

**Department of Physics and Astronomy
California State Polytechnic University Pomona**

**Temporary Faculty
Evaluation and Review Procedures**

Valid from FALL 2018 through Fall 2023

**Approved by the Physics and Astronomy Faculty on
5/22/2018**

The purpose of this document is to communicate the process and procedures by which temporary faculty are evaluated and reviewed in the department of Physics and Astronomy. 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 Department of Physics and Astronomy, 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 department 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 evaluation committee may be elected by the department, appointed by the chair or chosen by some other means. The choice of how to select the committee must be approved when lecturer evaluation document is approved by majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members in each department or equivalent unit. (Appendix 305.15). The committee will be elected or appointed during the Fall semester each academic year. The Lecturer Evaluation Committee (LEC) will consist of only full-time tenured faculty members in the Department of Physics and Astronomy (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). If the membership is elected, it requires a majority of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department.

B. Duties

The department chair will inform lecturers regarding evaluation procedures and timelines for evaluation within 2 weeks of being hired. The LEC will prepare a summary of the lecturers’ performance during the Spring semester, which will include the following items:

- Results and interpretation of student evaluations of teaching scores (student rating) available for the review period
- Interpretation of faculty classroom observation reports (if available)
- Interpretation of course grade distributions
- Instructional materials provided by the candidate per request from LEC.
- Other signed written statements from faculty or students (must have Bronco ID)

The LEC will submit their findings on the appropriate university form, Appendix 27B. They will forward Appendix 27B to the department chair who will write her/his own recommendation based on the evaluation criteria unless the department chair is a member of the LEC. All deliberations concerning any personnel review are to remain confidential. Interpretations will be done based on the principles described below in section II.

II. Evaluation Procedures

All lecturer evaluations shall be comprised of a review of the candidate's student ratings, peer observation of classroom or online teaching material (if available), analysis of grade distributions, and 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 by the department chair. (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 semester of the academic year in which the faculty was appointed. This review shall be conducted by the department LEC.

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 semester 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. For this review, the LEC shall rate the temporary faculty unit employee as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Satisfactory ratings may include narrative comments that include constructive suggestions for development. In the case of unsatisfactory performance, the reasons should be placed in writing.

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://www.cpp.edu/~faculty-affairs/evaluation/index.shtml>, <http://www.cpp.edu/~faculty-affairs/documents/section305.pdf> 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/.)]

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 the department chair. . 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 ratings, peer observations of classroom teaching, grade distribution consistency with departmental norms, instructional materials and other written commentary from faculty or students. Appendix A lists the indicators of teaching performance.

A. Student ratings of Teaching Scores

Student ratings will be conducted for each class taught in each semester (CBA 15.15) . Ratings will be returned to the temporary faculty member, a copy placed in the PAF, and a copy retained in the department office. Appendix 10 of the University Manual outlines the general procedures for student evaluations on this campus and can be found on the Faculty Affairs website <https://www.cpp.edu/~faculty-affairs/evaluation/index.shtml>

For temporary faculty unit employees who do not have 3 year appointments and for lecturers who will be eligible for an initial 3-year appointment or renewal of a three-year appointment:

The LEC shall examine the responses to all of the questions on the student ratings forms. Particular attention will be given to the response to the question “Overall, I rate this instructor as:” (Question 10 on the lecture and SCI forms, question 8 on the lab form). If the average response on Question 10 for all lecture courses or Question 8 for all lab courses is greater than 2.5 (between good and satisfactory but closer to satisfactory), it should be highlighted and addressed in the review. If 51% or more of the responses to any question for any course are below the Good to Very Good range (that is, 51% or more of responses are in the Satisfactory, Poor to Very Poor range), it should be highlighted and addressed in the review.

Faculty classroom observation reports

Continuous improvement is a requisite for effective teaching. Demonstrated corrections and improvements upon weaknesses that were noted in a past review cycle, (peer observations, LEC review, Chair’s statement, or Dean’s statement) should be taken into consideration during a current review process.

