

**Chemistry & Biochemistry Department  
California State Polytechnic University Pomona**

**Temporary Faculty  
Evaluation and Review Procedures**

**Approved by the Chemistry & Biochemistry Department Faculty  
on August 27, 2018**

The faculty members of the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department value teaching excellence. In order to provide our students with the best instruction possible, we are also committed to the professional development of our temporary faculty members (lecturers), both full and part-time. The purpose of this document is to communicate the process and procedures by which temporary faculty are evaluated and reviewed. It has been developed using the CBA and the University Manual. Should there be a discrepancy at any point between this document and the CBA and/or the university manual, the language of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) takes precedence followed by the University Manual (UM). Temporary faculty in the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department, both full and part-time, are referred to as “*lecturers*” in this document.

The criteria specified in this document inform our lecturers of the expectations that the faculty and administration have with respect to their performance. The results of the performance reviews will be used to help with continuous improvement of our lecturer’s teaching performance, and to make decisions with respect to one-year and three-year appointments.

## **I. Evaluation Committee**

### **A. Membership**

The lecturer evaluation committee (referred to as the Periodic Evaluation Committee, or PEC) will consist of only full-time tenured faculty members in the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department (CBA 15.2 and Appendix 305.15). FERP (Faculty Early Retirement Program) faculty may participate with permission from the President, at the request of the department (CBA 15.2), but the entire committee cannot be composed solely of FERP faculty. The number of members will be a minimum of two (Appendix 305.15). The membership will be determined by a method voted on by a majority of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department (it can be elected or appointed by the department chair). A committee chair will be elected by the committee after its establishment.

### **B. Duties**

The PEC will inform lecturers regarding evaluation procedures and timelines for evaluation. They will prepare a summary of the lecturer’s performance in the Spring term that will include the following items:

- Interpretation of student evaluations of teaching scores available for the review period
- Interpretation of faculty classroom visitation reports
- Instructional materials provided by the candidate
- Other signed written statements from faculty or students (must have Bronco ID)

The PEC will submit their findings with signatures to the temporary faculty member on the appropriate university form (see CPP Policy #1336, formerly named Appendix 27B). The department chair, unless the department chair is a member of the PEC, will also submit a statement on the appropriate university form to the temporary faculty member. All deliberations concerning any personnel review are to remain confidential.

## **II. Evaluation Procedures**

All lecturer evaluations shall be comprised of a review of the candidate's student evaluation scores, faculty evaluations of classroom teaching, other signed written statements from faculty and students, and the candidate's instructional materials. How often a review is conducted is determined by the status of the temporary faculty employee. A written record of the periodic evaluation shall be placed in the temporary faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File (CBA 15.27) The temporary faculty unit employee shall be provided a copy of the written record of the evaluation (CBA 15.27).

### **A. Temporary faculty unit employees appointed for one semester.(CBA 15.25)**

The faculty employee shall be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair, the appropriate administrator, or the department. The employee may also request that an evaluation be performed. In this case, the normal periodic evaluation process is followed but timing may be modified to fit the timing of the review.

### **B. Temporary faculty with one-year appointments**

The faculty unit employee must be evaluated in accordance with the periodic evaluation procedure (CBA 15.23/24). The evaluation will occur in the Spring of the academic year in which the faculty was appointed. This review shall be conducted by the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department Period Evaluation Committee.

### **C. Temporary faculty eligible for a three-year contract (CBA 12, 15.28 and 15.29)**

Temporary faculty eligible for an initial or subsequent 3-year appointment shall be evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of a 3-year appointment. The evaluation will occur in the Spring term preceding the issuance of the 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 temporary faculty member has performed satisfactorily before an initial or subsequent 3-year appointment may be issued. Please refer to the appropriate University Academic Policy (<http://academic.csupomona.edu/faculty/policies.aspx>), and Articles 12.12, 15.28 and

15.29 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement for further information  
([http://calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts\\_HTML/CFA\\_CONTRACT/2012-2014/](http://calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/2012-2014/).)]

#### **D. Temporary faculty who hold three-year appointments (CBA 15.26)**

The faculty unit employee shall be evaluated at least once during the term of their appointment. More frequent evaluation can be at the request of the employee or President. Lecturers who hold three-year appointments up for renewal, will also be evaluated as described in II.C.

### **III. Evaluation Criteria**

Teaching effectiveness will be determined based on the totality of the following criteria: student evaluation of teaching scores, peer evaluations of classroom teaching, instructional materials and other written commentary from faculty or students. Appendix A lists the indicator's of teaching performance.

