**POLICY ON ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

**(Proposed Reorganization of Policy with proposed revisions in redline;**

**Student Ratings Subcommittee 4/5/21. Additional revisions based on consultation with Personnel Committee proposed on 3/30/22.)**

Teaching is central to the mission of the University and, therefore, its effectiveness must be assessed. This policy establishes the framework for the assessment of teaching effectiveness, including procedures for the two major components of the assessment: (a) peer evaluation of instruction, (b) student ratings of instruction.

**I. Principles for the Assessment of Teaching**

1. The primary purpose of the assessment of teaching effectiveness is to provide the individual instructor with specific meaningful feedback to enhance instruction. The secondary purpose is to provide information for use in administrative personnel actions.
2. The primary responsibility for assessing all aspects of teaching effectiveness rests with the faculty. Each department or equivalent unit shall establish a written policy that describes:
	1. Whether individual faculty members or the collective department shall exercise the right to selection of items from the approved campus pool of items for student ratings.
	2. Frequency of peer evaluations and student ratings for faculty of different rank. Department policies must conform to the minimal standards set forth in this policy.
	3. Standards by which faculty will be judged using the data generated by peer evaluation and student ratings.
	4. How to handle low response rates
	5. Whether use of incentives is allowed and details

Department policies must be approved by Faculty Affairs.

1. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall address four basic elements of instruction:course content,instructional design, instructional delivery, and assessment methods.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. Eligible Courses: Eligible courses are designated as courses in PeopleSoft, have assigned instructors who are Fresno State employees, and that have at least three students enrolled who experience the course collectively. The following types of courses are not eligible for peer evaluation and/or student ratings:
	* 1. Independent study classes
		2. thesis and continuation units
		3. CalState Teach classes
7. In assessing the teaching effectiveness of a faculty member, care should be taken to avoid bias based upon race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, marital status, age, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, veteran's status, sex, and sexual orientation.

# **Peer Evaluations**

1. Instrument
	1. Each Department shall adopt peer evaluation forms that assess course content, instructional design, instructional delivery, and assessment methods. In the absence of a formally adopted departmental form, the department shall use a university-wide template provided by the Provost.
	2. Each department may adopt a protocol for face-to-face real time peer observations of teaching and review of online classes where applicable.
2. Frequency

# The following minimum frequency of peer evaluations shall apply:

* 1. For part-time temporary faculty, the first time an eligible course is taught by the instructor and the first time it is taught in a new modality, and, thereafter, at least one section every other year of employment regardless of a break in service.
	2. For full-time temporary faculty, two sections of eligible courses each semester for the first year and two sections each academic year thereafter.
	3. For probationary faculty, two sections (to include as many different eligible courses as possible) every semester.
	4. For tenured faculty, one section each academic year on a rotating basis such that during a five-year period the maximum number of different eligible courses is evaluated.
1. Additional peer evaluation reports may be requested by the instructor or required by the Department Chair, College/School Personnel Committee, Dean or Provost on a case by case basis.
2. Procedures
	1. Only tenured and probationary faculty shall conduct peer evaluations of courses. Probationary faculty may perform evaluations of temporary faculty only. Tenured faculty shall be evaluated only by other tenured faculty at a higher rank, except full professors who may evaluate faculty at any rank. Tenured faculty being considered for promotion and participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may not participate in personnel committee actions. However, they may conduct peer evaluations of courses pursuant to this policy.
	2. Department chairs shall assign peer evaluator(s) to review faculty members.
	3. Prior to the peer evaluation, the evaluator(s) shall notify the faculty member of the materials that will be required for the evaluation. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the materials to the evaluator. The materials shall include those designated on the peer evaluation form.
	4. When classroom visits (including assessments of online and hybrid courses) are utilized as part of the evaluation of a faculty unit employee, the individual faculty unit employee being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five (5) days that a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. (CBA, Article 15.14)
	5. Evaluators shall not interview students before, during or after the peer evaluation.
3. Data Analysis and Use
	1. Using the departmentally approved form, a written report on the peer evaluation of a course shall be prepared by the evaluator. The report shall include a review of the relevant components listed in Section I.
	2. The peer evaluator(s) and the faculty member should discuss the evaluation prior to the submission of the written report to the department chair.
	3. Each report shall be signed by the evaluator(s) and submitted to the department chair no later than the last day of the semester for placement by the Dean’s Office in the Personnel Action File after appropriately notifying the faculty member. Upon notification by the Dean’s Office, the faculty member shall maintain the right to submit a formal rebuttal letter into the PAF until the end of the next semester. The evaluated faculty member will not be held accountable for peer evaluations that were not submitted so long as they or their department chair provide evidence that reminders were sent and attempts were made to collect the missing peer evaluations.
	4. The results of these peer evaluations may be used both formatively and summatively.
4. **Student Ratings**
	1. Instrument
5. Student rating questionnaires shall provide for the assessment of the applicable components identified in Section I. Students will not be asked to rate the content of the course.
6. The rating instrument shall consist of questions selected from a campus-wide pool of items approved by the Academic Senate and Provost, and constructed in such a way that it has demonstrated reliability and validity. Departments may allow individual faculty members to make their own selections, or they may retain the right of approval/disapproval of those choices, or they may make collective choices that override individual faculty choices.
7. Student ratings programs for librarian faculty unit employees, counselor faculty unit employees, and coaching faculty unit employees may be developed at the campus level. If such programs are established, the evaluation process shall be developed by a committee comprised of faculty unit employees and appropriate administrators. (CBA, Article 15.18)
8. Departments may require that students be given the opportunity to provide comments in conjunction with numerical student ratings.
9. Additional items (including things like students’ self-reported attendance and anticipated grade) may be included on the instrument, but these items are not included in the calculated of ratings. They are used only to help faculty contextualize the ratings for a different class.
	1. Frequency
		* 1. Each department or equivalent unit shall establish a written policy which describes the frequency and scheduling of student ratings of instruction. Each instructor shall have a minimum of two sections rated by students annually.
			2. Courses selected to be rated must be representative of the instructor’s teaching assignment and be jointly determined in consultation between the instructor and their department chair.
			3. Additional student ratings of courses may be requested by the instructor or required by the Department Chair, college/ school Personnel Committee, Dean or Provost.
	2. Procedures
10. The administration of the questionnaire shall occur during the last half of the scheduled term of instruction, and must be completed before the last day of final exams for the term.
11. The student ratings questionnaires shall be anonymous.
12. Standardized instructions for student ratings must be provided to students. These standardized instructions shall:
	1. inform students of the purpose of the questionnaire, which is to enhance teaching effectiveness and to provide information for staffing decisions including retention, tenure, and promotion (if any);
	2. inform students that the results will not be available to the instructor until after final grades have been submitted.
	3. inform students that the statistical breakdown of scores and all comments will be provided to both the instructor and the department chair;
	4. inform students that care should be taken to avoid bias based upon race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, marital status, age, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, veteran’s status, sex, and sexual orientation.
13. Student rating questionnaires administered on paper in class:
	1. students must be given protected time in class (at least 15 minutes) for the completion of student ratings of instruction.
	2. shall be administered during the first fifteen minutes of class.
	3. shall be proctored by a faculty member, student, or administrative assistant. The questionnaire may not be proctored by the instructor of record for the course.
14. The instructor being rated may not be present in the classroom during the administration of the questionnaire.
15. The proctor shall not interview students before, during, or after the class session.
16. Student rating questionnaires administered online:
17. In asynchronous classes, a link to student ratings must be provided in a module of the course. Instructors must consider student workload when inserting the request for student ratings.
18. Do not require a proctor
19. Shall be available for at least 24 hours to allow students sufficient time to participate. Instructors must give students notification at least one week in advance of availability of the student rating questionnaires.
20. If the class meets synchronously face-to-face or online, it is recommended that protected time be provided during class for the completion of student ratings, The protected time should be during the first 15 minutes of the class meeting.

