

Zimbra

venitab@csufresno.edu

± Font Size ±

Fwd: Guiding Principles for APM 322 Departmental Policy

From : Michael Caldwell <mcaldwell@csufresno.edu>

Fri, Mar 25, 2011 08:25 AM

Subject : Fwd: Guiding Principles for APM 322 Departmental Policy

📎 1 attachment

To : Venita Baker <venitab@csufresno.edu>**Reply To :** Michael Caldwell <mcaldwell@csufresno.edu>

From: "Paula Popma" <ppopma@csufresno.edu>**To:** "Michael Caldwell" <mcaldwell@csufresno.edu>**Cc:** "Ted Wendt" <twendt@csufresno.edu>, "Mamta Rawat" <mrawat@csufresno.edu>, "Paula Popma" <ppopma@csufresno.edu>, "Julie Olson-Buchanan" <julieo@csufresno.edu>, "Np Mahalik" <nmahalik@csufresno.edu>**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2011 5:04:37 PM**Subject:** Guiding Principles for APM 322 Departmental Policy

Michael,

At its March 24, 2011 meeting, the Personnel Committee reviewed the document "Creating a Departmental Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness". We made a couple of minor changes, and also added a section "Preparation of an Overall Assessment of Teaching Performance" which addresses what a department needs to do in regards to sec. VIII of APM 322. Besides student ratings, and peer evaluations, the departments need to prepare an overall assessment, and we felt that should be part of the guidelines. Previously, it was just the last sentence in the Sample Departmental Policy. Hopefully, this makes sense.

Otherwise, we unanimously offer our support of the Guiding Principles, Sample Departmental Policy, and Proctor Guidelines documents.

Paula

Paula J. Popma
AUL for Technical Services
Madden Library
Fresno State
5200 N Barton Ave M/S ML34
Fresno CA 93740
559-278-5794

--

Dr. Michael Caldwell
Chair, Department of Music
Chair, Academic Senate
California State University, Fresno
(559) 278-7683
mcaldwell@csufresno.edu

CREATING A DEPARTMENTAL POLICY ON ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Please carefully review APM 322 prior to discussing and implementing a Departmental Policy on the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness. Please keep in mind that the sample policy at the end of this document includes the minimums required by APM 322 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Departments may choose to enhance the requirements in APM 322; however, Departments may not choose to decrease the minimum requirements. The Departmental Policy should address: a) student ratings of instruction, and b) peer evaluations.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Student Ratings of Instruction

APM 322 - III.B

B. Student Ratings of Instruction

Each department or equivalent unit shall establish a written policy which describes the frequency and scheduling of student ratings of instruction. Each faculty member shall have a minimum of two sections rated by students annually.

Please be certain that your Departmental Policy specifies frequency and scheduling, as stated above.

Please include this statement: 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.

APM 322 - VIII

VIII. Preparation of an Overall Evaluation of Teaching Performance

For recommendations regarding personnel actions such as retention, tenure and promotion, five year review, contract renewal of lecturers, and peer evaluation of courses, the statistical summary of student ratings along with other appropriate information in the Open Personnel File shall be assessed to identify patterns and trends of teaching performance and effectiveness.

Please be certain that your departmental policy recognizes that patterns and trends are more relevant than the ratings from a single course or narrow time period.

Peer Evaluations

APM 322 - II.A

II. Peer Evaluation Forms and Student Rating Questionnaires

A. Each Department shall adopt peer evaluation forms that will assess course content, instructional design, instructional delivery, and assessment methods. In the absence of a formally adopted departmental form, the department shall use a university-wide template provided by the Provost. Each department may adopt a protocol for face-to-face real time peer observations of teaching where applicable. The results of these peer evaluations may be used both formatively and summatively.

APM 322 - III.A

III. Frequency of Implementation

A. Peer Evaluation Reports

1. Each department or equivalent unit shall establish a written policy which describes the frequency and scheduling of peer evaluation of courses. The following minimum frequency shall apply:

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, two sections (to include as many different courses as possible) every 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. Additional peer evaluation reports may be requested by the instructor or required by the College/School Personnel Committee, Dean or Provost on a case by case basis.

APM 322 - VI.B.1

B. Reports

1. Using the **departmentally approved form**, a written report on the peer evaluation of a course shall be prepared by the evaluator. The report shall include a review of the relevant components listed in Section I of APM 322.

Preparation of an Overall Evaluation of Teaching Performance

APM 322 - VIII

For recommendations regarding personnel actions such as retention, tenure and promotion, five year review, contract renewal of lecturers, and peer evaluation of courses, the statistical summary of student ratings along with other appropriate information in the Open Personnel File shall be assessed to identify patterns and trends of teaching performance and effectiveness.

The preparation of the overall assessment of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted by a review committee composed of faculty of appropriate rank. Probationary faculty may only perform evaluations of temporary faculty. In general, tenured faculty shall be evaluated only by other tenured faculty at a higher rank, except full professors who may evaluate faculty at any rank.

The Department will follow the guidelines in APM 325, APM 327 and APM 328 when electing committees selected to prepare the overall evaluation of teaching.

