Alignment of the Student Evaluation in Banner
with the Recontracting and Tenure Memorandum of Agreement
(Updated Spring 2010)

The student evaluation instrument developed by the Faculty Center Student Ratings Learning Community and the staff of Enterprise Information Services (EIS), administered online via Banner, aligns well with the guidelines for student evaluations presented in the AFT-negotiated Recontracting and Tenure Memorandum of Agreement (T&R MoA), dated September 1, 2009. The purpose of the present document is to describe, point-by-point, how this evaluation aligns with the established guidelines, as they are presented in the T&R MoA; all page numbers refer to pages of the T&R MoA. Additionally, for ease of reading, all quotes taken from the T&R MoA appear in italics.

1. On page 11 of the T&R MoA, the following is listed as one of the candidate’s rights: “To participate in the department discussions to determine the method of colleague assessment and student evaluations that will be utilized in the evaluation process and to mutually agree with the department recontracting committee on the appropriate individuals and times to administer these processes”.

   a. The student evaluation in Banner, developed by the Faculty Center Student Ratings Learning Community and EIS, is now an option for all Rowan departments.

   b. Departments retain the right to use whichever instrument(s) of student evaluation they feel is/are most appropriate. This decision should be shared with the appropriate Dean.

   c. Therefore, departments may decide:

      i. to replace their currently-used method of student evaluation with the student evaluation in Banner

      ii. to use both their current method and the evaluation in Banner

      iii. to stay with their current method of student evaluation only

      iv. that one method of student evaluation is to be used for a particular subset of instructors (i.e. for adjuncts), while another method of student evaluation is to be used for a different subset of instructors (i.e. for probationary, tenure-track faculty).

2. “Student perception of the teaching/learning experience will be collected by the Department Recontracting Committee in any two (2) sections once per semester during the last five (5) weeks of the fall and spring semesters or during the last week of the summer session of the current recontracting period.” (p.16)

   a. Instructors may request that the student evaluation in Banner be accessible to their students only during the last five weeks of a fall or spring semester or the last week of a summer session. Instructors who submit a “Survey open date” or “Survey close date” falling outside of these time frames receive an error message on the “Request Student Course Evaluation” webpage.
3. “It is the candidate's responsibility to request that a member of the departmental recontracting committee administer departmentally approved student evaluation forms”. (p.32)
   o Only instructors may request the student evaluation in Banner for their classes by submitting requests via the “Request Student Course Evaluation” webpage.
   o If the student evaluation in Banner is to be completed by students during class time, instructors may request that a member of the departmental recontracting committee be present to supervise.

4. “A member of the departmental recontracting committee must administer the student evaluation forms. If no committee member can administer the evaluation, the departmental committee chairperson may appoint a delegate who is acceptable to the teacher being evaluated. Anyone who administers a teaching evaluation must be a member of the faculty or professional staff.” (p.32)
   o There are a variety of possible ways in which to administer the student evaluation in Banner.
   o Departments may decide to have students complete the evaluation during class time, in a computer lab or with students using their own laptops in class. In this case:
     ▪ Departments may decide that a departmental recontracting committee member or another member of the faculty or professional staff must be present to supervise the students’ completion of the student evaluation in Banner.
     ▪ It may be acceptable to the department and the teacher being evaluated to have the Banner system itself administer the student evaluation (i.e. be the appointed delegate); students may be asked to complete the evaluation in a computer lab during class time (i.e. for the first 15 minutes of class) with no human supervisor present.
   o Departments may decide to have students complete the student evaluation in Banner outside of class. In this case, the Banner system itself would have been chosen by the department to administer the evaluation.

5. “Upon arriving at the designated class, the evaluator will ask the faculty member to leave the room.” (p.32)
   o While the student evaluation in Banner is being completed by students during class time, in a computer lab or with students’ laptops, the instructor being evaluated should not be present. A faculty or professional staff colleague or simply the Banner system itself would be left to administer the evaluation.
     ▪ If no human supervisor will be present, prior to the instructor’s leaving the room, the instructor may arrange for one of the students in the class to come and find him/her in the hallway once all students have completed and submitted the evaluation.
   o The faculty member being evaluated would not be present in the case of students’ completing the evaluation outside of class.
6. “The evaluator may then read the recommended script…to the class prior to distributing the student evaluation forms.” (p.32)
   o When students log into their own Banner accounts, click on the “Personal Information” tab and then click on the “Answer a Survey” menu option, they will see the following text, which includes essential elements of the “recommended script” referred to on page 32 of the T&R MoA.
     ▪ “Student evaluations are an important part of the assessment process. They provide important feedback to professors so that they can understand the strengths of their teaching as well as areas that may need some more attention. However, teachers are also evaluated to provide information for purposes of recontracting, tenure, continuing professional development, and promotion.

