

## POLICY ON ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Teaching is central to the mission of the University and, therefore, its effectiveness must be assessed. The dual purpose of the assessment of teaching effectiveness is to provide the individual instructor with specific information to enhance instruction and to provide information for use in personnel actions. The primary responsibility for assessing all aspects of teaching effectiveness rests with the faculty.

This policy establishes the framework for the assessment of teaching effectiveness, including procedures for the two major components of the assessment: (a) peer evaluation of instruction; (b) student ratings of instruction. Standards for each component shall be established by academic departments. Standards should be based on the principle that the primary purpose of teaching assessment is to provide meaningful feedback to instructors. Assessment for administrative personnel purposes is a secondary goal. Moreover, statistical data must be analyzed with the realization that serious limitations exist relative to the accumulation and analysis of such data. Also, students cannot effectively evaluate all aspects of teaching, especially course content, so departments should use multiple methods of assessment. It is recommended that quantitative student ratings count for between 30 and 50 percent of the assessment of any instructor.

In assessing the teaching effectiveness of a faculty member, care should be taken to avoid bias based upon race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, marital status, age, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, veteran's status, sex, and sexual orientation.

**I. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall address four basic elements of instruction:** course content, instructional design, instructional delivery, and assessment methods.

- A. Course Content. The assessment of course content shall include a review of the currency of the content of a course, the appropriateness of the level of the content of a course, and the appropriateness of the sequencing of the content to best achieve the learning objectives for the course.
- B. Instructional Design. The assessment of the instructional design of the course shall include a review of learning objectives, syllabi, instructional support materials, organization of lectures, and the use of technology appropriate to the class.
- C. Instructional Delivery. The assessment of delivery shall include a review of oral presentation skills, written communication skills, skills using various forms of informational technology, and the ability to create an overall environment conducive to student learning.
- D. Assessment Methods. The evaluation of assessment methods shall consist of a review of the tools, procedures, and strategies used for measuring student learning, and providing timely and meaningful feedback to students.

## 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.
- B. Student rating questionnaires shall provide for the assessment of the applicable components identified in Section I. The student rating questionnaires shall be unsigned. Departments shall select questions having demonstrated reliability and validity from a campus-wide pool approved by the Academic Senate and Provost. When possible, the instructor should also receive adjusted scores that take into account external factors beyond the control of the instructor.
- C. The data from peer evaluations and student ratings shall be used in personnel decisions relating to retention, tenure and promotion.
- D. Additional student ratings of courses may be requested by the instructor or required by the college/ school Personnel Committee, Dean or Provost.

## 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.

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.

**IV. Confidentiality**

Information obtained from peer evaluation reports and/or student rating questionnaires shall be confidential. Possession or use of this information shall be restricted to

- A. the instructor, who may at his/her discretion, make such information available to others;
- B. those charged with conducting evaluations or administering this policy;
- C. those with access to the Open Personnel File.

**V. Use and Housing of Student Ratings Data**

- A. Student ratings data shall not be used for any extraordinary purposes including, but not limited to, comparison of programs, departments, colleges, or any external entity or institution without the approval of the Academic Senate.
- B. Data collected from the assessment of teaching effectiveness will be housed in the Offices of the Academic Senate on behalf of the Academic Assembly.

**VI. Administration of Peer Evaluation Reports**

A. Conducting Peer Evaluation of Courses

- 1. Only tenured and probationary faculty shall conduct peer evaluations of courses. Probationary faculty may perform evaluations of temporary faculty only. Tenured faculty shall be evaluated only by other tenured faculty at a higher rank, except full professors who may evaluate faculty at any rank. Tenured faculty being considered for promotion and participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may not participate in personnel committee actions. However, they may conduct peer evaluations of courses pursuant to this policy.
- 2. Department chairs shall assign peer evaluator(s) to review faculty members.
- 3. Prior to the peer evaluation, the evaluator(s) shall notify the faculty member of the materials that will be required for the evaluation. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the materials to

the evaluator. The materials shall include those designated on the peer evaluation form.

4. Evaluators shall not interview students before, during or after the peer evaluation.

**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.
2. The peer evaluator(s) and the faculty member should discuss the evaluation prior to the submission of the written report to the department chair.
3. Each report shall be signed by the evaluator(s) and submitted to the department chair for placement by the Dean's Office in the Open Personnel File after appropriately notifying the faculty member.

