

University Senate of Michigan Technological University

Proposal 2-22

(Voting Units: Academic)

Revisions to Procedure 504.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness Evaluations

Introduced by: The Office of the Provost

I. Introduction

Since at least the 2019-2020 academic year there has been interest among students, instructional personnel, academic leaders, and others to update the University's procedures for communicating the results of teaching evaluations. In all cases, the ultimate goal is to maximize the quality of instruction at Michigan Tech.

II. Rationale

Maximizing the quality of instruction requires providing instructional supervisors with direct access to student feedback regarding instructors' strengths and areas in need of improvement. Instructors' supervisors are expected to provide timely and appropriate assistance and support, when needed, to achieve excellence in instruction at Michigan Tech. The most significant change from the current version of this procedure to the proposed version is that students' comments will be shared with the academic administrators that lead academic units responsible for offering an academic course. This change will bring Michigan Tech's policy in line with policies at many other universities.

This proposal also includes editorial changes intended to update the language used in the procedures to match what is currently being used at Michigan Tech.

III. Proposal

The proposed changes to Procedure 504.1.1 are shown in red below.

Proposed Revisions Shown with Changes Tracked from Current Version:

Procedure 504.1.1

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATIONS

(PROPOSAL 12-03)

(PROPOSAL 22-13)

(PROPOSAL 22-18)

(PROPOSAL 41-19)

~~Senate Procedures 504.1.1~~

The Senate recommends that:

- ~~1. The University establish a permanent professionally staffed center for teaching excellence where individual faculty members can obtain help in developing teaching skills and improving instruction, and~~
- ~~2. The University adopt an equitable and standardized teaching evaluation system that will provide information for individual faculty to use in improving teaching performance and for administrators to use in making personnel decisions.~~

The following definitions are used in this proposal [from 2-87]:

- ~~1. "Faculty Member," "Instructional personnel" or "instructor"~~ refers to all persons responsible for teaching courses. This includes tenured and untenured faculty, non-tenure-track faculty (adjunct, visiting, instructor, lecturer, faculty assistant, temporary, part-time, etc.), and graduate teaching assistants/~~instructors (GTAs/GTIs).~~
- ~~2. "Academic Administrator"~~ refers to ~~department head,~~ department chairs, deans or directors of ~~academic units a college or school,~~ the chief academic officer and others who supervise faculty members.

~~I. CENTER FOR TEACHING, LEARNING, AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT~~

- ~~3. A "Center for Teaching and Learning" or "CTL," and Faculty Development~~ is ~~a the~~ professionally staffed facility ~~which that will sponsor~~s workshops and training programs ~~for faculty and graduate teaching assistants, as well as~~ and provides private consultations for ~~individual faculty members instructional personnel.~~ Individual ~~faculty~~ consultations with the ~~Center for Teaching, Learning CTL, and Faculty Development~~ ~~will be~~ are kept confidential and ~~will~~ are not ~~be~~ made available to administrators.

~~II. TEACHING EVALUATION SYSTEM~~

Each ~~department or school unit~~ will ~~will~~ establish es an internal mechanism by which it evaluates the appropriateness of level, content, and currency of courses taught by ~~individual faculty~~

~~members~~instructional personnel and the quality of ~~the~~an instructor's contribution to the teaching mission of the ~~university~~University.

A three-tiered approach to evaluation of teaching ~~has been found to be the current best practice~~is used. Therefore, in addition to student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, ~~the~~each instructor has the right to include peer and/or self-evaluation ~~(s) as a component of~~in the evaluation of their teaching. No single measure should constitute ~~the majority~~ (more than 50%) of the ~~teaching~~evaluation. The ~~Center for Teaching and Learning~~will be~~CTL~~ is responsible for establishing and maintaining a webpage that provides materials and best~~_~~practice procedures for ~~the~~evaluation of teaching.

