

**CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA
POLICY NO: 1329**

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The purpose of this document is to set forth the University policy and procedures on student evaluation of teaching performance. This policy is consistent with those 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 only one element to be considered by faculty evaluation committees in assessing the quality of teaching performance of colleagues. Other ~~indices~~ indices of the quality of teaching performance include (i) direct observations by peers in classroom; (ii) judgments about the quality of instructional materials; (iii) judgment about the appropriateness of examinations and examination procedures, (iv) maintenance of academic standards, etc.
- B. If student evaluation programs for librarian faculty unit employees, counselor faculty unit employees, and coaching faculty unit employees are established, the evaluation process shall be developed by a committee comprised of faculty unit employees and appropriate administrators. (CBA 15.18)
- 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 this policy.
- E. Administration of student evaluations shall ensure anonymity of the students participating in the evaluation process. 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.
- F. Departmental-University procedures shall include safeguards which preclude tampering or other activities ~~which may~~ that may invalidate the results of the evaluation.
- G. Student eEvaluation results should be delivered no later than five days after grades are due ~~the end of the second week of the following academic term subject to the as long as the grades have been submitted as stated in~~ provision ~~under~~ (E) above.

H. All student evaluations shall be administered electronically between the start of the 13th week and the end of the 14th week of the academic semester. There are two exceptions: One, when multiple instructors teach a class, the evaluation for each individual instructor shall take place during the last two weeks of the instructional period of each individual instructor. Two, when the duration of a course spans fewer than 15 weeks the evaluation shall take place during the last ~~two weeks~~ of the instructional period.

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

I. For synchronous classes, faculty shall set aside at least 15 minutes for students to complete the evaluations during class. During the survey time, faculty shall leave the virtual/on-campus environment. Faculty shall have the option to have the student evaluation period remain open ~~survey open~~ for the entire two-week window or only during the allotted class time.

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

J. Anonymous ~~w~~ritten comments as part of the student evaluations shall be for instructor use only and shall be ~~only~~ given directly and only to the instructor. Written comments and shall not be part of the PAF and shall not be used for any periodic evaluation or performance reviews.

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

H.

~~15 weeks the evaluation shall take place during the last two weeks of the instructional period.~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.1", Right: 0", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

I.K. There 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 of individual student's comments by a faculty member on their ~~his/her~~ own behalf, or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is considered unprofessional and is prohibited.

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 the content of responses to the evaluation instrument is unethical and is prohibited.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.03"

Formatted: Strikethrough

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 in the evaluation of faculty must be submitted as a written, signed statement. ~~comment requires that it be reduced to a written, signed statement.~~

Formatted: Tab stops: 0.69", Left

2.0 Out-of-Class Evaluation Comments

At any time a student may submit a letter/petition expressing [their/his/her](#) opinion of the teaching performance of a faculty member. Such a letter/petition must be signed and addressed either to the chair of the appropriate department or to the chair of the appropriate departmental evaluation committee. The letter/petition must include the Bronco Identification Number of all student [signers/ators](#). The department chair/chair of the appropriate department evaluation committee must provide the faculty member with copies of such letters/petitions [in a timely manner](#). The faculty member shall be allowed at least 10 calendar days to provide a rebuttal. Any rebuttal provided by the faculty members shall be attached to the original letter/petition and placed in the faculty member's Personnel Action File (PAF). Letters/petitions received as the result of appropriate solicitations by the evaluation committee (Section 3.2 of Policy 1328 of the University Manual) may be collected and presented as a group to the faculty member.

3.0 Official Student Evaluation of Teaching

All student evaluation summary sheets ([but not the anonymous written comments](#)) shall become part of the faculty member's Personnel Action File.

3.1 Frequency of Official Student Evaluation

3.1.1 Student questionnaire evaluations are required for all faculty unit employees who teach (CBA 15.15).

3.1.2 All classes taught by each faculty unit employee shall be evaluated (CBA 15.15). Courses that were not subject to student evaluation by a department prior to Winter Quarter 2013 shall continue to be exempt. Low enrollment class sections (5 or less students) [or supervisory courses \(i.e., courses including supervised research, thesis research, comprehensive exams, etc.\)](#) shall also be exempt from this requirement, unless the department by a majority vote of its probationary and tenured faculty members establishes a department policy to evaluate such classes or any other department courses. The department policy may be reviewed and changed by the department on an annual basis by spring term and revisions would apply the following Academic Year. Course evaluation requirements apply equally to probationary, tenured and temporary faculty.

Departments by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members may submit to the President or [her/his/their](#) designee (CBA 15.15) a request to have fewer

classes evaluated and shall include the reasons for the request. If the request is granted fewer classes would be evaluated. Approvals for such requests will be effective for a maximum of five years, subject to renewal.

3.1.3 In special circumstances, a faculty member may request an exemption from having ~~his/her~~[their](#) classes evaluated in a certain term. This exemption is restricted to conditions interfering with teaching such as prolonged illness, jury duty, maternity/paternity leave, or other events that could significantly affect the faculty member's attendance to his/her assigned classes. The faculty member may make this request to the department chair who, in consultation with the tenured faculty of the department, shall make a recommendation to the President or ~~her/his~~[their](#) designee who shall make the final decision regarding the exemption request.

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. Departments are encouraged to ensure that evaluation instruments are reliable and valid for the purpose of collecting data for summative evaluation of faculty. [The Center for Faculty Advancement and Excellence \(CAFÉ\)](#) ~~The Faculty Center for Professional Development~~ can provide resources and consultation to this end and faculty are urged to contact the center when developing evaluation instruments.

