

**Minutes of the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee (FERS)  
Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee (FIAC)  
UNCP Faculty Senate  
Tuesday, March 1, 2011**

**Members Present:** Elizabeth Denny (chair), David Dran, Wendy Miller, Frankie Denise Powell, Margaret Trueman, and Aaron Vandermeer

**Members Absent:** MJ Braun

**I. Call to Order**

Dr. Elizabeth Denny, Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee, called the meeting to order at 3:31p.m.

**II. Approval of Agenda**

Agenda (as sent through email) was approved unanimously.

**III. Approval of Minutes from February 1, 2011**

Minutes were approved unanimously following a minor correction.

**IV. Old Business**

**Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Revision:**

The entire meeting was devoted to an item-by-item review/revision of the currently used student evaluation instrument, the draft revision attached to the agenda, and the draft of Handbook revisions regarding its use. Each item revision was approved unanimously. The discussion was as follows.

**Instructions for the SEI use:** The following was approved:

**4-3.B Students**

Students who take a faculty member's courses play a ~~prominent~~ **an important** role in evaluating the faculty member's teaching **effectiveness**. They submit information on a Student Evaluation of Instruction Form (Figure, Section 4-12.D), from which summaries are compiled for each course, consisting of numerical data as well as all student comments. Student evaluations must be administered in a manner that conveys their importance and protects students' sense of freedom to give candid evaluations. Students should also have significant input in developing or selecting the instruments used to gather their evaluations of teaching (see Section 4-6.B.1).

Student evaluations by themselves do not provide sufficient information to validly judge a faculty member's performance as a teacher; hence, evaluation of teaching effectiveness involves a variety of types of documentation (see Section 4-2.B.3). **In addition, all parties involved in faculty evaluation are cautioned to avoid placing undue emphasis on individual student comments as these**

comments may not be reflective of the opinions of the majority of students in a given course. The Student Evaluation of Instruction completion rate in each course should also be taken into account by all evaluators when weighting the numerical data summary. The data should be viewed with extreme caution when completion rates for the listed course were low.

#### **4-6.B Student Evaluations of Instruction**

Although student evaluations *by themselves* do not provide sufficient information to validly judge a faculty member's performance as a teacher, they do contribute to the overall faculty evaluation process. Students evaluate the teaching of all teaching faculty according to the schedule in Section 4-6.B.3. Results are summarized in a Student Evaluation Report. In the following sections, the procedures, format, and reporting of these student evaluations are discussed.

#### **SEI Revision Changes:**

**Item #8:** “offered motivation”.

**Item #9:** Remains the same.

**Item #10:** Remains the same

**Item #12:** Instructor made good use of all required materials.

**Item #13:** Remains the same

**Item #14:** Remains the same

**Item #15:** (on-line options) Delete it

**Item #16:** (on-line options) Leave out all

**Item #17:** (on-line options) Delete

**Item #18:** (on-line options) Delete

**In addition to each item review/revision, the following changes were agreed upon.**

“The instructor provided course material in a timely fashion” becomes #14

Item #14 becomes Item #15

The code (scoring key) belongs at the top of the form.

We will not include N/A

The final approved form is as follows:

## 4-12.E STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Indicate the extent to which you agree the following statements characterize your instructor in this course.

**SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = no opinion; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree**

	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. The instructor was prepared for class.					
2. The instructor provided understandable course content.					
3. The instructor clearly explained/demonstrated complex concepts and techniques.					
4. The instructor conveyed a willingness to provide assistance on an individual basis.					
5. The instructor clearly stated the grading standards to be used in the course.					
6. The instructor followed stated standards when grading tests, assignments, and course activities.					
7. The instructor provided feedback about student performance on tests, assignments, and course activities in a timely manner.					
8. The instructor offered motivation to learn course material, concepts, and skills.					
9. The instructor interacted with students in a courteous and professional manner.					
10. The instructor encouraged student participation in the course.					
11. The instructor clearly described the objectives of the course.					
12. The instructor made good use of all required materials.					
13. The instructor clearly described the course requirements.					
14. The instructor provided course materials in a timely fashion.					
15. The instructor was effective in teaching this course.					

Student classification \_\_\_\_\_  
 Expected course grade \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date \_\_\_\_\_

Course number \_\_\_\_\_  
 Course title \_\_\_\_\_  
 Professor \_\_\_\_\_

**Please provide any additional comments below or on the back.**

**B. Chair report/PEC issue:** Postponed until the next meeting due to lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 PM. The next meeting will be on Tuesday, April 5, 2011 at 3:30 PM.

Submitted by:

Frankie Denise Powell  
 Acting Secretary