CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA

ACADEMIC SENATE

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

REPORT TO

THE ACADEMIC SENATE

FA-002-201

Revision and Updating of Policy 1329

Faculty Affairs Committee   Date: 1/27/2021

Executive Committee
Received and Forwarded   Date: 4/07/2021

Academic Senate   Date: 4/14/2021
                                                <u>First Reading</u>

Referral

Revision and Updating of Policy 1329

Background

The remote work environment needed for continuing university operations during the COVID-19 pandemic has made it more evident that Policy #1329 needs to be reviewed and adjusted. One important aspect university-wide is the elimination of paper-based processes and the need for wet signatures. Advantages are, savings in time, labor, paper, ink, copier contracts and associated costs for all these, therefore promoting more environmentally friendly and sustainable practices. Improvement of security is also important as Faculty Affairs has received reports of missing paper forms for entire courses due to mishandling, as well as evaluations that did not get done because the paper forms were placed on someone's mailbox and forgotten and never administered. Another important advantage is expediting the reports sent to faculty by eliminating the step requiring scanning of paper forms.

Allowing the students to provide written input through the official student evaluations of teaching after they complete the questionnaires is another sought change as discussed by Provost Alva with the Faculty Affairs Committee last Academic Year.

One last aspect is converting the wet signature requirement for student input outside the classroom official evaluations, to an electronic signature or other alternative means to confirm the identity of the sender to eliminate the need for letter printing and scanning. Input could be accepted if the student sends from the CPP email account while also providing their Bronco ID number as currently required.

The outcomes/actions requested:

  • Modify the policy so that the fully online system currently use continues after the
     mandated remote work environment due to the pandemic ends.
  • Allow for written comments from students in the in-class student evaluations of
     teaching.
  • Allow for digital signature or alternative electronic means to confirm identity for out of
     the class student comments.

Resources: • Jeanette Baez, Interim Executive Director, Institutional Research, Planning, and Analytics • Tim Raymond, Executive Director, IT Applications, Information Technology and Institutional Planning • Martin Sancho-Madriz, AVP Faculty Affairs • Policy #1329 • Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 15 "Evaluation" • Faculty evaluation policies at other CSU campuses

Discussion

The Faculty Affairs committee (FAC) examined other policies regarding online student evaluations at the other California State Universities as well as consulted with Victoria Bhavsar from CAFE. During this evaluation process, it was noted that the best practice for online student evaluations would be to have the potential window of administration of student

evaluations be between the beginning of week 13 and the end of week 14 of a standard academic semester.

To address poor response rates of online student evaluation, it has been suggested that it be made mandatory that faculty teaching asynchronous classes display on their course homepage a statement encouraging student participation. Further, for synchronous classes, faculty must devote at least 15 minutes of synchronous class time to the completion of the student evaluations of teaching. Because faculty are going to need to devote class time to having students complete online student evaluations, faculty teaching synchronous courses should have the ability to restrict the completion of the student evaluation until that allotted time is provided during class. This would also make the process commensurate with the implementation of the previous paper-based student evaluations of teaching at Cal Poly Pomona.

Finally, student comments should be added to student evaluations; however, given research has shown that people of color and women receive disproportionately more negative and irrelevant comments, the written (open-ended) responses by students should only be given to the instructor. These comments should neither go in the Personal Action File (PAF) nor be used in either performance reviews or periodic evaluations. Note: The inclusion of open-ended questions in the formal student evaluation process has no impact on out-of-class-evaluation comments that are signed by the student.

<u>Recommendations</u>

The FAC recommends the revised policy 1329 be adopted. These revisions would make all student evaluations of teaching online and allow for students to write responses as part of the student evaluation process that are only given to the faculty member.

The FAC also recommends that Cal Poly Pomona make sure that the University secure access to a service that allows for student evaluations to be carried out in a manner specified in this revised policy.

Finally, the FAC recommend the revised 1329 remove all language of "evaluation committees." It does not appear that departments maintain standing committees to provide evaluations of student evaluations of teaching summaries. Further, it is the FAC's belief that the interpretation of evaluations be made by periodic evaluation (Lecturer Review and PTR) and performance review (RTP) committees and that guidance regarding the departments' guidelines for interpretating the summaries of student evaluations of teaching be discussed in those relevant documents.