MEMORANDUM

CALIFORNIA
STATE
UNIVERSITY,
FRESNO

DATE: November 21, 2011

TO: Faculty
              Department of Computer Science
              M/S ST 109

FROM: William A. Coving
              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: Andrew Hoff, Interim Dean, College of Science and Mathematics
       Ted Wendt, AVP for Academic Personnel

MEMORANDUM

October 10, 2011

To: Todd Wilson
                Department of Computer Science

From: Andrew Hoff
                Dean, College of Science and Mathematics

Re: Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness
                Department of Computer Science

Following a review of the policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for the Department of Computer Science, including their policy on Student Ratings of Instruction and Peer Evaluations, the following recommendations are made to amend the policy:

1. Student ratings of instruction should be performed for all classes taught by probationary faculty in order to acquire sufficient data for faculty review

2. Specify Department standards that will be used to assess faculty performance in the peer evaluation process.

AH:cat

cc: William Covino
        Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER 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 faculty member shall have a minimum of two 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 of **"3.0 out of 5.0 or gray area"** 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 academic year** 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: 10/5/11

California State University, Fresno
UNIVERSITY-WIDE PEER EVALUATION FORM
Computer Science 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)
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 may be included on the reverse side of this form.

APM 322c