Academic Senate Policy #S15-213

Administration and Processing of Electronic and Paper Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation Forms

(Formerly A.S. Policy #S13-213)

Rationale: With the introduction of electronic Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation Forms (TEEFs) approved by the recent Collective Bargaining Agreement, and the ongoing campus initiative to implement fully electronic student evaluations of teaching effectiveness in fall 2013, the following revisions to policy S13-213 are proposed to help ensure uniformity in the administration and processing of TEEFs.

Requirements Governing both Electronic and Paper TEEFs:

1. Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness shall be anonymous.
2. The instructor shall not be in the room when students are completing the evaluations.
3. Instructors shall not be provided access to evaluation data until after all final grades for the course have been submitted.
4. All aspects of the evaluation process, including collection and storage of data, shall be conducted with due regard for necessary privacy and security policies, guidelines, and practices.
5. Evaluation data shall be stored in accordance with current university policy and practice regarding the secure storage of sensitive personnel data.
6. The sharing and dissemination of all evaluation data shall conform to the provisions of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement and all university policies related to hiring, retention, tenure and promotion.
7. The evaluation process is subject to ADA regulations.
8. All TEEFs shall include the six university core items, shown at the end of this policy document. Colleges and departments are encouraged to add items to the actual instrument. Standard instructions shall read as follows:

Please evaluate the teaching effectiveness of your instructor. Your responses are important and will play a significant role in performance evaluations and in retention, tenure, and promotion decisions and post-tenure reviews. Your responses are anonymous, and your instructor will receive this feedback ONLY after course grades have been assigned.

For items 1-6, rate the item on a scale ranging from the most positive response (a) to the least positive response (e).

Online Course Evaluation Process

1. Two (2) weeks before the end of instruction, students will be sent notice via official university communication methods that the TEEF is available for each course in which the students are enrolled. Such notice will explain the purpose of the TEEF, describe any incentives offered by the university for its completion, provide explicit instructions on how to complete the evaluation, and include a direct link to the TEEF.
2. Two (2) weeks before the end of instruction, instructors will receive notice via official university communication methods that TEEF notices have been sent to students. This message will include a copy of the message sent to the students and will request instructors to encourage their students to complete the TEEFs.
3. Access to electronic evaluation TEEF data will be provided to the instructor only after final grades have been
submitted for all students enrolled in the course.

4. Any additional items to be added to the TEEF standard six core items by either the College or the Department must be submitted to the evaluation system administrator prior to the beginning of the sixth (6th) week of instruction.

Additional Criteria for the Use of Paper Course Evaluations:

It is the intent of this policy that paper TEEFs be employed only when (a) the online system of TEEFs is not available or (b) a student requests paper TEEFs because of special needs.

1. Whenever possible, student evaluation forms should be distributed and their completion supervised by someone other than the instructor being evaluated, e.g., a teaching assistant, colleague, or office staff member.

2. If this is not possible, the instructor shall inform the department chair and assign a reliable student who will distribute the evaluation forms, read the instructions aloud, and collect the finished forms and take them immediately after class to a designated person or location for further processing.

3. Before the evaluation is conducted, the instructor shall inform the office staff of the name of the person who will collect the finished evaluation forms and deliver them to the designated person or location.

4. Before leaving the classroom, the instructor shall read the standard instructions (item 8 under Requirements, above) to the student(s).

Six Core Items To Be Used In Electronic And/Or Written TEEFs

1. The instructor defined the course objectives, learning activities, requirements and grading policies clearly in the syllabus.

   Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree
   A    B    C    D    E

2. The course was organized in a way that helped my learning.

   Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree
   A    B    C    D    E

3. The instructor created experiences that stimulated my learning.

   Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree
   A    B    C    D    E

4. The instructor provided helpful and timely feedback on my performance and progress throughout the semester.
5. The instructor was open to a variety of points of view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For item 6, please rate the overall effectiveness of your instructor on a scale ranging from the most positive response (highly effective) to the least positive response (ineffective).

6. When I consider the contribution to my learning, this instructor’s teaching was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy and all procedures related to the implementation of electronic TEEFs shall be reviewed jointly by the Academic Senate and appropriate University administrators no later than five (5) years after the date of implementation.

*Approved by the Academic Senate at its meeting on Tuesday, February 24, 2015*