
FACULTY SENATE

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE BILL 18-A-5

Approved by the Faculty Senate
March 7, 2018

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 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 or a course average of 2 or lower on a Likert scale) on two or
48 more classes, then evaluations for all courses from that semester will be forwarded by the
49 department chair to the dean of the college. Departments should determine an equivalent
50 threshold for reports being forwarded to the dean for semesters when a department-approved
51 instrument is used for course evaluations. In cases when evaluations are forwarded to the dean,
52 the faculty member should be given the opportunity to submit narrative with the evaluation
53 results describing circumstances that may have contributed to negative scores and plans to
54 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 (either fewer than 5 responses or below a 25% response rate,
65 whichever is greater) will not be forwarded to the dean of the college. The Center for
66 Scholarship in Teaching and Learning will receive a copy of the results from the university-

67 wide instrument and may receive a copy of the department assessment if the faculty member
68 so desires.

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

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

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

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

89

90 **Appropriate Use of Results in Personnel Decisions**

91

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

111 level. It would allow faculty to avoid focusing on maximizing numbers, but rather concentrate
112 on explaining their response to the numbers and students' written comments.
113

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

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

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

138 139 **Prohibited Use of Student Evaluation of Instruction Information in Personnel Decisions**

140
141 Because standardized rating instruments and department assessments may not adequately
142 capture the nuances and variations across disciplines or between types of courses within a
143 discipline, the use of the results of these evaluations may not be compelled in any kind of
144 decision regarding promotion, tenure, merit pay, termination, etc., and may only be used if the
145 individual faculty member wishes them to be so used. Individuals and bodies involved in such
146 personnel decisions are expressly directed not to draw any inferences whatsoever about the
147 absence of these results from any faculty member's dossier. Demonstrating teaching
148 effectiveness, however, is the responsibility of faculty members and may be achieved in a
149 variety of ways, such as those listed in the preceding section. It is important to reiterate that
150 student evaluation of instruction is just a part of the teaching effectiveness. Ratings and written
151 comments from students should be viewed as ongoing components of the overall process of
152 professional growth and teaching improvement. Relying solely on student evaluations to assess
153 the effectiveness of teaching and learning is inappropriate.

154 *Approved by Faculty Senate 3-24-99. Amended Faculty Senate Bill 98-A-05. Amended Faculty Senate Bill 99-A-03.*
155 *Approved by the Faculty Senate Bill 18-A-5, Reviewed by President [DATE], Posted for 15 Day Review*
156 *[DATE]*

157
158 ***

159 Please use the following table for Procedures:

Action	Date
Introduced to Senate	2/7/18
Second Senate Meeting	2/21/18
Faculty Senate Vote	3/7/18
President's Review	
15 Day Review	
Posted to Faculty Handbook	

160
161