The appropriate academic administrator will list on the Senate website their unit's evaluation instruments and processes in sufficient detail for instructors to understand how their teaching is being evaluated.

A. Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness

1. Evaluation instrument:

The ~~Center for Teaching, Learning~~CTL~~, and Faculty development~~ will be responsible for developing and distributing appropriate instruments to allow ~~MTU~~Michigan Tech students to provide meaningful and comprehensive feedback to ~~those charged with instructional duties~~instructors and their supervisors. The instrument should include language to inform students of potential bias during evaluation. Instruments will consist of a series of items pertaining to generally recognized features of quality instructional practices and will also give students the opportunity to provide their written opinions and suggestions for ~~instructional~~improvement.

All such instruments, or any changes to existing instruments, will be presented to the University Senate Academic and Instructional Policy Committee for consideration. Any changes to the university-wide default evaluation instruments or university-wide implementations of new instruments are subject to the prior approval of the University Senate, administration, and Board of Trustees.

2. Frequency of required student evaluation:

~~Faculty members and graduate teaching assistants~~Instructors will evaluate at least one section of each different course ~~preparation~~each semester, unless required to do more by the academic unit(s) associated with that course. Student rating of instruction surveys will be sent and summaries delivered ~~only in for~~sections with an enrollment of six or more students unless otherwise specified by an individual academic unit.

3. Procedures for student evaluations:

The ~~Center for Teaching and Learning~~CTL will ~~electronically~~direct end-of-term-survey requests to students only during the last ~~3~~three weeks of any term. ~~Faculty~~Instructors will be notified when surveys are ~~opened~~sent, and will have opportunities to ~~see~~monitor the response rates ~~and encourage responses according to their own discretion~~during the evaluation period.

The ~~Center for Teaching and Learning~~CTL will ~~electronically~~release the summarized numerical responses and written comments to the faculty member, their direct supervisor (for GTAs/GTIs), and the academic administrator of the unit(s) offering the course. Deans of colleges with

~~departments and the provost (or their designee) and their supervisor's supervisor. The Provost or their designee will also be provided with the summarized numerical responses and will be provided with access to written comments upon request. Copies of relevant section summaries. The written comments will be shared with supervisors only if the faculty member gives supervisors access to the comments.~~

Summaries from general education core course sections ~~will~~ constitute a special case and will also be sent to the relevant core course coordinator and to the person charged by the Provost with general education instructional oversight.

The Center for Teaching and Learning CTL will not release any information related to the student rating of instruction scores of any instructor prior to the end of the grade submission period for that term. No release will occur at any time to any other parties without the prior written permission of that instructor, except as required by law.

The Center for Teaching and Learning CTL will present an annual report on teaching at Michigan Tech to the Senate. This report must include but is not limited to statistical analysis of the university-required questions.

4. Uses of the results of student evaluations:

The goal of conducting student evaluations is to give the appropriate academic administrator information that they can use to help instructional personnel develop and implement plans to promote continuous improvement of the quality of instruction across campus. The overall process and specific procedures pertaining to how student evaluations will be addressed and utilized by the academic administrator in promoting teaching improvement are to be defined in the charter of each unit.

The evaluated instructor will be able to use the information derived from student evaluations to identify strengths and weaknesses. The responsibility to act on evaluation information to improve instruction rests with the evaluated instructor.

The appropriate academic administrator will also use the numerical ratings derived from student evaluations in partial support for and justification of personnel decisions (e.g., reappointment, promotion, tenure, and yearly salary adjustments) concerning the faculty member/instructor being evaluated. ~~[from 5-99]. The appropriate academic administrator will list on the Senate website their evaluation instruments and processes (peer evaluation form, self-evaluation forms, etc.) in sufficient detail for new faculty to understand the basis on which their teaching is being evaluated, and the percentage weight given to each instrument. [JH1]~~

~~The evaluated faculty member will be able to use the information derived from student evaluations to identify strengths and weaknesses. The responsibility to act on evaluation information to improve instruction rests with the evaluated instructor. [JH2]~~

5. Trial usage of alternative student evaluations instruments: ~~[from 2-97]~~

Any alternative instrument will be furnished by the Director of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development CTL. These are understood to be trial instruments being considered for adoption by the University.

