



CALIFORNIA  
STATE  
UNIVERSITY,  
FRESNO

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** November 21, 2011

**TO:** Faculty  
Department of Construction Management  
EE 94

**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: Ram Nunna, Interim Dean, Lyles College of Engineering  
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 POLICY ON ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS***

### **DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 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* rated by students annually.

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 [**3.5 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 semester* 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: 03 October 2011

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

Enter Department

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

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

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

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

Ratings Scale: 5 = superior | 4 = above average | 3 = average | 2 = below average | 1 = weak

Category	Rating (1-5)
<p><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.</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p>	
<p><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.</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p>	
<p><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.</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p>	
<p><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.</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p>	

*Additional comments may be included on the reverse side of this form.*