

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

1 **Procedures** *Faculty Senate Bill 12-A-34 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 or where an integrated set of courses may best be evaluated by a
8 single administration of the evaluation instrument. The costs of administration of this form
9 shall be borne by the Office of the Provost. The data collected from this administration may be
10 used to compare and contrast Southeast to other universities. Separate departmental evaluation
11 instruments, if approved by the department as described below, may be administered during
12 these same semesters if so desired by the department and/or the individual faculty member.

13
14 The university-wide instrument used for course evaluations will be examined at least every
15 five years to determine if it is adequately addressing the needs of the university. In the event
16 that a change to the instrument is warranted, the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee
17 and additional representatives selected by the Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness
18 and Student Success will coordinate the implementation of changes and new procedures
19 regarding the evaluation and reporting process.

20
21 The course/instructor evaluation instrument(s) used within a department during the
22 semesters when a university-wide evaluation instrument is not utilized must be approved by a

23 2/3 vote of the faculty of that department. The instrument(s) should recognize the diversity of
24 subject matter, instructional styles, and student groups across and within disciplines. Faculty
25 may add additional questions to the instrument(s) to ensure that all appropriate data needed for
26 instructional improvement are provided.

27
28

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

40

41 The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will assist in the processing of the
42 evaluations. The results will be returned to the faculty member and the department chair. In
43 semesters when a university-wide instrument is required, if a summary measure of teaching
44 effectiveness indicates a 60% or greater level of dissatisfaction (for instance, a course average
45 of 2 or lower on a Likert scale), then evaluations for all courses from that semester will be
46 forwarded by the department chair to the dean of the college. The faculty member may submit
47 to the chair and dean an explanation for circumstances that may have contributed to the
48 negative scores and a plan to modify the course or instruction techniques for future semesters.
49 The dean, in consultation with the department chair and faculty member, may also suggest
50 further classroom evaluation by peers, attendance at instructional development activities
51 provided by the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, or attendance at other
52 instructional development workshops or programs relevant to the appropriate discipline. It is
53 expressly understood that the department chair and dean of the college will use the results only
54 for encouraging teaching improvement, and not for any other personnel decisions. Any other
55 use of the results requires the approval of the faculty member, except in cases where the
56 aggregate data are used for specific institutional reporting purposes. It is also understood that
57 evaluations with response rates that are too low to be reliable will not be forwarded to the dean
58 of the college. The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will receive a copy of the
59 results from the university-wide instrument and may receive a copy of the department
60 assessment if the faculty member so desires.

61

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

66
67 As part of its commitment to improving and assuring quality instruction, the University shall
68 provide professional development resources and assistance to improve teaching
69 effectiveness. The Director of the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will be
70 responsible for coordinating effective mentoring systems, seminars, workshops, instructional
71 materials, and other professional development activities and for ensuring that faculty
72 development is suggested and professional development resources provided to support
73 improvement of instructional quality.

74
75 In summary, student evaluation of instruction may be viewed as part of a continuous,
76 formative process of assessment used to measure the effectiveness of classroom instruction by
77 faculty members. This process should culminate in an overall view of the instructional and
78 content effectiveness of the courses being examined.

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

81
82 **Appropriate Use of Results in Personnel Decisions**

83
84 Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report numerical results from the university-wide
85 instrument and/or the specific department assessment form(s) for evidence of teaching
86 effectiveness in personnel decisions (such as promotion, tenure, merit pay, termination, etc.).
87 Faculty members may not be compelled to submit student evaluation results for these
88 purposes (see “Prohibited Use” below). If faculty choose to include results, the results should
89 be presented comprehensively, rather than selecting only some semesters or isolated
90 comments. However, faculty members may instead describe their responses to the numerical
91 results and/or students’ written comments. They may describe the content or teaching
92 techniques that contribute to their success or describe changes in content or teaching
93 techniques they have made or will make, or innovations they have made or planned that might
94 enhance teaching effectiveness. They may describe how more recent results reflect a previous
95 change in teaching activities. They can reflect on what the results reveal or confirm. They may
96 explain the assistance they sought from their colleagues, the Center for Scholarship in
97 Teaching and Learning, and/or professional organizations. The narrative thus developed
98 would be reflective and explain how faculty members used the results of student evaluation of
99 instruction to improve teaching. Narratives would be included in the faculty member’s record
100 of service as evidence of the implementation and response to student evaluation of instruction.
101 Developing a response to student evaluations rather than merely reporting the summary
102 numbers is more consistent with the formative intent of student evaluations at the individual
103 faculty member level. It would allow faculty to avoid focusing on maximizing numbers, but
104 rather concentrate on explaining their response to the numbers and students’ written
105 comments.

106
107 When developing recommendations or making decisions on faculty teaching
108 effectiveness, committees and individuals must take into account other activities presented

109 by the faculty member consistent with accomplishment in teaching effectiveness, including
110 but not limited to:

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

122

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

131

132 **Prohibited Use of Student Evaluation of Instruction Information in Personnel Decisions**

133

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

141 Demonstrating teaching effectiveness, however, is the responsibility of faculty members and
142 may be achieved in a variety of ways, such as those listed in the preceding section. It is
143 important to reiterate that student evaluation of instruction is just a part of the teaching
144 effectiveness. Ratings and written comments from students should be viewed as ongoing
145 components of the overall process of professional growth and teaching improvement. Relying
146 solely on student evaluations to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning is
147 inappropriate.

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

150

151

152 ***
153 Please use the following table for Procedures:
154
155

Action	Date
Introduced to Senate	2/7/2018
Second Senate Meeting	
Faculty Senate Vote	
President's Review	
15 Day Review	
Posted to Faculty Handbook	

156
157 **Notes:**
158 **Original language in lines 5-14 has been moved forward from 92-103.**
159 **The sentence beginning on line 59 with the text “Any other use...” is original language that**
160 **has been moved forward from lines 71-73.**
161