SAMPLE DEPARTMENTAL POLICY

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

[BRACKETS INCLUDE SUGGESTED INFORMATION THAT MAY BE INCREASED]

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 score **[3.0 out of 5.0]** or above using adjusted or unadjusted scores, whichever are higher, on a regular basis; however, it is more important to evaluate on the basis of multi-year trends rather than focusing on a single course or narrow time frame.

PEER EVALUATIONS

[BRACKETS INCLUDE SUGGESTED INFORMATION THAT MAY BE INCREASED]

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, **[two sections (to include as many different courses as possible) every 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 evaluator may elect to perform a face-to-face real time peer observation as part of the peer evaluation upon the request of the faculty member being evaluated. **[Departments may elect to require no in-class observations, observations for certain types of classes or observations in all classes.]**

OVERALL

The Department will follow the guidelines in APM 325, APM 327 and APM 328 when electing committees selected to prepare the overall evaluation of teaching.

CREATING A DEPARTMENTAL POLICY ON ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Please carefully review APM 322 prior to discussing and implementing a Departmental Policy on the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness. Please keep in mind that the sample policy at the end of this document includes the minimums required by APM 322 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Departments may choose to enhance the requirements in APM 322; however, Departments may not choose to ~~do~~ decrease the minimum requirements. The Departmental Policy should address: a) student ratings of instruction, and b) peer evaluations.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Student Ratings of Instruction

APM 322 - III.B

B. Student Ratings of Instruction

Each department or equivalent unit shall establish a written policy which describes the frequency and scheduling of student ratings of instruction. Each faculty member shall have a minimum of two sections rated by students annually.

Please be certain that your Departmental Policy specifies frequency and scheduling, as stated above.

Please include this statement: 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.

APM 322 - VIII.

VIII. Preparation of an Overall Evaluation of Teaching Performance

For recommendations regarding personnel actions such as retention, tenure and promotion, five year review, contract renewal of lecturers, and peer evaluation of courses, the statistical summary of student ratings along with other appropriate information in the Open Personnel File shall be assessed to identify patterns and trends of teaching performance and effectiveness.

Please be certain that your departmental policy recognizes that patterns and trends are more relevant than the ratings from a single course or narrow time period.

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Left

Peer Evaluations

APM 322 - II.A

II. Peer Evaluation Forms and Student Rating Questionnaires

A. Each Department shall adopt peer evaluation forms that will assess course content, instructional design, instructional delivery, and assessment methods. In the absence of a formally adopted departmental form, the department shall use a university-wide template provided by the Provost. Each department may adopt a protocol for face-to-face real time peer observations of teaching where applicable. The results of these peer evaluations may be used both formatively and summatively.

APM 322 - III.A

III. Frequency of Implementation

A. Peer Evaluation Reports

1. Each department or equivalent unit shall establish a written policy which describes the frequency and scheduling of peer evaluation of courses. The following minimum frequency shall apply:

- 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, two sections (to include as many different courses as possible) every 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. Additional peer evaluation reports may be requested by the instructor or required by the College/School Personnel Committee, Dean or Provost on a case by case basis.

APM 322 - VI.B.1

B. Reports

1. Using the **departmentally approved form**, a written report on the peer evaluation of a course shall be prepared by the evaluator. The report shall include a review of the relevant components listed in Section I of APM 322.

Preparation of an Overall Evaluation of Teaching Performance

APM 322 - VIII

For recommendations regarding personnel actions such as retention, tenure and promotion, five year review, contract renewal of lecturers, and peer evaluation of courses, the statistical summary of student ratings along with other appropriate information in the Open Personnel File shall be assessed to identify patterns and trends of teaching performance and effectiveness.

The preparation of the overall assessment of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted by a review committee composed of faculty of appropriate rank. Probationary faculty may only perform evaluations of temporary faculty. In general, tenured faculty shall be evaluated only by

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Font: Bold, Underline

Formatted: Font: Bold, Underline

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

other tenured faculty at a higher rank, except full professors who may evaluate faculty at any rank.

The Department will follow the guidelines in APM 325, APM 327 and APM 328 when electing committees selected to prepare the overall evaluation of teaching.

Formatted: Font: Italic

SAMPLE DEPARTMENTAL POLICY

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

[BRACKETS INCLUDE SUGGESTED INFORMATION THAT MAY BE INCREASED]

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 score **[3.0 out of 5.0]** or above using adjusted or unadjusted scores, whichever are higher, on a regular basis; however, it is more important to evaluate on the basis of multi-year trends ~~trending~~ rather than focusing on a single course, ~~semester~~ or narrow time frame.

PEER EVALUATIONS

[BRACKETS INCLUDE SUGGESTED INFORMATION THAT MAY BE INCREASED]

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, **[two sections (to include as many different courses as possible) every 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 evaluator may elect to perform a face-to-face real time peer observation as part of the peer evaluation upon the request of the faculty member being evaluated. **[Departments may elect to require no in-class observations, observations for certain types of classes or observations in all classes.]**

OVERALL

The Department will follow the guidelines in APM 325, APM 327 and APM 328 when electing committees selected to prepare the overall evaluation of teaching.