

Recommended Procedures for Evaluation of Instruction

This semester, fall 2016, the campus undergoes a transition from the student assessment of instruction survey (SAIS), which we have used for many years, to a new end-of-course survey (EOCS) still to be named. The new instrument debuts after three years of study, gathering of feedback, and piloting of new questions and on-line platform. This document is intended to provide guidance to the campus community on evaluation of instruction and is timed to coincide with the implementation of the EOCS.

The recommendations are based on the principle that evaluation of instruction should be comprehensive and holistic. It should never be carried out on the basis of any one data element submitted for the evaluation, *especially on the basis of EOCS results alone*. Furthermore, any evaluation should consider multiple years of instructional performance and all pertinent contexts (comparisons, level of difficulty, and so on).

Elements of evaluation of instruction: The following elements, without limitation, should be considered in the evaluation of instruction.

1. Instructor's self-assessment of instruction;
2. Peer review of instruction;
3. EOCS results;
4. Appropriate aggregate EOCS data;
5. Appropriate supporting materials submitted by the faculty member, such as, without limitation, evidence of professional development activities related to instruction, creation of new courses, awards for teaching, scholarship on teaching and learning, or evidence of innovation in instructional content or delivery;
6. Other documentation, as appropriate or required by departmental or collegiate bylaws.

End-of-Course Survey (EOCS)

Administration: In order to maximize response rates, instructors should set aside 10-15 minutes of regular class time to allow students to complete the EOCS. During this time, the instructor should leave the room and ask a member of the class to guide the process and encourage completion of the survey. Because students will need a laptop, tablet, or smart phone to complete the survey, instructors should announce the date of in-class completion of the EOCS well in advance. In-class administration removes the need for incentives to encourage student participation. The Office of the Provost strongly discourages offering any incentives to individual students to complete the EOCS.

Use in the Annual Performance and Planning Review (annual evaluation): *EOCS results alone should never be the grounds for evaluation of instruction.* They are to be used in conjunction with the other elements of evaluation, listed above. Moreover, the evaluator should consider, where appropriate, multiple years of EOCS results for the course and instructor; EOCS results for similar courses in an academic or collegiate unit; overall departmental, collegiate, and university EOCS results; and other factors of significance, as appropriate or required by departmental or collegiate bylaws.

Evaluators will be given access to EOCS results, including two free-form (discursive) responses, which are incorporated into the new instrument and reported with the quantitative results. The Office of the Provost will work with campus units to provide them with appropriate

aggregated EOCS results, as noted in item 4 under the heading, “Elements of evaluation of instruction.

Use in the tenure and promotion process: As required by the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (MFE), the EOCS results will replace the SAIS results in the tenure and promotion dossier. The dossier will contain a table of responses to the first eight (quantitative) questions of the EOCS. The summary of the “best liked” and “least liked” aspects of instruction will be taken from the two free-form (discursive) questions in the EOCS.

Peer Review of Teaching

The *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (MFE) requires that an application for tenure and / or promotion contain one or more peer reviews of teaching. This requirement reflects consensus that peer review is an essential element in the evaluation of faculty performance in instruction. Because evaluation of instruction continues beyond the probationary period and after promotion to professor, and because many instructional faculty are not on the tenure track and thus not covered by the MFE’s peer-review requirements, all instructional faculty members must undergo peer review of teaching *at least every seven years*. Units may require more frequent peer review. A mechanism will be developed in the annual evaluation online system to monitor compliance with this requirement.

Each college will develop its own recommended process for peer review of teaching. After approval by the provost, the recommended peer-review process will be published by the college.