

Criteria for Appointment, Evaluation & Range Elevation of Temporary Faculty

Effective Fall 2023

The following criteria for the appointment, evaluation, and retention of temporary faculty (henceforth to be referred to as lecturers) address four basic needs:

1. Appointment of new lecturers from the list of active pool members;
2. Evaluation of lecturers, including peer and student evaluations;
3. Re-appointment of lecturers; and
4. Movement on the salary schedule by range change and/or Salary Step Increase (SSI).

Initial Hiring Criteria

The minimal requirements for admission to the lecturer pool are the possession of an MA degree in area of specialization—rhetoric and composition; linguistics; TESOL; literature; or modern languages—or MA in related field and relevant teaching experience; and completion of the application process. The following criteria supplement the CLASS Guidelines for the Appointment of Temporary Faculty, which are available from the Dean's Office.

Candidates will be selected on the basis of the following ordered criteria:

1. Quantity and quality of educational training in the subject area/s to be taught. Usually, the minimum qualifications are an MA/MFA degree.
2. Quantity and quality of teaching experience, especially in the subject area(s) to be taught.
3. Professional recommendations, including those submitted in writing and those solicited verbally.
4. Evidence of continuing professional development in the discipline.
5. Evidence of familiarity with and willingness to use relevant technology for the classroom.

These criteria are weighted as follows:

- 80%** – Academic preparation and qualification in the area of specialization, as needed by the department
- 20%** – Previous teaching experience in the area of specialization

Evaluation

The following criteria reflect the department's conviction that, as teaching is the primary function of any lecturer, it must be weighed most heavily. The criteria also reflect the department's conviction that demonstrated ongoing efforts to stay current (scholarly and

pedagogically) in the area(s) of one's teaching are essential for sustaining and enhancing teaching effectiveness and therefore should count in the evaluation and reappointment of lecturers.

The English & Modern Languages Department conducts annual periodic reviews of lecturers each spring semester by tenured faculty. Reviews cover calendar years (not academic years); this means that periodic evaluations due in Spring 2024 cover Calendar Year 2023 (Spring 2023 and Fall 2023 semesters). **The review cycle begins each fall and ends at the close of the spring semester.** All lecturers who teach are required to ensure that student evaluation of teaching is conducted on their behalf. The results of these evaluations are placed in their Personnel Action Files. Student evaluations should represent the scope of a lecturer's teaching assignment.

Weight of review & reappointment criteria:

90% – Teaching Performance

10% – Professional Development

Measures of Teaching Performance include but are not limited to:

- Overall command of subject matter
- Adherence to departmental curriculum standards and outcomes
- Adherence to current pedagogical standards in the field
- Clarity, currency, suitability, and innovativeness of course materials
- Intellectual and creative ability
- Ability to stimulate and inspire a high level of student engagement and achievement
- Accuracy, fairness, and thoroughness in student evaluation techniques
- Availability to students during office hours, and by phone or email

Measures of Professional Development include but are not limited to:

- Participation in local teaching related activities, such as workshops at the CPP Library, CAFE, or I&IT
- Professional presentations related to one's area of teaching
- Evidence of familiarity with and willingness to use relevant technology for the classroom
- Continuing progress toward a doctorate or equivalent terminal degree in a field related to one's area of teaching
- Writing and publication of scholarly articles or book reviews
- Writing/editing a book related to one's area of teaching

Student Evaluations

All faculty in the department are evaluated through instructional assessment forms completed by students near the end of the semester but before the end of instruction. (Evaluations cannot be completed during finals week.) Students receive an email around week 13 with a subject like "CPP Fall 2023 Course Evaluations" and the necessary link. They can also access course evaluations through Canvas. (More information for students is at <https://www.cpp.edu/data/documents/course-evs/accessing-evaluations-students.pdf>.) Student evaluation results are released to the department chair and the instructor via email.

The department requires that:

- a. Student evaluations be conducted for *all* courses assigned by each program within the department and taught in each semester; and
- b. *All* student evaluations conducted be submitted for periodic evaluation (except per COVID-19 exceptions listed at <https://www.cpp.edu/faculty-affairs/temporary-faculty/periodic-evaluation.shtml>).

