

**Revised February 9, 1996**

**Declaration of Governance Principles of the University of Arizona  
Prepared by the Committee of Eleven**

*"Subject to the responsibilities and powers of the Board of Regents and the University Presidents, the Faculty members of the Universities, through their elected Faculty representatives, shall share responsibility for academic and educational activities and matters related to Faculty personnel. The Faculty members of each University, through their elected Faculty representatives, shall participate in the governance of their respective Universities and shall actively participate in the development of University policy." In the spirit of this Arizona Law (ARS 15-1601B) mandating shared governance, the General Faculty of the University of Arizona declares that:*

1. The basic structure and procedures for policy-making and implementation of the entire University shall be developed by the Faculty Senate, the Administration, and the Committee of Eleven. Final approval and subsequent modifications of the general structure shall be approved by a majority of the General Faculty. The basic structures and procedures for policy-making and implementation of the University's constituent units shall be developed by the Faculty of those units and approved by secret ballot. Future revisions of policy-making and implementation structures of constituent units shall be approved by secret ballot of their Faculties.
2. Academic administrators are, first and foremost, members of the Faculty and can have a clear mandate and strong support from the Faculty only if elected by the Faculty. Department heads shall be elected by their constituent faculties, unless those faculties decide otherwise, for specific terms. Search committees for deans shall consist predominately of faculty selected by college faculty governance, with final nominee approval from the entire faculty of the college. Search committees for provosts, vice provosts, and vice presidents shall consist of at least 1/2 elected faculty selected by Faculty Governance, and final selection shall require approval by the Faculty Senate. Each academic administrator shall undergo periodic review by the Faculty and must retain the support of a majority of the General Faculty in order to continue in the position.
3. The total University budget embodies the educational priorities of the University. Consequently, this budget, including non-state funds, shall be prepared by the Administration, publicized to the Faculty, reviewed by elected Faculty representatives, and approved or disapproved without amendment by the Faculty Senate for submission to the Arizona Board of Regents. Records of all University expenditures, including non-state funds, shall be open to inspection by the Public.

4. Selection of faculty and administrators is essential to maintaining the academic quality of the University. All faculty and key administrative appointments are to be made, following open national competitive searches, with selection based on merit and due consideration of intellectual and cultural diversity, and with final approval by the appropriate faculty body.
5. At all levels of the University, Faculty representation is based upon election through secret ballot by faculty peers or through a Committee on Committees elected by the General Faculty. Faculty members have the responsibility to participate in governance, and their participation shall be recognized as service.
6. Curricular and educational decisions rest primarily with the Faculty and they shall take primary responsibility for such decisions. Decisions to create or remove programs, units, and positions shall be regulated by unambiguous, clear, and readily accessible policies and procedures.
7. Conflicts shall be resolved by clear and unambiguous policies and procedures, including appeals. These processes shall be carried out by elected Faculty and shall permit rescission by a majority vote of the Faculty Senate or other appropriate elected Faculty body. Only in unusual circumstances which could jeopardize the welfare of the University shall the President propose the reversal of a Faculty ruling, and then s/he shall appear before the appropriate Faculty body for explanation and debate. Failure to abide by the established procedure may be subject to censure by a two-thirds vote of the General Faculty, the Faculty Senate, or the Committee of Eleven.

Adoption of these principles will be a major step toward achieving excellence in teaching, research, and service and will lead to compliance with the Faculty Governance Law (ARS 15-1601B). We recommend adoption of this Declaration to the Faculty Senate.

Kenneth J. Smith, Chair  
Committee of Eleven

Committee of Eleven: L. Aleamoni, A. Bhappu, N. Buras, T. Downing, H. Ewbank, R. Feltham, S. Jacobs, K. Montanaro, J. Schwarz, A. Silverman, M. Szilagyi, M. Witte

**PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR COLLEGIAL  
DECISION-MAKING ON ACADEMIC POLICY\***  
submitted by the Co-Governance Working Group

The relationship between the administration and faculty in the making of policy decisions at the University of Arizona ought to be a collegial one. Collegial decision-making involves mutual participation and agreement in the development of policies by both the faculty and the administration. This kind of process should be the rule on academic and curricular policies, on policies relating to student affairs and admissions, on yearly academic budgets and long range strategic planning, on faculty personnel policy, on the recruitment, hiring, review, and retention of faculty members and key administrative personnel (Vice Presidents, Deans, and Department Heads), and on the guidelines for faculty and administration salary policy. It is in the interests of the University that decisions on the above matters be reached in a manner as to be mutually acceptable to both the faculty and the administration, and that any exceptions to the principle of mutual acceptance be extremely rare and occur only in highly unusual circumstances. The following guidelines, spelling out the spirit of collegial decision-making between the faculty and administration, shall define the way the administration and faculty address issues:

1. The administration (at both the University and the college levels) shall refer all policy and personnel decisions on the matters listed above to committees on which faculty representatives, chosen through a faculty governance process, comprise half or more of the committee. The faculty representatives will be able to meet apart from the committee, should they desire, to ascertain whether the decision of the faculty representatives and of the whole committee coincide. Such committees shall be used for the initiation and formulation of new policies in the above areas and for the initiation of amendments to existing policies, and shall also be used for academic personnel matters. (With respect to personnel decisions concerning individual faculty and heads at the department or unit level, committees shall convene at the department or unit level. These committees, and committees making decisions on departmental or unit personnel at all other levels, shall be comprised entirely of faculty representatives, unless the faculty has determined otherwise. In addition, decisions at the departmental level on these matters shall require a vote of the full constituent faculty unless the faculty has decided otherwise.)

2. Faculty representatives on committees shall be elected directly by the faculty or chosen by faculty who have been directly elected, such as by a committee on committees. The same will be the case at the college and unit level.

3. The ultimate representative of the faculty on academic, curricular, student affairs, and admissions policies, on faculty personnel policy, and on salary guidelines shall be the Senate (the college council at the college level). On other matters, ultimate representation of the faculty shall reside in committees containing faculty representatives (such as SPBAC) that report back to the Senate (college council) and receive full input from the Senate (council).

4. Collegial decision-making means that the faculty and administration will work to attain an outcome agreeable to both. When mutual agreement on a policy is reached, the administration will describe the steps it intends to take to implement the policy and provide a timeline so as to assure proper implementation of the policy and faculty review. Until the point that mutual agreement is reached, the status-quo ante prevails.

5. Since the President may on rare occasions act unilaterally, the faculty has the responsibility to determine whether, on the whole, the spirit of collegial decision-making has been maintained or breached. The Senate, by two-thirds vote, shall be the vehicle for undertaking such determinations. Petitions from the faculty shall initiate the process.

6. Because individual colleges face special circumstances and differing past experiences, collegial decision-making in the college may be altered and adapted to address those special circumstances and experiences as long as the underlying spirit of collegial decision-making is fully maintained.

7. The involvement of faculty in governance at the university and college levels shall be facilitated in a manner that teaching and scholarship, not governance, remain the paramount activities of the faculty. Even though not paramount, service in governance activities is crucial to the strength and ultimate success of the institution. These activities should be a component of the promotion and tenure dossier within the service category and given the weight necessary to ensure successful governance.

8. The impetus toward collegial governance at both the university and college levels will require greater knowledge of and articulation between these two levels within the faculty. This requires an increase in faculty representation from the colleges in the Senate. It is recommended that there be approximately one Senate representative per forty faculty members within each college, with every college having at least one representative. Faculty from unattached units also must have representation. At-large representation in the Senate shall continue as at present.

9. There is a need to incorporate involvement in the process by year-to-year academic professionals and staff.

Working Group members : Betty Atwater, Michael Cusanovich, Michael Gottfredson, Martha Gilliland, John Schwarz, Andy Silverman, Shiela Slaughter, Kenneth J. Smith, Paul Sypherd, Tom Volgy

February 17, 1996

\* With the exception of the final sentence in Point 1, this document is the same as the one dated February 2, 1996. The sentence has been added for the purpose of clarification.

This item was discussed by the Faculty Senate on October 2, 1995 and is now included for action under Agenda Item #6 on the March 4, 1996 agenda.

