




CALIFORNIA
STATE
UNIVERSITY,
FRESNO

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 21, 2011

TO: Faculty
Department of Geography
M/S SB 69

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 GEOGRAPHY
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 part-time, full-time, and probationary faculty shall have all sections rated every semester while each tenured faculty shall have a minimum of two sections rated every semester.

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 of 3 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 year of employment regardless of a break in service.
- b. For full-time temporary faculty, two sections each semester.
- c. For probationary faculty, two sections every semester to include as many different courses as possible.
- d. For tenured faculty, a minimum of 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. The Department of Geography reserves the right to adjust this policy, including the student ratings standard, as deemed necessary and will submit a revised policy for approval if and when such a change is made.

APPROVAL PROCESS

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

California State University, Fresno
Department of Geography
PEER EVALUATION FORM

Professor Evaluated: _____ Course: _____

Term/Year: _____ Evaluation Date: ___ / ___ / ___ Evaluator: _____

Category
A. Course Content. Includes a review of the currency of the course content, the appropriateness of the level of the content, and the appropriateness of the sequencing of the content to best achieve the learning objectives for the course. COMMENTS:
B. Instructional Design. Includes a review of learning objectives, syllabi, instructional support materials, organization of lectures, and the use of technology appropriate to the course. COMMENTS:
C. Instructional Delivery. Includes 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. COMMENTS:
D. Assessment Methods. Does the syllabus include tools and methods appropriate for assessing student learning and providing feedback to students? COMMENTS:
E. Recommendations/Feedback. COMMENTS: