SENATE RESOLUTION #1492

Title: Support of Faculty Bill on Teacher Evaluations

Introduced: March 1, 1985

Thesis:

Sponsor: Academic Affairs Committee

1. Whereas the students desire the right to evaluate their teachers, and
2. whereas Trustee Regulations guarantees this right, and whereas the current
3. open-ended university-wide evaluations are too general and ineffective;
4. Be it resolved by the Student Senate of the Associated Students of the
5. University of Wyoming that ASUW support the Faculty Senate Bill #182
6. introduced by the Faculty Academic Standards, Rights and Responsibilities
7. Committee which offers a solution to the current teacher evaluation
8. problem, insures the anonymity of the student, and prohibits release of
9. these evaluations to the instructor or his/her supervisor until the
10. semester or term is completed and final grades have been submitted to
11. the Registrar's Office.

Refereed to: DOI, Pass 3/9/85

Date of Passage: ___________________ Signed: ___________________

ASUW Senate Chairperson

"Being enacted on____________________, I do hereby sign my name hereto and
approve this Senate action." ________________________________ ASUW President

1st Reading 3/2/85
2nd Reading 3/9/85
3rd Reading 3/9/85
A BILL FOR A REGULATION TO
ESTABLISH A FLEXIBLE, FACULTY-APPROVED
TEACHER-RATING SYSTEM

WHEREAS Trustees Regulations, Chapter V, mandates that there
will be systematic student evaluation of teaching, although it is
recognized that this is only one source of information about teaching
performance, and

WHEREAS there is great diversity across campus in course content,
teaching methodologies, and preferred evaluation approach, and conse-
quentially a probable diversity in "the best available tool for the job
at hand," and

WHEREAS more departmental-specific evaluation mechanisms may
enable more precise definition of faculty development needs and solu-
tions, and

WHEREAS there are already experimental evaluation forms being
tested around the campus, and

WHEREAS student evaluations of teaching are used for multiple
purposes including self-improvement of faculty and enhancement of
learning for students, and these purposes may be more effectively
achieved through different evaluation systems, and

WHEREAS the relevant content of UNIREG 401 has been incorporated
herein, therefore, be it

ENACTED by the Faculty Senate of the University of Wyoming that
the current UNIREG 800, Revision 5, be amended by deleting all lan-
guage after the title of the UNIREG and replacing it with the following:

Initiating Authority: University Faculty

Subject: Establishment of a Flexible, Faculty-Approved Teacher-Rating
System

References: (a) Regulations of the Trustees, Chapter IV, Section 2;
    Chapter V, Sections 4 and 5.
(b) Faculty Senate Bill No. ___, adopted by the Faculty
    Senate ___________. 1985
(c) UNIREG 800, Revision 5
(d) UNIREG 401, Revision 1
1. Purpose: Pursuant to the authority contained in reference (a), to establish through the implementation of reference (b) a faculty-approved teacher rating system, and to repeal references (c) and (d).

The purpose of a system for student evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness is twofold:

a. To provide feedback to faculty from students to aid in the improvement of instructional methods; and
b. To provide independent data on teaching effectiveness for consideration in the administrative decision-making process relating to continued employment, salary, promotion, tenure and awards.

2. Policy. a) Teaching faculty are encouraged to survey their students periodically in order to get feedback on matters of interest. Such faculty may wish to devise their own survey forms or utilize existing departmental ones and administer these at any time. Teaching faculty shall use good professional judgment in the design, handling, and interpretation of evaluation materials/comments so that anonymity of the student is reasonably protected.

b) The results of these instructor-initiated evaluations may remain with the instructor, or may be shared with appropriate university administrators at the option of the instructor. If the instructor wishes to have such evaluations included in his or her personnel file, they should be accompanied by a course syllabus and appropriate related material in order to help in their interpretation. Teaching faculty should not consider that the formal, university-mandated evaluations described below are the only evaluations permitted.

c) Student evaluations of teaching and learning, both formal and informal, are only one source of information about an instructor's classroom abilities and performance. Such information can be collected in a variety of ways and at a variety of times. Some approaches to the collection of this type of information include pre- and post-tests, end-of-semester evaluations, exit interviews with graduating seniors, systematic surveys of graduates, and performance of students after graduation. Evaluations by colleagues and peers, by the instructor, and by administrators should, in fairness, be included in any comprehensive evaluation of teaching and learning.

3. Procedures for Mandated Evaluation of Teaching

   a. Each department shall design a format for student evaluation of teaching in all courses taught in/by that department. The chosen format shall provide a reasonable opportunity for all students in a course to express their evaluations. More than one department may choose to use the same format.

   b. Such format shall be designed by, and approved by, the teaching faculty of that department.

   c. In order reasonably to preserve the anonymity of students, "open-ended" or "free response" comments will be typed. Departments shall
decide whether such typing will be done by departmental secretaries, 
or by the students themselves in completing the form outside of class. 
If departmental transcription is employed, any original handwritten 
comments shall be destroyed upon completion of the typed copies. Data 
relating to the class or major of the individual student may be collect-
ed and reported separately, but shall not be keyed in any way to any 
individual open-ended or free response comment(s).

d. The evaluations described in this Section and to be completed in 
the classroom must be administered by an appropriate University employee 
other than the class instructor.

e. The evaluations described in this Section must be given during 
the last two weeks of the semester, or during the last ten percent of 
the contact hours of a term/session less than a semester in length.

f. The evaluations described in this Section shall be released to 
the instructor and/or his or her immediate supervisor only after 
the semester or term is completed and final grades have been 
submitted to the Registrar's office.

g. Except as provided below, raw data from any student evaluation system 
shall not be available outside the department. Such data will be sum-
marized and interpreted by the departmental chair for subsequent admin-
istrative decision making. These summaries and interpretations shall be 
shown to the faculty member so that they may be discussed with the 
departmental chair. Similarly, data pertaining to an administrator 
as a teaching faculty member will be summarized, interpreted and 
discussed by/with a senior member of the faculty who is chosen by 
the faculty of the department. If there is unresolved disagreement 
over the summary of interpretation, or if for any other reason the 
instructor so requests, the raw data must be forwarded along with 
any other available evidence regarding teaching performance to the 
administrative official or committees duly charged with the respon-
sibility for making decisions regarding the instructor's continued 
employment, salary, promotion, tenure or awards. In any event, upon 
request by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and 
after written notification to the individual faculty member, the 
instructor's immediate supervisor shall provide the raw data to the 
administrative officials or committees duly charged with the respon-
sibility for making decisions regarding the individual instructor's 
continued employment, salary, promotion, tenure or awards.

h. Since students and administrators may be utilizing a variety of 
evaluation instruments, it is important that clear instructions to the 
students be part of each instrument. The complete instrument and clear 
interpretation guidelines shall be included in each instructor's 
personnel file.

i. Untenured faculty will be evaluated in each course every semester 
for their first three years. After that, evaluation will be conducted 
in at least one course each semester with different courses (if feasible) 
evaluated in the fall and spring semester of any academic year.

j. There must be a documented professional (peer/colleague or depart-
ment head) review of untenured instructors during their fourth year of
teaching at the University, or one year prior to the year of decision on
tenure, whichever comes first. This review must utilize such items as
course syllabus, tests, texts used, course structure and content, and
observed teaching performance as well as student evaluations of teaching.
k. Tenured assistant and tenured associate professors will be evaluat-
ed in at least one course per semester with different courses (if feas-
ible) evaluated in the fall and spring semester of any academic year.

1. Tenured full professors will be evaluated in at least one course
per year with different courses (if feasible) evaluated during any two
year sequence.

m. In utilizing the results of the teacher evaluation system in the
decision-making process relating to continued employment, salary,
promotion, tenure, and awards, overemphasis on isolated ratings
should be resisted. Department heads and deans are encouraged to
support their recommendations for promotion and tenure with
accumulations of student evaluation data collected over a period
of years.

n. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness in decisions relating to
continued employment, salary, promotion, tenure and awards must
include information from at least these four independent sources:
from students, from the instructor, from peers, and from admini-
strators. Every precaution must be taken by department heads, deans,
and other administrative officers to construe the results of the
student evaluation system for what they are: informal and, in some
cases, uncritical reactions by students to an instructor's classroom
performance and effectiveness.

o. The right to challenge any set of evaluations and their inter-
pretation, or to make a written statement to accompany the results
of the evaluation process as they are distributed, is the prerogative
of any instructor, department/division chairman, dean, or appropriate
committee.