The instrument will be used only by those [faculty members/instructors](#) who freely elect to use the instrument in their classes. These [faculty members/instructors](#) will cooperate with the [Director](#) in the administration of the evaluation.

The results of the evaluations will be furnished to the [faculty members/instructors](#) and [others as appropriate/department chairs](#), following current policy. The results of the evaluation will also be furnished to the [Director](#).

Before ~~the~~ administration of the evaluation, [faculty members/instructors](#) may elect to have the results of some or all items of the trial instrument released for publication, ~~e.g., by the USG Teaching Standards Committee~~.

The results of the evaluation will be retained by the [Director/director](#), who will maintain the results in strict confidence. The results will be used only for assessing the usefulness of the trial instruments, unless other use is granted in written permission from the individual [faculty member/instructor](#) to the [Director/director](#).

B. Peer or Colleague Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

1. Procedures for peer or colleague evaluation:

Peer or colleague evaluations of teaching will be conducted according to [departmentally each unit's](#) established procedures and reported initially to the evaluated [faculty member/instructor](#). After ~~they/the instructor has/have had~~ the opportunity to [provide a written response](#) to the evaluation ([within 14 days](#)), the evaluators will report a final summary evaluation [that includes the instructor's written response](#) to the [head/chair/dean/academic administrator that leads the instructor's unit](#). ~~The evaluated faculty member may then submit a written statement if they wish to formally rebut or affirm the evaluation.~~ All instructors have the opportunity to provide a peer or colleague evaluation as part of their evaluation of teaching.

2. Uses of peer or colleague evaluation:

The evaluated [faculty member/instructor](#) will be able to use the evaluation's guidance in course development and teaching improvement. Peer or colleague evaluations are intended to ensure that instructors receive constructive advice concerning their professional development, but the responsibility for using that advice to improve instruction rests with the evaluated instructor.

The information derived from peer or colleague evaluations may be used by academic administrators [as in](#) partial support ~~of~~ and [as](#) justification for personnel decisions ([e.g.](#), reappointment, tenure, promotion, and yearly salary adjustments). The evaluation of teaching will be weighted in a manner [which-that](#) is commensurate with the assigned teaching responsibilities of each [faculty member/instructor](#).

C. Self-Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

1. Procedures for self-evaluation:

Self-evaluations of teaching will be conducted according to ~~departmentally~~ each unit's established procedures. All instructors have the opportunity to provide a self-evaluation as part of their evaluation of teaching to the head/chair/dean.

2. Uses of self-evaluation:

The instructor will be able to use the evaluation's guidance in course development and teaching improvement. Self-evaluations are intended to serve as a documentation of and reflection on the instructional experience.

The information derived from self-evaluations may be used by academic administrators ~~as in~~ partial support of and as justification for personnel decisions (reappointment, tenure, promotion, and yearly salary adjustments). The evaluation of teaching will be weighted in a manner ~~which~~ that is commensurate with the assigned teaching responsibilities of each ~~faculty member~~ instructor.

Proposal 12-03:

Adopted by Senate: 23 April 2003

Approved by President: 19 May 2003

Proposal 22-13:

Introduced to Senate: 27 March 2013

Approved by Senate: 10 April 2013

Approved by Administration: 27 April 2013

Proposal 22-18:

Introduced to Senate: 11 April 2018

Approved by Senate: 25 April 2018

Approved by Administration: 21 May 2018

Proposal 41-19:

Introduced to Senate 27 March 2019

Approved by Senate: 10 April 2019

Approved by Administration with editorial changes: 29 April 2019

[Proposal XX-22 \(this proposal\):](#)