

**HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**University Senate**

**Resolution on Revision to the Student Rating of Instruction Form**

31-14/15 FAC – May 12, 2015 – Second Reading

**RESOLVED:** That the University Senate of Humboldt State University recommends to the President that the attached set of questions be adopted for use in a revised Student Rating of Instruction form; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the University community recognizes that student ratings of instruction are a supplement to the primary method of evaluating teaching effectiveness, as outlined in Appendix J: “Teaching effectiveness is assessed primarily through collegial evaluation of classroom teaching and summary analysis of student evaluations by peers. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness shall be based primarily on written statements from colleagues within the candidate's academic discipline(s). The statements should be supported by direct observation of the candidate's performance. Such observation can take place in a variety of ways, such as classroom visitations, team teaching, guest lecturing, etc. Multiple observations, conducted over a period of time, are preferable to a single observation conducted solely for personnel purposes” (Appendix J, Section IX.B.1.a)(4); and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That use of the new Student Rating of Instruction Form begin in the Fall of 2015, with a review date of one year from implementation to allow for any needed changes to be made by the University Senate.

**RATIONALE:** *The current course evaluation instrument has been in place for approximately a decade. In AY 13-14, the Faculty Affairs Committee established a task force to review the survey and to suggest changes as necessary. Faculty Affairs brought forward Resolution #40-13/14-FAC (Resolution on Revising the Standard Course Evaluation Form) at the end of the spring semester. The Resolution and proposed revised survey questions were voted down.*

*Faculty Affairs took up the issue again this year. Building off the work that had previously been completed, and assisted by the Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, the Committee created two versions of a new instrument, which were vetted across campus this spring. The committee received a great deal of very valuable feedback and commentary, and using that information, revised the document accordingly. The questions presented here are the result of this considered work.*