By the time a lecturer is eligible to receive an initial or subsequent 3-year appointment the lecturer should demonstrate significant improvement of noted deficiencies. A committee of the whole consisting of tenure-line faculty will perform classroom observations. The Chair of the LEC will be responsible for assignment of tenure-line faculty to in-class teaching observations of lecturers undergoing peer review. Lecturer’s on one or three-year contracts are to receive classroom observations once per review period. If the lecturer is in the third year of a three-year contract, they will be observed during the Fall semester of their third year. They have the option of requesting a second observations by a different observer during that academic year. If the lecturer has a one-year contract, they will be observed during the Fall semester with the option of an additional observation during that academic year.

Faculty observers will be required to arrange a visitation with the temporary faculty member with at least one week notice. A peer observation letter will include reflections about exams, the syllabus and the class visit. The written, signed observations will be given to the candidate and to the department office within two weeks.

B. 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 LEC. 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 LEC 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.

C. Academic Standards

The LEC shall examine the lecturer's grade distribution and compare it with the department-wide distribution for all sections of similar courses. For first year lecture courses (PHY1210, 1220 and PHY 1510, 1520), a course average GPA of approximately 2.0 (a C grade) is expected. For first year lab courses (PHY1210L, 1220L and PHY 1510L, 1520L), a course average GPA of approximately 3.0 (a B grade) is expected. When considering whether the grade distribution is appropriate, the LEC shall take into account the difficulty level of the tests and assignments, the amount of opportunities that students were given for practice (e.g. it is reasonable to expect that students will perform better if required to do assignments more than just once per week, online or in-class quizzes to incentivize preparation before class, or in-class practice activities), and comparisons between student performance in the lecturer's class and departmental or external benchmarks (e.g. gains on widely-used tests such as the Force Concepts Inventory). Any useful written evidence that might give some context to unusually high or low average grades is appreciated and shall be considered (e.g. scores on pre-tests that might indicate an unusually well-prepared or poorly-prepared group of students).

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.

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 the accuracy and relevance of information in lectures, presentations, handouts, 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 the peer evaluation of teaching in lecture and laboratories (e.g. 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 academic standards.
- 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.

Appendix C: Instructional Assessment Forms for Physics and Astronomy (Student Evaluations)

These are the official forms used by the Department of Physics and Astronomy for student evaluations. There are separate forms for Lecture, Laboratory and SCI/Activity courses. Student evaluations are to be conducted between weeks 14 and 15 of the semester.

Lecture:

- 1) Instructor's concern that students learn & understand the material:
- 2) Instructor's use of practical applications of the course material:
- 3) Instructor's availability and helpfulness outside of class:
- 4) Instructor's organization and clarity of presentation:
- 5) Instructor's knowledge of the subject matter:
- 6) Instructor's ability to arouse student interest and enthusiasm:
- 7) Instructor's respect and consideration shown toward students:
- 8) Fairness of the instructor's grading:
- 9) Instructor's ability to challenge students and motivate them to do their best:
- 10) Overall, I rate this instructor as:

Laboratory:

- 1) Instructor's preparation for the lab:
- 2) Instructor's respect & consideration shown toward students:
- 3) Instructor's ability to arouse student interest and enthusiasm:
- 4) Instructor's knowledge of the subject matter:
- 5) Instructor's effectiveness in answering student questions:
- 6) Help given to students by the instructor:
- 7) Instructor's availability to students during lab:
- 8) Overall, I rate this instructor as:

SCI/Activity:

- 1) Instructor's organization of the course:
- 2) Instructor's knowledge of the subject matter:
- 3) Instructor's enthusiasm for the course material:
- 4) Instructor's concern that students learn and understand the material:
- 5) Instructor's concern that students make the connection between the course material and its practical applications:
- 6) Instructor's respect and consideration shown toward students:
- 7) Instructor's availability outside of class, either during office hours, by appointment, or via email during the work week:
- 8) Fairness of the instructor's grading:
- 9) Ability of the instructor to challenge students and motivate them to do their best:
- 10) Overall, I rate this instructor as: