

**The following updates were made in response to recent policy adoptions. None of the changes in the following document add any new policy to the faculty handbook. The changes are meant only to reflect the recent adoptions.**

### **6.3**

May 9, 2017 is added to the amended dates.

#### **6.3.2**

This section is updated to highlight the changes that occurred in the Spring 2018 semester rather than the Spring 2007 semester previously highlighted. The language is then adjusted to discuss the self-assessment of teaching document.

The original document: In addition to materials illustrative of the candidate's scholarship and teaching, the dossier must contain a current curriculum vita; a self-assessment by the candidate of accomplishments and expectations in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service that avoids unnecessary duplication of the curriculum vita; and a copy of the report of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee during the department review, if any, for contract renewal.

The updated language: In addition to materials illustrative of the candidate's scholarship and teaching, the dossier must contain a current curriculum vita; a self-assessment by the candidate of accomplishments and expectations in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service that avoids unnecessary duplication of the curriculum vitae. The self-assessment of teaching should be a reflective statement that includes the candidate's teaching philosophy and goals as well as a self-evaluation of his/her teaching efforts and accomplishments. The dossier should also include a copy of the report of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee during the department review, if any, for contract renewal.

Then later in the section the language is adjusted to reflect the move from the SCEQ's to the SCE's and the DIFF's):

The original document: Copies of all SCEQ's<sup>1</sup> administered in at least three years of teaching preceding the year of the review shall be included in the dossier. Blue sheets, which were designed to provide feedback to instructors and are not intended for use by promotion and tenure committees, are not to be included in the dossier.

The updated language: Copies of all Student Course Evaluations (SCE's) administered in at least three years of teaching preceding the year of the review shall be included in the dossier. Direct Instructor Feedback Forms (DIFF's), which were designed to provide feedback to instructors and are not intended for use by promotion and tenure committees, are not to be included in the dossier.

### **6.4 (6.4.1 and 6.4.1.1. are combined into a single section titled 6.4.**

The history presented in this section is being trimmed down, because we are no longer using the SCEQ.

The original language in 6.4.1: (Adapted from M.D. Wang & B.C. Schumann, Student Course Evaluation Guide, October 1980; Amended by the Faculty Senate March 14, 2006)

The original language: in 6.4.1.1: Formal procedures for student evaluation of teaching were established by the UMBC Faculty Senate May 4, 1971. At that time, the Senate approved the Student Course

Evaluation Questionnaire (SCEQ) and the free response questionnaire (blue sheet), which was to be returned directly to the instructor after grades were turned in and which was not to be used as part of the formal evaluation. The Senate also asserted four principles of faculty rights in teaching evaluation:

1. A faculty member must have the right to petition that a given method of evaluation is not applicable to his or her situation and the right to propose an alternative method of evaluation.
2. A faculty member must have the right to see and respond in writing to all formal teaching evaluations.
3. Whenever possible, evaluations of a faculty member's teaching should not be used for promotion, tenure, or contract decisions until the instructor has had the opportunity to alter his or her teaching in the same course.
4. The faculty member has the right to expect that the questionnaire will be administered so as to minimize the possibilities of respondent bias.

The Senate approved guidelines for peer evaluation of teaching, suggesting that faculty members submit statements of course objectives, as well as supplementary materials such as a list of readings, a course syllabus, tests and quizzes, and written assignments. These documents plus the results of the student course evaluation questionnaire would be included in the dossier which is reviewed by promotion and tenure committees.

Lastly, the Senate established a Student Course Evaluation Committee and a set of procedures for SCEQ administration. The Committee's responsibilities included directing the administration and processing of the SCEQ, approving requests for exemptions, and making recommendations for revision or modification of the SCEQ.

The SCEQ was substantially revised by the Student Course Evaluation Committee (comprised of faculty and students) and adopted by the Senate in 1976. This revised form, still in use today, was implemented in Fall 1977.

