

## APPENDIX 10

### STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The purpose of this Appendix is to set forth University policy and procedures on student evaluation of teaching performance. The Appendix is consistent with policies of the Trustees of the CSU and with the provisions of the current Unit 3 (Faculty) Collective Bargaining Agreement. The guiding principles in establishing these policies and procedures are as follows:

- a) Evaluations by students are an important element to be considered by faculty evaluation committees in assessing the quality of teaching performance of colleagues. Such evaluations are not the only element which must be considered. Other indexes of the quality of teaching performance include i) direct observations by peers in classroom; ii) judgments about the quality of instructional materials; iii) examinations and examination procedures, iv) maintenance of academic standards, etc.
- b) Student opinion is also a source of information for faculty members in making regular assessments of their own teaching performance;
- c) The department faculty is best prepared to judge the quality of teaching by peers;
- d) The department should be given the maximum possible latitude in collecting, assessing and reporting available information on teaching performance consistent with the policies in this Appendix.

These are two avenues by which students may submit their opinions of teaching performance: official student evaluations and out-of-class evaluation comments. Each of these avenues is addressed separately below (2.0 and 3.0).

#### **1.0 Solicitation of Student Evaluations/Comments**

- 1.1 The only professional manner to solicit student opinion on teaching performance for the purpose of peer review is by posting a public announcement, or by publication of such, or by some other means designed to reach students collectively, not individually.
- 1.2 Any solicitation by a faculty member on his/her own behalf, or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is unprofessional.
- 1.3 The person assigned the responsibility of administering an in-class course evaluation may stress the importance of participating in the process. To attempt to influence responses to the evaluation instrument is unethical.
- 1.4 A department chair, or dean/director may, in response to an unsolicited oral comment from a student, advise the student that any formal consideration of the comment requires that it be reduced to a written, signed statement.

#### **2.0 Out-of-Class Evaluation Comments**

At any time a student may submit a letter/petition expressing his/her opinion of the teaching performance of a faculty member. Such a letter must be signed and addressed either to the chair of the appropriate department or to the chair of the appropriate departmental evaluation committee. The signature must include the student's Permanent Identification Number (PIN). The department chair must provide the faculty member with copies of such letters and allow the faculty member at least 7 days to provide any rebuttal if they are placed in the Personnel Action File (PAF). Letters received as the result of appropriate

solicitations (e.g., by a department at the beginning of an RTP cycle) may be collected and presented as a group to the faculty member.

### **3.0 Official Student Evaluation of Teaching**

Official student evaluations are those administered to a class using a department evaluation instrument. All faculty members who teach are required to ensure that student evaluation of teaching is conducted on their behalf and that the results of these evaluations are placed in their Personnel Action Files.

#### **3.1 Frequency of Official Student Evaluation**

- 3.1.1 The evaluation schedule should be established early in the academic year and allow for modifications occasioned by unexpected changes in teaching assignment.
- 3.1.2 A faculty member in consultation with the department chair may elect the classes he/she wishes to be evaluated provided that a) they represent the scope of his/her teaching assignment, and b) they number **at least two per year**, unless the annual assignment is less than two classes. If the department chair and faculty member disagree on which classes are to be evaluated, each shall select one-half of the total to be evaluated. **All student evaluation summary sheets become part of the faculty member's Personnel Action File (as per CBA 15.14).**
- 3.1.3 A department may establish a policy **by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members** requiring more than two student evaluations per year or a varying number not less than two per year dependent upon rank or probationary status.
- 3.1.4 A faculty member may request that student additional evaluations be conducted on his/her behalf; the department may not refuse such a request unless it is made after a deadline established by the department.

#### **3.2 The Evaluation Instruments**

- 3.2.1 The probationary and tenured faculty of each department or equivalent unit shall design the instruments for official student evaluation. Instruments appropriate to the content, method of instruction, and learning objectives of the course shall be designed by the department. Therefore, there can be more than one instrument used for official student evaluation in a department.
- 3.2.2 The instruments shall be in the form of a questionnaire, responses to which are quantifiable such that a numerical summary can be interpreted in relative terms ("excellent", "good", etc.).
- 3.2.3 The instruments shall *not* provide for written student comments.

The instruments may be designed for in-class evaluation and administered to an assembled class or for on-line distant evaluation of the class through internet.

#### **3.3 Conduct of the In-Class Student Evaluations**

The department shall develop procedures for conducting in-class student evaluations consistent with the following principles:

- a) A brief procedure statement shall be written and approved by each department, and the statement shall be distributed or read in class when the student evaluations are conducted.
- b) Each evaluation shall be conducted by a person other than the faculty member being evaluated; this person preferably will be another faculty member in the department.

