The Academic Affairs Committee recommends the endorsement and adoption of the following Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching by Students.

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING BY STUDENTS

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MILWAUKEE

I. The Instrument used for Evaluation of Teaching.
   A. The validity of the instrument will be demonstrated. This will include each of the following generally recognized types of validity
1. Construct validity: Those behaviors identified as related to high (or low) quality teaching will be based upon well formulated hypotheses about the goals of teaching and the various methods appropriate to meet these goals.

2. Content validity: The items used in the instrument will constitute a representative sample of the behaviors identified as related to high (or low) quality teaching.

3. Concurrent Validity: The instrument will be related to concurrent criteria of teaching effectiveness, such as peer review.

4. Predictive Validity: The instrument, if it measures teaching effectiveness, will predict subsequent performance in the area (such as grades in courses for which the evaluated course is a prerequisite, or subsequent achievement after graduation). Obviously, one teacher in one course will not account for all the variance in these later criteria; it should only claim to do part of the job of predicting.

5. Internal Validity: The instrument will be internally consistent and stable, as measured by indices of reliability, low intercorrelations between dimensions, high correlations between items within dimensions, and the identification of the dependence or independence of item responses to irrelevant external variables (GPA, whether course is required, etc.).

B. The evaluation instrument will be objective in form, but will include optional open-ended questions and allow space for comments.

C. The instrument will be as brief as is consistent with the requirements of validity stated above.
D. The instrument or instruments will be written with an appreciation of the diversity of classes taught at UWM (e.g., lecture, discussion, lab, studio, and seminar formats) and will be available in a form or forms appropriate for use throughout the University.

II. Administration Procedures

A. All evaluations will be administered by a central campus office
   1. This office will be responsible directly to the Faculty Senate and be advised by a standing faculty committee on teaching evaluation. The office will be safeguarded from interference by the university administration.
   2. The office will be staffed by one or more experts in the field of testing and measurement.
   3. The office will make available a standardized, valid instrument (conforming to the requirements of Section I above) and provide for its uniform and unbiased administration and scoring by its representatives in the absence of the faculty member in question.

B. Students will be held accountable for their statements, but proper safeguards will be taken to ensure that participation by a student can never affect his or her grade in the course under evaluation or in any future course. The accomplishment of this guideline will doubtless require legal counsel, but its implementation is deemed essential.

III. Compilation, Interpretation, and Use of Data

A. Compiled data will be furnished by the Evaluation Office only to the individual faculty member who was the subject of the evaluation and to the faculty member's departmental chairperson and Executive Committee members.
B. Comparisons among faculty will not be made in the absence of norms. Therefore, norms available to all faculty will be constructed for the University, Schools, and Departments using variables such as class size, the proportion of the class participating in the evaluation, whether the course is required or elective, and others deemed relevant by the faculty. The norms will never present data on an individual.

C. Each faculty member will have the opportunity to attach a written statement of explanation to any evaluation of his or her teaching made by students. This statement will then be considered a permanent part of the evaluation.

D. As the demographic and academic characteristics of students may affect their evaluations of faculty, information on such student variables as GPA, major, degree program, sex, age, etc. will be available for the interpretation of faculty evaluation data.

E. Using the established norms and demographic information, the faculty member's departmental chairperson and Executive Committee will interpret the data and any statement attached by the faculty member as one source of information about the quality of that faculty member's teaching. Therefore, in making any recommendation for retention or nonretention, tenure, or merit salary increase, the Executive Committee will consider all relevant data, including student evaluation of teaching, and shall incorporate them in its decision. All procedures for evaluating and making recommendations will be in accordance with institutional rules and procedures.
F. In cases of retention or nonretention, promotion, or tenure, a minimum of two years (and preferably three years) of data on student evaluation of teaching will be available on the faculty member before the data may be considered by the Executive Committee in making its recommendation.

G. The compiled data themselves will not be forwarded to any Dean or Divisional Executive Committee by a departmental chairperson or Executive Committee.

H. Answer to optional open-ended questions will be made available only to individual faculty members and will be in a form that ensures the anonymity of students.

I. The Office of Evaluation will be engaged in a continuous program of research aimed at improving the accuracy and usefulness of teaching evaluation by students.
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ADDENDUM

Rationale for the proposed Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching by Students.

The Regents have mandated the use of student evaluation of teaching in the consideration of retention, promotion, and merit salary increases. They have urged that a uniform procedure be adopted. The Guidelines provide for that uniformity and also attempt to protect faculty from the misinterpretation and misuse of student evaluation data.

1. All faculty must be protected from the application of invalid, unreliable, or biased data to decisions regarding their employment and compensation.
   Section I of the Guidelines deals with characteristics of the evaluation instrument(s) and is primarily concerned with what it is that student evaluation questionnaires actually measure.

2. All faculty must be assured that data on their colleagues are accurate and unbiased so that comparisons made within and between departments will be both meaningful and just.
   Section II calls for uniformity and objectivity in the administration of evaluation questionnaires.

3. All faculty must be assured that their colleagues have either the expertise or a set of well-defined guidelines for an accurate and unbiased interpretation of the summarized evaluation data.
   Section III deals with the compilation of interpretative data. This section also reaffirms the principle of peer review by indicating that only the interpretation of evaluation data will be forwarded for administrative use.