such as promotion, tenure, merit  
115 pay, termination, etc.). Faculty members may not be compelled to submit student evaluation  
116 results for these purposes (see “Prohibited Use” below). If faculty choose to include results,  
117 the results should be presented comprehensively, rather than selecting only some semesters or  
118 isolated comments. ~~Instead, h~~However, faculty members ~~should may instead~~ describe their  
119 responses to the numerical results and/or students’ written comments. They may describe the  
120 content or teaching techniques that contribute to their success or describe changes in content  
121 or teaching techniques they have made or will make, or innovations they have made or  
122 planned that might enhance teaching effectiveness. They may describe how more recent  
123 results reflect a previous change in teaching activities. They can reflect on what the results  
124 reveal or confirm. They may explain the assistance they sought from their colleagues, the  
125 Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, and/or professional organizations. The  
126 narrative thus developed would be reflective and explain how faculty members used the  
127 results of student evaluation of instruction to improve teaching. Narratives would be included  
128 in the faculty member’s record of service as evidence of the implementation and response to  
129 student evaluation of instruction. Developing a response to student evaluations rather than  
130 merely reporting the summary numbers is more consistent with the formative intent of student  
131 evaluations at the individual faculty member level. It would allow faculty to avoid focusing on  
132 maximizing numbers, but rather concentrate on explaining their response to the numbers and  
133 students’ written comments.

134  
135 When developing recommendations or making decisions on faculty teaching  
136 effectiveness, committees and individuals must take into account other activities presented  
137 by the faculty member consistent with accomplishment in teaching effectiveness, including  
138 but not limited to:

- 139 • peer evaluations
- 140 • portfolios
- 141 • course improvement activities
- 142 • curriculum improvement activities
- 143 • team teaching activities
- 144 • faculty self-evaluation statements concerning philosophy and teaching techniques
- 145 • pre-test/post-test measures designed to assess gains in student knowledge
- 146 • other “value added” outcomes measures
- 147 • documented informal or formal mid-semester student evaluations of instruction
- 148 accompanied by reflections thereon
- 149 • other measures of effectiveness prescribed by departmentally-approved criteria

150

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

159  
160 **Prohibited Use of Student Evaluation of Instruction Information in Personnel Decisions**

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

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

178

179

180

181

182

183

\*\*\*

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	

184

185

186

187

188

189

**Notes:**

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

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