




CALIFORNIA
STATE
UNIVERSITY,
FRESNO

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 21, 2011

TO: Faculty
Department of Mechanical Engineering
M/S EE 15

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: 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 OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
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 of courses taught each semester rated by students. Student evaluations are used for assessment purposes as part of the accreditation process.

While the IDEA Short Form is 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, at a minimum, meet or exceed the department minimum standard of 3.0 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. Faculty may choose to use a greater minimum standard as part of an approved probationary plan.

PEER EVALUATIONS

1. Frequency

- a. For part-time temporary faculty, each time a course is taught by the instructor and, each time thereafter, regardless of break(s) in service.
- b. For full-time temporary faculty, each time a course is taught by the instructor.
- c. For probationary faculty, minimum of two sections per semester, preferably to include as many different courses as possible. Sections to be evaluated are chosen by mutual consent of the probationary faculty member and peer evaluators for that faculty member.
- d. For tenured faculty, minimum of one section each semester, on a rotating basis such that during a five-year period the maximum number of different courses is evaluated.

2. The attached Departmentally-approved form(s) are used 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.

California State University, Fresno
UNIVERSITY-WIDE PEER EVALUATION FORM
 Department of Mechanical Engineering

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)
A. Course Content. 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. Instructional Design. 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:	
C. Instructional Delivery. 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.	
COMMENTS:	
D. Assessment Methods. 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:	

Additional comments are included on the reverse side of this form.