

Faculty Chapter Six

Faculty Performance Review

FAC 6.0. Incorporation of College Personnel Materials.

Please note that substantive requirements relating to faculty appointment, renewal, tenure, promotion, and merit may be found in materials developed at the college or department level. College-specific information has been included as an appendix to this material.

FAC 6.1. UWS 3.05 {Faculty Appointments: Periodic Review} of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code, Rules of the Board of Regents*.

UWS 3.05 Periodic Review.

The faculty and Chancellor of each institution, after consultation with appropriate students, shall establish rules providing for periodic review of faculty performance.

History: Cr. Register, January, 1975, No. 229, eff. 2-1-75.

FAC 6.2. Pre-Tenure Review.

The review and evaluation of faculty on probationary appointments is conducted through the renewal/nonrenewal process described in chapter titled "Faculty Renewal and Tenure".

FAC 6.3. Post-Tenure Review.

Every four years, all tenured faculty who have not been promoted in rank in the past four years, shall participate in a performance appraisal. Colleges shall identify a process for post tenure review that must include the following:

- (1) General guidelines for the collection and assessment of evidence of quality teaching, professional and scholarly growth, and service. These guidelines must be consistent with the collection and assessment of such evidence in the merit process and in the promotion process.
- (2) A process for providing written feedback to faculty members being evaluated and for face-to-face feedback with the unit head and/or personnel committee representative.
- (3) A process for identifying those faculty whose performance does not meet professional expectations in the area of teaching, professional and scholarly growth, and service. For faculty who are not meeting expectations, a faculty development plan should be developed. The faculty development plan should outline major goals to be attained in order to eliminate the deficiencies.
- (4) Provision for using the results of the post tenure review in determining merit pay adjustments without conducting a separate merit review.
- (5) Provision for filing summaries of evaluations with the Provost and Vice Chancellor's Office.

FAC 6.4. Faculty Teaching Evaluation.

Faculty evaluation for renewal, tenure, post-tenure review and merit will be based on documentation submitted as it relates to a variety of teaching performance categories: (1) course planning and preparation; (2) actual teaching; (3) evaluating student learning and providing feedback; and (4) keeping up with the professional field in areas related to teaching performance.

- (1) Each academic unit (department of instruction or college) is responsible for establishing specific criteria for teaching evaluation and weights to be used. Evaluation of each of the teaching categories must be included in the evaluation process.
- (2) The specific evaluation process, criteria, and evaluation weights to be used must be communicated in writing to each faculty member within the unit prior to the start of a new evaluation period. Student opinion surveys can represent no more than 50% of the evaluation weight with consideration given to different types of courses.
- (3) The adopted procedures are required of all faculty members, tenured or untenured, in the academic unit. Faculty members may supplement the procedures with other evaluation material but the basic evaluation process must be uniform for all faculty members in an academic unit. The in-