   This process is voluntary on your part. Should you decide to participate please take this responsibility seriously. Your responses will be anonymous and your instructor will not see the results of your evaluation until the semester is completed and grades have been submitted to the Registrar.

   This survey contains at least 15 items. Feel free to include typed comments along with each item. Leaving an item blank is equivalent to a response of NA (Not Applicable). At the end of the survey, you may press the "Return to Beginning of Survey" button in order to edit your responses.

   Thank you for your participation.”
   o If students are to complete the evaluation during class time and if they are to be supervised by a member of the faculty or professional staff, this individual could read aloud the script that the students would see in Banner or another script approved by the department.

7. “A signature sheet will then be distributed, and students will be asked to sign their names if they participate in the evaluation process… After all forms have been returned to the evaluator, he/she will immediately meet with the candidate, who will validate the names on the signature sheet as students officially enrolled in the class.” (p.32)
   o After an instructor submits a request for a student evaluation, using the “Request Student Course Evaluation” webpage, the evaluation is automatically created and stands ready to be deployed to only those students registered for that particular class on the dates chosen by the instructor.
   o Since students must log into their own Banner accounts in order to access the student evaluation in Banner, this serves as a check on their identity.
   o Once the evaluation has opened to the students of a particular class, the instructor may check the “View Student Course Evaluations Requested” page in Banner to see how many students have completed the evaluation to date. Also, the results report received by the instructor after final grades have been submitted lists the number of students enrolled in the class and the number of evaluations completed.
   o Should the need arise, it would be possible for EIS to produce a listing of the names of the students who completed a particular evaluation.
8. “The chairperson of the department committee will do or oversee the compilation and analysis of the evaluation data and prepare a summary report.” (p.32)
   o With the evaluation in Banner, following the submission of final grades and the entering of the students’ grades into academic history by the Registrar’s Office, each instructor will automatically receive a results report, which will be a PDF attachment to an e-mail message.
   o Only the instructor who requested the evaluation for his/her class will receive the results report.
   o Departments may create their own guidelines regarding whether results reports should be shared and, if so, with whom. For example, a department may decide that adjunct instructors must share their results reports with the department chairperson; in this case, adjuncts may be asked to print a copy of the results report and deliver it to the chairperson or forward the PDF report to the chairperson over e-mail.

9. “The summary report must include all of the following: (a) name of the candidate, (b) class in which the evaluation was conducted, (c) date of administration, (d) name of the evaluator, (e) number of students enrolled in the class, (f) number of students completing the evaluation forms, (g) mean and frequency distribution for each structured-response item on the evaluation form, (d) all verbatim narrative responses by students to all open-ended questions.” (p.32)
   o The results report that will automatically be generated and e-mailed to the instructor as a PDF attachment has been programmed to include the items above with the following exceptions/caveats:
     ▪ Rather than “date of administration”, the results report lists the term or session during which the evaluation was carried out (i.e. “Fall 2009”). Since instructors may choose to have the evaluation be accessible to their students on multiple days, one single date would not be listed.
     ▪ The “name of the evaluator” is not listed, since the evaluation may be completed by students online, outside of class.
   o In addition to the suggested summary report contents listed on page 32 of the T&R MoA, the results report for this evaluation has been programmed to include:
     ▪ A coversheet with information identifying the instructor and the course
     ▪ Comparative overall statistics on the department-wide, college-wide and university-wide levels
     ▪ The median and standard deviation along with the mean for all items.

10. “In the presence of the person being evaluated, the chairperson of the department committee will seal the envelope containing the completed student evaluation forms, and ask the teacher to sign his/her name across the seal. The sealed envelope should then be sent to the Human Resources Office, where it will be kept for a period of five (5) years and then be discarded.” (p.32)
   o Student evaluation data for all classes using this evaluation may be stored in Banner for a period longer than five years.
   o If an instructor loses his/her results report, he/she may request that EIS produce another identical results report; this is possible since the information would be stored in Banner.