RESOLUTION ON
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

WHEREAS, The present guidelines are out-of-date; and

WHEREAS, The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the California State University and Unit 3 faculty addresses the issue of student evaluation; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Administrative Bulletin 74-1 be deleted from the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the new guidelines be included in CAM as Administrative Bulletin 88--

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
March 1, 1988
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1. Student evaluations will be conducted in accordance with sections 15.14, 15.15, and 15.16 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between The California State University (CSU) and Unit 3-Faculty.

2. The primary purpose of this student evaluation program is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program at Cal Poly.

3. The results of this student evaluation program will be used for both the improvement of instruction, and in partial substantiation of recommendations in appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. They will also be considered during the post-tenure peer review process.

4. Annually, a minimum of two (2) classes of each instructor shall participate in this student evaluation program.

5. The student evaluation form and additional procedures used by any department shall be in accordance with these guidelines and shall be endorsed by the department faculty, department head/chair, and dean of the appropriate school. Student opinion regarding the form and additional procedures of any department shall be considered prior to the dean's endorsement through consultation with the student council of the school.

6. The following procedures shall be used in the administration of student evaluations:
   (a) each department is responsible for providing its faculty with copies of these guidelines and any other procedures covering student evaluation of faculty in order to ensure that proper procedures are followed.
   (b) 10-20 minutes of class time will be provided by the faculty member for the student evaluation process in each class in which s/he is being evaluated. During this time, the faculty member shall be absent from the classroom.
   (c) only students officially enrolled in the class will be permitted to participate.

7. Subsequent to the issuance of the grades for the quarter in which a faculty member has been evaluated using this process, the results (as defined in department procedures) of this program shall be made available to the faculty member, his/her department head/chair and the custodian of the faculty member's personnel action file. The results shall be included in the faculty member's personnel action file.

8. If the results of a department's student evaluation form include written comments in addition to quantitative data, then any summary of the written comments must be approved by the faculty member being evaluated. If the faculty member feels that the summary is inaccurate, then all of the written comments shall be placed in the personnel action file.
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

I. The primary purpose of student evaluation of faculty is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

II. Evaluation Instruments should be developed with emphasis on those factors which students are especially capable of evaluating (e.g. course organization, quality of presentation, grading procedures, examinations, etc.).

III. All classes (except for individual supervision courses) of every instructor shall participate in the student evaluation of faculty program at least annually.

IV. Only students officially enrolled in an instructor's class will be permitted to participate in the evaluation. No signature or other methods by which individual students could be identified are to be requested on the evaluation form.

V. The results of the annual evaluation will be used for both improvement of instruction and in partial substantiation of recommendations on faculty personnel actions regarding promotion, retention and tenure. There will be only one official evaluation required annually.

VI. Subsequent to the issuance of the grades for the quarter for which the faculty member has been evaluated, the results of the program of student evaluation of faculty shall be made available to the individual faculty member, his tenured colleagues and department head for their deliberations and recommendations regarding personnel actions, and for the individual's aid in improving his performance.

VII. To allow for obvious lack of similarity of various instructional programs, each of the seven schools shall be entitled to its own evaluation form. Additionally, it might be necessary for a department to develop its own evaluation instrument if its best interests will be served in that manner. The specific form, questions and methods of reporting results for the several types of instruction offered in any individual school or department shall be endorsed by the faculty, department head and dean of that department or school. Student school councils are charged with the responsibility of obtaining representative student opinion which shall be considered in the development of the questionnaire.

VIII. Each department is responsible for furnishing its faculty with copies of these guidelines as well as with the necessary instructions to insure that proper procedures be followed in the administration of the evaluation. During any one quarter, faculty will provide not more than twenty-five minutes of any one class for the time necessary to complete the evaluation process. During the evaluation process, the instructor shall be absent from the classroom with the evaluation being administered in the classroom by students.
Memorandum

To: A. Charles Crabb, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
    President

Subject: Academic Senate Resolution on Student Evaluation of Faculty (AS-284-88/PPC)

I have reviewed the subject resolution together with the modifications which were made as a result of the consultation which occurred among Malcolm Wilson, Paul Murphy, and you. I appreciate the effort which has gone into this document. I believe that it is an improvement over the current Administrative Bulletin 74-1.

