BACKGROUND

In order to clarify our recommendations, we have separated and numbered the sentences in the first recommendation. Following the recommendations is a list of the issues addressed by the legislation and the parts of the recommendations which address them.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation 1. Revise the third paragraph in the description of Department, Campus, or Program Review level (in section III of PS-23) as follows:

In evaluating a candidate for promotion or tenure, the department committee should seek the views of senior members of the candidate's academic unit. Furthermore, evaluations of teaching faculty for promotion and tenure shall be accompanied by documentation of student views. In many cases, evaluations by expert peers in other institutions may provide essential helpful information.

(1) EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS FOR PURPOSES OF PROMOTION AND TENURE SHALL INCLUDE BOTH PEER AND STUDENT INPUT.

(2) THE METHODS OF EVALUATION TO BE USED WITHIN A UNIT, AS WELL AS THE MANNER IN WHICH THE RESULTS ARE PRESENTED IN THE DOSSIER, SHALL BE SELECTED BY THE FACULTY OF THAT UNIT.

(3) IN THE CASE OF THE COLLEGE, "UNIT" IS DEFINED TO MEAN THE DEPARTMENT OR SIMILAR ACADEMIC ENTITY; FOR THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES, "UNIT" IS DEFINED AS THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES.

(4) IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNIT TO PROVIDE CLEAR DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE OF A CANDIDATE'S TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS, INCLUDING BOTH PEER AND STUDENT EVALUATION.

(5) REGARDING STUDENT EVALUATIONS, ALL UNITS SHALL ASK A FEW STANDARDIZED COMPREHENSIVE QUESTIONS ON THE OVERALL QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION.

(6) IN ADDITION TO THESE STANDARDIZED QUESTIONS, EACH UNIT MAY ALSO SEEK THROUGH STUDENT EVALUATIONS WHATEVER OTHER INFORMATION THE UNIT DEEMS APPROPRIATE.

(7) THE STANDARDIZED COMPREHENSIVE QUESTIONS ARE INTENDED TO PROVIDE A COMMON BASE OF INFORMATION SO THAT ALL LEVELS OF REVIEW CAN BETTER UNDERSTAND AND INTERPRET STUDENT EVALUATIONS.

(8) THE EVALUATION PROCEDURE SPECIFIED BY EACH UNIT MUST BE APPROVED BY THE APPROPRIATE DEAN (AND BY THE DEAN OF THE COMMONWEALTH CAMPUS FOR THOSE FACULTY ASSIGNED TO ANY OF THE COMMONWEALTH CAMPUSES); WHATEVER PROCEDURE A UNIT CHOOSES TO USE MUST BE DESIGNED BY OR SELECTED BY THE FACULTY OF THAT UNIT FOR EVALUATING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS FOR PURPOSES OF PROMOTION AND TENURE.

(9) THE PROCESS MUST BE MANAGED SO THAT THE CANDIDATE IS NOT IN A POSITION TO INFLUENCE THE STUDENT RESPONSES OR THE INTERPRETATION OF THE SURVEY RESULTS.
(10) SUCH SURVEYS SHALL BELONG TO THE UNIT WHICH ADMINISTERS THEM AND SHALL
BE SUMMARIZED AND INTERPRETED AS PART OF THE PROMOTION AND TENURE DOCU-
MENTATION.

(11) THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEYS SHALL BE MADE KNOWN TO THE CANDIDATE.

Recommendation 2.

This legislation shall supersede all previous University Faculty Senate legislation
concerning the evaluation of teaching for purposes of promotion and tenure. The Senate
hereby repeals all other such legislation.

Recommendation 3.

The Provost's Office shall act to facilitate the exchange of methods and ideas
concerning the evaluation of teaching among the various units of the University.

Recommendation 4.

The President of the University and the Chairman of the University Faculty Senate
shall jointly appoint an ad hoc committee of faculty and administrators to develop the
standardized comprehensive questions referred to in Recommendation 1.

CLARIFICATION OF ISSUES

Following are the issues and problems involved with evaluation of teaching for
promotion and tenure which the present legislation addresses. Many are longstanding
problems. Some have been discussed at length in previous Senate debates. We believe
that the present legislation represents a step toward solving these problems.

(1) There is and has been confusion between evaluation of teaching for
promotion and tenure and evaluation for course or instructor improvement.
Early Senate legislation dealt with the latter. PS-23 deals only with
the former. What is appropriate for one type of evaluation may not be
appropriate for the other. Recommendation 1; sentences 8 and 10; recom-
mandation 2.

(2) Student evaluations shall not be used as the sole data for evaluating
teaching effectiveness. Recommendation 1; sentences 1 and 4.

