

---

**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 18-A-XX 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 and the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning. 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

25 2/3 vote of the faculty of that department. The instrument(s) should recognize the diversity of  
26 subject matter, instructional styles, and student groups across and within disciplines. Faculty  
27 may add additional questions to the instrument(s) to ensure that all appropriate data needed for  
28 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 and/or  
35 department chairs to require timely administration and processing of the evaluations and to  
36 ensure the integrity of the entire student evaluation process. Instructions for completing the  
37 instrument and adequate time for the completion in class will be provided. Students will be  
38 informed (a) that the data and written comments on the evaluation form are confidential, (b)  
39 that the data will be an important part of the information considered in improving instruction at  
40 Southeast Missouri State, and (c) that the instructor will not have access to the data until final  
41 grades have 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 significant level of dissatisfaction (for instance, a course 60% or  
47 greater level of dissatisfaction (for instance, a course average of 2 or lower on a Likert scale)  
48 on two or more classes, then evaluations for all courses from that semester will be forwarded  
49 by the department chair to the dean of the college. Departments should determine an  
50 equivalent threshold for reports being forwarded to the dean for semesters when a department-  
51 approved instrument is used for course evaluations. In cases when evaluations are forwarded  
52 to the dean, the faculty member should be given the opportunity to submit narrative with the  
53 evaluation results describing circumstances that may have contributed to negative scores and  
54 plans to modify the course or instruction techniques for future semesters.

55

56 The dean, in consultation with the department chair and faculty member, may also  
57 suggest further classroom evaluation by peers, attendance at instructional development  
58 activities provided by the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, or attendance at  
59 other instructional development workshops or programs relevant to the appropriate discipline.  
60 It is expressly understood that the department chair and dean of the college will use the results  
61 only for encouraging teaching improvement. Any other use of the results requires the approval  
62 of the faculty member, except in cases where the aggregate data are used for specific  
63 institutional reporting purposes. It is also understood that evaluations with response rates that  
64 are too low to be reliable (fewer than 5 responses or below a 25% response rate) will not be  
65 forwarded to the dean of the college. The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning  
66 will receive a copy of the results from the university-wide instrument and may receive a copy  
67 of the department assessment if the faculty member so desires.

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

73  
74 As part of its commitment to improving and assuring quality instruction, the University shall  
75 provide professional development resources and assistance to improve teaching  
76 effectiveness. The Director of the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will be  
77 responsible for coordinating effective mentoring systems, seminars, workshops, instructional  
78 materials, and other professional development activities and for ensuring that faculty  
79 development is suggested and professional development resources provided to support  
80 improvement of instructional quality.

81  
82 In summary, student evaluation of instruction may be viewed as part of a continuous,  
83 formative process of assessment used to measure the effectiveness of classroom instruction by  
84 faculty members. This process should culminate in an overall view of the instructional and  
85 content effectiveness of the courses being examined.

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

### 88 89 **Appropriate Use of Results in Personnel Decisions**

90  
91 Faculty members may voluntarily choose to report numerical results from the university-wide  
92 instrument and/or the specific department assessment form(s) for evidence of teaching  
93 effectiveness in personnel decisions (such as promotion, tenure, merit pay, termination, etc.).  
94 Faculty members may not be compelled to submit student evaluation results for these  
95 purposes (see "Prohibited Use" below). If faculty choose to include course evaluation results,  
96 the information presented should reflect a fair representation of all the results collected.  
97 However, faculty members may instead describe their responses to the numerical results  
98 and/or students' written comments. They may describe the content or teaching techniques that  
99 contribute to their success or describe changes in content or teaching techniques they have  
100 made or will make, or innovations they have made or planned that might enhance teaching  
101 effectiveness. They may describe how more recent results reflect a previous change in  
102 teaching activities. They can reflect on what the results reveal or confirm. They may explain  
103 the assistance they sought from their colleagues, the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and  
104 Learning, and/or professional organizations. The narrative thus developed would be reflective  
105 and explain how faculty members used the results of student evaluation of instruction to  
106 improve teaching. Narratives would be included in the faculty member's record of service as  
107 evidence of the implementation and response to student evaluation of instruction. Developing  
108 a response to student evaluations rather than merely reporting the summary numbers is more  
109 consistent with the formative intent of student evaluations at the individual faculty member  
110 level. It would allow faculty to avoid focusing on maximizing numbers, but rather concentrate  
111 on explaining their response to the numbers and students' written 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 decision regarding promotion, tenure, merit pay, termination, etc., and may only be used if the  
144 individual faculty member wishes them to be so used. Individuals and bodies involved in such  
145 personnel decisions are expressly directed not to draw any inferences whatsoever about the  
146 absence of these results from any faculty member’s dossier. Demonstrating teaching  
147 effectiveness, however, is the responsibility of faculty members and may be achieved in a  
148 variety of ways, such as those listed in the preceding section. It is important to reiterate that  
149 student evaluation of instruction is just a part of the teaching effectiveness. Ratings and written  
150 comments from students should be viewed as ongoing components of the overall process of  
151 professional growth and teaching improvement. Relying solely on student evaluations to assess  
152 the effectiveness of teaching and learning is inappropriate.

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

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

156  
157 \*\*\*

158 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 |             |

159  
160