



MEMORANDUM

CALIFORNIA
STATE
UNIVERSITY,
FRESNO

October 10, 2011

To: Doug Singleton
Department of Physics

From: *AH* Andrew Hoff
Dean, College of Science and Mathematics

Re: Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness
Department of Physics

Following a review of the policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for the Department of Physics, including their policy on Student Ratings of Instruction and Peer Evaluations, I would like to make the following recommendations for amending the policy:

1. Include the Department standards to be used for peer evaluations
2. Include a mechanisms for assessment of course content, instructional design and student assessment methods in their peer evaluation form.

AH:cat

cc: William Covino
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

College of
Science and Mathematics
Office of the Dean

2576 E. San Ramon Ave. MS ST90
Fresno, CA 93740-8039

559.278.3936
Fax 559.278.7139



CHECKLIST FOR PEER CLASS VISITION

Department of Physics

Date ____ / ____ / ____

Teacher _____ Course _____ Room _____ Time _____

SPACE AND TIME	
Prelecture condition of classroom – Are blackboards clean? Is the teaching environment orderly and conducive to learning? Is the lighting sufficient?	
Punctuality – Did the teacher start and end on time?	
Organization of in-class collection and return of homework, exams, handouts, etc.	
Postlecture condition of classroom – Did the teacher erase blackboards? Remove handouts, HW, exams, papers? Rearrange furniture? Return demonstration equipment? Turn off OHP, video?	
LECTURE	
Lecture preparation	
Lecture organization – Statement of topics, Structure	
Cogency of explanations	
Coherence of lecture	
TEACHING SKILLS	
Audibility – Voice projection, Pronunciation	
Rhetoric – Persuasion, Rhetorical habits	
Visibility – Lighting, particularly under competing circumstances (blackboard, OHP, digital projector)	
Legibility – Blackboard writing and drawing, Size and arrangement	
Powerpoint/Overhead Projection – Proper use? Legibility.	
Video projection, computer-assisted instruction, web-assisted instruction, – Proper use?	
DEMONSTRATIONS	
Number of demonstrations?	
Appropriateness of demos?	
Visibility of demos?	
Effectiveness of demos?	
STUDENT INTERACTION	
Questions from teacher to class – Number and quality of questions	
Responses from class to teacher – Number and quality of responses	
Effectiveness of teacher-class interaction	
Questions from students to teacher – Number and quality of questions	
Responses from teacher to students – Number and quality of responses	
Effectiveness of student-teacher interaction	
Level of student interest	
Teacher's respect and politeness toward students Teacher's rapport with students – Emotional climate in class	
Class discipline Teacher's ability to deal with disruptive behavior	

Rating: E – excellent, G – good, N – needs improvement, N/A = not applicable

**DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS
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 all sections they teach rated by students each 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 that their student evaluation score shall fall in or above the “gray area” of the Idea Center evaluation form 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.

To enable fair and meaningful comparison within the department, the department will set standards for how the 12 listed “objectives” on the IDEA center’s *Faculty Information Form* should be filled out. These standards will be decided by the department faculty (majority vote) with consultation from the instructors teaching each course, and will be reflective of each course’s learning outcomes and objectives as written in our standard syllabi and university catalog descriptions. With these standards in place for each course, every section of a particular course must use the same ranking for each of the 12 objectives on the IDEA center form.

PEER EVALUATIONS

1. Frequency

- a. For part-time temporary faculty at least one section per year will be evaluated
- b. For full-time temporary faculty, at least one section per year will be evaluated.
- c. For probationary faculty, all courses they teach will be evaluated.
- d. For tenured faculty, at least one course every 4 years will be evaluated.

2. Faculty will use the attached Departmentally approved checklist to do the peer evaluation. In addition to the checklist the evaluator will write a memo about the evaluation to be submitted to the chair.

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: 10/3/11