## University College Proposal

### Background

The creation of the Colleges of Fine Arts, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, and Science last year suggests that a name change for the College of Arts and Sciences is appropriate. Much of the operation that reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and which handles much initial student contact with the University is now named the "College of Arts and Sciences". This was appropriate when the various Faculties were not called colleges, but it now is the source of some confusion. While the Colleges of Fine Arts, Humanities, Social and Behavioral Science, and Science organize and administer academic departments, faculty members, and degree programs, the student programs that are housed in the College of Arts and Sciences are broad, University-wide programs essential to our undergraduate students. The Office of Academic Services, for example, is a large program that offers advising to all incoming students, to students who have not declared a major, to transfer students, and to students changing from one college to another. (Some 40% of the students who enter the University do not declare a major when they first enter.) This office also contributes to summer orientations, administers much of the Finish in Four! program, and implements and monitors academic policy for the students in the Arts and Sciences Colleges as well as students without a major. (These academic policy areas include (a) standards for academic progress (probation, disqualification, readmission); (b) student requests for exceptions to university and college academic policy by means of petitions; and (c) mandated academic support for special student populations (e.g. student athletes, pre-health professions and pre-law students).) The College of Arts and Sciences also monitors and supports the general education program for B.A. and B.S. degrees in the four Arts and Sciences Colleges as well as the first-year composition, math, and language courses for the entire University. Finally, the Interdisciplinary Studies major is administered here. In this major, students take programs of study determined by faculty advisors in concert with the Office of Academic Services and drawing on departmental offerings from colleges around the University.

Following on the change in name for the Colleges of Fine Arts, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, and Science and given the scope of the operations housed within the "College of Arts and Sciences", the name of the latter should be changed to the University College. This proposal represents a name change only,

(over)

with no change in functional responsibilities or reporting structure. It does not call for additional administrative staff or resources, but rather is a consequence of our obligation to provide services to our undergraduates, sometimes outside the boundaries of existing colleges. All of these functions now exist and are administered under the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. In addition to those described above, there are other University-wide units, also reporting to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, that would be housed under the umbrella of the University College. They include the Honors Program (which now admits 700 undergraduates a year), the Humanities Program (faculty who offer mostly general education courses to undergraduates, with no graduate program and no undergraduate major), the Center for Transfer Students, the First-Year Colloquia, the Science and Mathematics Education Center, and the Writing Skills Improvement Program. The University College, thus, would serve as the home of incoming students without a College affiliation and would facilitate the "hand-off" of students once they declare a major.

This proposal does not call for structuring faculty lines through the University College (other than those now in the Humanities Program which already flow through the Vice Provost's office). In the event that additional degree programs or faculty lines were to be affiliated with the University College in the future, these would necessarily first be approved by the appropriate Senate bodies and the Senate itself.

INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE  
Faculty Center  
1400 East Mabel  
621-1342 (Fax: 621-8844)

*OK'd but  
delete  
slashes &  
change them  
to "and"*

Procedure for Informing Arizona

Community Colleges of Significant Changes

in UA Undergraduate Lower-Division Courses and Requirements

The Instruction and Curriculum Policy submits for approval, as a seconded motion, the above-described Procedure to the Faculty Senate.

The Procedure was approved by the Undergraduate Council on December 12, 1995.

\*\*\*\*\*

*NOTE: This item was tabled during the February 5, 1996 meeting, and has been placed on the agenda for the March 4, 1996 meeting.*

## **Procedure for Informing Arizona Community Colleges of Significant Changes in UA Undergraduate Lower-division Courses and Requirements**

In order for Arizona universities and community colleges to coordinate academic programs effectively, articulation of curriculum is essential. Presently, a statewide course articulation procedure exists to evaluate new community college courses (or major revisions in community college courses) with respect to their transfer applicability to UA degree requirements. There is, however, no "early warning system" to alert community colleges to anticipated changes in courses or requirements at the UA which might have significant impact on their effort to provide equivalent courses to prepare students to complete their degrees at the University of Arizona. To assist community colleges in their curricular planning, the following procedure is proposed.

### Objectives

1. At an early stage in the UA curriculum approval process, to inform Arizona community colleges of significant changes in undergraduate courses or degree requirements which might impact the curricular planning of Arizona community colleges.
2. To provide Arizona community colleges the opportunity to comment on anticipated changes in UA undergraduate lower-division courses or requirements at a point in the UA curriculum approval process which would allow their comments to be considered in that process.

### Definition of courses or requirements which are subject to this community college information/review process

1. Permanent undergraduate lower-division courses--i.e. course numbers with 100 to 299--which currently meet or are propose to meet a degree requirement or for which at least one Arizona community college has a course equivalency.
2. Undergraduate lower-division requirements for which at least one Arizona community college has a course fulfilling the requirement or offers courses in a subject area which have the potential to fulfill the requirement.

### The Process

#### 1. Departmental Responsibility

*For courses*--At the point at which the department head first receives a completed Recommendation to Establish a New Course form, Recommendation for Course Deletion form or the Catalog Recommendation form (preferably prior to departmental curriculum committee review), he or she shall (1) determine if the request relates to a course subject to the community college information/review process and (2) send courses which are subject to the process to the articulation specialist in the University Curriculum Office.

*For requirements*--At the point at which the department head first receives the completed Catalog Recommendation form or other document proposing the requirement change (preferably prior to departmental curriculum committee review), he or she shall (1) determine



if the request relates to a requirement which is subject to the community college information/review process and (2) send proposed requirements which are subject to the process to the articulation specialist in the Curriculum Office.

2. Curriculum Office Responsibility

Upon receipt from the department head of a course or requirement change subject to the community college information/review process, the articulation specialist shall immediately send the proposed change to each Arizona community college with a cover memo containing the following points: (1) the UA would like the community colleges to be aware of the possible change described in the accompanying document; (2) the UA invites comment from the community colleges related to the proposed change; (3) comments should be sent to the indicated department head with copy to the articulation specialist; (4) comments must be received within three weeks of the time of notification; (5) comments will be considered as part of the approval process, but approval authority remains with the UA faculty. The department head shall be copied with the cover memo.

3. Final approval by the department may not occur prior to the three-week information/review period for community colleges.
4. Compliance with the procedure will be monitored by the University Curriculum Office and the Curriculum Office will inform the community colleges regarding the final disposition of the proposed change.

Presented to the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona  
by the Committee of Eleven  
March 4, 1996

**Resolution:**

Whereas it has been determined that the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona is indeed a "branch campus of the University of Arizona" and not an independent institution, the Arizona International Campus and its programs will not be approved until established guidelines and regulations regarding branch campus establishment and program approval be fulfilled as in the case with other branch campuses such as Sierra Vista, established at the University of Arizona;

1. The academic program shall follow the approval process which includes action by the Faculty Senate and Arizona Board of Regents as required by University Regulations<sup>1</sup>, the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual<sup>2</sup>, and the Arizona Shared Governance Law (ARS15-1601b)<sup>3</sup> according to the established guidelines.
2. According to the University Curriculum Procedures Manual<sup>4</sup>, the entire curriculum, not just "experimental" courses, shall be presented to academic department and college committees for approval.
3. Recruitment of faculty shall be approved by the appropriate academic departments at the University of Arizona in accordance with Board of Regents Policy Manual and the University of Arizona Recruitment/Hiring procedures<sup>2,5</sup>.
4. Program Planning shall be carried out by advisory committees composed of elected faculty representatives as provided for in the Arizona Shared Governance Law (ARS 15-1601b)<sup>3</sup>. A tenure system similar to that in operation at the University of Arizona, Arizona State University, and Northern Arizona University shall be put into place according to the Constitution and By-Laws of the University of Arizona and Arizona Board of Regents policy<sup>2</sup>.

Up to the present time the establishment of the Arizona International Campus has not been in compliance with the existing rules and regulations of the University of Arizona, Arizona Board of Regents policy<sup>2</sup>, and the Arizona Shared Governance Law<sup>3</sup>, and, therefore, the Faculty Senate should not recognize the Arizona International Campus as a branch of the University of Arizona. Because the leadership of the Arizona International Campus has carried out the organization of this campus in violation of these guidelines and also bypassing the faculty governance mechanisms, the Faculty Senate must express its serious concern.

Therefore:

- (1) The Faculty Senate has no confidence in the administrative leadership of the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona.

- (2) The Faculty Senate does not recognize the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona and its administrative leadership.
- (3) The Faculty Senate requires that the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona follow standard University of Arizona and Arizona Board of Regents policies for hiring faculty, offering programs and courses, and all other activities.

Kenneth J. Smith, Chair

Committee of Eleven Members: L. Aleamoni, A. Bhappu, N. Buras, T. Downing, H. Ewbank, R. Feltham, S. Jacobs, K. Montanaro, J. Schwarz, A. Silverman, M. Szilagyi, and M. Witte

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Item 1, page 3, of the Handbook of the Faculty Senate. This item reads, in part, as follows: "To recommend curricula and degrees for approval. While matters pertaining to courses, major and minor requirements, the kinds of degrees and requirements for each will originate in the various colleges, the final formulation to be recommended to the Board of Regents shall be determined by the Faculty Senate."

<sup>2</sup>Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual, Chapter II, Academic Degree Program Planning and Implementation, Section C; Chapter VI, Personnel Policies, Section D.

<sup>3</sup>ARS 15-1601b, Arizona Shared Governance Law.

<sup>4</sup>Requirements for submitting experimental courses are delineated in the University Curriculum Procedures Manual (Approval Process for Academic Courses) and require departmental, college, and Curriculum Office approval. Programs require approval by the Faculty Senate (Approval Process for Academic Programs or Units).

<sup>5</sup>University of Arizona Recruitment/Hiring Form requires approval by academic departments.

February 12, 1996

January 30, 1996

## The Undergraduate Council

The Undergraduate Council approves annual publication by ASUA of TCE course/instructor evaluations subject to the following conditions:

1. Only the unprocessed distributions of student responses to the nine TCE core questions plus pilot question ten will be published in a format similar to that used by Northeastern University. The published report will include number of students in the evaluated class and the number of respondents.
2. Evaluations and publications of results is required for all undergraduate courses at the University which meet minimum enrollment requirements. House numbered courses may be exempted at the discretion of the department head. These and other exemptions approved by the department head shall be reported to the Undergraduate Council.
3. The content of evaluation forms will be determined by departments, but all evaluations forms must include the nine TCE core questions and pilot question ten.
4. Technical issues regarding the content of the TCE evaluation form will be decided by a committee consisting of two faculty members, two students, and a representative from the Office of Evaluation and Faculty Development. The Undergraduate Council shall appoint the faculty members based on nominations from the Committee on Committees. ASUA shall appoint the student members; the Office of Evaluation and Faculty Development shall appoint its member.
5. The committee specified in point 4 shall report the results of its activities to the Undergraduate Council.
6. The Office of Evaluation and Faculty Development shall produce the final evaluation document. ASUA assumes full financial responsibility for all production and distribution costs.
7. The first publication in Fall 1997 shall consist of the results of evaluations for Fall 1996 and Spring 1997.

## Course/Instructor Evaluations Core Questions

The first publication will contain data from the 1996-97 academic year in a format similar to the SGA publication of Northeastern University. **A sample of the Northeastern publication is included in this document.**

Technical issues will be resolved by a faculty/student/assessment office committee during the 1996-97 year. The committee shall consist of two faculty representatives, two students, and one person from the assessment office.

At the top of the listing for each class:

number of students enrolled in the class

number of respondents

number of students who listed the class as required

1. What is your overall rating of this instructor's teaching effectiveness?
  - ∞ almost always effective
  - ∞ usually effective
  - ∞ sometimes effective
  - ∞ rarely effective
  - ∞ almost never effective
2. How much do you feel you have learned in this course?
  - ∞ an exceptional amount
  - ∞ more than usual
  - ∞ about as much as usual
  - ∞ less than usual
  - ∞ almost nothing
3. What is your overall rating of this course?
  - ∞ one of the best
  - ∞ better than average
  - ∞ about average
  - ∞ worse than average
  - ∞ one of the worst
4. What is your rating of this instructor compared with other instructors you have had?
  - ∞ one of the most effective
  - ∞ more effective than usual
  - ∞ about as effective as usual
  - ∞ less effective than usual
  - ∞ one of the least effective

5. Rate the usefulness of the outside assignments (homework, writings, reports, and special projects, etc.) in helping you learn.
- ∞ almost always useful
  - ∞ usually useful
  - ∞ sometimes useful
  - ∞ rarely useful
  - ∞ almost always useless
  - ∞ not applicable, no outside assignments
6. The textbook(s) and readings used in this course are:
- ∞ extremely useful
  - ∞ very useful
  - ∞ somewhat useful
  - ∞ not very useful
  - ∞ nearly useless
  - ∞ not applicable, no book or readings used
7. Rate the usefulness of the in-class activities (lectures, discussion, etc.) in this course in helping you to learn.
- ∞ almost always useful
  - ∞ usually useful
  - ∞ sometimes useful
  - ∞ rarely useful
  - ∞ almost always useless
8. I was treated with respect in this class.
- ∞ strongly agree
  - ∞ agree
  - ∞ uncertain
  - ∞ disagree
  - ∞ strongly disagree
9. The difficulty level of the course is:
- ∞ among the easiest
  - ∞ easier than average
  - ∞ about average
  - ∞ more challenging than average
  - ∞ among the most challenging

A question to be run as a pilot and tested to determine validity.