**VII. Administration of Questionnaires for Student Ratings of Instruction**

**A. Administration of Student Rating Questionnaires**

1. Student rating questionnaires shall be proctored by a faculty member, student, or administrative assistant. The questionnaire may not be proctored by the instructor of record for the course.
2. The instructor being rated may not be present in the classroom during the administration of the questionnaire.
3. Proctor Responsibilities.
  - a. The proctor shall not interview students before, during, or after the class session.
  - b. The administration of the questionnaire shall occur during the last half of the scheduled term of instruction and shall be administered during the first fifteen minutes of class. Nothing besides a pencil and the rating form shall be handed out during the administration of the questionnaire.
4. Standardized instructions to the rating questionnaire will be provided by the proctor. All proctors will receive standardized written instructions on administering the forms as well as a written statement about the use and processing of the evaluations to be read to the students. These standardized instructions shall:

- a. inform students that the results will not be available to the instructor until after final grades have been submitted.
- b. inform students of the purpose of the questionnaire, which is to enhance teaching effectiveness and to provide information for staffing decisions including retention, tenure, and promotion (if any);
- c. inform students that the original or a copy of the original of the comments (if any) will be given to the instructor;
- d. inform students that the instructor may not be present in the classroom during the administration of the questionnaire.
- e. inform students that care should be taken to avoid bias based upon race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, marital status, age, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, veteran's status, sex, and sexual orientation.

B. Analysis of Student Rating Data

1. *Quantitative Results*

- a. A statistical summary of the quantitative results of the student ratings shall be generated. This summary shall be user-friendly. This summary shall be known as the Statistical Summary. The department uses the quantitative data from the Statistical Summary to compare against departmental standards.
- b. The instructor shall receive a copy of the statistical summary. In the interest of instructional improvement and fairness to retention/tenure/promotion candidates, these copies should be provided to the instructor as soon as possible after final grades are turned in. Candidates for retention/ tenure/ promotion should have priority over temporary and tenured faculty in the receipt of this information.
- c. After final grades are turned in by the instructor, the Statistical Summary shall be placed in the Open Personnel File

2. *Open-Ended Student Comments*

- a. The department may require that students be given the opportunity to provide comments in conjunction with numerical student ratings. A copy of the student comments shall be given to the department chair and the faculty member. The department chair shall not share the student comments with review committees. The department chair shall review the

student comments in a timely fashion for evidence of gross violations of university policy.

- b. In the interest of instructional improvement and fairness to retention/tenure/promotion candidates, these copies shall be provided to the instructor as soon as possible after final grades are submitted.

### **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.

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.

### **IX. Summary of Policy**

In accord with the foregoing provisions, departments shall develop written policies and procedures in accord with colleges as appropriate that describe:

- A. the selection of items from the campus-wide pool of validated items.
- B. the frequency (if the minimum described above is to be exceeded) and scheduling of student ratings.
- C. how faculty peers will be selected to prepare the overall evaluation of teaching.
- D. the minimum standards for teaching effectiveness.

---

Approved by the Academic Senate April 15, 1991  
Approved by the President May 6, 1991  
Approved by the Academic Senate September 27, 2010  
Approved by the President January 20, 2011

## **GUIDE TO 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, expected faculty standards and scheduling.*

*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.*

**See APM 322b for a Sample Departmental Policy template.**

[BRACKETS INCLUDE SUGGESTED INFORMATION THAT MAY BE INCREASED]

**DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY  
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 the department standard **[X out of 5.0]** 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**

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.

**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.

**APPROVAL PROCESS**

Departmental policies will be submitted to the appropriate School/College Dean and to the Provost for review and approval.

Last Updated: Enter Date

**California State University, Fresno**  
**UNIVERSITY-WIDE PEER EVALUATION FORM**

Enter Department

**Professor Evaluated:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Rank:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Course:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Term/Year:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Classroom Visitation:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Evaluator** \_\_\_\_\_ **Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

Ratings Scale: 5 = superior | 4 = above average | 3 = average | 2 = below average | 1 = weak

Category	Rating (1-5)
<b>A. Course Content.</b> The assessment of course content shall include a review of the currency of the content of a course, the appropriateness of the level of the content of a course, and the appropriateness of the sequencing of the content to best achieve the learning objectives for the course. <b>COMMENTS:</b>	
    <b>B. Instructional Design.</b> The assessment of the instructional design of the course shall include a review of learning objectives, syllabi, instructional support materials, organization of lectures, and the use of technology appropriate to the class. <b>COMMENTS:</b>	
    <b>C. Instructional Delivery.</b> The assessment of delivery shall include a review of oral presentation skills, written communication skills, skills using various forms of informational technology, and the ability to create an overall environment conducive to student learning. <b>COMMENTS:</b>	
    <b>D. Assessment Methods.</b> The evaluation of assessment methods shall consist of a review of the tools, procedures, and strategies used for measuring student learning, and providing timely and meaningful feedback to students. <b>COMMENTS:</b>	

*Additional comments may be included on the reverse side of this form.*