Provost’s Protocol for the Administration of Teaching/Course Evaluations

(Conducted in Class or Electronically)

Student assessment of teaching will be completed using a standard department instrument agreed to by at least a two-thirds majority of the faculty members. This instrument will be administered as per the following protocol, which has been determined by the Provost and Vice-President Academic

1. To allow students to understand fully the purpose and goals of the evaluations and to generate more thoughtful responses, course evaluation instruments (or a précis thereof) will be available to the students at the beginning of the semester either electronically or as part of the introductory course package. Each department must make available to students a concise statement of the policies and procedures involved in the evaluation of courses and its administration. This statement should be available to students via hard copy, web pages, or other means. This protocol does not suggest distribution to classes; it suggests availability to interested individuals.

2. Questionnaires will be filled out during the last two weeks of classes; when more than one professor is assigned to the course, then questionnaires will be filled out for each faculty member in turn within the final two weeks of each professor’s segment of the course or at the end of the semester, as each faculty member chooses.

3. Sufficient time must be allowed for the student to complete the questionnaire in a thoughtful manner.

4. Each department must have an independent third party (called herein the “Administrator”) designated by the Chair, who will be responsible for the administration of the course evaluation process. The independent third party is defined as someone not involved in the instruction or grading of the course and not a member of the Tenure and Promotions Committee. All teaching evaluation will be conducted in the absence of anyone involved in the grading of the course. Other faculty and instructors in the department are also not considered to be an independent third party.

5. Completed questionnaires are provided to the Administrator for processing. Processing will be in accordance with this Protocol.

6. Students should be informed of the purpose of the evaluation and the value of the process to the department, the program and the instructor. It should be stated that professors do not see these evaluations until after the assignment of final grades. It should also be stated that teaching evaluations are looked at by the University in the context of the instructor’s teaching dossier. This is done to ensure that there is no disincentive to strategic innovation.
7. All questionnaires will begin with a clear statement of the following provisions of the Collective Agreement concerning signed student comments: (i) that only signed comments (with a clearly legible handwritten or appropriately authenticated electronic signature) will be provided to the Chair of the Department and the Tenure and Promotion Committee and (ii) that unsigned comments will be provided only to the faculty member (but NOT to the Chair or the Tenure and Promotion Committee unless the faculty member so wishes).

8. It is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that teaching evaluations are completed for all courses and conducted in accordance with the Collective Agreement.

9. Prior to the administration of teaching evaluations in each semester, each faculty member will elect to have his or her courses evaluated in one of two ways—in hard copy during a class session or by electronic means. When there is more than one section of the course or more than one faculty member assigned to teach in the course, however, then the faculty members who will be evaluated will choose a single method of evaluation—either the in-class or the electronic method—in order to ensure consistency in the process. In the event that the collected faculty members cannot agree, then the Chair of the Department will choose the method of evaluation.

10. The results of the evaluations, including both detailed comments and numerical ratings shall not be released publicly by the University.
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