



CALIFORNIA  
STATE  
UNIVERSITY,  
FRESNO

## Memorandum

March 24, 2015

To: Rajee Amarasinghe, Chair  
Department of Mathematics

From: Lynnette Zelezny, Provost

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lynnette Zelezny".

Re: Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness  
Department of Mathematics

Upon review of the policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for the Department of Mathematics, including their policy on Student Ratings of Instruction and Peer Evaluations, the following recommendation to amend the policy has been approved.

- Change the minimum expectation for adjusted or unadjusted scores in the Student Ratings of Instruction from 3.0 to 3.5.

LZ:er

cc: Andrew Lawson  
Michael Caldwell

**Office of the Provost  
and Vice President  
for Academic Affairs**

Harold H. Haak Administrative Center  
Henry Madden Library  
5200 N. Barton Ave. M/S ML54  
Fresno, CA 93740-8014

559.278.2636  
Fax 559.278.7987

**DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
POLICY ON ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

APM 322 is the official policy on the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness. This Departmental policy is designed to further define requirements at the Departmental level as specified in APM 322.

**STUDENT RATINGS OF INSTRUCTION**

Each faculty member shall have a minimum of **two sections** rated by students annually.

While the IDEA Short Form will be the standard paper instrument for the campus, faculty may elect to use either the Diagnostic Form or Online version.

Student ratings of instruction shall be assessed to identify patterns and trends of teaching performance and effectiveness. It is expected that the faculty member shall meet or exceed on a regular basis one of the following department standards:

- **3.5 out of 5.0** using adjusted or unadjusted scores, whichever are higher.
- **a converted average** (when compared to all classes in the IDEA Database) **in the gray area (Similar) or above (Higher or Much Higher).**

However, it is more important to evaluate faculty on the basis of multi-year trends rather than focusing on a single course or narrow time frame.

**PEER EVALUATIONS**

1. Frequency
  - a. For part-time temporary faculty, the first time a course is taught by the instructor and, thereafter, at least **one section every other year of employment** regardless of a break in service.
  - b. For full-time temporary faculty, **two sections each semester for the first year and two sections each academic year thereafter.**
  - c. For probationary faculty, **at least two sections (to include as many different courses as possible) every semester or all sections if fewer are taught in a semester.**
  - d. For tenured faculty, **one section each academic year** on a rotating basis such that during a five year period the maximum number of different courses is evaluated.
2. Faculty will use the attached departmentally approved form to evaluate Course Content, Instructional Design, Instructional Delivery and Assessment methods.
3. The peer evaluations must be completed and turned in by the end of 10<sup>th</sup> week of instruction.

Last Updated: 10/02/14

## PEER REVIEW REPORT: CLASS SESSION

Faculty being reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Course: \_\_\_\_\_

Nature of today's session: \_\_\_\_\_

Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluate the instructor's performance on the following items, using this five-point scale:

5-outstanding    4-good    3-average    2-below average    1-inadequate

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Syllabus: Course content, course goals, primary learning outcomes, assignment and exam schedule, grading method.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Effectiveness of opening discussion and achieving appropriate closure of class.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Knowledge of subject matter and quality of preparation.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Command of language and clarity of articulation.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Organization of lecture, flow of material, clarity of analysis, etc.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Instructional design: effective and appropriate use of lecture, group discussion, technology, etc.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Presentation of material: concrete examples, appropriate visual aids, avoidance of irrelevant digressions, focus on central materials, etc.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Speech: voice quality, clarity, appropriate pacing, avoidance of monotony, etc.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Enthusiasm: for subject matter and in presentation.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Rapport with class; skill in discussions, answering questions, responding to comments.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Ability to convey importance of material and stimulate interest in subject-matter.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Methods of assessment: assignments, exams, etc. (appropriate level/frequency)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Overall effectiveness of class section.

**COMMENTS:**