



*Presented to the Mānoa Faculty Senate by the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP) for a vote of the full Senate on Wednesday, May 4, 2016. A resolution opposing UH System Course Evaluation System. Approved by the Mānoa Faculty Senate on May 4, 2016 with 59 votes in support of approval, 4 votes against approval and 4 abstentions.*

### **RESOLUTION OPPOSING UH SYSTEM COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM**

**WHEREAS**, The UH System President announced on March 8, 2016 the mandatory implementation of the UH System’s “Course Evaluation System (CES)” with automatic inclusion of 100% of credit courses and no option to opt out; and

**WHEREAS**, the announcement establishes the expectation that CES will be used for “assessment of program effectiveness” and assessment of teaching, stating that it will provide feedback “faculty can use to inform their teaching practices, to evaluate new teaching methods and techniques, and to demonstrate teaching effectiveness;” and

**WHEREAS**, Board of Regents Executive policy 9.203 clearly delineates the locus of control for faculty evaluation at campus-level, noting “Faculty review procedures will be developed and maintained by the University Chancellors for their respective campuses...;” and

**WHEREAS**, BOR Policy 1.210 assigns duly authorized campus faculty organizations the “responsibility to speak for the faculty on academic policy matters such as... 1. the initiation, review, and evaluation of ... instructional, and academic programs;..4. evaluation of faculty...;” and

**WHEREAS**, the Mānoa Faculty Senate is the duly authorized faculty organization holding the responsibility to speak for faculty on evaluation of both academic programs and faculty; and

**WHEREAS**, there is a lack of clarity as to how the CES will be used, for individual faculty improvement, faculty evaluation, program review, or student learning assessment, and how different levels of questions will be used and by whom; and

**WHEREAS**, there is a difference in framing evaluative questions appropriate for program review and those appropriate for evaluating the quality of teaching; and

**WHEREAS**, it is unclear as to whether significant research-based concerns related to course evaluations and biases related to protected classes were considered when crafting this tool and accompanying policy; and

**WHEREAS**, the memo states that implementation of the CES is to begin in Fall 2016, while the faculty were only made aware of the CES initiative in March 2016 and no formal consultation with Mānoa Faculty Senate has yet occurred;



**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Mānoa Faculty Senate opposes the implementation of “New UH Course Evaluation System” (CES) until such time as appropriate faculty governance consultation occurs per BOR policy 1.210; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that prior to development of questions the purpose or purposes of the instrument must be clarified with faculty input; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that control of the design of any such instrument and its manner of administration should be done collaboratively between faculty and campus level administration and not involve system representation or ITS; and

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED**, that the Mānoa Faculty Senate requests that authority for policies and procedures delegated to campus level under the Chancellor’s authority remain free of system level intrusion.

Supporting Documents:

1. [March 8, 2016 Memo from President Lassner announcing Course Evaluation System](#)
2. [UH BOR Policy EP 9.203](#)
3. [UH BOR Policy RP 1.210](#)
4. [MOA Regarding Roles on Consultation Protocols Involving UH Administration, UHPA, and UH Faculty Senate dated Feb. 5, 2015](#)