The updated language condensed into 6.4: (Adapted from M.D. Wang & B.C. Schumann, Student Course Evaluation Guide, October 1980; Amended by the Faculty Senate March 14, 2006)

Formal procedures for the evaluation of teaching for Promotion and Tenure were established by the UMBC Faculty Senate May 4, 1971. These procedures were amended on May 10, 2016 and May 9, 2017.

In 1971 the Senate asserted four principles of faculty rights in teaching evaluation:

1. A faculty member must have the right to petition that a given method of evaluation is not applicable to his or her situation and the right to propose an alternative method of evaluation.
2. A faculty member must have the right to see and respond in writing to all formal teaching evaluations.
3. Whenever possible, evaluations of a faculty member's teaching should not be used for promotion, tenure, or contract decisions until the instructor has had the opportunity to alter his or her teaching in the same course.
4. The faculty member has the right to expect that the questionnaire will be administered so as to minimize the possibilities of respondent bias.

The history taken out of this section is moved to the next section 6.4.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching.

Updated section 6.41 Student Evaluation of Teaching: In 1971 the Senate established formal procedures for student evaluation of teaching. At that time, the Senate approved the Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire (SCEQ) and the free response questionnaire (blue sheet). The Senate also established a Student Course Evaluation Committee and a set of procedures for the administration of student

evaluations. The Committee's responsibilities included directing the administration and processing of student evaluations, approving requests for exemptions, and making recommendations for revision or modification. The SCEQ was substantially revised by the Student Course Evaluation Committee (comprised of faculty and students) and adopted by the Senate in 1976.

In 2016 the Senate approved the implementation of an online delivery system for student course evaluations and a validated survey instrument: the Student's Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ), which was renamed the SCE (Student Course Evaluation).

#### **6.4.1.2 is also updated to reflect the change from the SCEQ to the SCE:**

Original language: The questionnaire consists of seven sets of items. One set contains general questions that should be applicable to almost all courses. The remaining sets are designed for lectures, discussion, mathematics and science laboratories, seminars, field experience, and self-paced courses. Six questions permit separate evaluation of as many as four instructors. The instructor has the option of administering whichever sets of questions are applicable.

The SCEQ should have a cover page that states: UMBC appreciates your taking a few minutes to fill out this very important questionnaire. The results of this questionnaire will be used for (1) promotion and tenure decisions for full-time faculty; (2) post-tenure review for tenured faculty; (3) decisions regarding salary merit increases for faculty; (4) re-hiring decisions for part-time faculty. In addition, aggregate result from your class will be posted on the UMBC website as a matter of public record.

Updated language: The SCE is a validated instrument used to obtain student feedback on teaching quality and effectiveness. The SCE consists of 32 standardized questions that were developed iteratively with feedback from students and teachers and represent factors related to teaching effectiveness. Many studies have confirmed that teaching effectiveness is a multidimensional concept not captured by any single question or factor. Questions are grouped with others that students answer similarly based on extensive and repeated analysis.

The first part of the SCE consists of 29 questions organized under eight factors: Learning, Enthusiasm, Organization, Group Interaction, Individual Rapport, Breadth, Examinations and Assignments. These questions are formative questions that provide faculty with diagnostic feedback about their teaching. The average score for each factor (e.g. Learning, Organization) and the individual, global questions 30 – 32 are summative scores that provide a summary of overall teaching effectiveness. The SCE also provides open-ended Direct Instructor Feedback Form (DIFF) questions, which are available only to the instructor and are not considered in formal evaluations.

#### **6.4.1.3 Administration Procedures is updated to reflect change from SCEQ to SCEs and the online distribution/completion.**

Original language: Administration of the SCEQ is the responsibility of the course instructor. Preparation and distribution of evaluation materials is organized and supervised by the Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support. Within each department, one person, a faculty or staff member, is designated by the department chairperson as SCEQ coordinator. The coordinators act as liaisons between the faculty and the Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support in several phases of the evaluation process and in the preliminary processing of the completed questionnaires.

Under unusual circumstances, exemption from student course evaluation may be requested from the department chair. If such exemption is granted, this should be communicated to the SCEQ coordinator as early in the semester as possible.

