

**SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
ONE WASHINGTON SQUARE
SAN JOSÉ, CA 95192**

**F12-6, Policy Recommendation, Evaluation in Effectiveness
in Teaching for all Faculty**

**Legislative History: Replaces S91-9, S06-6, F83-2, S08-1,
S83-12, S08-6, S89-6, S73-8, F12-1**

At its meeting of December 10, 2012, the Academic Senate approved the following policy recommendation brought to the Senate by Senator Peter for the Professional Standards Committee.

**Action by University President: Approved by President
Mohammad Qayoumi on
January 7, 2013**

**Policy Recommendation
Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching
for all Faculty**

Resolved: The attached be accepted as University Policy.

Resolved: The policy will be effective beginning with the 2013-14 Academic Year, except for provisions concerning the administration of SOTES (sections E, F, G, and H) which shall be used to regulate the administration of SOTES beginning Spring 2013. Departments should prepare and seek approval of their guidelines for Direct Observations (section C.1) by the end of Spring semester, 2013.

Resolved: The President's assent to this policy constitutes approval of "a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after consideration of the

recommendations of appropriate faculty committees” as stated in the CSU/CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Rationale: This is a general revision and consolidation of numerous policies that regulated the evaluation of teaching at San José State University. Part of the need for the revision is obsolescence—for example, there is no provision for adjusting “classroom visits” to the requirements of online courses. Part of the need for revision is that the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA) have recently approved a new contract. The new contract significantly changes article 15.15, which concerns the administration of student evaluations of teaching.

One major issue addressed here is the contract change on selection of SOTES. The new contract mandates that all classes be evaluated, “unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after consideration of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s).” The old contract allowed for faculty to select the courses they wanted to have evaluated, and the old contract language was paralleled in S91-9, rendering the language of S91-9 in conflict with the new contract.

A second major issue addressed by this policy is the conversion to electronic evaluations. S06-6 regulates how paper SOTES are administered, but was not designed to protect the integrity of an online electronic evaluation system. Much of the old policy concerned proctoring the paper SOTES, for example, and is clearly irrelevant to an online survey instrument.

A third major issue addressed by this policy is the timing of classroom visits for temporary faculty. S91-9 mandates visits every third semester, but temporary faculty contracts are renewed annually and then sometimes extended into three year contracts after they earn six years of seniority. The three-semester interval is too infrequent to correspond to the review period early in a temporary faculty’s SJSU career and too frequent to correspond to the three year contracts that often characterize a temporary faculty’s later career.

Numerous other changes are also contained in this policy, and language has been updated to reflect new teaching methods that were not customarily practiced in 1991 when the last major revision of this policy occurred.

To aid in understanding the scope of this policy, the following is a list of policies being replaced and short descriptions of what they contained.

- S73-8 “Tower List--Not to be used in evaluation of faculty members' performance.” This policy prevented an independent student-run faculty evaluation system from being used in the official faculty rating process. Therefore, the attached policy updates this restriction to cover more modern equivalents, such as Rate My Professor.com.
- S83-12 “Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: prohibition on reporting with percentiles.” We are not entirely sure what this one was about, but it seems to have been intended to prevent an excessively precise “labeling” of teachers on a percentile basis. The attached policy requires a sophisticated norming system that protects faculty more effectively than this restriction.
- F83-2 “Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: Written (Open Ended) Responses Mandated.” This was considered a major reform at the time—students would be allowed to express their specific opinions through written remarks. Therefore, the attached policy preserves the opportunity for students to provide qualitative remarks.
- S89-6 “Guidelines for Interpretation of Student Evaluations.” Henceforth student evaluation results would be accompanied with an interpretation guide designed to educate people about appropriate and inappropriate ways to interpret the results. The attached policy preserves this requirement.
- S91-9 “Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching for All Faculty.” This is the core policy being amended here. It insisted on a holistic evaluation of faculty that used several sources of data—not just the SOTES. It required peer evaluations for all teaching faculty as a way of balancing the escalating importance of SOTES with a different source of information. The attached policy preserves the holistic approach taken by S91-9, although it introduces numerous reforms.
- S06-6 “Procedures to be Followed when Administering SOTES.” This contained the practical regulations used to administer

paper SOTES, including proctoring and signatures. Many elements of this policy will be discarded as irrelevant with the implementation of the electronic SOTES.