I particularly appreciate Item two which asserts that the primary purpose of the student evaluation program is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program at Cal Poly. To further that goal, I would appreciate it if the Academic Senate would explore the possibility of including language which would provide for evaluation of all courses and course sections taught by probationary faculty during at least the initial few years of their probationary period.

I believe feedback on their teaching effectiveness across the full spectrum of the courses they teach can be of significant benefit to new faculty as they seek to develop and enhance their teaching skills. Furthermore, evaluation of all courses and course sections taught would allow for more effective counsel from senior faculty and department heads/chairs as they assist new faculty in their professional growth. A similar strategy for lecturers would also seem to be important to the goal of improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program.

I believe that it is important for our tenured faculty, who have the primary responsibility for the quality and effectiveness of our instructional programs, to have the benefit of the most complete data possible upon which to base their performance evaluations when they are faced with making critical decisions on retention, promotion, and tenure. And, I believe that it is fairer to our probationary employees if we can avoid the potential for distortion which can occur when our judgments are based on a limited sample.
To: Malcolm Wilson

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION ON STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY (AS-284-88/PPC)

Attached is a copy of the subject resolution forwarded to me by the Chair of the Academic Senate. I would appreciate your having this recommendation reviewed with the Deans' Council. I am particularly interested in your and the Deans' Council's reactions and recommendations relative to the proposed changes which apparently reduces the number of evaluations and presumably the number of students participating in these evaluations.

Attachment
State of California

Memorandum

To: A. Charles Crabb, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
   President

Subject: Academic Senate Resolution on Student Evaluation of Faculty (AS-284-88/PPC)

Date: August 25, 1988

I have reviewed the subject resolution together with the modifications which were made as a result of the consultation which occurred among Malcolm Wilson, Paul Murphy, and you. I appreciate the effort which has gone into this document. I believe that it is an improvement over the current Administrative Bulletin 74-1.

I particularly appreciate Item two which asserts that the primary purpose of the student evaluation program is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program at Cal Poly. To further that goal, I would appreciate it if the Academic Senate would explore the possibility of including language which would provide for evaluation of all courses and course sections taught by probationary faculty during at least the initial few years of their probationary period.

I believe feedback on their teaching effectiveness across the full spectrum of the courses they teach can be of significant benefit to new faculty as they seek to develop and enhance their teaching skills. Furthermore, evaluation of all courses and course sections taught would allow for more effective counsel from senior faculty and department heads/chairs as they assist new faculty in their professional growth. A similar strategy for lecturers would also seem to be important to the goal of improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program.

I believe that it is important for our tenured faculty, who have the primary responsibility for the quality and effectiveness of our instructional programs, to have the benefit of the most complete data possible upon which to base their performance evaluations when they are faced with making critical decisions on retention, promotion, and tenure. And, I believe that it is fairer to our probationary employees if we can avoid the potential for distortion which can occur when our judgments are based on a limited sample.
MEMORANDUM

To: Warren J. Baker  
President

From: Malcolm W. Wilson  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Academic Senate Resolution on Student Evaluation of Faculty (AS-284-88/PPC)

The Academic Deans’ Council, at its June 6, 1988 meeting, reviewed the above subject resolution of the Academic Senate. Attached is a revised document which includes the recommendations of the Academic Deans’ Council and which also has been endorsed by the Chair of the Academic Senate. In addition, the document has been reviewed by Michael Suess of the Personnel Office.

It was recommended that the specific portions of the Faculty Unit Contract pertaining to student evaluation of faculty be incorporated into the campus policy document. With the specific language incorporated into the document, #4 of the resolution was deleted. The previous #8 (now #7) was reworded to more clearly state the objective of this section. Regarding #5, the word "school/" was added to all references to department faculty (now reading "school/department faculty").

