

Spring 4-14-2023

DOC 2006-08 (amended) Evaluating Faculty Teaching for the Purposes of Tenure

University of Dayton. Provost Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Provost Committee, "DOC 2006-08 (amended) Evaluating Faculty Teaching for the Purposes of Tenure" (2023). *Senate Documents*. 308.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs/308

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

PROPOSAL TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

TITLE: EVALUATING FACULTY TEACHING FOR THE PURPOSES OF TENURE

SUBMITTED BY: Provost Committee (see April 2006 version); reviewed and revised by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate

DATE: April 21, 2006 (Sense of the Senate Discussions); November 13, 2006; March 7, 2008 (Approved as amended April 11, 2008); March 31, 2023 (approved as amended April 14, 2023)

ACTION: Legislative authority

REFERENCE: II. B. 1. C.; DOC 2021-05; DOC 2023-05

I. Purposes of Evaluating Faculty Teaching

The evaluation of faculty teaching serves two distinct but related purposes, one administrative and the other developmental. Administratively, information gathered through the evaluation of faculty teaching helps faculty and administrators make important personnel decisions primarily concerning retention, tenure, promotion, and merit. The evaluation of faculty teaching also serves important developmental purposes: the results help guide faculty toward appropriate support services and resources.

Developmentally, the evaluation of faculty teaching helps faculty and administrators promote excellent teaching administratively, it helps faculty and administrators recognize and reward such teaching.

II. Evaluating Faculty Teaching through Multiple Sources of Information and Multiple Measures

Those evaluating faculty teaching for administrative purposes must gather information from multiple sources and employ multiple measures in accordance with department, program, or academic unit guidelines or bylaws.

III. Use of Faculty Teaching Evaluations for the Purpose of Tenure

- A. The Evaluation of faculty teaching for the purpose of tenure must be based on multiple measures drawn from multiple sources.
- B. All tenure track faculty must have their teaching evaluated according to a schedule determined by department or unit guidelines or bylaws.

- C. The results of all evaluations must be shared with the faculty member and the faculty member must be accorded the opportunity to respond in writing to any evaluation of their teaching.
- D. When making final recommendations regarding tenure, the evaluation of faculty teaching must be based on at a minimum:
1. **Student evaluations** and yearly reflections for every class the faculty member has taught at the University of Dayton
 2. At least two **peer reviews of the faculty member's classroom teaching** conducted during at least two different semesters
 3. At least two **peer reviews of the faculty member's course material** conducted during at least two different semesters
 4. At least one **chair or administrator evaluation of the faculty member's teaching.**¹
 5. At least one **self-evaluation** produced by the faculty member.
 6. Faculty-provided **evidence of student achievement of learning objectives.**²

NOTE: Any exceptions to these minimum expectations must be approved by the appropriate dean.

When and how this information is gathered during the faculty member's probationary period will be determined by department or unit guidelines or bylaws.

If the faculty member is teaching an online course, each department or program will take steps to ensure that peers observe the faculty member's interactions with students online at least twice prior to any final recommendations concerning tenure and that the chair includes in their evaluation an assessment of the faculty member's teaching in that course.

¹ The chair or administrator review of a faculty member's teaching can include, but need not be limited to a summary of the written comments on the faculty member's student course evaluations; commentary on how well the faculty member has lived up to contractual obligations; classroom observations of faculty teaching; observations on the faculty member's contributions to the teaching mission of the department, unit, or university; an assessment of the faculty member's teaching in the context of overall teaching performance in the department, unit, or university.

² When and how evidence of student achievement of learning objectives will be determined should be in line with department bylaws and guidelines.

- E. All procedures regarding the evaluation of faculty teaching for the purpose of tenure must adhere to the University of Dayton Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

IV. Evaluation Guidelines

A. Guidelines for Student Feedback Tool (SFT)

Faculty will follow University policy related to the Student Feedback Tool.³

B. Guidelines for Peer Review of Faculty Teaching and Course Material

1. When possible, peer reviewers should have experience teaching in the same or related area(s) of study as the faculty member being reviewed.
2. Peer review of a faculty member's teaching should include an evaluation of the faculty member's instruction and interaction with students.
3. Peer reviewers should evaluate at least two different courses.
4. Peer reviewers should meet with the faculty member prior to observing their class to discuss the course goals and the faculty member's plans for the days he or she will be observed. Each department should develop a consistent process for disseminating the results of the review with the individual faculty member.
5. Departments or units should develop a standard evaluation instrument peer reviewers employ when evaluating a faculty member's teaching.
6. Each department or unit must develop its own set of procedures governing the peer review of teaching. These procedures should stipulate how peer reviewers are to be selected, which courses they are to evaluate, what type of report they are to submit, and identifies which person(s) are to receive the peer review report.
7. Peer review of a faculty member's course material should include, at a minimum, an evaluation of their course syllabi, assignments, and examinations.
8. Peer reviewers should meet with the faculty member prior to reviewing their course material to discuss the faculty member's course goals,

³ See [DOC 2023-05: Use and Administration of the Student Feedback Tool](#) or most current policy.

students, and teaching philosophy. Each department should develop a consistent process for disseminating the results of the review with the individual faculty member.

9. Departments or units should develop a standard evaluation instrument peer reviewers employ when evaluating a faculty member's course material.
10. Each department or unit must develop its own set of procedures governing the peer review of course material. These procedures should stipulate how peer reviewers are to be selected, what material they will evaluate, and what type of report they are to submit to whom.
11. The faculty member must have an opportunity to respond to any report submitted by a peer who observed their classroom teaching or evaluated their course material.

C. Guidelines for Self-evaluations of Faculty Teaching

1. In their self-evaluations, faculty should assess the strengths and weaknesses of their teaching and indicate steps they have taken to improve the quality of the instruction they offer students
2. Each department or unit must develop its own set of guidelines for the self- evaluation of faculty teaching including the specific content of the evaluation, its length, and its format.

D. Guidelines for Submitting Evidence of Student Learning

1. Evidence of student achievement of learning objectives can be drawn from sources such as:
 - samples of student work
 - test or quiz results
 - comprehensive examinations
 - pre-and post-test scores
 - standardized test scores
 - third party testing (e.g., licensure)
 - performance in capstone courses
 - artistic presentations
 - oral presentations
 - exhibits
 - video- or audiotape evaluations
 - student surveys or interviews
 - reflective student essays
 - employer evaluations

- internship evaluations
2. Each department or unit must develop its own set of guidelines concerning the submission of evidence of achievement of learning objectives. These guidelines should indicate what types of evidence faculty should submit and how they will be evaluated. Faculty should clearly articulate in writing the student learning objectives that are to be evaluated.