From Fall 2014 through Spring 2020, the department used a student questionnaire consisting of eleven (11) items where first few questions asked students to self-assess their own work. Therefore, instructors should not count them in their self-evaluation, instead using the Course-Oriented section (#s 6-10) and the Instructor-Oriented section (#s 11-16). Starting in Fall 2020, the department adopted an updated questionnaire to reflect the online and mixed-instruction-mode nature of pandemic-era teaching. For Fall 2020 through present, then, instructors should use question #s 4-8 on Course Design and 9-14 on Instructor Performance. **The score of all Course-Oriented and Instructor-Oriented items averaged together should be 2.0 or better (i.e., lower).**

Scoring patterns that are .5 or more above this mean do not meet department expectations (e.g., if the mean across all sections of the same course is 2.0, a 2.5 does not meet expectations). Scoring patterns above the mean across all sections of the same course by .5 or more will be reviewed individually and contextualized with reference to other evaluative evidence of the instructor's teaching effectiveness.

Student Grades

All faculty are responsible for posting the final student grades by the scheduled due date. According to the College of Letters, Arts & Social Sciences' policy, failure to submit final grades in a timely fashion will constitute unsatisfactory performance.

Peer Observations

In this spirit of fairly evaluating teaching effectiveness, the EML Department recognizes the legitimacy of complementing student evaluations with peer observations. Both the department and individual lecturers have the option to request one or more class observations on an annual basis. Following such a request, each lecturer will be notified at least five (5) days prior to the visit and will receive a report in writing from the full-time faculty observer within two weeks after the class visit. It is recommended that a discussion be held between the full-time faculty observer and the lecturer to be observed prior to the class visit.

Peer observations of teaching are required in Periodic Evaluation packets for lecturers up for 6-year and 3-year review. In your 6th year of lecturing or 3rd year of a 3-year contract, you should be observed in the Fall semester by a tenure-track faculty member of the department who teaches in your program. This is arranged through your program coordinator.

Periodic Evaluations

Faculty are required to submit periodic evaluations. These are due annually for lecturers on semester and academic year appointments and in the final year of the contract for lecturers on 3-year contracts. Reviews cover calendar years (not academic years); this means that periodic

evaluations due in Spring 2024 cover Calendar Year 2023 (Spring 2023 and Fall 2023 semesters).

Periodic evaluations consist of the following materials:

1. **A current CV.** At minimum, this should list your: education history, academic and other relevant work history, courses taught, and professional development activities. Include campuses, dates, etc., as is relevant. (Good guidance for writing a CV is at <https://career.ucla.edu/grad/academic-job-search>.)
2. **Student evaluations from all courses taught in the calendar year(s) under review** (except per COVID-19 exceptions listed at <https://www.cpp.edu/faculty-affairs/temporary-faculty/periodic-evaluation.shtml>). Include summary sheets for each section taught *and* calculated averages for both individual Course-Oriented and Instructor-Oriented averages for the year(s) under review. Your course coordinator can provide guidance on calculating these averages. See the Student Evaluations section just above for more information.
3. **A self-evaluation narrative.** The content of this narrative needs to be specific, self-evaluative, and self-reflective. While it may include discussion of your teaching in general, this narrative should also focus on the course covered in the “Supplemental Documents” materials (see #5 below). This focused part of the narrative should:
 - a. articulate course objectives and practices,
 - b. explain any changes you have made to the course or your approach to it since your last periodic evaluation (particularly in light of previous Professional Development, Student Evaluations, Peer Observation, and Periodic Evaluation feedback),
 - c. discuss the effectiveness of course materials and pedagogic strategies, including how you address equity and inclusion in your pedagogy,
 - d. explicate how you might revise your methods, materials, or approach (particularly in light of Professional Development, Student Evaluations, or Peer Observation received during the period under review), and
 - e. contextualize your student evaluations and how they will inform your future course planning.
4. **Letters from peer observations** (if relevant; required in 6-year and 3-year evaluations).
5. **Additional materials** uploaded to the Supplemental Documents section of Interfolio. Different programs in the department require or suggest various types of documentation. Please see program-specific information below for details.

Linguistics

In addition to the department-wide materials listed in the Periodic Evaluations section above, lecturers for linguistics must submit the following additional materials to the Supplemental Documents section in Interfolio:

1. **One syllabus** from a course taught during the period under review
2. **One assignment prompt** from that course. (For prompt development, the see the Transparency in Higher Learning [Transparent Assignment Template](#) and [additional resources](#).) Since traditional essays are typical of assignments used in linguistics classes,

any written assignment can be submitted as part of the evaluation package.

Assignments may include:

- Problem sets
 - Reflective papers
 - Research projects
 - Linguistic analyses
 - Etc.
3. **Three graded essays** written in response to that assignment: one graded A (or the highest grade awarded, if no A was given to any student in the class), one graded C (or C+, C-), and one graded F (or the lowest grade given, if no F was given to any student in class) generated from the writing assignment above. The students' names (or student ID numbers), course number, and semester must be identified in all three samples; each sample must bear your marking (preferably both "localized" marking in the margin of the sample and "global" marking at the end of the sample).
 4. A brief **explanation of the differences between the three essays**, justifying the grades.

Note: ENG 2200 (Introduction to English Linguistics) and ENG 4220 (Sociolinguistics) are both General Education courses: GE C2/3 and GE D4, respectively. As such, these courses must include a **significant writing component**. The assignments submitted with the periodic evaluation package must demonstrate that the students were provided with the opportunity to develop skills in **writing effectively for various audiences**.

Literature

In addition to the department-wide materials listed above, lecturers for Literature must submit the following additional materials to the Supplemental Documents section in Interfolio:

1. **One syllabus** from a course taught during the period under review
2. **One assignment** from that course (For prompt development, the see the Transparency in Higher Learning [Transparent Assignment Template](#) and [additional resources](#).)
3. **Three graded student works** written in response to that assignment across the range of grades given (e.g., A, C, F). The students' names (or student ID numbers), course number, and semester must be identified in all three samples; each sample must bear your marking (preferably both "localized" marking in the margin of the sample and "global" marking at the end of the sample).
4. A brief **explanation of the differences between the three works**, justifying the grades.

Rhetoric & Composition (including Multilingual Composition)

In addition to the department-wide materials listed in the Periodic Evaluations section above, lecturers for Rhetoric & Composition must submit the following additional materials to the Supplemental Documents section in Interfolio:

1. **One syllabus** from a course taught during the period under review
2. **One writing assignment** from that course (For prompt development, the see the Transparency in Higher Learning [Transparent Assignment Template](#) and [additional resources](#).)
3. **Three graded projects** written in response to that assignment: one graded A (or the highest grade awarded, if no A was given to any student in the class), one graded C (or

C+, C-), and one graded F (or the lowest grade given, if no F was given to any student in class) generated from the writing assignment above. The students' names (or student ID numbers), course number, and semester must be identified in all three samples; each sample must bear your marking (preferably both "localized" marking in the margin of the sample and "global" marking at the end of the sample).

4. A brief **explanation of the differences between the three projects**, justifying the grades.

Modern Languages

In addition to the department-wide materials listed in the Periodic Evaluations section above, lecturers in Modern Languages must submit the following additional materials to the Supplemental Documents section in Interfolio:

1. copies of 2 tests, preferably from two different courses
2. 2 syllabi from two different courses (If you have only taught multiple sections of SPN 1111, one syllabus is sufficient.)

Periodic Evaluation Review

The periodic evaluation package will be reviewed by the Department's Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee (TFEC), which is composed of the coordinators of the writing programs in English (Composition and Composition for Multilingual Speakers), Modern Languages, and Literature. The evaluating committee's written assessment consists of a summary and interpretation of the student evaluations and of the other materials listed above. You will see what the committee writes, and you have the right to respond and have your response entered into your record. Each instructor should work with their coordinator to find out what materials need to be submitted.

Maria emails courtesy reminders to submit periodic evaluation packages during each semester, and you will have several weeks to prepare and assemble the materials. Plan ahead to make sure that all required materials will be available when you need to submit them. For more information—including a calendar of due dates and information about using Interfolio—see: <https://www.cpp.edu/faculty-affairs/temporary-faculty/periodic-evaluation.shtml>.

In the case of an inconsistency between this document and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) or the University Manual, the CBA takes first precedence, and the University Manual takes precedence over this document. Article 15 of the CSU/CFA contract and Section 305.15 of the University Manual cover the evaluation of temporary faculty.

Reappointment

In assigning courses available to lecturers, official Personnel Action Files must be reviewed and the PAF Log signed (located in the CLASS Dean's office). The Order of Assignment for offering work per the CBA will be followed (<https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/labor-and-employee-relations/Documents/unit3-cfa/article12.pdf>). Careful consideration will be exercised on the basis of a number of factors, including starting date and depth of experience (i.e., accumulated WTUs).

Lecturers eligible for an initial or subsequent 3-year appointment shall be evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of a 3-year appointment. This periodic evaluation shall consider the faculty unit employee's cumulative work performed during the entire 6-year or 3-year qualifying period. The Dean of the College shall determine whether the lecturer has performed satisfactorily before an initial or subsequent 3-year appointment may be issued. Please refer to the appropriate University Academic Policy (https://www.cpp.edu/academic-manual/1300-1399-academic-personnel-policies/1325-1349/policy_1336--periodic_eval_temp_faculty_members--2020.07.21.pdf), and Articles 12.12, 15.28 and 15.29 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement for further information: <https://www.calstate.edu/csusystem/faculty-staff/labor-and-employee-relations/Pages/unit3-cfa.aspx>.

Range Elevation on the Salary Schedule and/or Salary Step Increase (SSI)

Range elevation may occur when a lecturer is not eligible for more SSIs in his or her current range and will have been employed in his or her current range for at least five (5) years by the end of the academic year.

A lecturer may apply for range elevation on the basis of demonstrated evidence of sustained effective outstanding teaching performance and demonstrated efforts to stay current in one's area(s) of teaching.

Lecturers will be considered for a Service-based Salary Increase (SSI) after they have taught twenty-four (24) Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) in *this* department and after they have satisfied the criteria for retention in this department.

Range Elevation Criteria

Movement from A to B Range; from B to C Range; from C to D Range

A lecturer will be considered for movement on the salary schedule from the A range to B, B to C, and C to D when the faculty member is not eligible for more SSIs in the A, B, or C range and will have been employed in their current range for at least five (5) years by the end of the academic year. A lecturer will merit movement from one range to the next if they have exhibited a **pattern of effective teaching**, as evidenced by their periodic evaluations. A **pattern of effective teaching** refers to consistently strong annual evaluations, as opposed to effective teaching achieved sporadically or confined to a single evaluation period.

Effective teaching will be judged by the lecturer's completed evaluation packet, submitted to the Chair via email, which shall contain the following:

1. **A current CV.**
2. **Student evaluations** from all courses taught in the calendar year(s) at the current salary range, including both summary sheets for every section taught and calculated averages for both individual Course-Oriented questions and Instructor-Oriented averages for the years under review. (See the Student Evaluations section above for additional information.)
3. **A self-evaluation narrative** that is specific, self-evaluative, and self-reflective. It should be written in reference to the course covered in the Additional Materials section (#5) below and:

- a. articulate course objectives and practices, and explain how these have evolved during the calendar years at the current salary range,
 - b. explain any changes you have made to the course or your approach during the calendar years at the current salary range,
 - c. discuss the effectiveness of course materials and pedagogic strategies, including how you address equity and inclusion in your pedagogy, and how these have evolved during the calendar years at the current salary range,
 - d. explicate how you might revise your methods, materials, or approach in the future, and
 - e. contextualize your student evaluations during the calendar years at the current salary range and how they will inform your future course planning.
4. **Letter(s) from peer observations** conducted while at the current salary range.
 5. **Additional materials.** Different programs in the department require or suggest various types of documentation. Please see program-specific information below for details.

In addition, the College of Letters, Arts & Social Sciences requires a Range Elevation Package that minimally includes:

- Application
- Committee Recommendation
- Chair Recommendation (if Chair is not part of the Committee)
- Course Evaluations (previous five years)

Peer Evaluations (depending on department procedure)