- S08-1 “Administration of Online Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) Evaluations for Online Courses.” This was an amendment to S06-6 concerning the evaluation of online courses and conflicts with the old contract. This should be rescinded since S06-6 is being replaced by this new policy.
- S08-6 “Developing Baseline Values (Norms) for the Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) Surveys for Use in Periodic and Performance Evaluations.” The norming of paper SOTES was difficult because it required all classes be evaluated—something that the old contract did not permit without special permission. The attached policy allows for continual re-norming, eliminating the need for S08-6.
- F12-1 “Administration of Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness Surveys (SOTES) Evaluations Online.” This recently passed policy set us on course to move to online SOTES. Its key provisions are absorbed here in order to unify our teaching evaluation policy.

Approved: (December 3, 2012 email vote after November 26 discussion)

Vote: (10-0-0)

Present: (Green, Reade, Maldonado-Colon, Gleixner, Winnard, Brown, Peter, Condon, Semerjian, Hsu)

Financial Impact: (Savings for electronic SOTES that were already considered in F12-1.)

Workload Impact: (Generally fewer peer reviews, but some will be more thorough, depending on department culture. Department Chairs are assigned responsibilities for implementing Direct Observations, but will often be following procedures similar to existing responsibilities. There will be some work for the Center for Faculty Development and for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics in implementing this policy.)

Policy Recommendation
Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching
For all Faculty

(Replaces S91-9, S06-6, F83-2, S08-1, S83-12, S08-6, S89-6, S73-8, F12-1)

Effectiveness in teaching is the primary consideration in evaluating most faculty members' performance. (In the case of faculty who do not teach, or who teach rarely, some or all of the provisions of this policy may be waived by the appropriate college dean.) When evaluating effectiveness in teaching, chairs, committees, and administrators are required to conduct a holistic evaluation. This means that teaching must be considered in context and must be evaluated using multiple sources of information. The factors to be considered include the following categories:

A. Context, Purpose, and Objectives of the Course

1. Relation of course objectives to the purposes of curriculum and the particular course taught.
2. Circumstances such as the nature of the particular course, whether required, experimental, a revision of an older course, a new course or new preparation, a course outside the faculty member's primary area of specialization, a team-taught course, a course using technological mediation, or a course involving close coordination of labs and lectures. Other relevant considerations might be whether a course is taken to fulfill major or General Education requirements.

B. Implementation of the Course

1. Course materials in relation to "A" above, including syllabi and texts used; method, rigor, and level of instruction; tests; and papers.
2. The faculty member's knowledge of the subject, attitudes toward teaching and students, preparation, and grading practices. (Some departments may wish to review at least one set of graded papers or examinations.)

C. Direct Observation by Peers.

As one component of the evaluation of teaching, faculty will be observed by their peers. These direct observations are designed to evaluate teaching within the broad context of factors "A" and "B" cited above. Direct observations may consist of visits to the classroom, laboratory, or supervisory sessions. For courses with majority electronic or online content, direct observations will consist of peer observers experiencing the course content from the vantage-point of the students.

1. Guidelines for Direct Observations

- a. Creation of Guidelines: Each department shall adopt guidelines for the conduct of direct observations of teaching faculty by peers. Departments may adopt their own unique guidelines, or they may opt to adopt guidelines that are widely shared throughout the college or across the university. In all cases, guidelines will be approved by a majority vote of the department faculty, following standard department voting rights. The Center for Faculty Development shall provide model guidelines, and instruments, and suggestions which a department may use to develop and implement its own guidelines. The adopted guidelines must then be approved by the appropriate college Dean.
- b. Content of Guidelines: Observation guidelines will:
 - 1) Provide details on the frequency of direct observations (if greater than the minimum established by this policy) and on the frequency of any required formative observations (reference section "I" of this policy).
 - 2) Provide either a specific observation instrument (form) or a list of the content to be included in a direct observation report. Through either a form or content list, guidelines will be constructed to reflect what the department deems relevant to teaching within its discipline, so that direct observation reports will comment on all relevant factors listed above in sections "A" and "B" of this policy.
 - 3) Require reports to acknowledge any unfavorable conditions in the learning environment beyond the control of the faculty member.
 - 4) Indicate whether training by the Center for Faculty Development is optional or required for peer observers.
 - 5) Elaborate as needed on any aspects of the criteria, procedures, or conduct of direct observations, provided the guidelines remain in accordance with this policy, the collective bargaining agreement, and any other current university policy.