#### **A. Student Evaluation of Teaching Scores**

Student Evaluations will be conducted for each class taught in each term (excluding summer) (CBA 15.15). Summaries of the evaluations will be returned to the temporary faculty member, a copy placed in the PAF, and a copy retained in the department office. CPP Policy #1329 of the University Manual outlines the general procedures for student evaluations on this campus and can be found on the Faculty Affairs website ([http://academic.csupomona.edu/faculty/rtp\\_fac.aspx](http://academic.csupomona.edu/faculty/rtp_fac.aspx)).

1. For temporary faculty unit employees who do not have 3 year appointments:  
The PEC shall examine the responses to the following questions: 1) Question 1 on both the lecture evaluation form and Question 1 on the lab evaluation form, "*Instructor presents material in a clear and organized manner*"; 2) Question 13 for the lecture evaluation form and Question 9 for the lab evaluation form, "*What is the overall rating of the instructor in this course*"  
The candidate shall have **70%** of the responses to each of these questions in the Very Good + Good range. In the case where the response ranges are in the 60-70% region, a positive evaluation may still be possible when taken in total with all other evidence presented.
2. For lecturers who will be eligible for an initial 3-year appointment or renewal of a three-year appointment:
  - The responses to Question 1 & Question 13 of the lecture form and Question 1 and Question 9 of the laboratory evaluation forms must increase to 75% of the total responses being Very Good + Good. In the case where the ranges are in the 65-75% region, a positive evaluation may still be possible when taken into account with all other evidence evaluated.

## **B. Faculty Classroom Visitation Reports**

Continuous improvement is desired to gain effectiveness in teaching. If weaknesses that have been noted in past faculty classroom visitation reports have been corrected, they should be noted in later reviews so the PEC can take this into consideration during the review process.

By the time a lecturer is eligible to receive an initial or subsequent 3-year appointment, faculty classroom visitation reports shall indicate significant improvement of noted deficiencies.

Classroom Visitations will be conducted for a minimum of two courses per year (preferably different courses, one each term). Visitations will be from one of the tenured or tenure-track faculty in the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department as assigned by the PEC or the Department Chair. Faculty evaluators will be required to arrange a visitation with the temporary faculty member with at least 5 days' notice. The written, signed evaluation will be reported on the department-approved form (Appendix B) and given to the candidate within two weeks. The visitation report should be discussed with the lecturer by the evaluator.

## **C. Instructional Materials**

For evaluation purposes, lecturers are required to submit copies of the syllabi, exams, quizzes, schedules, homework and other instructional materials, as requested by the PEC. These documents should be placed in a separate file, and indexed by the candidate. The file will remain at the first level of review unless access is requested from subsequent levels (UM 305.11). The members of the PEC will determine if the level of assignments, quizzes, and exams are what is expected for the course being taught. Feedback will be provided to the candidates if improvement is necessary. Candidates are not required to submit copies of all documents for all courses. For example, in teaching multiple sections of the same course, only one set of documents representative of that course will suffice.

## **D. Other Written Input**

If written input about the performance of a lecturer is received that is signed with a Bronco ID number attached, it can be used for evaluation purposes. It must have been received within the timeframe of the review period.

## **IV. Range Elevation (University Policy #1332)**

Lecturers who do not have any additional SSIs available in their current rank and have been employed in the current rank for five years may be eligible for a range elevation. The AVP for Faculty Affairs will notify lecturers of their eligibility to apply by December 1 of each year. Applications are to be submitted in the time frame established by university policy.

### **A. Criteria for Range Elevation**

Candidates will be evaluated for continued competence in their teaching. This will be evidenced by favorable classroom visitation reports, continued favorable student evaluation results, completion of professional development opportunities that enhance one's teaching ability, and any scholarship the candidate may have completed (including the scholarship of teaching). These activities will be evaluated from the time of initial appointment or from the start of the last range elevation (the more recent one).

## **B. Application**

Applications will consist of the following items and be submitted to the Department Chair:

- 1) Written letter or memorandum to the Range Elevation Review Committee (will be carried out by the PEC) clearly stating the candidate's request.
- 2) A current CV.
- 3) A description summarizing the applicant's teaching effectiveness (this will discuss the candidate's classroom visitation reports, student evaluation scores, development of instructional materials, or other evidence of sustained or improved teaching effectiveness).
- 4) A description summarizing any completed professional development activities, scholarship, or service if applicable.

## **C. Review**

Please see Policy #1332 section 3.

## **D. Appeals**

Please see Policy #1332 section 5

## **Appendix A: Indicators of Teaching Performance**

Some indicators of good teaching are given below. These are the items that the department considers when conducting peer evaluations and examining instructional materials. The student evaluations also assess some of these areas.