- 1 tent of this section is to prohibit an academic unit policy which permits each faculty member to es-
2 tablish his or her own evaluation process, and to require a single process for all members of an
3 academic unit.
- 4 (4) Every faculty member has a right to adequate feedback on his or her teaching evaluations. Writ-
5 ten feedback will inform faculty members of ratings in each category as well as an overall score.
6 In the event unsatisfactory ratings are assigned, written feedback in each category and a sum-
7 mary statement must be provided to the faculty member.
- 8 (5) In the event unsatisfactory ratings are assigned, a written improvement plan must be formulated
9 and communicated to the faculty member. Improvement plans may be jointly written by the re-
10 viewing committee and/or department chair and faculty member. All parties involved must sign the
11 teaching improvement plan.
- 12 (6) The written policies and procedures of each academic unit include: (a) the form(s) by which data
13 are collected (including the specific student opinion survey forms required); (b) a description of
14 the collection process; (c) requirements concerning frequency of collection, dates of submission
15 of material and similar administrative procedures; and (d) a description of the criteria to be used
16 and the process by which the information is to be interpreted or analyzed. A copy of the policies
17 and procedures must be on file with the Faculty Senate.
- 18 (7) Each faculty member is responsible for assuring that his or her personnel folder contains evalua-
19 tion information consistent with unit policy for merit, promotion, reappointment, or post-tenure re-
20 view. This evaluation information will be both current and comprehensive enough to serve to re-
21 flect student's opinions of teaching effectiveness and to support accomplishments in the four
22 teaching categories.
- 23 (8) To be eligible for consideration for merit salary increases, all faculty members must have in their
24 personnel folders documentation supporting accomplishments in the teaching categories and evi-
25 dence of student's opinion of instruction in accordance with academic unit policy. Student opinion
26 surveys for no less than three courses per evaluation period, for both tenured and untenured fa-
27 culty, must be included. Academic unit policy may require more than three evaluations per eval-
28 uation period.
- 29 (9) To be eligible for consideration for promotion or reappointment, personnel folders must contain
30 documentation supporting accomplishments in the teaching categories and evidence of student's
31 opinion of instruction collected in accordance with unit policy and procedures. The documentation,
32 at a minimum, must consist of a copy of all student opinion of instruction summary results col-
33 lected; a summary of student's opinions prepared by the department; a summary of the accom-
34 plishments in teaching the categories prepared by the department; and a specific and thorough
35 analysis of the results of the documentation and data collected. These documents accompany the
36 personnel folder from the department level through all levels of review. Faculty members have the
37 right to place for consideration additional documentation to support teaching effectiveness or ad-
38 ditional student opinion material in their personnel folders. If documentation is found to be insuffi-
39 cient at a level above the initiating academic unit, clarification or additional information may be re-
40 quested of the faculty member's academic unit.
- 41 (10) Suggested documentation for the four teaching categories may include but not be limited to the
42 following items:
- 43 (a) Course Planning and Preparation.
- 44 1. Degree of participation in new courses written and taken to the Curriculum
45 Committee.
- 46 2. Degree of participation in major course revisions that were taken to the Curriculum
47 Committee.
- 48 3. Major updating and change of courses beyond usual updating but not of sufficient nature
49 to go through the Curriculum Committee (attach syllabus of old vs. new with the changes
50 highlighted)
- 51 4. Development of materials for courses. This could include course manuals, audio-visual
52 support, study guides, etc. (describe materials and/or attach)

- 1 5. Innovations in teaching. Describe alternative delivery systems you have tried or other in-
2 novations.
- 3 6. Self evaluation of course planning and preparation activities.
- 4 7. Unique aspects about the courses taught or your load such as new preparations, over-
5 load, extensive travel for teaching responsibilities, etc.
- 6 8. Unit or individual research activities involving courses or teaching activities, program re-
7 views, or other improvement of instruction assignments.
- 8 9. Efforts to incorporate materials and methods that address issues of diversity.
- 9 (b) Actual Teaching.
- 10 1. List of all courses taught, number of credits, and enrollments.
- 11 2. Summary evaluations and copies of appropriate student opinion survey forms for at least
12 three classes taught during the review period.
- 13 3. Written student comments.
- 14 4. Other letters or evidence of student satisfaction with teaching.
- 15 5. Peer evaluations.
- 16 6. Self-evaluation of teaching.
- 17 7. Teaching awards received or other special recognitions related to teaching.
- 18 8. Independent study or readings course responsibilities.
- 19 9. Labor intensive teaching of basic skills (e.g. oral and written communications, computer
20 skills, research skills, etc.)
- 21 (c) Evaluating Student Learning and Providing Feedback.
- 22 1. Include copies of tests, assignments, and major projects used to evaluate student learn-
23 ing. Describe types of student learning assessed with each instrument.
- 24 2. List the names of students and your role on any comprehensive examination committees
25 and thesis committees.
- 26 3. Identify advisement responsibilities at the undergraduate or graduate levels.
- 27 4. Self-evaluation of student learning, test validation, and providing feedback.
- 28 (d) Keeping Up with the Professional Field in Areas Related to Teaching Performance.
- 29 1. Professional development and service activities that enhanced teaching performance.
- 30 2. New or expanded areas of professional investigation relating to teaching responsibilities.
- 31 3. Professional literature most commonly read.
- 32 4. Self-evaluation indicating how you are keeping up with the professional field in areas re-
33 lated to your teaching.

34 **FAC 6.5. UW System Policy on Student Evaluation of Instruction.**

35 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System Policy on Student Evaluation of Instruction. On
36 October 4, 1974, the Board of Regents approved resolution 868 that created policy document 74-13 relat-
37 ing to "Student Evaluation of Instruction." This policy, as revised, was approved by Chancellor Kerrigan on
38 12/22/93 to be effective 2/1/94.