(3) The evaluations done for promotion and tenure purposes must be administered
in an objective manner, so that the candidate cannot unduly influence the
results. (See the report of the Student Evaluation Subcommittee of the
Senate Committee on Academic Affairs; February 1, 1977). Recommendation 1; sentence 9.

(4) Different units may need to seek different information concerning teaching
effectiveness. What may be an appropriate question about a large lecture
may not be appropriate concerning a smaller seminar or a lab. Some units
prefer one method of evaluation; other units may prefer another (e.g., in-
class surveys vs. alumni surveys). Recommendation 1; sentences 2,3,4,6,& 8.
(5) Some faculty have complained that college or department administrations have imposed a method of evaluation on the faculty without appropriate consultation. Others have complained about an imposed method of presenting the evaluation results. Recommendation 1; sentences 2, 3. (The faculty must approve the procedures).

(6) There is confusion, if not outright contradiction, in earlier Senate legislation. Recommendation 2.

(7) Multiplicity of forms and formats makes the use of student evaluations difficult for College promotion and tenure committees as well as the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Recommendation 1; sentences 5 and 7; Recommendation 4.
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HISTORY OF LEGISLATIVE ACTION

The preceding recommendations, in a slightly different form, were moved and seconded by the committee at the October 6 meeting of the Senate.

At the end of debate, Sally Small moved to delete numbered items 5, 6, & 7 of Recommendation 1 and add (substitute in the place of numbered items 5, 6, & 7) this sentence.

"Each unit shall seek, through its student evaluations, whatever information the unit deems appropriate."

Small also moved to delete Recommendation 4.

The motion was tabled until the next regular Senate Meeting. The November Senate Meeting was cancelled and this report was on the Agenda for the December 15 Senate Meeting. Bad weather resulted in poor representation from the campuses so the Senate agreed with a motion by George Franz to table the action until the next regular meeting, February 2, 1982.

The report, labeled "Teaching Ability and Effectiveness" has no official standing. It is included as one example and is for information only (See Attachment I).

ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY THE SENATE

The Senate must first vote on Sally Small's motion before preceding with the committee recommendations.
"Teaching Ability and Effectiveness"
A Criterion for Promotion and Tenure

[Example - For Information Only]

1. Course Evaluations for Instructional Improvement

   A. Periodically during the academic term a faculty member should encourage and permit students to evaluate the on-going course. An instrument should be developed which would be of benefit to the instructor with questions related specifically to teaching the on-going course.

   B. On a three-year cycle, at least three colleges annually should submit samples of instruments used and a narrative to describe department and college course evaluation for instructional improvement. These instruments should be forwarded to the Undergraduate Instruction Committee of the Senate for review and discussion.

2. Instructor Evaluations

   A. Each year all instructors should submit a student evaluation on teaching effectiveness to the Departmental Chair or Campus Director for at least one term's teaching. Each department and/or college should use a common core of at least three questions. These questions should include: (1) the instructor's ability to motivate the student to learn, (2) the instructor’s capacity to deal with the students in a fair and equitable manner and (3) the student opinions on the overall rating of the instructor. Additional questions regarding teacher evaluation may be added to the three core questions at the department's discretion.

   B. A three-year cycle is proposed, with at least three colleges annually submitting instruments used and a narrative to the Office of the Provost, who in turn will report to the Senate. The content and form of the teacher evaluations are a responsibility of the academic departments of the University.

3. Use of Measures of Teaching Effectiveness in Promotion and/or Tenure Reviews

   A. All dossiers forwarded by Colleges, University Libraries and/or the Dean of the Commonwealth Educational System to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for faculty members whose duties include classroom teaching, must include evidence of student evaluations and, separately, peer review judgements of teaching effectiveness. Summaries of the Instructor Evaluations discussed in (2A) above must be used to satisfy the requirements for student evaluations, unless the Department or College has an approved alternative form. (Surveys of former students after some time has elapsed or graduates are explicitly included as appropriate alternative measures of student evaluation of teaching for this purpose.)
A responsible officer, the Departmental Chair for example, as well as a representative of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee should describe the faculty member's teaching as: (a) exceptional, (b) excellent, (c) very good, (d) above average, (e) average, (f) below average, or (g) unsatisfactory. The criteria for making this judgement should be included in the faculty member's dossier and forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. These criteria should be explicit and straightforward.

B. Peer reviews should also be summarized by the responsible officers mentioned above.

(FOR EXAMPLE ONLY)

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor's Effect on Motivation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Treatment of Students in a Fair and Equitable Manner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall Rating of Instructor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U - Unsatisfactory
BA - Below Average
A - Average
AA - Above Average
VG - Very Good
E - Excellent
S - Superior

FROM: A Subcommittee of Deans, Karl G. Stoedetalke, Chairman.