



CALIFORNIA
STATE
UNIVERSITY,
FRESNO

MEMORANDUM

Approved:	
Dr. Saúl Jiménez-Sandoval Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs	Date: 24 Feb 2020

Date: February 20, 2020

To: Dr. Saúl Jiménez-Sandoval
Provost

From: Dr. Michelle DenBeste, Dean
College of Social Sciences

Subject: Departmental Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

I am in receipt of the request from the Department of Political Science for review and approval of the updated Departmental Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness effective in Spring 2020. After carefully reviewing the policy, I approved and forward it to Provost Saúl Jiménez-Sandoval for review and approval.

cc: Dr. Melanie Ram, Chair, Department of Political Science

College of Social Sciences
Office of the Dean

5340 Campus Drive M/S SS91
Fresno, CA 93740-8019

559.278.3013
Fax 559.278.7664
fresnostate.edu/socialsciences

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
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 temporary faculty member (both part-time and full-time) not on a 3-year appointment shall have all of their course sections rated by students for their first two years of employment and a minimum of two sections per semester thereafter, so as to have assessment of most of the courses taught by each faculty member on an annual basis. All courses should be rated the first time they are taught.

Each probationary faculty member shall have a minimum of two sections rated by students each semester, so as to have assessment of most of the courses taught by each faculty member on an annual basis.

Each temporary faculty member on a 3-year appointment and tenured faculty member (including FERP faculty) shall have a minimum of two sections rated by students each academic year, so as to have assessment of most of the courses taught by each faculty member on an annual basis.

If a faculty member is teaching less than the minimum number of courses required to be reviewed in a semester, they shall have all of the classes they are teaching reviewed that semester.

Faculty may use the paper or online version of the university student ratings instrument. In either case, class time should be allotted for students to complete ratings in each course being rated. This will help ensure that data is collected from a sufficient number and percentage of students in the course for the instructor to enhance instruction and for use in personnel actions. An instructor with low response rates may be assigned a proctor to administer their evaluations in class.

Students should have an opportunity to provide comments in conjunction with numerical student ratings.

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 3.5 out of 5.0 on a regular basis; it is more important, however, to evaluate on the basis of multi-year trends rather than focusing on a single course or a single year.

PEER EVALUATIONS

1. Frequency

- a. For part-time temporary faculty not on a 3-year appointment, the first time a course is taught by the instructor and at least one section every semester of employment for the first three years regardless of a break in service, and one section per academic year of employment thereafter.
- b. For full-time temporary faculty not on a 3-year appointment, two sections each semester for the first year, one section each semester for the next two years, and two sections each academic year thereafter.
- c. For full-time temporary faculty on a 3-year appointment, two sections each academic year.
- d. For probationary faculty, two sections every semester (to include as many different courses as possible).
- e. For tenured faculty, one section every year on a rotating basis such that during a five year period the maximum number of different courses is evaluated.

2. Online and in-class sections of a course may both be evaluated the first time taught.

3. Faculty may use the attached Department-approved form to evaluate course content, instructional design, instructional delivery, and assessment methods, and provide recommendations for improvement. If faculty choose an alternate method for evaluation besides this form, that method must at least include a discussion of the four areas listed above. Peer evaluators should discuss the evaluation with the instructor evaluated prior to submission of the report to the department Chair. All submitted evaluations must be signed by the evaluator and submitted confidentially to the Department Chair for review, signature, and submission to the Dean's office.

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. Participation in departmental self studies (SOAP) will not be used as part of the assessment of individual faculty teaching effectiveness. The Department of Political Science 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 Dean of the College of Social Sciences and to the Provost for review and approval.

Updated 2/1/20. Effective date: Spring 2020

California State University, Fresno
Department of Political Science
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:

Signature of evaluator:

Date:

Department Chair signature:

Date: