



CALIFORNIA  
STATE  
UNIVERSITY,  
FRESNO

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** November 21, 2011

**TO:** Faculty  
Department of Psychology  
ST 11

**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 approved for implementation during the remainder of AY11-12.

I fully understand that the statistical standard chosen for student ratings is provisional, and may require further adjustment once we have obtained a sufficient amount of comparison data. However, the mean you have selected seems a reasonable initial benchmark.

I also 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: Andrew Hoff, Interim Dean, College of Science and Mathematics  
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 PSYCHOLOGY  
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**

**Procedures**

**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, every course every semester.
- d. For tenured faculty, two sections each academic year on a rotating basis such that during a five year period the maximum number of different courses is evaluated.

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.

The Department of Psychology's Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and Graduate Curriculum Committee will select the particular objectives, and the weighting of the objectives (e.g., important, essential) by course (e.g., Psychology 144). The Faculty Information Form will then be standardized by course (with the exception of class size). Individual faculty may consult with the Undergraduate and/or Graduate Curriculum Committees to request exceptions to this standardization policy on a course-by-course basis.

**Standards**

Item 17 provides for an overall rating of instructor effectiveness: "Overall, I rate this instructor an excellent teacher." The five ratings points on the scale are 1) definitely false, 2) more false than true, 3) in between, 4) more true than false, and 5) definitely true. It is expected that the average raw (unadjusted) score on this item should, as a rule, be at least midway between "in between" and "more true than false" (in numerical terms, 3.5 or above). Low numerical evaluations by themselves shall not automatically preclude a favorable recommendation. It is expected, however, that the overall pattern of evaluations over a series of semesters would match or exceed this expected standard.

## **PEER EVALUATIONS OF INSTRUCTION**

### **Procedures**

#### **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 difference 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.

Faculty will use the attached departmentally-approved form to evaluate Course Content, Instructional Design, Instructional Delivery, and Assessment methods.

Probationary faculty may only perform evaluations of temporary faculty. Tenured faculty shall be evaluated only by other tenured faculty at a higher rank. Full professors may evaluate faculty at any rank.

The Chair will assign evaluators using random assignment without replacement; the evaluator and evaluatee will arrange for a mutually-agreed upon date for visit.

### **Standards**

Course content, Instructional design, Instructional delivery, and Assessment methods will each be rated by the evaluator as either “meets or exceeds departmental expectations” or “below departmental expectations.” Peer reviews from classroom visitations should be consistently positive from semester to semester and course to course. Receiving a low assessment shall not automatically preclude a favorable recommendation. It is expected, however, that the overall pattern of evaluations over a series of semesters should show evidence of meeting or exceeding departmental standards.

### **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 30, 2011

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

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

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

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

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

Rating Scale:            \_\_\_     meets or exceeds departmental expectations (ME)  
                               \_\_\_     below departmental expectations (B)

Category	Rating
<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.	
COMMENTS:	
<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.	
COMMENTS:	
<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 (include command of language, flow of information, use of examples, enthusiasm, rapport with class, ability to convey importance of material)	
COMMENTS:	
<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.	
COMMENTS:	

Note: The Department of Psychology has high standards for accurate, professional, engaging teaching. A rating of "meets or exceeds departmental expectations" reflects a high quality of teaching.