Course evaluation questionnaires are delivered to the faculty with certain information precoded on them: the course schedule number, the department, the course and section numbers, and the name(s) of the instructor(s). This information is compiled from the Course Schedule Master, a database maintained by the registrar. Any inaccuracies in the Course Schedule Master entries will produce inaccuracies in the course evaluation materials. After the schedule adjustment period at the beginning of the semester, pertinent information is obtained from the Course Schedule Master and sent to the SCEQ coordinators for verification. Corrections, if any, are submitted directly to the registrar.

Each course section with a distinct schedule number in the Schedule of Classes for the semester is treated as a distinct “course” when the SCEQ data are processed. If the instructor wishes to combine certain sections for course evaluation, this information must be supplied to the SCEQ coordinator at least five weeks before the end of classes. The questionnaires for all such sections are then be precoded with a single schedule number and will be processed together.

Updated language: The online platform and the distribution of the SCE are maintained and supervised by the Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support. Within each department, one person, a faculty or staff member, is designated by the department chairperson as SCE coordinator. The coordinators act as liaisons between the faculty and the Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support in several phases of the evaluation process and in the preliminary processing of the completed questionnaires.

Under unusual circumstances, exemption from student course evaluation may be requested from the department chair. If such exemption is granted, this should be communicated to the SCE coordinator as early in the semester as possible.

The SCE's are made available to students two weeks before the end of classes unless a department has opted to change when the survey is launched. The secure online system grants students 24/7 access during the evaluation period, and can be accessed by any device (desktop, laptop, tablet, smartphone).

Although students have unlimited access during this period, all faculty members at UMBC are encouraged to set aside 15 – 20 minutes in their classes to enable students to take the survey. Faculty are also encouraged to make the following announcement to students concerning the utilization of the SCE:

“The Student Course Evaluation (SCE) is a standardized course evaluation instrument used to provide measures of an instructor’s teaching effectiveness. The results of this questionnaire will be used by promotion and tenure committees as part of the instructor’s evaluation. The Direct Instructor Feedback Forms (DIFFs) were designed to provide feedback to instructors and they are not intended for use by promotion and tenure committees. The responses to the SCE and the DIFFs will be kept confidential and will not be distributed until final grades are in.”

The following line, at the conclusion of this section: “Courses that are currently taught on-line shall be evaluated on-line” is going to be deleted from the faculty handbook. A more developed policy concerning online teaching will be discussed in the near future.

**6.4.2 (Departmental Review Procedures) is being replaced with a new section (Additional Qualitative Measures for Evaluation of Teaching). Departmental Review Procedures will be moved to 6.4.3**

6.4.2 Additional Qualitative Measures for Evaluation of Teaching: (new language): A multi-pronged analysis of teaching contributes to an equitable review of the candidate's teaching effectiveness and helps to minimize student and institutional bias in the areas of racism, sexism, ageism, classism, and other

forms of discrimination. For this reason, UMBC also requires at least two qualitative measures of teaching effectiveness in addition to the quantitative data through student evaluations for promotion and tenure. Each department will decide what kinds of measures are appropriate for their field or fields of study, and must indicate these measures in their departmental policies.

#### **6.4.3 (Was 6.4.2 - Departmental Review Procedures) Added information about Qualitative Measures amendment.**

Original language: (Approved by the Faculty Senate, March 14, 2006)

Each department must develop a written policy to allow for evaluation by the DP&TC of a faculty member's teaching. The written policy prepared by the department shall be kept on record in the department office and made available to department faculty.

To allow for evaluation by the DP&TC of a faculty member's teaching, in addition to the submission of SCEQs, documentation from a minimum of 3 courses (the exact number to be determined by each department) should be included. Ideally these would be courses at different levels (lower division/upper division/graduate) or different types (lecture/discussion). Documents may include, for example, the syllabus, written assignments, exams, examples of feedback to students, or other documentation that the department deems appropriate.