- c. Enforcement of Guidelines: Department Chairs will be responsible for ensuring that all reports of direct observations follow the adopted guidelines. Any reports that do not follow these guidelines will be returned to the respective peer observer for revision, or else discarded and reassigned.
2. Assignment of Direct Observations.
 - a. All peer observers will be assigned by the department chair or the department personnel committee. The peer observers must be currently employed as SJSU faculty members of at least equal academic rank as the faculty member being observed, and preferably of higher academic rank.
 - b. A faculty member may request additional direct observations.
3. Training for Peer Observers. The Center for Faculty Development shall make available training materials and will conduct group sessions, as needed, to instruct peer observers on best practices when conducting direct observations.
4. Frequency of Direct Observations.
 - a. For probationary candidates seeking tenure, direct observations will be made for a minimum of one course per year. Over the entire probationary period, observations must be made to view the full range of courses taught.
 - b. For candidates seeking promotion to Professor, direct observations shall be made in at least two different courses during the period of review.
 - c. For tenured full professors, direct observations may be made upon request of a faculty member with the observations used for professional development.
 - d. An appropriate departmental committee of equal or higher rank, such as the personnel committee, may at its discretion require direct observations when problems of instruction come to its attention. The committee or its evaluators may make appropriate recommendations for the improvement of instruction (e.g. referral to appropriate faculty development resources).

- e. Faculty in temporary positions shall receive a direct observation in at least one course during their first semester of appointment. Subsequently, they shall receive at least one direct observation during each appointment (e.g., one-year or three-year appointments). Observations will be made for a representative sampling of courses over time.
 - f. Departments who have too few qualified peer observers to complete the required number of observations may request assistance from another department. If a sufficient number of peer observers is still not identified, a temporary reduction in the number of required direct observations may be authorized by the appropriate college Dean. Under these circumstances, departments will give priority to faculty who need direct observation reports for impending reviews. Any faculty denied their request for a required observation will instead receive an explanatory letter from the Department Chair that will take the place of the missing observation report in any periodic review.
 - g. A faculty member who has not received the required number of direct observations will remind the department Chair of the need for additional observations at least one month prior to a periodic review.
 - h. When departments create their guidelines for direct observations, they may choose to encourage or require a higher number of direct observations than the minimum set by this policy (see C.1.b earlier in this policy). Departments may also specify whether the additional observations shall be used for periodic evaluations or whether they will be formative evaluations (see I.3 later in this policy).
5. Procedures for Direct Observations.
- a. Faculty shall be notified a minimum of five working days in advance of his/her direct observation. Advanced consultation is required so that the peer observer can understand how to put the observation into the context of the overall course and curriculum.
 - b. Direct Observation Report: A written report must be provided by the peer observer to the faculty member and the Department Chair within fifteen working days. The faculty member has the right to respond to or rebut in writing the report within five working days after receiving the report.

D. Student Testimonials, Complaints and Unofficial Surveys

1. Any student communications or opinions provided outside of the regular evaluation process must be identified by name to be included in a Personnel Action File.
2. Student opinions published separately (e.g., “Rate My Professor,” “The Tower List,” etc.) are specifically excluded from consideration in any periodic review.
3. Individual faculty, departments and other academic units may choose to administer unofficial student surveys designed to provide various forms of feedback for faculty. These surveys are unofficial and the results may not be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.
4. SERB (Student Evaluation Review Board) may elect to administer one qualitative question at the same time as the SOTES (Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness Surveys), for the purpose of collecting student advice to share with other students. This is subject to the following provisions:
 - a. While administered at the same time as the SOTES, the results of this question will not be part of the SOTES, will not be entered into the faculty personnel file, and will be limited as per D.2. above (i.e., excluded from consideration in faculty periodic reviews.) The question will be clearly demarcated as separate from the SOTE so that students will be aware that their answers to this question will be made available to other students, while their answers to the SOTES will be confidential.
 - b. Only the faculty member, and current San José State University students who completed SOTES during the previous semester, will have access to the results of this survey question.
 - c. The specific question will allow for students to offer advice to other students who are considering taking the course. The question shall be the following or a close approximate: “What advice do you have for future students taking this course to assist them to learn the most they can?”
 - d. The responses to this question will be anonymous. The AVP for Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) and SERB will

determine the best method for distributing the information obtained from this question.

- e. There shall be a reasonable time period when faculty can examine the responses before the results are released; faculty will have the option to prevent release if, in their view, the comments would not be helpful to future students.
- f. If technically feasible, first-time students both transfer and freshmen, would be able to view these comments with the same status as responding students.

E. Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness Surveys (SOTES); both Qualitative and Quantitative

1. Caveat. Since student opinion surveys measure student satisfaction rather than student learning, they cannot be considered perfect indicators of teaching quality. Students can be dissatisfied with good teaching and satisfied with poor teaching. Despite this inherent limitation in student opinion surveys, class satisfaction is positively correlated with effective teaching; better teachers in general (not all) have more satisfied students and thus higher evaluation scores.ⁱ To guard against the limitations of the instrument, all those using SOTES as part of the SJSU evaluation process must consult the official interpretation guide referenced elsewhere in this policy. Information from SOTES is *but one* source of information for assessing teaching effectiveness. Additional sources of information pertaining to faculty teaching effectiveness must also be considered when reaching any personnel decision.
2. Terminology. Throughout this policy the term SOTES is understood to also apply to parallel survey instruments (e.g. the SOLATE--Student Opinion of Laboratory Effectiveness) and other instruments that may be created by SERB and approved by the Senate to better fit various forms of instruction.
3. The AVP for IEA in consultation with SERB may create a list of classes which will be excluded from all SOTE administration on technical or ethical grounds (e.g., individual studies, supervisions, experimental classes). Provisions will be made to allow faculty to individually request that SOTES be administered in a class that is normally excluded.
4. Other than those classes excluded in E3 (above), SOTES shall be administered in all classes and the results placed in the faculty personnel file. Faculty, however, under some circumstances may exclude the results

of an occasional course from their periodic evaluations. Faculty may choose to exclude the survey results from one course per Academic Year from their periodic evaluation, provided that they teach at least fifteen units of courses during that Academic Year. Faculty who are credited with teaching double sized courses will be credited with teaching twice the normal number of units.

5. When SOTES are included in a periodic evaluation, both the quantitative scores and the associated qualitative comments will be included. When SOTES are excluded from a periodic evaluation, both the quantitative scores and the associated qualitative comments will be excluded.
6. SERB shall prepare the specific questions and survey instrument to be used to measure student opinions of teaching effectiveness. It shall decide the scale, format, and layout of the instrument, and determine the information that is provided in the reports generated by the surveys. The instrument shall be approved by the Senate upon recommendation of SERB and the Professional Standards Committee, and may only be amended by SERB.
7. SERB shall prepare a suitable interpretation guide which explains how the quantitative results of the SOTEs will be interpreted, complete with analysis of factors expected to influence ratings and an explanation of statistical norms, etc. It is the responsibility of the Provost to see that the interpretation guide is provided to all personnel committees and administrators responsible for evaluating the teaching of faculty.
8. Any SOTE with a response rate of less than fifty (50)% or with fewer than 10 responses will be flagged as potentially unreliable and interpreted with caution.
9. If technically feasible, surveys from students earning the grade "WU" are to be excluded from results.
10. The SOTE instrument must be compliant with all pertinent accessibility regulations.

F. SOTES: Qualitative Surveys

1. All SOTES shall provide opportunity for unsigned, open-ended (qualitative) student comment. When a SOTE is included in a periodic evaluation, all qualitative comments associated with that SOTE must be included (with the exception only of F.3 below). However, comments may

be reported in ways that minimize the use of space, provided that the comments from each student are grouped together.

2. Summaries of qualitative remarks for use in performance reviews or periodic evaluations of a faculty member are to follow the guidelines below:
 - a) Departments may, at their option, devise methods to provide unbiased summaries of qualitative remarks.
 - b) The AVP for IEA, after consultation with SERB, may implement a system to provide faculty with unbiased summaries of qualitative remarks.
 - c) When summaries of qualitative remarks are provided, they may supplement but may not replace a copy of all student qualitative remarks.
 - d) Only summaries approved by the Department Chair or the AVP for IEA may be used in a performance review or periodic evaluation. Use of any summaries will be at the discretion of the faculty member under review.
3. Faculty may request the removal of remarks in the qualitative surveys that are completely unrelated to teaching, such as comments that are bigoted, hateful, comment on personal appearance, or otherwise violate campus policies.
 - a) Such remarks will be removed after verification of their content by the Department Chair.
 - b) The AVP for IEA, upon consultation with SERB, may implement software that “flags” and removes such remarks. To assist in evaluating possible bias in the SOTES, faculty will receive a full report that includes the text and frequency of all such remarks.