- c) Completed evaluation instruments shall be delivered in a closed envelope to the person (not a student) responsible for coordinating in-class evaluations for the department; this person will preferably be the department chair, department secretary, or the chair of the department evaluation committee.
- d) The results of an evaluation shall not be made available to the faculty member being evaluated until after grades for the class have been submitted.
- e) Departmental procedures shall include safeguards which preclude tampering or other activities which may invalidate the results of the evaluation.

### **3.4 Conduct of the On-line Student Evaluations**

The Division of Instructional and Information Technology shall develop procedures for conducting on-line student evaluations consistent with the following principles:

- a) A brief statement shall be written and approved by each department. The statement shall be displayed on the course homepage for a sufficient duration of time prior to conduct of survey questionnaire.
- b) Administration of the on-line evaluations shall ensure anonymity of the students participating in the evaluation process. No data on identity of the students who participated as well as those who choose not to participate in the evaluation process shall be directly or indirectly collected and saved.
- c) The implementation of the on-line evaluation shall ensure that each student can only complete one survey and that students are not allowed to alter their responses after submission.
- d) The implementation process shall ensure that the evaluation form designated by the department for the class is used for online evaluation of the class.
- e) The implementation process shall ensure that the individual student response to each survey question is saved and an electronic file containing the responses by each student participating in the survey is created and delivered to the faculty member after grades for the class have been submitted.
- f) The implementation process for on-line evaluation shall produce a numerical summary of the evaluation results showing frequency distribution of responses by category in printable format. Printed copies of the summary results shall be produced. One copy of the summary results shall be delivered to the department chair. One copy of the summary results together with the student response to each question as described in (e) above shall be delivered to the faculty member. .
- g) The implementation process shall collect aggregate data on response rate to the on-line survey and report the percentage of the students enrolled in the class who completed the on-line survey on the summary sheet described in (f) above..
- h) Online student evaluations shall be completed by the end of 10<sup>th</sup> week of the academic quarter
- i) Evaluation results described under (e) and (f) above should be delivered no later than the end of the second week of the following academic quarter.

### **3.5 Analysis of the Results of Official Student Evaluations**

- 3.5.1 Analysis of the results of in-class evaluations is the exclusive responsibility of the appropriate department evaluation committee. Committee members must not participate in the analysis of their own evaluations.

- 3.5.2 The analysis of the official student evaluations shall consist of a **summary** of the results of the evaluation(s) and an **interpretation** of the results prepared by the department evaluation committee.
- 3.5.3 The summary of the of the official student evaluations shall be numerical. A computer printout showing frequency distribution of responses to questions by category ("excellent", "good", etc.) shall suffice as the numerical summary.
- 3.5.4 The interpretation of the results of the evaluation shall be a written statement, prepared by the department evaluation committee based on the summaries, which identifies the level of performance in terms of departmental standards of expectation. The interpretation shall be an explicit statement which conveys the committee's opinion of the meaning of the summaries upon which it is based.
- 3.5.5 Interpretation of the results of in-class evaluations is the exclusive responsibility of the appropriate department evaluation committee. Committee members must not participate in the interpretation of their own evaluations.
- 3.5.6 The department evaluation committee may provide a composite interpretation of the summaries prepared over the period of time since the last peer evaluation, or it may prepare an interpretation for each class evaluated. In the case of a composite interpretation, the statement must include a list by course/section/quarter taught of those evaluations being considered.

### **3.6 Disposition of Analysis**

- 3.6.1 No analysis or other evaluation material shall be given to a faculty member before grades for the class evaluated have been submitted.
- 3.6.2 The analyses of results of all official student evaluations shall be placed in the PAF of the affected faculty member. A faculty member shall not have the option to choose those analyses to be placed in his/her PAF.
- 3.6.3 The faculty member shall be provided a copy of the analyses before they are placed in the PAF; he/she may rebut any summary or interpretation, or make any comment upon the results of the evaluation within seven days after receiving a copy of the results. Any rebuttal or comment submitted must also be placed in the PAF.
- 3.6.4 Normally only the analysis of the results of evaluations shall be physically placed in the PAF.
- 3.6.5 Original copies of questionnaires for in-class evaluations and the electronic file of student responses for on-line evaluations become the property of the faculty member evaluated.

### **3.7 Use of the Analyses**

The analyses of the results of student evaluation of teaching serve as one of the elements by which peer review committees evaluate the quality of teaching performance. They are a source of information contained in the PAF available to RTP committees, post-tenure review committees, temporary faculty review committees, and other committees of tenured faculty charged with recommending actions based in part or wholly upon teaching performance.