I recommend your approval of the revised resolution. If you approve, this will establish a new campus policy on the subject of student evaluation of faculty, and the current Administrative Bulletin 74-1 will need to be revised. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Attachment
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1. Student evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the following sections of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between The California State University (CSU) and Unit 3-Faculty:

15.14 Written student questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. A minimum of two (2) classes annually for each faculty unit employee shall have such written student evaluations. Student evaluation shall be conducted in classes representative of the faculty unit employee's teaching assignment. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File. Unless consultation with an academic unit has resulted in an agreement by the administration and faculty to evaluate all classes, the classes to be evaluated shall be jointly determined in consultation between the faculty unit employee being evaluated and his/her department chair. In the event of disagreement, each party shall select 50% of the total courses to be evaluated.

15.15 Students may, with the concurrence of the department and administrator, be provided an opportunity to consult with the department peer review committee.

15.16 a. Student evaluations collected as part of the regular student evaluation process shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section. The format of student evaluations shall be quantitative (e.g., "Scrantron" (sic) form, etc.) or a combination of quantitative and qualitative (e.g., space provided on the quantitative form for student comments).

b. Any student communications or evaluations provided outside of the regular evaluation process must be identified by name to be included in a Personnel or Personnel Action File.

2. The primary purpose of this student evaluation program is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program at Cal Poly.

3. The result of this student evaluation program will be used for both the improvement of instruction, and in partial substantiation of recommendations in appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. They will also be considered during the post-tenure peer review process.

4. The student evaluation form and additional procedure used by any school/department shall be in accordance with these guidelines and shall be endorsed by the school/department faculty, department head/chair, and approved by the dean. Deans shall send a copy of approved forms and procedures, or revisions thereof, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Student opinion regarding the form and additional procedures of any school/department shall be considered prior to the dean's approval through consultation with the student council of the school.
5. The following procedures shall be used in the administration of student evaluations:

(a) each department is responsible for providing its faculty with copies of these guidelines and any other procedures covering student evaluation of faculty in order to ensure that proper procedures are followed.

(b) 10-20 minutes of class time will be provided by the faculty member for the student evaluation process in each class in which s/he is being evaluated. During this time, the faculty member shall be absent from the classroom.

(c) only students officially enrolled in the class will be permitted to participate.

6. Subsequent to the issuance of the grades for the quarter in which a faculty member has been evaluated using this process, the results (as defined in school/department procedures) of this program shall be made available to the faculty member, his/her department head/chair and the custodian of the faculty member's personnel action file. The results shall be included in the faculty member's personnel action file.

7. If written comments from student evaluation forms are included in the personnel file, they may be either in summary form or by inclusion of all the written comments. If a summary is used, it must be approved by the faculty member being evaluated.
Memorandum

To: Malcolm Wilson

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION ON STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY (AS-284-88/PPC)

Attached is a copy of the subject resolution forwarded to me by the Chair of the Academic Senate. I would appreciate your having this recommendation reviewed with the Deans' Council. I am particularly interested in your and the Deans' Council's reactions and recommendations relative to the proposed changes which apparently reduces the number of evaluations and presumably the number of students participating in these evaluations.

Attachment
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1. Student evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the following sections of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between The California State University (CSU) and Unit 3-Faculty:

15.14 Written student questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. A minimum of two (2) classes annually for each faculty unit employee shall have such written student evaluations. Student evaluation shall be conducted in classes representative of the faculty unit employee's teaching assignment. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File. Unless consultation with an academic unit has resulted in an agreement by the administration and faculty to evaluate all classes, the classes to be evaluated shall be jointly determined in consultation between the faculty unit employee being evaluated and his/her department chair. In the event of disagreement, each party shall select 50% of the total courses to be evaluated.

15.15 Students may, with the concurrence of the department and administrator, be provided an opportunity to consult with the department peer review committee.

15.16 a. Student evaluations collected as part of the regular student evaluation process shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section. The format of student evaluations shall be quantitative (e.g., "Scrantron" (sic) form, etc.) or a combination of quantitative and qualitative (e.g., space provided on the quantitative form for student comments).

b. Any student communications or evaluations provided outside of the regular evaluation process must be identified by name to be included in a Personnel or Personnel Action File.

2. The primary purpose of this student evaluation program is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program at Cal Poly.

3. The result of this student evaluation program will be used for both the improvement of instruction, and in partial substantiation of recommendations in appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. They will also be considered during the post-tenure peer review process.