10. Adequate help was available outside of class.
- ∞ strongly agree
  - ∞ agree
  - ∞ uncertain
  - ∞ disagree
  - ∞ strongly disagree

### **Issues to be Addressed Before Publication**

ASUA asks that the following issues be addressed by the faculty/student/assessment office committee requested in the Undergraduate Council motion.

#### **Issues to improve proper analysis of the Data**

1. Results will published by department. At the beginning of each departmental listing, information will be included which states that results of the evaluation are distributed differently across departments, making global comparisons inaccurate. If possible the aggregate distribution of responses for each department will be presented at the heading for the department.
2. Prominent disclaimers will be placed at the beginning of the publication stating that questions regarding the overall rating of the course and effectiveness of the teacher are not a complete method with which to judge an instructor/courses' worth. It will be stated that this is particularly true in comparisons across disciplines.
3. A caution will be placed in the booklet regarding the interpretation of the "workload/difficulty" question.

#### **Future Mechanisms for Student Access**

1. The possibility of publication of results on the internet will be analyzed, including the possibility of allowing Internet access to the results from the UA campus only.

#### **Campus Input**

1. The committee will discuss any input from the University community and respond to any questions.

## **ASUA Proposal on Student Access to Course/Instructor Evaluations**

Student evaluations of courses are now a part of our University's culture and play a role in the University's ability to conduct self-analysis. Students, for many years, have been concerned about their ability to have access to the results of these forms. They feel that access would allow them to be better prepared and informed participants in their own education. In light of this interest, ASUA has researched this issue and presents relevant information and a specific proposal to allow student access to evaluation results for the University of Arizona.

### **National Survey**

Over 50 public universities across the nation were surveyed to find out what type of student access was given to course/instructor evaluations. The major finding of the survey is that **24 of 51** public institutions surveyed allow student access. Additionally, many of the institutions that do not currently allow access were investigating the issue.

Several mechanisms for allowing student access were revealed. Most of the state university systems surveyed cited their states' public record laws as a justification for student access. In three states, law suits were filed by students to demand access; in each case the suit resulted in student access. One state system has a Board of Regents policy which mandates that all institutions permit student access.

Many of the institutions that allow access are among our top peer universities. The list included the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, University of Illinois, Ohio State University, and University of California at San Diego.

### **Proposed Structure of UA Student Access**

After gathering national data, ASUA researched the implications of allowing student access to evaluation results on our campus. First, we addressed the issue of whether the results of course evaluations are a valuable, valid measure. **Statistically the relation between the difficulty of the course and effectiveness of the teacher was insignificant.** This means that so called "easy" professors are not more likely to be rated as effective teachers as so called "difficult" professors. ASUA also concluded that if evaluations are already mandatory across the University and are used in various ways to determine an instructor's effectiveness, then the University must consider the evaluations valid and insightful in some respect.



Further, ASUA concluded that students should be allowed to access only quantitative results from a list of 10 core questions. ASUA feels that written student comments are not appropriate data to be distributed. Nine of these ten questions are currently on the University standard form. ASUA also concluded **that it would be more accurate and insightful to include the entire distribution or frequency of student responses rather than a mean or average response**. ASUA proposes, therefore, a system similar to Northeastern's publication of student evaluations of teachers, a copy of which is included in the materials.

ASUA feels that a booklet should be published each year which includes data from Fall and Spring semester classes. **ASUA proposes that data be collected for the 1996-97 academic year and released in a booklet for distribution in Fall 1997.**

The method of allowing student access to evaluations described in this section is fair and accurate and is not likely to be misused by students. It should be noted that some universities do publish comments or other qualitative data and most publish means rather than full distributions or frequencies.

#### **Reasons for Allowing Student Access**

ASUA believes that there will be numerous benefits from this proposal. Three of the most basic benefits are: students will be better prepared for classes, students and faculty members will consider evaluations more seriously, and the quality of teaching at the University will be highlighted.

Allowing student access using the proposed format will permit students to enter a class with a better idea of what the course will entail. Under this policy, students will be able to select their classes more knowledgeably rather than through the current random process. At a university as large as the UA it is impossible for students to get a good idea about courses or instructors by relying solely on word of mouth.

Knowing that the results of course evaluations will be made public, students and faculty members will take evaluations more seriously. Students will give more thoughtful answers and will feel that they play a more important role in the University's mission. Faculty will realize the need to give these forms greater attention if they know that future students will see the results.