G. SOTES: Quantitative Surveys

1. The survey instrument shall include a quantitative component as per provision 15 in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
2. Results shall be reported as the means, standard deviations, and medians for each item by class. The mean for each class will be compared against the mean and norms for the particular College and University, when

appropriate. The frequencies of responses (e.g., the number of “5”s and “4”s and “3”s etc.) for each question will also be reported.

3. Norming. Norms (an indicator of the middle range of scores) shall be provided to assist in the interpretation of quantitative SOTES. The results of all quantitative evaluations will be used for norming purposes. Norms will be established and reported for all courses rated at the university and college levels.
4. When possible, an additional report will adjust norms for factors that may influence ratings (e.g., level of instruction, classification of course, size of class, average expected grades for a class, or any other relevant differentiation). The specific norms provided shall be determined by SERB in consultation with the AVP for IEA.
5. Reports will include average ratings by expected grades for each class, to enable users to distinguish the opinion of students expecting high grades in a class from the opinion of students expecting low grades in the same class.
6. Refreshing norms. New norms may be established each semester, but norms must be refreshed
 - a) At a minimum of once every five years,
 - b) After each change in the survey instrument,
 - c) As often as practicable.

H. Procedures to be used in administering and managing SOTES

1. SOTES shall be collected by electronic means.
 - a) The AVP for IEA shall arrange for all students to receive regular electronic reminders to complete their SOTES, and these reminders will inform students how to connect to and complete the survey instrument. The reminders will also inform them of on-campus locations where they can obtain connectivity if they do not have independent access.
 - b) SERB shall prepare statements that clearly explain to students the seriousness with which SJSU takes the results of the survey; students should know its importance for the performance evaluation of faculty as well as its benefits for course design and the improvement of instruction. These statements should be provided both in the electronic reminders and at the beginning of the survey instrument.

2. SERB will be responsible for researching "best practices" and for determining collection and incentive methods that work for SJSU to achieve response rates comparable to paper-and-pencil evaluation response rates—an absolute minimum of 60%. A variety of incentives may be used, provided they are approved by SERB and the AVP for IEA. Incentives may include the avoidance of a temporary delay in the ability for students to access their official grades until after submitting their SOTES. However, this incentive is subject to the following limitations:
 - a) The delay must be temporary and reasonable (e.g. no more than three weeks.)
 - b) The Registrar shall always have the option of releasing grades more promptly for serious academic purposes (e.g. to inform students of academic disqualification.)
 - c) Students shall have the option of accessing the SOTE survey and opting out; deliberately opting out shall count as completing a survey for the purpose of avoiding any penalties.
 - d) Students who complete their surveys will receive their grades at the normal time; students who do not will have their grades delayed for a period after the final faculty deadline for reporting grades.
3. Students shall be able to complete SOTES outside of class through secure electronic access.
4. Faculty may provide time so that students may complete the SOTES in class, subject to the following provisions:
 - a) Students must be informed that they may complete the SOTE outside of class if they prefer, or if they do not have an appropriate electronic instrument with them in class.
 - b) If faculty provide class time, it must be at least a 15 minute block.
 - c) The faculty member must not be present while the survey is being completed.
5. The period of time in which the SOTES will be administered shall be set by SERB in consultation with the AVP for IEA, but shall not be earlier than the final ten days of class nor later than the normal time when the student's final grade is released. The specific "window" for administration of the survey will be established so as to best enhance the integrity and

quality of the survey results. A minimum of ten calendar days will be provided to respond.

6. All SOTES must be administered in such a way as to maintain absolute confidentiality for the student respondents. Official SOTE reports shall include responses to a question that asks respondents about any undue influence from others while completing the SOTE.
 7. No SOTE results—either quantitative or qualitative-- may be released to faculty until after grades for the class are officially submitted.
 8. No students will be allowed to submit SOTES after they have seen their official semester grade for a course.
 9. Results for SOTES will be stored on a secure server and the server shall be considered an extension of the personnel file. The AVP for Faculty Affairs shall determine procedures for secure access to this extension of the faculty personnel file. The AVP for Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the AVP for IEA and SERB, shall determine the most appropriate method for providing faculty and appropriate evaluators with access to the results of SOTES.
 10. Additional technical and implementation details not covered in this policy will be decided by the AVP for IEA in consultation with SERB and the Professional Standards Committee. Changes in implementation procedures will be reported to SERB and the Professional Standards Committee.
- I. Use of SOTES and Observations for Formative Purposes
1. All evaluations of teaching are ultimately intended for the improvement of instruction, and will be implemented and interpreted in that spirit.
 2. Formative use of SOTES. SERB, the Center for Faculty Development (CFD), and the AVP for IEA will collaborate on ways to use the SOTE design and SOTE feedback for the improvement of instruction. This collaboration may use SOTE results to alert faculty to resources that are available to help improve instruction, such as links to help sites, interpretive reports, and invitations to work on particular issues with faculty development personnel. Any contact with faculty on the basis of SOTE results must be subject to the following provisions:
 - a) Department Chairs may initiate contact with faculty to suggest development opportunities that address possible concerns