# Data Analysis and Use

# A statistical summary of the quantitative results of the student ratings shall be generated. It shall include the response rate for each class, mean scores, and standard deviations for each item and for the overall score that is a composite of all included items. This summary shall be user-friendly. This summary shall be known as the Statistical Summary.

# the Statistical Summary shall also include adjusted scores that take into account external factors beyond the control of the instructor when such adjustments can be justified by statistical analysis of university-wide student ratings data.

* 1. The instructor and department chair shall receive a copy of the statistical summary and all student comments. In the interest of instructional improvement and fairness to retention/tenure/promotion candidates, these copies should be provided as soon as possible after final grades are turned in. Candidates for retention/ tenure/ promotion should have priority over temporary and tenured faculty in the receipt of this information.
	2. The dean shall receive a copy of the statistical summary , without student comments. After final grades are turned in by the instructor, the Statistical Summary shall be placed in the Personnel Action File and the faculty member appropriately notified by the Dean’s Office. Upon notification, the faculty member shall maintain the right to submit a formal rebuttal letter into the PAF until the end of the next semester.
	3. The department chair shall review the student comments in a timely fashion for evidence of violations of university policy.
	4. The department chair, personnel committees, the dean, and the Provost shall compare quantitative data from the Statistical Summary against departmental standards for evaluation of teaching effectiveness. The standard must be a minimum threshold, not a departmental or other average.

# Only the overall score (not the subscores for Design, Delivery, and Instruction) may be considered as a basis of personnel decisions. Mean scores must be interpreted in conjunction with their response rate and standard deviations so that mean score scores that are not statistically reliable are not used as grounds for personnel decisions.

1. Data collected from the assessment of teaching effectiveness will be housed in the Offices of the Academic Senate on behalf of the Academic Assembly.
2. Student ratings data shall not be used for any extraordinary purposes including, but not limited to, comparison of programs, departments, colleges, or any external entity or institution without the approval of the Academic Senate.
3. **Overall Evaluation of Teaching Performance**
4. The data from peer evaluations and student ratings shall be used in personnel decisions relating to retention, tenure and promotion.
5. Information obtained from peer evaluation reports and/or student rating questionnaires shall be confidential. Possession or use of this information shall be restricted to
6. the instructor, who may at his/her discretion, make such information available to others;
7. those charged with conducting evaluations or administering this policy;
8. those with access to the Personnel Action File.

# For recommendations regarding personnel actions such as retention, tenure and promotion, five year review, contract renewal of lecturers, and peer evaluation of courses, the statistical summary of student ratings along with other appropriate information in the Personnel Action File shall be assessed to identify patterns and trends of teaching performance and effectiveness.

# The preparation of the overall assessment of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted by a review committee composed of faculty of appropriate rank. Probationary faculty may only perform evaluations of temporary faculty. In general, tenured faculty shall be evaluated only by other tenured faculty at a higher rank, except full professors who may evaluate faculty at any rank.

# It is recommended that quantitative student ratings count for between 30 and 50 percent of the assessment of any instructor.
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