39 (1) Preamble.

40 The Regents, administrations and faculties of the University of Wisconsin System have in com-
41 mon the purpose of providing the most effective instruction possible for all students. They also
42 share the interest which students have in improvement of teaching quality, and assert that teach-

1 ing ability should be one of the chief criteria considered in tenure decisions and in the retention,
2 promotion, and compensation of faculty.

3 (2) Student evaluation of teaching is an important source of information on classroom performance.
4 For this reason, the Regents seek to establish University of Wisconsin System policy on the use
5 of student evaluation of teaching for (a) improvement of instruction; (b) retention, promotion, and
6 tenure decisions; and (c) merit salary increase deliberations. The statement herein is limited to
7 formal student evaluation of instruction only and does not cover evaluation of non-instructional
8 personnel or activities, or evaluation of instruction by faculty peers or administrators. As back-
9 ground for such a System policy, the Regents offer the following commentary:

10 (a) General Observations.

11 Student evaluation for such purposes as those stated above is now conducted in a variety of
12 ways throughout the University System. The Regents recognize that the faculties of the sev-
13 eral Institutions have the primary responsibility for setting policy concerning the method or
14 methods by which student evaluation of instruction may be undertaken. Currently in the Sys-
15 tem some campuses have in operation a uniform Institution-wide method of student evalua-
16 tion, others permit departmental/divisional autonomy, and others use systems devised and/or
17 administered by student groups. Institutional faculty governance bodies are encouraged to
18 work toward an evaluative methodology, including delineation of faculty/student involvement
19 in development of evaluation instrument(s) and procedures for its (their) use, particularly
20 suited to the needs and nature of their Institutions.

21 While research on the use of student evaluation has been extensive, no single instrument or
22 methodology can be identified which is clearly more valid or useful than another. Emphasis
23 may to good effect be placed on description of what happens in the classroom; research is
24 still clearly needed to improve evaluation methodologies. Consequently, whatever practice is
25 followed will need to be improved by an on-going process of testing and perfecting, and a
26 wise understanding of the strengths and limitations of the student evaluation methodology in
27 use. The Regents accordingly believe that variety of practice, affirmed by the considered
28 judgment of the faculties of the several Institutions, constitutes the best basis for carrying out
29 a Regent policy on student evaluation.

30 (b) Use of Student Evaluation for Improvement of Instruction.

31 One of the widest uses of student evaluation is as a source of information for the improve-
32 ment of instruction. The Regents recognize that a variety of instruments or methods of stu-
33 dent evaluation may serve the purpose of improving instruction, yet at the same time have lit-
34 tle value for purposes of comparative evaluation of teaching performance. For example, short
35 questionnaires checking student reaction to particular teaching materials, units, forms of
36 presentation, or exams; open-ended suggestions solicited from class members for course
37 improvements; or class discussion as part of the on-going process of course planning and
38 conduct may be useful for instructional improvement but not of value for peer group advice or
39 administrative uses. Frequently, student evaluation for self-improvement is best used when
40 the faculty member has freedom of choice as to instrument, methods or frequency. In this
41 context, information which a faculty member solicits from students may be of greatest value
42 for teaching improvement when there is no requirement that it be submitted to support promo-
43 tion, tenure, or merit increase decisions.

44 (c) Use of Student Evaluations for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Decisions.

45 Peer group evaluation of a faculty member for retention, promotion, or tenure is necessarily
46 based on multiple criteria which include effectiveness in teaching as well as high quality in
47 scholarly activity and public service. Final consensus prior to a recommendation requires a
48 judicious weighing of such criteria, both singly and in relation to one another, relative to the
49 current mission and developmental needs of a department and Institution. In assessing
50 teaching effectiveness, the Regents believe that student evaluations are an important and
51 useful source of evidence which should be explicitly considered in reaching judgments. The
52 Regents assert, however, that student evaluation must not be a substitute for direct peer
53 judgement of teaching effectiveness through a variety of means such as observation of teach-
54 ing, assessment of syllabi, examinations, and other course materials, and evaluation of con-

1 tributions to development and strengthening of departmental curriculum. Moreover, effective
2 peer judgment of teaching effectiveness necessarily includes both examination of the faculty
3 member's current level of performance, and also his or her potential for growth.

4 (d) Use of Student Evaluations in Merit Salary Increase Decisions.

5 With regard to merit salary increase, the Regents are aware that sharp differences of opinion
6 exist within the System, and within higher education nationally, concerning the value of re-
7 peated and regular use of a single evaluative instrument as one of the bases for annual deci-
8 sions. While some campuses regularly use student evaluations for the purpose of improving
9 teaching, other campuses believe that requiring annual or semester use for all classes of all
10 teachers (since all teachers might properly be considered for merit increases) may generate
11 costs well beyond any benefits received. The system may be time consuming and costly to
12 manage. It may generate a volume of data much of which is redundant in the sense that
13 steady and repetitious use may not generate new information. Such concerns should be re-
14 flected in a policy statement on student evaluation.

15 (3) Policy Statement.

16 In light of these considerations and in an effort to ensure considered use of student evaluation for
17 certain administrative purposes and to encourage its increased use for other purpose, the Re-
18 gents have prepared the following statement of System policy:

19 (a) Student evaluation for the improvement of instruction. Each Institution of the System should
20 develop policy supporting the widest possible use of student evaluation for the improvement
21 of instruction, together with supporting services which will best encourage and assist faculty
22 members to use student evaluation for this purpose.

23 (b) Student evaluation of instruction as information used in actions on promotion, retention or the
24 awarding of tenure. Each Institution of the University System shall adopt such policies for in-
25 structional faculty as will ensure (1) that student evaluation of the instruction of each faculty
26 member being considered for promotion or tenure shall be undertaken; (2) that the faculty
27 body which initiates recommendations for promotion or tenure shall consider, in addition to
28 independent peer judgment of teaching effectiveness, student evaluation data, taking into ac-
29 count existing limitations in validity and reliability of the evaluation methodology employed;
30 and (3) that the faculty body initiating the recommendation shall include both its explicit eval-
31 uation of the teaching effectiveness of the person for whom the recommendation is made,
32 and shall include a summary of information provided by student evaluation as part of the sup-
33 porting evidence for its recommendation.

34 Each Institution shall develop systematic and firm procedure(s) for the manner and form of pre-
35 senting student evaluation material for administrative purposes. Faculty members being evaluated
36 should be informed of and have the right to respond to any summaries of student evaluations to
37 be submitted for administrative use.

38 (c) Student evaluation of instruction as information used in actions on merit salary increase. All
39 faculty members being considered for merit salary increases shall be evaluated by their peers
40 as to their instructional ability, using information from student evaluation of their instruction,
41 as well as other information relevant to assessment, at least once every three years. The in-
42 tent of this policy is to delegate to the Institutions and their faculties decision as to the minimal
43 frequency with which full assessment of teaching performance should be undertaken and
44 formal analysis of student evaluation data carried out. It does not, however, imply that more
45 frequent student evaluation might not be wise or desirable in order to provide the most sub-
46 stantial basis for the formal assessment of teaching performance.

47 N.B.--The Policy Statement on Student Evaluation of Instruction shall be applied to all teaching
48 faculty understanding that in UW-Extension major portions of faculty assignments may be to con-
49 tinuing education and public service. Accordingly, this institution should develop analogous pro-
50 cedures for gathering information on the response of client groups to the performance of such fa-
51 culty.

52 (4) Reporting.

1 The Regents ask that by March 1, 1975, each Institution report to the Office of Academic Affairs
2 its policies then in effect concerning student evaluation of instruction, together with copies of any
3 instruments in widespread use by the faculty, and a description of any institutional services pro-
4 vided the faculty member or department in carrying out evaluation procedures. It is assumed that
5 by this date (March 1, 1975), all campuses will be carrying out the student evaluation actions
6 needed to implement the requirements of section 2, foregoing. It is further assumed that the
7 process of developing, testing, and phasing in an Institutional policy and practice concerning stu-
8 dent evaluation will be completed not later than July 1, 1976. The Office of Academic Affairs shall
9 summarize such information in a report to the Regents, and, as requested by the council of Chan-
10 cellors, shall assist in disseminating information on practice within the System to the several Insti-
11 tutions.

12 **FAC 6.6. University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Policy and Procedures.**

13 Introduction: The following is intended to implement Regent policy regarding student evaluation of instruc-
14 tion. This policy meets the requirements of the Regent statement and addresses the University's commit-
15 ment in the area of soliciting and interpreting student opinions on teaching.

16 (1) Policy.

17 Student opinions on teaching are an important source of information on classroom performance.
18 When combined with data from other sources, student opinions on teaching allow informed te-
19 nure, appointment, promotion and salary decisions. When survey instruments are designed with
20 teaching improvement in mind, student opinions also provide a basis for strengthening instruction.
21 Faculty are encouraged to seek advice which will assist them in improving their teaching as well
22 as obtaining student opinions for that purpose. The following procedures assist the implementa-
23 tion of this policy in personnel decisions. Supplementary survey instruments may be needed for a
24 faculty member to obtain student opinions specific enough to permit improvement of instructional
25 methods.

26 (2) Procedures.

27 (a) All committees and individual decision-makers involved in promotion, tenure, renewal, and
28 merit decisions must consider teaching effectiveness data from multiple sources. There is no
29 single set of survey questions about instructor effectiveness that is universally appropriate
30 across disciplines, course levels, and programs. In addition to student surveys, evidence of
31 teaching effectiveness includes information such as: peer reviews of teaching based on
32 classroom observation and other data; reviews of teaching materials, assignments, and grad-
33 ing practices; evidence of instructional innovation and curricular development; and reviews of
34 other instructor-provided information such as essays, videotapes, software, and other
35 courseware.

36 (b) Each academic unit (departments of instruction in the College of Letters and Science or the
37 college, elsewhere) must prepare and adopt formal procedures for conducting surveys of stu-
38 dent opinions concerning instruction and courses. Academic units which have procedures in
39 place are required to reconfirm that they are consonant with this policy. Each unit will consult
40 with, but not seek the approval of, the college regarding its proposed instructor and written
41 procedure. The sole focus of this consultation will be consistent with University policy. Since
42 student evaluations play a major role in TARPS deliberations, committees that make college-
43 wide promotion, renewal, and tenure recommendations will be given an opportunity to com-
44 ment on the adequacy of the proposed procedure.

45 1. Unit instruments and policies will be reviewed at least once every five years and, if mod-
46 ified, resubmitted for consultation and recommendation.

47 2. The means of preparing and adopting procedures in each academic unit are to be in ac-
48 cordance with existing bylaws, except that in all cases students may participate in the
49 development of procedures. The manner of student participation is subject to the approv-
50 al of the unit's faculty members. For purposes of this policy, the terms "faculty" and "fa-
51 culty member" refer to all faculty and academic staff with teaching assignments.

52 (c) The procedures adopted by each unit must take into account the differing instructional de-
53 mands and expectations in individual units.

- 1 1. The primary principle which should guide the collection of student opinions is that the
2 content of the survey instrument and procedure used should be set by those closest to
3 the field -- the smallest academic unit engaged in personnel decisions. Units shall be free
4 to decide which types of information best meet their needs.
- 5 2. Units will obtain quantitative and/or qualitative student survey data from student surveys
6 and other sources, but will in any case seek the best kinds of information to serve as a
7 basis for efforts to improve instruction and for meaningful assessments of teaching effec-
8 tiveness.
- 9 3. Committees and decision-makers beyond the academic unit may not require any particu-
10 lar type of data without concurrence by the academic unit. However, it is the responsibili-
11 ty of units and their candidates to make the strongest possible cases by assuring that
12 quantitative and qualitative data presented is adequate and has been seriously and tho-
13 roughly analyzed.
- 14 (d) The instrument and procedure adopted by the unit will be uniformly required of all faculty
15 members. No academic unit may adopt a policy which permits individual faculty members to
16 establish their own data collection processes. Individual faculty members may supplement
17 data collected under unit policy with additional data.
- 18 (e) The written policies and procedures of each department shall address:
 - 19 1. the form(s) by which data are to be collected;
 - 20 2. the collection process;
 - 21 3. requirements concerning frequency of collection, dates of submission and similar admin-
22 istrative requirements; and
 - 23 4. how the information is to be interpreted and summarized.
- 24 (f) A copy of the approved policies and procedures of each academic unit will be filed with the
25 Faculty Senate and available for review. Units are responsible for assuring their own mem-
26 bers are aware of requirements and their policy.
- 27 (g) Other general considerations:
 - 28 1. Student surveys are conducted anonymously.
 - 29 2. To be eligible for consideration for merit salary increases, faculty members must have in
30 their personnel folders evidence of students' opinion of instruction, consistent with unit
31 policy. The data must be collected no less often than every three years, though more fre-
32 quent assessment is encouraged.
 - 33 3. To be eligible for consideration for promotion or reappointment, faculty members must
34 have in their personnel folders evidence of students' opinion of instruction collected ac-
35 cording to unit policy and procedures. The documentation, at a minimum, must consist of
36 a summary of students' opinions prepared by the unit and a specific and thorough analy-
37 sis of the data collected. Review levels beyond the unit may request further information,
38 such as copies of opinion surveys. Ordinarily, only the academic unit will receive raw cop-
39 ies of student opinion data. These documents will be provided to all levels of review.
 - 40 4. Each faculty member is responsible for assuring that his or her personnel folder contains
41 information sufficiently current and comprehensive to reflect students' opinions of teach-
42 ing effectiveness. To provide adequate support for tenure, reappointment, promotion, and
43 salary decisions, faculty should provide current student opinion data for most, and ideally
44 all, courses they teach.
 - 45 5. If the student opinion information or teaching effectiveness data from other sources is
46 found to be insufficient by higher levels of review, clarification or additional information
47 may be requested of the faculty member's unit. Review bodies are responsible for inform-
48 ing candidates of inadequacies in their documentation of teaching effectiveness, so that
49 they may improve their presentation of data in the future. The unit bears primary respon-