- a. Knowledge of subject matter in one's area of specialty, as demonstrated by peer evaluation of teaching in lecture and laboratories and examination of handouts, exams, and other instructional materials.

- b. Clear presentation of course content, as demonstrated by peer evaluation of teaching in lecture and laboratories, student evaluations, and organization of instructional materials.
- c. Organization of class, as demonstrated by peer evaluation of teaching in lecture and laboratories, student evaluations, and examination of syllabi and other course materials.
- d. Appropriate course content, as evidenced by peer evaluation of teaching in lecture and laboratories, examination of handouts, exams, quizzes, homework and other course materials.
- e. Use of various teaching methods and aids, as evidenced by peer evaluation of teaching in lecture and laboratories, and examination of course materials and instructional resources (e.g., websites, Blackboard, etc.)
- f. Appropriate methods of evaluating student achievement, as evidenced by peer evaluation of blank exams, homework and quizzes, and other assessment materials.
- g. How well the stated course objectives and schedules are met, as evidenced by peer evaluation of exams, homework, quizzes, and other course materials and by peer evaluation of teaching in lecture and laboratories.
- h. Involvement in improving lecture and/or laboratory course materials, as evidenced by peer evaluation of course materials produced.
- i. Teaching performance, as evaluated by peer review and analysis of student evaluations.

**Appendix B**

**PEER EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING**

|                   |                  |
|-------------------|------------------|
| <i>Instructor</i> | <i>Date</i>      |
| <i>Course</i>     | <i>Time</i>      |
| <i>Topic</i>      | <i>Evaluator</i> |

- I. Organization (development of concepts, important points emphasized etc.)**

II. Preparation (at appropriate level, examples, etc.)

III. Student Interaction

IV. Summary of class observation (strengths, weaknesses, suggestions for improvement).

### Appendix C: Instructional Assessment Forms for Chemistry (Student Evaluations)

These are the official forms used by the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department for student evaluations. **There are separate forms for lecture and laboratory courses.** Student evaluations are to be conducted between weeks 13-15 of the semester (see CPP Policy #1329). Packets containing these forms are available in the department office.

Class Climate

TERM: 2163 -Spring 2016

CLASS NBR:

INSTRUCTOR

COURSE: SAMPLE CHM Lecture





Mark as shown:     Please use a ball-point pen or a thin felt tip. This form will be processed automatically.

Correction:     Please follow the examples shown on the left hand side to help optimize the reading results.

## 1. Student Evaluation

|   | Very Good                    | Good                     | Satisfactory             | Poor                     | Very Poor                | Not Appropriate             |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1.1 Instructor presents material in a clear and organized manner.         | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.2 Instructor presents material in an interesting manner.                | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.3 Instructor's enthusiasm for the course material.                      | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.4 Instructor's willingness to answer questions.                         | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.5 Instructor's ability to answer questions.                             | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.6 Instructor summarizes major points clearly.                           | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.7 Instructor's concern that students learn and understand the material. | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.8 Instructor's exams are representative of the course material.         | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.9 Instructor returns exams in a reasonable amount of time.              | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.10 Instructor provides a useful critique of exams.                      | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.11 Instructor's availability during office hours.                       | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.12 Instructor's helpfulness during office hours.                        | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.13 What is your overall rating of the instructor in this course?        | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.14 Would you like to take another course from this instructor?          | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |                          |                          |                          |                          | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Class Climate

TERM: 2163 -Spring 2016

CLASS NBR:

INSTRUCTOR:

COURSE: SAMPLE – CHM Laboratory



Mark as shown:     Please use a ball-point pen or a thin felt tip. This form will be processed automatically.

Correction:     Please follow the examples shown on the left hand side to help optimize the reading results.

## 1. Student Evaluation

|   | Very Good                    | Good                     | Satisfactory             | Poor                     | Very Poor                | Not Appropriate             |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1.1 Instructor presents material in a organized and clear manner.               | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.2 Instructor's ability to explain and/or demonstrate laboratory procedures.   | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.3 Instructor's availability and helpfulness during lab.                       | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.4 Instructor's concern that students learn and understand the lab procedures. | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.5 Lab exams are representative of material in lab lecture or experiment.      | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.6 Instructor's enforcement of all safety procedures during lab class.         | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.7 Instructor's availability during office hours.                              | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.8 Instructor's helpfulness during office hours.                               | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.9 What is your overall rating of the instructor in this course?               | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| 1.10 Would you like to take another course from this instructor?                | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |                          |                          |                          |                          | <input type="checkbox"/> No |