

1 Faculty Alliance of Miami, AAUP-AFT Proposal to Miami University

2
3 October 25, 2023

4
5 EVALUATION OF TEACHING

6
7 **1. General**

8 1.1. Miami University and FAM, AAUP-AFT recognize the importance of high-quality
9 teaching and its impact on student learning and recognize that there are differing professional
10 views on the nature and utility of student evaluations of teaching. The University also
11 recognizes that rights for determining the criteria for teaching effectiveness rests with the
12 faculty.

13
14 1.2. Teaching is a complex and multi-faceted process, requiring multiple approaches to
15 measurement beyond student evaluations of teaching. Much of the richness of information is
16 not necessarily quantifiable, but relies instead on qualitative information.

17
18 **2. Teaching Evaluation Plan**

19 2.1. Each department shall develop a teaching evaluation plan for their department's faculty
20 members. The major purpose of this plan is to provide a process to enhance the quality of
21 teaching and, subsequently, student learning at Miami. When implemented, each plan should
22 provide faculty with information useful in improving their teaching (formative) and for
23 documenting teaching effectiveness for promotion, tenure and/or annual performance
24 appraisals (summative). Accordingly, candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure should
25 submit to their departments/divisions a variety of evaluation results administered on a yearly
26 basis starting in their second year.

27
28 **3. Assessment Components**

29 3.1. The department's plan shall reflect the complexity of the teaching/learning process by
30 including multiple sources of evaluation data, including both quantitative and qualitative
31 assessment methods. The plan shall also address both formative and summative assessments.

32
33 3.2. High quality in teaching can be clearly demonstrated by multiple measures of
34 instructional classroom performance. All dossiers must include multiple sources of teaching
35 evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, and may include but not rely solely on student
36 evaluations of teaching. Faculty members have the right to determine, in consultation with
37 their departmental promotion and tenure committee, which measures will be used.

38
39 3.2.1. Evidence of high quality teaching can include but not limited to examples of:

- 40 • Classroom teaching
- 41 • One-on-one or small group teaching
- 42 • Teaching in continuing education programs
- 43 • Development of teaching materials
- 44 • Development of courses and curricula
- 45 • Embedding experiential-learning activities
- 46 • Peer evaluations
- 47 • Student portfolios
- 48 • Teaching (faculty) portfolios
- 49 • Senior exit surveys
- 50 • Alumni surveys

51

52 **4. Formative evaluations by students provide valuable feedback for the improvement of**
 53 **course design and instruction and may be conducted by the instructor.**

54 Formative evaluations of instructors by mentors and peers are likewise designed to aid in course
 55 and teaching development. The University will not require the use of formative evaluations for
 56 summative purposes. However, faculty may elect to provide data from formative evaluations (i.e.
 57 mid-course evaluations) with description of improvements made in the materials that they submit
 58 for tenure, promotion, post-tenure review and merit salary increases.

59

60 **5. Summative evaluations will be retained and used as a part of the evaluation process for**
 61 **tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and merit salary increases.**

62 Summative evaluations may be conducted for faculty by request and included in their annual
 63 activity report or their Promotion Packet.

64

65 **6. Use of Peer Evaluation**

66 A faculty member or departments may choose to use Peer Evaluation as a method of summative
 67 evaluation. Should they choose this method, the following criteria should be followed:

68

69 6.1. Appointment of Peer Evaluator(s) - Peer evaluators must be mutually agreeable to the
 70 faculty member, the chair of the department P&T committee, and department chair. Peer
 71 evaluators may come from cognate discipline departments or outside the university. The
 72 department is responsible for ensuring peer evaluations are completed.

73

74 6.2. Peer Evaluator(s) visits - Observational visits shall be scheduled for and conducted at
 75 times and dates mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and their evaluator.

76

77 6.3. Peer Evaluation Reports and Outcomes

78

79 6.3.1. Final Peer Evaluation Report

80 6.3.1.1. The peer evaluator(s) submit a final written report. This summary must
81 contain specific examples from each observation session.

82
83 6.3.1.2. Peer evaluator(s) will share the report with the faculty member at least one
84 (1) week before the final report has been submitted. Peer evaluator(s) are encouraged
85 to discuss the report with faculty along with any other observations they may have
86 made during the evaluation period.

87
88 6.3.1.3. The faculty member will have the opportunity to respond or correct any
89 errors in the report before it is submitted to the chair and shall have at least one (1)
90 week to review it.

91
92 6.3.1.4. The final report is submitted to the department chair. Once submitted, the
93 report will be available to the faculty member and the department chair.

94
95 6.3.2. Final summative reports for each evaluation may be submitted along with the
96 annual performance report and the dossier for promotion and tenure, at the reviewee's
97 discretion.

98
99 **7. University Student Evaluations of Teaching**

100 7.1. Any mandatory evaluation of faculty must be appropriate to the discipline and specific
101 type of course (independent studies and other such courses, as well as classes with
102 enrollments of fewer than twelve (12) are exempt from evaluation). These evaluations shall
103 be constructed in such a manner as to ensure credibility, integrity, and the professional rights
104 and academic freedom of faculty.

105
106 7.2. The faculty members are not responsible for administering their own student evaluations.
107 The University shall administer evaluations electronically. Faculty are not responsible for
108 low response rates.

109
110 7.3. University evaluators may not use non-university student evaluations (e.g., internet
111 evaluations; blog posts) for promotion and tenure purposes or any other purpose. Faculty
112 may refer to such evaluations.

113
114 7.4. All questions on mandatory student evaluations, whether departmental or otherwise,
115 shall be approved by University Senate and FAM, AAUP-AFT and shall refer to the student
116 experience in the course exclusively and not call upon students to judge the professional
117 expertise, personal traits, or disciplinary perspectives of faculty.

118
119 7.5. An ad-hoc committee consisting of at least two Administrative members, at least one
120 CTE staff member, a department chair, and at least two FAM, AAUP-AFT, shall be
121 composed to study the best practices in designing student evaluations of teaching including
122 best practices in mitigating bias. This committee shall report its conclusions to the University
123 and the Union within three months of the ratification of the contract and the Union and the
124 University shall negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding within six months of the
125 ratification of the contract.

126

127 **8. Waiver of course evaluation reporting**

128 8.1. A faculty member may waive the reporting of end-of-semester or term course evaluation
129 data for one or several courses on their annual reports or promotion and/or tenure dossiers
130 (for example, to try experimental or innovative course practices).

131

132 8.2. After reviewing any evaluation, faculty may omit single, several, or all student
133 evaluations for a course for cause.