4. The student evaluation form and additional procedure used by any school/department shall be in accordance with these guidelines and shall be endorsed by the school/department faculty, department head/chair, and dean of the appropriate school. Student opinion regarding the form and additional procedures of any school/department shall be considered prior to the dean's endorsement through consultation with the student council of the school.

5. The following procedures shall be used in the administration of student evaluations:
(a) each department is responsible for providing its faculty with copies of these guidelines and any other procedures covering student evaluation of faculty in order to ensure that proper procedures are followed.

(b) 10-20 minutes of class time will be provided by the faculty member for the student evaluation process in each class in which s/he is being evaluated. During this time, the faculty member shall be absent from the classroom.

(c) only students officially enrolled in the class will be permitted to participate.

6. Subsequent to the issuance of the grades for the quarter in which a faculty member has been evaluated using this process, the results (as defined in department procedures) of this program shall be made available to the faculty member, his/her department head/chair and the custodian of the faculty member's personnel action file. The results shall be included in the faculty member's personnel action file.

7. If written comments from student evaluation forms are included in the personnel file, they may be either in summary form or by inclusion of all the written comments. If a summary is used, it must be approved by the faculty member being evaluated.
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1. Student evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the following sections of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between The California State University (CSU) and Unit 3-Faculty:

15.14 Written student questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. A minimum of two (2) classes annually for each faculty unit employee shall have such written student evaluations. Student evaluation shall be conducted in classes representative of the faculty unit employee's teaching assignment. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File. Unless consultation with an academic unit has resulted in an agreement by the administration and faculty to evaluate all classes, the classes to be evaluated shall be jointly determined in consultation between the faculty unit employee being evaluated and his/her department chair. In the event of disagreement, each party shall select 50% of the total courses to be evaluated.

15.15 Students may, with the concurrence of the department and administrator, be provided an opportunity to consult with the department peer review committee.

15.16 a. Student evaluations collected as part of the regular student evaluation process shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section. The format of student evaluations shall be quantitative (e.g., "Scrantron" (sic) form, etc.) or a combination of quantitative and qualitative (e.g., space provided on the quantitative form for student comments).

b. Any student communications or evaluations provided outside of the regular evaluation process must be identified by name to be included in a Personnel or Personnel Action File.

2. The primary purpose of this student evaluation program is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program at Cal Poly.

3. The result of this student evaluation program will be used for both the improvement of instruction, and in partial substantiation of recommendations in appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. They will also be considered during the post-tenure peer review process.

4. The student evaluation form and additional procedure used by any school/department shall be in accordance with these guidelines and shall be endorsed by the school/department faculty, department head/chair, and dean of the appropriate school. Student opinion regarding the form and additional procedures of any school/department shall be considered prior to the dean's endorsement through consultation with the student council of the school.

5. The following procedures shall be used in the administration of student evaluations:
(a) each department is responsible for providing its faculty with copies of these guidelines and any other procedures covering student evaluation of faculty in order to ensure that proper procedures are followed.

(b) 10-20 minutes of class time will be provided by the faculty member for the student evaluation process in each class in which s/he is being evaluated. During this time, the faculty member shall be absent from the classroom.

(c) only students officially enrolled in the class will be permitted to participate.

6. Subsequent to the issuance of the grades for the quarter in which a faculty member has been evaluated using this process, the results (as defined in department procedures) of this program shall be made available to the faculty member, his/her department head/chair and the custodian of the faculty member's personnel action file. The results shall be included in the faculty member's personnel action file.

7. If written comments from student evaluation forms are included in the personnel file, they may be either in summary form or by inclusion of all the written comments. If a summary is used, it must be approved by the faculty member being evaluated.
6/6/88

Dear Council,

Summary of Recommendations for AS Re. on Student Induction of Faculty (AS 284.88/39C)

1) Add to policy the M.O.U. dates -- 10/14, 10/15, and 10/16. (Accept #3 wording)

2) Reconstruct #8

3) Change #5 to add the phrase... "/school" to the end of the first line.

4) Note: Add some new language on #4 that would be more specific

[Signature]

Cheryl A. Oliver
9:00 A.M.