1 sibility for providing guidance to its faculty, including information on ways to improve
2 teaching and resources available to assist faculty in that endeavor.

3 (h) Student Opinion Statistics and Their Interpretation.

4 The following conditions apply:

- 5 1. Most levels of review will receive summaries of student opinion surveys. It is particularly
6 important that all reviewers appreciate the limitations of purely statistical information and
7 are sensitive to factors which can affect individual scores.
- 8 2. Testing and Research Services shall be responsible for the calculation of statistics for all
9 survey forms that it provides for campus wide use. Colleges shall have the same respon-
10 sibility for any forms provided by a college and used by more than one department within
11 that college. Academic units that choose to develop their own student opinion survey
12 forms are responsible for summarizing the statistics and providing the interpretations
13 needed to make reasoned and appropriate judgments regarding teaching effectiveness.
14 Academic units have the responsibility and right to collect any student opinion data nec-
15 cessary to build a data base for interpretation of that data.
- 16 3. In light of the widely acknowledged limitations of student opinion surveys, interpretations
17 of raw data become particularly important. Unit policy will provide for those interpreta-
18 tions.
- 19 4. Empirical research has shown that scores on student opinion surveys may be affected by
20 a variety of factors, such as class size, course level, program (graduate/undergraduate),
21 course type (required/elective), department, gender, age, experience with prior teaching
22 of the course, years of teaching experience, expected or actual grades earned by stu-
23 dents, etc. Data interpretations should note how such factors are likely to have favorably
24 or unfavorably affected the data gathered.
- 25 5. Quantitative student opinion survey data should include medians, means, and standard
26 deviations and frequency distribution of responses for each of the items in the survey for
27 each context of analysis. Since the distribution of opinion scores for individual items is
28 typically negatively skewed, the median is the preferred measure of central tendency.
29 (e.g., reactions, instructors, course, etc.)
- 30 6. Because of the inherent multi-dimensionality of student opinion surveys, statistics that re-
31 sult from averaging or summing the responses to all of the items in a survey are inappro-
32 priate. Ideally, appropriate statistical analysis will be performed to determine meaningful
33 item clusters with summary statistics specific to these clusters. The summary statistic for
34 a cluster will normally be a mean of the median responses to the individual items in the
35 cluster. Percentile, decile, or quartile distributions may then be based upon this summary
36 statistic, allowing faculty members within a unit to be compared in terms of performance
37 in each cluster. No attempt should be made to combine cluster summary statistics.
- 38 7. Comparisons of teaching evaluation scores between faculty members in different aca-
39 demic units may not be used in promotion, tenure, renewal, and merit considerations. As
40 an alternative to this procedure, medians and distributions may be presented for individ-
41 ual items. Since the statistics and analyses listed above may not be available for years
42 preceding implementation of this policy, decision-makers must exercise extreme caution
43 in the interpreting student opinion data that does not consider factors unrelated to teach-
44 ing effectiveness or beyond the control of the instructor.
- 45 8. Written comments from students will not be collected or recorded from any University
46 student opinion survey form.