**SENATE RESOLUTION 96-08**

The Improvement of Instruction Committee recommends that the following resolution be adopted by the Faculty Senate:

*Whereas* the Faculty Senate has charged the Improvement of Instruction Committee to examine alternative/additional measures of evaluation of instruction that would be both intellectually defensible and economically feasible for implementation; and

*Whereas* the Committee strongly feels that formative evaluations, which may be developmental in nature, and summative evaluations, several of which may be included in tenure and promotion decisions, should normally be separate processes; and

*Whereas* formative evaluation is an essential element of instructional improvement, and

*Whereas* the practice of teaching is a continually evolving process, requiring multiple, defensible forms of evaluation which are practical to implement, the Center for Faculty Development, with its varied resources, expertise, and autonomy, should play a vital role in the formulation of teaching development programs;

*Be it therefore resolved* that the Faculty Senate approves the following recommendations by the Faculty Senate Improvement of Instruction Committee.

**Recommendations**

1. Each department shall have a teaching development program to help instructional staff to improve their teaching effectiveness. Such a program must provide formative evaluation of instruction by several means and appropriate options for amelioration.
2. Among possible procedures for formative evaluation, each department should consider methods mentioned in PS-36 and the faculty handbook, but especially:
   a. Peer observations. Formative peer observation is the process of faculty members attending and observing peers in the classroom to assist with the improvement of teaching. Peer observations can be based on checklists, rating scales, and/or written analyses. The teacher being observed must be allowed to respond in writing to any observation that will become part of that teacher's record or portfolio. Peer reviewers should receive appropriate training through the Center for Faculty Development.
   b. Teaching portfolios. A portfolio would contain material such as self-evaluations, syllabi, lecture notes or textbooks, comments from observers, comments from student evaluations, statements on how students were graded, innovative approaches r teaching methods. Faculty should seek advice on portfolio development from the Center for Faculty Development.
   c. Student evaluations. In addition to completing a multiple-choice form, students should be encouraged to write comments regarding the course and teacher.
   d. Student performance on uniform departmental exams or standardized tests

     e.    Preparation of creative teaching material or instructional strategies or exceptional contributions to a department's instructional program.

3. The amelioration component of the teaching development program should comprise multiple options, which may include:
    a. Mentoring.  An experience, skilled faculty member in the department or in the College or School would help and advise another teacher.
    b. Videotaping of classes.  Videotaping done by a trained reviewer, with the expectation that the teacher would then self-review the taped session, and subsequently meet with the reviewer to discuss observations.
    c. Consultation with the Center for Faculty Development on methods to improve teaching effectiveness.

4. Since evaluation of teaching quality may be a major part of promotion and tenure decisions, the following procedures should be followed at the minimum:
    a. The chair shall publicize the department's teaching development program to the teaching staff and encourage development of formative evaluation methods appropriate to the subject matter in each course.  The chair shall especially see that junior faculty and new hires are familiar with department formative evaluations procedures.  The chair shall also hold a conference with any faculty member who scores less than half of the maximum points on the "overall rating" question on student evaluations in any section, for faculty who show evidence of grade inflation, or for whom there is other evidence that a significant problem exists regarding teaching.  At such a conference, the chair will explore the reasons for the low evaluations or problem and will recommend appropriate actions for improvement consistent with the department's teaching development program.
    b. The dean or director of each college or school is responsible for assuring each department has in place a teaching development program consistent with this document. The dean or director of each college or school shall also coordinate a mentoring program for the departments within that unit. The dean or director shall publicize criteria used for evaluating teaching for promotion and tenure purposes. Mentors within the college or school shall be identified based on teaching awards or a long history of outstanding instruction.  Each mentor may be given appropriate release time depending on the number of teachers that he/she advises.
    c. The Office of Academic Affairs should monitor methods of teaching assessment used in colleges and departments both for evaluation and for faculty development and assure that multiple and appropriate assessment techniques are used.  The Office of Academic Affairs should also provide adequate support to colleges and departments to encourage instructional staff to explore and experiment with diverse teaching methods and strategies, incorporating new technology and interdisciplinary approaches where appropriate.  Assessment strategies should be appropriate to the innovations employed and should be designed to enhance teacher effectiveness.

5. The Center for Faculty Development should be given adequate support to develop and conduct workshops on the formative evaluation of teaching for teaching faculty, chairs, and academic convenience. The Center for Faculty Development shall review each department's teaching

development program once each five years and make recommendations as to how each department might improve/modify its program.