



CALIFORNIA
STATE
UNIVERSITY,
FRESNO

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 21, 2011

TO: Faculty
Department of Criminology
M/S ST 104

FROM: William A. Covino 
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Approval of your Department Policy on Peer Evaluations
and Student Course Evaluations (RE: APM 322)

I have received and reviewed your departmental documents, and they are tentatively approved for implementation during the remainder of AY11-12.

I am, however, concerned about your department's use of a relatively low statistical standard for student ratings—a standard that may render data used to support AY12-13 RTP recommendations less than persuasive. Thus, it is my hope that, once AY11-12 data becomes widely available, you may wish to adjust the departmental standard upward to a more meaningful measure of relative teaching performance.

In the meantime, I want to reiterate my commitment to our Academic Senate's stated beliefs that student feedback is best viewed from a multi-year perspective, and considered within the larger context of all evidence presented in support of a colleague's teaching effectiveness.

WAC:kyp

cc: Luz Gonzalez, Dean, College of Social Sciences
Ted Wendt, AVP for Academic Personnel

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 CRIMINOLOGY
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.

The IDEA Short Form will be the standard paper instrument for Criminology.

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 3.0 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: September 2011.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINOLOGY
Peer Classroom Visitation Evaluation Sheet

Evaluator: _____ Professor Evaluated: _____

Rank/Title: _____ Rank/Title: _____

Signature: _____ Department Chair Signature _____

Course: _____ Term: _____

Visitation Date: _____ Hours: _____ Room: _____

Did evaluated professor know in advance if evaluation was to be made? ___Yes ___No

*Comments should appear under each heading. Comments can vary from an adjective or two ("Satisfactory," "Good because . . .," etc.) to an analysis of a paragraph or two. Unusual strengths and/or weaknesses should be described in detail. If the item is not applicable in this situation, state this along with the reason(s). **FINAL COPY MUST BE TYPED.***

1. INSTRUCTOR'S PREPARATION AND/OR ORGANIZATION:

2. THE DEGREE TO WHICH THE CLASS PRESENTATION RELATED TO THE COURSE CONTENT AS DESCRIBED IN THE SYLLABUS:

3. ABILITY TO STIMULATE STUDENTS (INCLUDING VOCAL CHARACTERISTICS AND MANNERISMS):

4. CONSIDERATION FOR STUDENTS (INCLUDING OPEN-MINDEDNESS AND RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS):

5. OVERALL EVALUATION OF CONDUCTING CLASS AND/OR ARRANGING FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION:

6. ASSESSMENT METHODS (E.G., TOOLS, PROCEDURES, STRATEGIES, AND FEEDBACK).

7. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

**DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINOLOGY
PEER CLASSROOM VISITATION APPRAISAL SCALE
SUMMARY**

Instructor Evaluated

Semester

Lowest 1	Appraisal Scale:				Highest 5	Full-Time	Tenured:	Part-Time:	Probationary Year:
	2	3	4	5					
Fifteen Statements on Peer Classroom Visitation Appraisal Scale						Courses/Evaluators		Mean: Arith- metic Average	Depart- mental Standard
1. The class presentation was planned and organized.									3
2. The professor exhibited mastery of the course content in the materials presented.									3
3. Class time was well-used.									3
4. Important ideas covered during the visit were clearly explained.									3
5. The instructor encouraged critical thinking and analysis.									3
6. The instructor encouraged relevant student involvement in the class.									3
7. The instructor was able to react well to student viewpoints different from the instructor's.									3
8. The attitude of the students in the class reflected acceptance of the instructor's materials and methods used in the presentation.									3
9. Materials used in the presentation reflected acceptable authorities as well as new views and evidence in the subject area.									3
10. Students appeared interested in the subject area.									3
11. Students were made to feel they were members of the class as a whole.									3
12. The students in the class seemed to have a challenging and meaningful experience.									3
13. The instructor's method and style of teaching fit in well with the subject matter being covered.									3
14. The overall atmosphere, including materials and student participation, was conducive to the learning situation.									3
15. Assessment methods (e.g., tools, procedures, strategies, and feedback.)									3
16. As a visitor, the overall reaction to the presentation reviewed.									3
Mean (Arithmetic Average)									3
Median									3

Evaluators Signature _____

Department Chair Signature _____

Evaluation Date: _____