REVISED POLICY ON THE ADMINISTRATION AND PROCESSING OF

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION FORMS[1]

Policy #S03-213

(Formerly A.S. Policy #S01-213)

At its meeting of March 11, 2003, the Academic Senate approved by resolution the following revision to the policy on the Administration and Processing of Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation Forms.

1. Written and/or verbal explanations provided to students shall make clear the purpose of the evaluation.

2. Whenever possible, student evaluation forms should be distributed and their completion supervised by a teaching assistant, colleague, or office staff member.

   1. If this is not possible, the instructor shall: inform the department chair; and assign a reliable student who will distribute the evaluation forms, read the instructions aloud, and collect the finished forms and take them immediately after class to a designated person or location for further processing.
1. Before the evaluation is conducted, the instructor shall inform the office staff of
the name of the person who will collect the finished evaluation forms and deliver
them to the designated person or location.

5. The evaluation process is subject to ADA regulations.

6. The instructor shall not be in the room when students are completing the teaching
effectiveness rating form.

7. Before leaving the classroom, the instructor shall inform the students that their
responses are anonymous and that they are not to write their names on the evaluation forms. The instructor shall inform
the students that he/she will receive the results only after course grades have been posted.

1. Under no circumstance shall the instructor have access to the evaluation data
until the final grades for the course have been posted.

1. All teaching effectiveness instruments shall include six university core items. Colleges and departments are
encouraged to add items to the actual instrument. The core items are as follows:

1. The instructor defined the course objectives, learning activities, requirements
and grading policies clearly in the syllabus.
2. The course was organized in a way that helped my learning.

3. The instructor created experiences that stimulated my learning.

4. The instructor provided helpful and timely feedback on my performance and
progress throughout the semester.

5. The instructor was open to a variety of points of view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For item 6, please rate the overall effectiveness of your instructor on a scale ranging from the most positive response (highly effective) to the least positive response (ineffective).

6. When I consider the contribution to my learning, this instructor’s teaching was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Standardized instructions for responding to the six university core items as recommended by the Academic Senate Task Force on Teaching Effectiveness, 1994 shall be as follows:

Please evaluate the teaching effectiveness of your instructor. Your responses will be used in retention, tenure, and promotion decisions and post-tenure reviews so please take them seriously. Your responses are intended to be anonymous, and your instructor will receive this feedback after course grades have been assigned.

For items 1-6, rate the item on a scale ranging from the most positive response (a) to the least positive response (e). Use a #2 pencil to mark the letter on the scanning form that best represents your view.

***APPROVED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE AT ITS MEETING ON MARCH 11TH, 2003***

[1] The cycle of review for all temporary, tenure-track, and tenured faculty shall coincide with any process specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, e.g. Article 15.14 in the July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2001 CBA.