If a department decides to use classroom observations as part of its review of teaching, proper procedures need to be adopted for conducting such observations. The department needs to provide a written document indicating the procedures followed for conducting classroom observations.

Updated language: (Approved by the Faculty Senate in 1971, amended March 14, 2006 and May 9, 2017)

In 1971 the Senate approved guidelines for peer evaluation of teaching, suggesting that faculty members submit statements of course objectives, as well as supplementary materials such as a list of readings, a course syllabus, tests and quizzes, and written assignments. In 2017 the Senate approved the requirement of an additional two qualitative measures of teaching. These documents plus the results of the student course evaluation questionnaire would be included in the dossier which is reviewed by promotion and tenure committees.

Each department must develop a written policy to allow for evaluation by the DP&TC of a faculty member's teaching. The written policy prepared by the department shall be kept on record in the department office and made available to department faculty.

To allow for evaluation by the DP&TC of a faculty member's teaching, in addition to the submission of SCE's, at least two qualitative measures of teaching effectiveness are required. Each department policy must include a statement regarding the kinds of specific qualitative measures that the department will use to evaluate teaching. Documentation from a minimum of 3 courses (the exact number to be determined by each department) should also be included. Ideally these would be courses at different levels (lower division/upper division/graduate) or different types (lecture/discussion). Documents may include, for example, the syllabus, written assignments, exams, examples of feedback to students, or other documentation that the department deems appropriate.

If a department decides to use classroom observations as part of its review of teaching, proper procedures need to be adopted for conducting such observations. The department needs to provide a written document indicating the procedures followed for conducting classroom observations.

#### **6.5.1.2 Required and Prohibited Documentation for the Annual Review Process**

SCEQ in point 2 needs to be switched to ‘available SCE from the previous two semesters may be included, but DIFFs shall be excluded.’

#### **6.5.2.3.2 Required and Prohibited Documentation for the Comprehensive Review File**

SCEQ in point 2 needs to be switched to ‘available SCE from the previous two semesters may be included, but DIFFs shall be excluded.’

#### **6.8.4 Procedures**

In the second point, the language should be changed from SCEQ results to SCE results.

**6.9 is originally Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure, but everything needs to be moved in order to include UMBC Guidelines for Promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer. Everything previously listed beginning with 6.9 will be adjusted to 6.10. Everything beginning with 6.10 will be adjusted to 6.11.**

#### **6.9.3 Teaching (now 6.10.3)**

All mentions of SCEQs should be changed to SCE. There should also be added a line “Describe the two additional required qualitative measures and how they will be administered.”

### **6.9 UMBC GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF PRINCIPAL LECTURER**

#### **6.9.1 Eligibility**

This is the highest rank for full-time non-tenure track instructional faculty at UMBC, and the appointment should be made only after careful investigation of the candidate’s professional and leadership accomplishments and promise of continued growth. In addition to the qualifications required of the Senior Lecturer, candidates for promotion to Principal Lecturer must have a distinguished and sustained record of teaching excellence over the course of at least five years since promotion to Senior Lecturer. Candidates for promotion to Principal Lecturer must also meet appropriately higher expectations in terms of the scope, range, or impact of professional activities.

#### **6.9.2 Criteria**

##### **Teaching**

Criteria for the evaluation of teaching should be consistent with those employed by the University in evaluating candidates for appointment or promotion to the rank of Full Professor. A candidate for appointment to the rank of Principal Lecturer should have a record of outstanding leadership in the educational programs of the University; a record of involvement in obtaining financial support for education initiatives; or have established an outstanding record of scholarship on teaching and learning.

##### **Service**

Candidates for the rank of Principal Lecturer should have demonstrated leadership in the category of service within the University and the academic profession. These accomplishments may include but are not limited to leadership in curricular development, revision, and assessment or leadership in College/University governance and committees or elected or appointed leadership in professional or community organizations.

#### Procedures

Procedures for promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer are consistent with those used for promotion to other faculty ranks and follow the university's calendar for non-scheduled promotion reviews . . . [same language as "Procedures" for Senior Lecturer in 6.8]