

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD**

DESIGNATION CODE: 1985-86 FAC 5  
DATE SUBMITTED: February 20, 1986

TO: Members of the Academic Senate  
FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee  
SUBJECT: Summaries of Student Evaluation for Personnel Files  
PURPOSE: Action by the Senate

ACTION  
REQUESTED: That The Senate Adopt Proposed Policy

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The Senate requested that FAC review campus policies concerning maintenance of faculty personnel files in the light of the Chancellor's memo FSR 84-31. The Senate also requested that FAC consider a proposal from Professor Richard Rivenes, School of Education, regarding the size of dossiers. We contacted all members of recent School and University P&T Committees as well as others with relevant information.

Here are the main points of agreement. Dossiers have grown considerably. While there are several reasons for this, the worst offender is the required student evaluations. Although it is desirable to reduce the size of dossiers, it is more important to leave the candidate free to place in the dossier what he or she wishes. Reducing the size of dossiers can best be achieved by eliminating out-of-date material, most notably student evaluations more than five years old. The five year rule is already an approved campus practice. It should be noted that nothing in this proposal prevents the candidate from including all or part of these evaluations in the candidate's portion of the dossier.

Summarizing the statistical portion of the evaluations seemed to us not to pose a problem but attempts to summarize comments present problems of accuracy and fairness. These are best handled by using only the original comment pages, in the student's own handwriting, and retaining any graphics or graffiti the student may have included, thereby allowing a reader the opportunity to judge the weight and seriousness of the comments.

The following policy proposal, together with the accompanying revision of the Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy and Procedures of the Faculty Handbook, are recommendations resulting from that consideration. These are being presented to you as two separate items to allow you the greatest flexibility in dealing with them but obviously they go together and could reasonably be combined.

Note: FSR 84-31 is attached to 1985-86 FAC 6 for further information.

POLICY ON SUMMARY OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS

(85-86 FAC 5, Approved Academic Senate 4/29/86, President Approved 5/2/86)

Summary of student evaluations shall be construed to include (1) for each multiple choice question, a frequency distribution of student responses and may include other descriptive statistics, and, 2) a reference to the location of the original written student comments.

California State University, Hayward

A POLICY PROVIDING FOR  
STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

1. Basis for the Policy

This policy is intended to meet the requirements specified in a resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees on September 27, 1978, directing all CSUC campuses to develop programs for student evaluation of teaching for all faculty in at least two courses each academic year, such programs to be in effect by the 1979-80 academic year.

2. Evaluation Policy

2.1 All faculty offering courses at CSUH during an academic year shall have students evaluate their teaching in at least two courses\* by means of impartially administered evaluation forms. This requirement includes temporary and part-time faculty as well as tenure track faculty at all ranks. Evaluations shall ordinarily be conducted during the last week of classes.

2.2 Departments are encouraged to take advantage of the Assessment and Testing Services by using the core questions and form developed and approved by FAC. In addition, each department or program may develop evaluation questions to include on this form. Alternatively, departments or programs may submit their own proposals to the Committee on Faculty Affairs for the committee's approval. In its consideration of such forms the Committee shall:

2.2.1 determine, in consultation with representatives of departments or programs if necessary, if the form or forms are appropriate to the discipline and to the courses within the discipline which will be evaluated;

2.2.2 insure that appropriate space is provided for written student commentary on significant aspects of an instructor's teaching; and

2.2.3 insure that some portion of the students' evaluation of instruction can be readily summarized.

2.3 Approved forms shall be distributed and collected under the general supervision of department or program chairs. These evaluations shall be given to the instructor and the department or program chairs after grades have been assigned to students in the classes.

2.4 The summarized results of these evaluations shall be placed in faculty personnel files. These summaries must be accompanied by documentation specifying the class, date, number of students in the class and the number of respondents. Summaries shall be prepared by or under the supervision of department or programs chairs. The instructor may also offer his or her own summary or interpretation of results.

\*If a faculty member teaches only one course, then that course shall be evaluated.

- 2.5 These evaluations shall be used:
- 2.5.1 by department or program chairs as one element in assessing the quality of instruction provided by temporary or part-time faculty;
  - 2.5.2 by appropriate committees and administrators as one element in assessing quality of instruction during consideration of candidates for retention, tenure, promotion, and merit salary adjustments; and
  - 2.5.3 by department or program chairs, when appropriate, in reviewing their teaching performances with professors, including full professors at step 5.

Approved by the Academic Senate 1/20/98  
Approved by the President 8/20/98

See also the Approved Evaluation Form and 5/7/98 letter from Sheila Cowen (Assessment & Testing) and Jodi Servatius (Faculty Development) to Department Chairs.

# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

## Student Rating Questionnaire

Department: \_\_\_\_\_



California State University, Hayward is committed to excellence in teaching, and student evaluations are vital to the continuing improvement of our instructional programs. Your responses to this questionnaire will be carefully considered and your feedback may be used for program improvement. **RESPONSES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL NOT BE REVIEWED BY INSTRUCTORS UNTIL AFTER GRADES HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED.**

**PLEASE WRITE COMMENTS ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS PAPER.**

USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY

NOT APPLICABLE/NOT OBSERVED N  
STRONGLY DISAGREE 4  
DISAGREE 3  
AGREE 2  
STRONGLY AGREE 1

Mark Ref: by NCS MM018822.1 554321 ED06 Printed in U.S.A.

### UNIVERSITY-WIDE QUESTIONS:

1. Requirements for the class were clearly communicated. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
2. Lectures and discussions were clearly related to the goals of the course. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
3. Texts and materials were clearly related to the goals of the course. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
4. Assignments and exams were clearly related to the goals of the course. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
5. Instructor made adequate provisions for consultation and assistance. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
6. Classes were regularly met as scheduled. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)

**OVERALL RATING:**                      1=Outstanding      2=Good      3=Fair      4=Poor

7. Give an overall rating of the class. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
8. Give an overall rating of the instructor. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)

### DEPARTMENTAL QUESTIONS: Use the "STRONGLY AGREE" to "NOT APPLICABLE/NOT OBSERVED" scale.

9. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
10. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
11. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
12. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
13. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
14. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
15. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
16. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
17. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
18. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
19. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
20. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
21. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
22. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
23. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
24. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
25. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
26. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
27. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
28. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
29. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)
30. (1) (2) (3) (4) (N)



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

HAYWARD, CALIFORNIA 94542-3008

OFFICE OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Telephone: (310) 881-4006

Fax: (510) 888-4618

May 7, 1998

Dear Department Chairs,

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommended, and the faculty Senate recently approved, a new campus questionnaire for student evaluations of teaching, to be available beginning this quarter. We have been asked to provide information and support to departments.

Departments now have three choices with regard to student evaluations of faculty:

1. Use the new approved evaluation form, as is. (See attached basic sample.)
2. Use the new approved evaluation form, but add customized questions for the department. (See attached customized sample.)
3. Continue to use the current department form or any new department form different from the above, as long as it has been approved by FAC.

Please note that only the new forms (options #1 and #2) may now be submitted to Assessment and Testing for processing by the Computer Center. It is important that you understand that, although your department may choose option #3, "blue forms" can no longer be scored, so departments will need to arrange to analyze those data themselves.

The reports your department will receive, whether option #1 or #2 above, will be largely the same as we have had in the past.

The Receiving Department would appreciate advance notice of the number of forms you will require this quarter, so please let them know by calling Bob Youngs, X3703. Forms may be requisitioned from University Stores as usual, under the new catalog number 1-918-00. This will assure that sufficient supplies are available for your department's use next month.

For those departments which wish to exercise option #2 above (the new approved form plus customized departmental questions), there will be a workshop on Tuesday, May 19th from 10-11a.m. in the Biella Room, which will explain this simple customizing process to chairs and/or staff. Please call Julie Roberts to reserve places in this workshop or email her at <jroberts@csuhayward.edu>. For those who cannot make this workshop but wish help in customizing, please call Sheila Cowen at X3661, and she will set up a special time for you.

Sincerely,

Sheila Cowen,  
Assessment and Testing

Jodi Servatius  
Faculty Development

cc: Michael Leung, Jay Tontz, Arthurlene Towner, Jim Fay, Frank Martino, Stanley Clark, John Charles, Alex Cassuto, Bruce Trumbo, Bob Youngs, Julie Roberts

**California State University, Hayward**

DESIGNATION CODE: 1985-86 FAC 6

DATE SUBMITTED: February 20, 1986

Senate approved: 04/29/86

President approved: 05/02/86

TO: Members of the Academic Senate

FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee

SUBJECT: Maintenance of Faculty Personnel Files

PURPOSE: Action by the Senate

**ACTION**

REQUESTED: That the Senate Adopt Proposed Revision to the Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy and Procedures of the Faculty Handbook

**BACKGROUND  
INFORMATION:**

The Senate requested that FAC review campus policies concerning maintenance of faculty personnel files in the light of the Chancellor's memo FSR 84-31. The Senate also requested that FAC consider a proposal from Professor Richard Rivenes, School of Education, regarding the size of dossiers. We contacted all members of recent School and University P&T Committees as well as others with relevant information.

Here are the main points of agreement. Dossiers have grown considerably. While there are several reasons for this, the worst offender is the required student evaluations. Although it is desirable to reduce the size of dossiers, it is more important to leave the candidate free to place in the dossier what he or she wishes. Reducing the size of dossiers can best be achieved by eliminating out-of-date material, most notably student evaluations more than five years old. The five year rule is already an approved campus practice. It should be noted that nothing in this proposal prevents the candidate from including all or part of these evaluations in the candidate's portion of the dossier.

Summarizing the statistical portion of the evaluations seemed to us not to pose a problem but attempts to summarize comments present problems of accuracy and fairness. These are best handled by using only the original comment pages, in the student's own handwriting, and retaining any graphics or graffiti the student may have included, thereby allowing a reader the opportunity to judge the weight and seriousness of the comments.

The following revision of the Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy and Procedures of the Faculty Handbook, together with the accompanying policy proposal, are commendations resulting from that consideration. These are being presented to you as two separate items to allow you the greatest flexibility in dealing with them but obviously they go together and could reasonably be combined.

3.3.3 It is intended that for tenure, and for each successive instance of retention and promotion, a candidate's dossier will be augmented by evidence of intervening achievement appropriate to the instance at hand, and that outdated or otherwise superfluous documentation will be removed. Prior to the award of tenure, letters of recommendation on retention shall remain in the dossier. After the award of tenure, no letters of recommendation pertaining to earlier considerations for retention, tenure, or promotion shall be placed in the dossier unless the candidate himself or herself chooses to do so. Department and School Offices shall not maintain a cumulative file of copies of past letters of recommendation; such copies of letters of recommendation as are kept by Department and School Offices shall be destroyed by the Department Chairperson and School Dean respectively at the end of the academic year in which they are written. The original letters of recommendation in promotion and tenure actions shall be disposed of by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs according to the provisions of Section 12.2.12. All student evaluation materials for each course evaluated more than five academic years before the current consideration shall be returned to the candidate. This shall not preclude the candidate from adding these evaluations to the dossier.