

6  
7  
8  
9 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**  
10 **Amendment B to University Policy S15-8**  
11 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**  
12 **Criteria and Standards**

13  
14  
15 Resolved: That S15-8 be amended as shown in the ~~strikeout~~ and underline of the  
16 excerpted policy.

17  
18 Rationale: Professional Standards has become aware of several limitations in the  
19 “baseline” teaching descriptor of our RTP policy. This descriptor sets the  
20 minimum standards in teaching expected for tenure.

21  
22 The main purpose of our amendment is to achieve the policy’s original intent  
23 that teaching be evaluated holistically and fairly, using multiple sources of  
24 information, including but not limited to the Student Opinion of Teaching  
25 Effectiveness surveys (SOTES.)

26  
27 First, our revised language seeks to correct a problem with the way the  
28 current language discusses the “norms” of our SOTES. As one example of  
29 the problem, it is sometimes the case that a SOTE evaluation of 4.0 is  
30 “below the norm” as set by the Student Evaluation Review Board, even  
31 though the SOTE instrument states that a “4” means that the student agrees  
32 that the instructor is “effective.” Thus, faculty who are judged to be  
33 “effective” by their students are sometimes judged to be “below the norm”  
34 with important negative consequences for their professional advancement.  
35 Our proposed language corrects this problem by providing needed flexibility,  
36 indicating that the survey results, “are considered supportive if they are  
37 either within appropriate norms, or if a preponderance of student opinion  
38 from objective and subjective questions indicates effective teaching.”

39  
40 The committee also inserted a reference to “course syllabi and other  
41 teaching materials.” These materials are already commonly present in  
42 dossiers, but the explicit inclusion of this language reminds evaluators that  
43 information beyond the SOTES must also be considered.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Approved: December 10, 2019  
51 Vote: 10-0-0  
52 Present: He, Cargill, Peter, Monday, Kumar, Mahendra, Kemnitz, Birrer, Chin,  
53 Riley  
54 Absent: None  
55 Financial Impact: No direct impact  
56 Workload Impact: No direct impact  
57

58 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**

59 **Amending S15-8**

60 **University Policy, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**  
61 **Criteria and Standards**

62  
63 ....

64  
65 ~~3.3.1.3.2 Baseline. The candidate has taught assigned courses that are well crafted and~~  
66 ~~appropriate for the catalog description. The candidate has taken measures to~~  
67 ~~correct any problems identified earlier in either direct observations or prior~~  
68 ~~performance evaluations. Recent direct observations are supportive. Student~~  
69 ~~evaluations, taking into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught,~~  
70 ~~generally within the norms by the end of the review period, particularly for~~  
71 ~~classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically~~  
72 ~~identified in the appointment letter.—~~

73  
74 3.3.1.3.2 Baseline. The candidate has documented effectiveness in teaching, particularly  
75 for classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically  
76 identified in the appointment letter. Assigned courses are well crafted and  
77 appropriate for the catalog description, as shown in course syllabi and other  
78 teaching materials. The candidate has taken measures to correct any problems  
79 identified earlier in either direct observations or prior performance evaluations.  
80 Recent direct observations and surveys of student opinion of teaching  
81 effectiveness (SOTEs) are also supportive. SOTEs are considered supportive  
82 if they are either within appropriate norms, or if a preponderance of student  
83 opinion from objective and subjective questions indicates effective teaching.

84  
85 ....