identified by their SOTES. As technology permits, the AVP for IEA, in consultation with SERB and CFD, may develop automated ways of confidentially screening SOTES to help Department Chairs to identify faculty who could benefit from available resources for teaching development.

- b) Faculty development activities resulting from this contact will be kept strictly separate from faculty evaluation.
 - c) Participation in faculty development programs resulting from this contact are voluntary.
3. Formative Use of Direct Observations. So long as the minimum number of formal direct observations for evaluative purposes (under "C") are collected, departments are encouraged to make use of additional observations for formative purposes. A formative observation is designed to assist a faculty member to improve his/her teaching but is completely confidential and the results are not to be used in any periodic review. For example, the very first direct observation of a faculty member might best be done according to formative guidelines. Faculty with serious teaching concerns will usually be helped first through the formative process. If departments wish to make use of formative observations, they can adopt the relevant procedures as part of their observation guidelines (described in C1.)
- a) Formative teaching reviews are frequently initiated by faculty request to the Center for Faculty Development; however, reviewing bodies for periodic or performance reviews (as specified in the CFA-CSU Agreement) may also request a formative review. In the latter situation, the reviewing bodies may not obtain the results of that review.
 - b) Individuals must have received training from the Center for Faculty Development (CFD) in relation to conducting a review in order to perform formative teaching evaluations. Reviewers who have received training will receive a document indicating that they have completed the training. Reviewers will, in most cases, be members of the same department or college as the faculty member being reviewed.
 - c) The review process shall consist of three components:

- 1) A pre-instruction conference between the faculty member and the reviewer to determine areas for which the faculty member would like to be reviewed.
 - 2) As determined in the pre-conference, the reviewer will follow established guidelines and determine observation tools needed to perform the review. The reviewer will spend a minimum of one hour observing.
 - 3) The reviewer will use strategies presented to coach the faculty member to indicate where the faculty member might try to improve and to suggest workshops, seminars, or other resources that would be beneficial.
- d) The results of the formative review shall be disclosed only to the reviewer and to the faculty member being reviewed, though appropriate procedures will be adopted to track that reviews have taken place and to acknowledge the participation of the observer and the faculty member. Faculty members may request certificates of completion for any workshops or seminars attended but records of attendance at those functions shall not be public.
- e) Faculty members are encouraged to consider the recommendations of the reviewer but are not required to follow them.

ⁱ For just a few of the thousands of articles available in the literature on the effective use of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, the AVP for IEA and SERB recommend the following:

Abrami, P.C., d'Apollonia, S. and Cohen, P.A. (1990), Validity of student ratings of instruction: what we know and what we do not, *Journal of Education Psychology*, 82(2), 219-31.

Carrell, S.E. and West, J.E. (2010), Does professor quality matter? Evidence from random assignment of students to professors, *Journal of Political Economy*, 118(3), 409-432.

Cashin, William E. (1995), Student Ratings of Teaching: The Research Revisited. Idea Paper #32. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Kansas State University.

Clayson, D.E. (2009), Student evaluations of teaching: Are they related to what students learn? A meta-analysis and review of the literature. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 31(1), 16-30.

Dowell, D.A. and Neal, J.A. (1983), A selective review of the validity of student ratings of teachings, *Journal of Higher Education*, 53(1), 459-63.

Feldman, Kenneth A. (1996), Identifying Exemplary Teaching: Using Data from Course and Teacher Evaluations, *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 65 (Spring 1996), 41-50.

Nuhfer, E.B. (2010), A fractal thinker looks at student ratings. Retrieved from <http://sites.bio.indiana.edu/~bender/resources/Assessment/fractalevals10.pdf>

Theall, M. (2002) Student ratings: Myths vs. research evidence: Focus on Faculty, Faculty Center newsletter article, BYU. Retrieved from <http://studentratings.byu.edu/info/faculty/myths.asp> See especially the bibliography.