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. However, outside the official student evaluation process, student opinion may be a source of information for faculty members in making regular assessments of their own teaching performance may allow for written comments. Departments will determine the prompts for these questions. These written comments will be provided to the faculty member with the numerical summaries of the closed-ended questions. However, only the numerical summaries of the close-ended questions shall be placed in the Personal Action File (PAF) and used for either periodic reviews or performance evaluations of faculty.~~

~~The instruments may be designed for in-class evaluation and administered to an assembled class or for online distant evaluation of the class through the Internet.~~

3.3 Conduct of the Student Evaluations

~~Online student evaluations shall be used only for classes that are designated asynchronous local, synchronous local, fully asynchronous, or fully synchronous.~~ Procedures for conducting ~~in-class and online~~ student evaluations for both synchronous and asynchronous courses should be developed consistent with the following policies.

- ~~A.~~ A brief procedure statement shall be written and approved by each department. For ~~in-class evaluation~~ synchronous courses the faculty member shall provide time during the scheduled class meeting for students to complete student evaluations. During this time, the faculty member shall excuse themselves from the classroom or online environment. ~~on, the statement shall be distributed or read in-class when the student evaluations are conducted.~~ For asynchronous courses, a statement informing student about the student evaluations shall be displayed on the course homepage for a sufficient duration of time to administer the evaluation instrument.
- A. ~~online evaluation, the statement encouraging survey participation shall be displayed on the course homepage for a sufficient duration of time prior to the conduct of the survey questionnaire.~~
- B. The process shall ensure that the evaluation ~~form-instrument~~ designated by the department for the class is used for evaluation of the class.
- ~~C.~~ Each ~~in-class evaluation shall be conducted by a person other than the faculty member being evaluated. To ensure the confidentiality of the process, the completed in-class evaluation instruments shall be delivered in a closed and sealed envelope to a location and/or person designated by the department chair.~~
- ~~D.~~ C. All evaluations shall ensure that each student can only complete one evaluation instrument survey and that students are not allowed to alter their responses after submission.
- ~~E.~~ D. The process shall produce a numerical summary of the evaluation results showing frequency distribution of responses by category. Printed copies of the summary results shall be produced. ~~One A~~ copy of the summary results shall be delivered to the department chair. ~~A One~~ copy of the summary results together with the student response to each question in ~~print or~~ electronic form shall be delivered to the faculty member. In addition, all written comments will shall be compiled and electronically shared exclusively with the faculty.
- ~~F.~~ For ~~online evaluation, a secured electronic file containing the responses by each student participating in the survey shall be prepared and delivered to the faculty member.~~

Commented [A1]: Can this go?

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.5", Right: 0", Line spacing: Multiple 1 li, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: A, B, C, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.1" + Indent at: 1.1"

~~G.E.~~ The process shall collect aggregate data on response rate to the survey and report the percentage of the students enrolled in the class who completed the survey on the summary sheet described in ~~(C.E)~~ above.

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1 li

~~3.4~~ ~~Analysis of the Results of Official Student Evaluations~~

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

3.4.1 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.

~~3.4.2 The summary of the official student evaluations shall be numerical. A computer printout and t showing frequency distribution of responses to questions by category ("excellent", "good", etc.) shall suffice as the numerical summary.~~

Formatted: Strikethrough

~~3.4.33.4.2 The evaluation committee's interpretation of the results of the student evaluation for evaluation of faculty performance 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. Departmental committees are urged to strive to use best practices in interpreting student evaluation data to create their statements. The Faculty Center for Professional Development can provide resources and consultation to this end.~~

Formatted: Strikethrough

~~3.4.43.4.3 Interpretation of the results of student evaluations for evaluation of the faculty performance is the responsibility of the appropriate department evaluation committee. Evaluation committee members must not participate in the interpretation of their own evaluations.~~

Formatted: Strikethrough

~~3.4.53.4.4 The department evaluation committee may develop 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/term taught of those evaluations being considered.~~

~~3.43.5~~ ~~Disposition of Student Evaluations and Analysis Summaries~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.1", Hanging: 0.01"

~~3.4.15.1 No analysis or other evaluation material shall be given to a faculty member before grades for the class evaluated have been submitted. The results of the student evaluations shall be securely given to the faculty within 5 days of when grades are due of the end of the grading period.~~

3.4.2 The summary of the official student evaluations shall be numerical and show frequency distribution of responses to questions by category ("excellent", "good", etc.) and shall suffice as the numerical summary.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.09", Hanging: 0.64", No bullets or numbering

3.45.32 The ~~analyses of results summaries~~ of ~~the~~ official student evaluations shall be placed in the PAF of the affected faculty member, excluding comments. A faculty member shall not have the option to choose ~~those analyses~~which summaries are to be placed in ~~his/her~~their PAF.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.5", Right: 0", Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

3.45.43 The faculty member shall be provided a complete copy of the ~~analyses summaries~~student evaluations before they are placed in the PAF; ~~he/she~~the faculty member 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.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.5"

3.45.54 Normally, the summaries of student only the analysis summaries of the results of evaluations shall be physically placed in the PAF.

3.45.65 ~~Original copies of questionnaires for in-class evaluations and~~ The electronic file of student responses ~~for online evaluations~~ become the property of the faculty member evaluated.

3.56 Use of the Analyses Summaries

The ~~analyses summaries~~ 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.

Written comments will not be used in any periodic evaluations or performance reviews.