Finally, students rate teachers at the University of Arizona very highly. The University community should not conceal this fact but should allow student access to highlight the overall satisfaction that students feel about their faculty members.

## READING THE TABLES

Each course section is listed in a box in order by department, instructor, course number, and term. Read the columns from top to bottom, then left to right as in a newspaper. A key summarizing the SGA TCE items appears in the lower right hand corner of each right hand page. The complete text of the items appears at the bottom of this page.

The diagram in this box explains the contents of the course-section boxes. For information about interpreting the numbers in the boxes, please read the section, "Guide for Reading SGA TCE Results".

The diagram labels the following parts of the table:

- Year & Quarter:** 91-WINTER
- Course Name:** FUND MATH
- # Enrolled-Responded (%):** Enr-Resp: 22-16 (73%)
- Instructor:** DEMOGUY J
- Department, Course Number, & Section Number:** MTH 1234-02
- Key #:** (key: 1234S)
- Response Option Key:** A B C D E F and/or Omit
- 10 SGA Questionnaire Items:** (1) Overall amount learned, (2) Overall instructor rating, (3) Overall course rating, (4) Workload, (5) Difficulty, (6) Text & readings, (7) Syllabus, (8) Outside assignments, (9) Course organization, (10) Instructor punctuality
- % Response for Options:** (indicated by arrows pointing to the data columns)
- % Response N.A. or omit:** (indicated by an arrow pointing to the 'Omit' column)

ITEM	A	B	C	D	E	F and/or Omit	
(1) Overall amount learned	0	12	88	0	0	--	0 (1) C
(2) Overall instructor rating	6	56	38	0	0	--	0 (2) C
(3) Overall course rating	0	25	69	0	0	--	6 (3) C
(4) Workload	70	12	50	0	0	--	0 (4) W
(5) Difficulty	12	38	50	0	0	--	0 (5) D
(6) Text & readings	6	6	69	6	0	6	6 (6) T
(7) Syllabus	0	19	50	0	12	--	19 (7) S
(8) Outside assignments	0	31	62	0	0	6	6 (8) C
(9) Course organization	0	25	69	0	0	--	6 (9) C
(10) Instructor punctuality	50	12	25	0	0	0	12 (10) I

  

DOE J MTH 1234-03 (key: 67890)	FUND MATH Enr-Resp: 27-13 (48%)	91-WINTER	DI M
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------	---------

## SGA TCE RATINGS ITEMS

1. Overall, how much do you feel you have learned in this course?
  - A. an exceptional amount
  - B. more than usual
  - C. about as much as usual
  - D. less than usual
  - E. almost nothing
2. What is your overall rating of this instructor's teaching effectiveness compared with other college instructors you have had?
  - A. one of the most effective
  - B. more effective than average
  - C. about average
  - D. less effective than average
  - E. one of the least effective
3. What is your overall rating of this course?
  - A. one of the best
  - B. better than average
  - C. about average
  - D. worse than average
  - E. one of the worst
4. The workload for this course is:
  - A. one of the lightest
  - B. lighter than average
  - C. about average
  - D. heavier than average
  - E. one of the heaviest
5. The difficulty level of the course activities and materials is:
  - A. extremely easy
  - B. easier than average
  - C. about average
  - D. more difficult than average
  - E. extremely difficult
6. The textbook(s) and reading in this course are:
  - A. among the best
  - B. better than average
  - C. about average
  - D. worse than average
  - E. among the worst
  - F. this item is NOT applicable; texts and readings not used in this course
7. Rate how well the syllabus, course outline, or other overviews provided by the instructor helped you to understand the goals and expectations of this course.
  - A. unusually well
  - B. better than usual
  - C. about as well as usual
  - D. worse than usual
  - E. not at all or no such information was provided.
8. Rate the usefulness of the outside assignments (writings, reports, and special projects) in helping you to learn.
  - A. extremely useful
  - B. more useful than average
  - C. of average usefulness
  - D. less useful than average
  - E. almost useless
9. Rate how well the various elements of the course (e.g., class activities, textbooks/readings, and outside assignments) work together in helping you learn.
  - A. very well
  - B. better than average
  - C. about average
  - D. worse than average
  - E. very poorly
10. The instructor is punctual in meeting class and office hour responsibilities.
  - A. almost always
  - B. more than half of the time
  - C. about half of the time
  - D. less than half of the time
  - E. almost never
  - F. this item DOES NOT apply to this course

