At its meeting of May 8, 2006, the Academic Senate passed the following Policy Recommendation presented by Senator Bros for the Professional Standards Committee.

**POLICY RESOLUTION**

**PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED WHEN ADMINISTERING SOTES**

Whereas increased standardization and accountability of the SOTE administration will improve the integrity of the process; and

Whereas policy S03-3 has been rescinded; and

Whereas polices S87-9, S86-2 and S98-4, which had been rescinded by S03-3, are again in effect; be it therefore

Resolved that, policies S87-9, S86-2, S98-4 are hereby rescinded; be it further

Resolved that the following procedures for the administering of SOTES be adopted; be it finally

Resolved that SERB continue to evaluate the efficacy of on-line SOTES, including administration subsequent to final exams.

Financial Impact: It is estimated that the costs for SOTE administration and analyses will be reduced by $7,000-$10,000 per semester.

Vote: 7-0-0

Present: Bros, Desalvo, Dhar, Liu, Merdinger, Nelson, Perry

Absent: Gao, Glover, Jiang, Pogodzinski
1. Timing of SOTE Administration

1.1. SOTEs shall be administered during the final 10 days of classes.

1.2. Instructors are encouraged to administer the SOTE during the first 30 minutes of class. Instructors shall ensure that students have sufficient time to fully complete all evaluation instruments (with a 15-minute minimum suggested).

2. Faculty Responsibilities

2.1. Faculty are encouraged to select a proctor and a substitute proctor at least one week before the administration of the SOTE instrument.

2.2. Faculty shall be given a checklist that fully and clearly describes the procedures to be followed while administering SOTES. Faculty shall be required to indicate with their signature that they have read and complied with the procedures.

3. Proctor Instructions

3.1. Proctors shall be given a checklist that fully and clearly describes the procedures to be followed while administering SOTES. Proctors shall be required to indicate with their signature, printed name, and student ID that they have read and complied with the procedures.

3.2. Proctor instructions shall require the proctor to read the following statement: "You are being asked to complete a Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness, or SOTE, form. The results of the SOTE serve some important purposes. First, the results provide helpful feedback to the instructor, which can assist in improvement of instruction and course design. In addition, the results are an element of the instructor's performance evaluation. While the SOTE results are an important part of the instructor's evaluation process, they are but one element of that process."

3.3. Under no circumstances shall any completed SOTE instruments be returned to the instructor of record. In on-campus classes commencing before 5:00 p.m., proctors should return the completed SOTE instruments to the department office. The Institutional Planning and Academic Resources Office, in consultation with the Professional Standards Committee, shall be responsible for devising procedures whereby proctors in night and off-campus classes can return completed SOTE instruments without giving them to their instructors. Except for off-campus classes, all SOTE instruments should be returned on the same day they were administered.

4. Qualitative Section of SOTE

4.1. The qualitative section of the SOTE forms will be returned to the department and processed as stated in F83-2. However, these data, unlike department-developed forms for evaluating student opinions on teaching effectiveness, will be collected as part of the SOTE process.


5.1. SOTEs are required for all faculty who teach.

5.2. Each instructional faculty member is required to have a minimum of two (2) classes annually evaluated with SOTEs.

5.3. SOTEs shall be collected in classes representative of the faculty member’s teaching assignment.
5.4. Unless consultation with an academic unit has resulted in an agreement by the administration and faculty
to evaluate all classes, the classes to be evaluated shall be jointly determined in consultation between the
faculty member being evaluated and his/her department chair.

5.5. In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the department chair, each party shall
select 50% of the total courses to be evaluated.

6. Implementation date. The policy will become effective immediately.

ACTION BY UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT: Approved by President Don Kassing on

May 15, 2006