

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL AND MANUFACTURING ENGINEERING
CRITERIA FOR THE PERIODIC EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY
2022/2023 Academic Year

Table of Contents

SECTION I- INTRODUCTION.....	1
I.1. DEFINITIONS	1
SECTION II. DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES.....	2
SECTION III. TEMPORARY FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA	4
APPENDIX A: TEMPORARY FACULTY PEER OBSERVATION FORM.....	5
APPENDIX B: TEMPORARY FACULTY MEMBER SELF-NARRATIVE.....	6
APPENDIX C: STUDENT EVALUATION SURVEY QUESTIONS - LECTURE	7
APPENDIX D: STUDENT EVALUATION SURVEY QUESTIONS - LAB.....	8

SECTION I- INTRODUCTION

One of the key goals of the IME department is graduating knowledgeable and job-ready individuals. Several factors significantly contribute to the achievement of this goal, the most important one being "quality of education" provided to students. One of the mechanisms that need to be in place toward assuring education quality for our students is the evaluation of our temporary faculty and promoting their professional development. The IME department faculty as a whole is in the best position to provide clear expectations, create an environment conducive to achieving expectations, and render the most informed evaluation of the temporary faculty member. The results of temporary faculty evaluation will be used for decisions related to rehiring temporary faculty and/or their salary range elevation (salary increase), as well as providing the opportunity to give instructors clear feedback about their teaching and ways to improve.

The primary purpose of this document is to communicate the IME Department criteria, expectations, and procedures for periodic evaluation of temporary faculty to the department temporary faculty members with clarity and specificity. This departmental document must only supplement and may not conflict with Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) or university policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes the first precedence and university policies take the second precedence over departmental policies.

Please visit the university website for the most updated policies and timeline related to temporary faculty evaluation (policy 1336, policy 1337, policy 1329, and CBA Article 15 Evaluation).

I.1. DEFINITIONS

Some of the important terms used in this document are defined below:

- a) The IME Department Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee (TFEC) is responsible for the periodic evaluation of temporary faculty members. Members of the TFEC must be full-time tenured faculty members, including faculty on FERP, and are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty of the department. TFEC should have at least three members including the department chair. If department faculty decide, the Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) can also act as the TFEC for the evaluation of temporary faculty members.
- b) Temporary faculty evaluation criteria are the department expectations articulated in Section III of this document.
- c) Student evaluation of teaching is governed by Policy 1329 of the University Manual.
- d) Peer observation of teaching happens when a tenured or probationary faculty visits the class of a temporary faculty (virtually or in person) to observe the mechanics of instruction by temporary faculty, review the course syllabus, handouts, exams and other teaching materials. Peer observation of teaching is arranged by the TFEC.

e) When a temporary faculty member is appointed for two (2) or more semesters, regardless of break in service, they shall receive an "annual evaluation" each year and the review period is a calendar year.

f) A "cumulative periodic evaluation" happens when a temporary faculty becomes eligible for a three-year appointment under the terms of the CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement and, depending on whether it is an initial or subsequent appointment, is evaluated over the entire qualifying evaluation period of three or six academic years.

g) Temporary faculty members holding three-year appointments shall be evaluated at least once during their appointment and may be evaluated more frequently upon the request of either the faculty member or the department.

SECTION II. DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES

At each academic year, the TFEC duly elected members will meet to elect a chairperson who shall assume primary responsibility for ensuring compliance with this document and corresponding university policies. The following is the procedure and set of actions to be taken by the TFEC, the chair of TFEC, and temporary faculty.

Upon Temporary Faculty Appointment:

The IME Department Chair shall inform the chair of TFEC of the hiring of any new temporary faculty each year within two weeks from finalizing the hiring process. Within two weeks of the hiring notice provided by the department chair, or no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term, whichever is earlier, the TFEC chair shall email the new temporary faculty member an electronic copy of this document along with a link to policy 1336, policy 1337, policy 1329, and CBA Article 15 Evaluation. This document includes the applicable departmental criteria and procedure used for temporary faculty performance evaluation.

- The temporary faculty members under evaluation shall use the department criteria in effect at the time of their appointment. At any point of time that this document gets updated the chair of the TFEC shall notify all temporary faculty of the new version of this document. Consequently, all temporary faculty have to adopt and follow the criteria and guidelines in the new version of this document in their following evaluation period. For example, if a temporary faculty is in the middle of a three-year entitlement when this document gets updated, their evaluation at the end of their three-year entitlement will be based on the revised version of the document as long as the document was provided to them within 14 days of the first day of instruction of year three of the 3-year appointment.

Throughout Each Year:

- Chair of TFEC shall (1) ensure that at least one peer observation per calendar year is conducted for all temporary faculty members (2) distribute the tasks related to temporary

faculty classroom visits (peer observation) among all tenured and probationary faculty of the department (no matter if they are part of TFEC or not) by the end of third week of the semester.

- Tenured and probationary faculty will perform peer observations. After performing a peer observation, they shall fill out the Temporary Faculty Peer Observation Form (Appendix A) where they give a rating to the temporary faculty with respect to the criteria specified in that form. The Temporary Faculty Peer Observation Form (Appendix A) should be emailed to the temporary faculty as well as the chair of TFEC within 2 weeks from the day of the class visit. Temporary faculty should include the Temporary Faculty Peer Observation Form (Appendix A) in their periodic evaluation package. TFEC is responsible for ensuring the completion of the required peer observations for all temporary faculty.
- The faculty who will perform peer observation must communicate with the temporary faculty who will be evaluated about days of the visit at least a week ahead of the visit. If the instructor is non-responsive to the emails, the evaluator should notify the instructor of the day and time of class visit at least 5 days in advance, and then conduct the peer observation.
- The TFEC will perform an overall evaluation of temporary faculty based on faculty member's self-narrative, student evaluations, peer observations, and adherence to the criteria described in Section III of this document and develops an overall evaluation letter. The letter will then be forwarded to the temporary faculty member for review. The temporary faculty member will have ten calendar days to acknowledge the TFEC evaluation letter with or without response or rebuttal statement. For cumulative reviews, the evaluation letter will then be forwarded to the dean's office by the chair of the TFEC. The dean of college of engineering will then perform the evaluation and decide on the reappointment of temporary candidate. The timeline/deadline for these evaluation steps have been identified in the university's temporary faculty evaluation policies and timeline.
- In case a temporary faculty does not meet the criteria listed in Section III, the TFEC will reflect that in the overall evaluation letter they put together for each faculty. For faculty undergoing an annual evaluation, the department chair, if not a member of TFEC, conducts their own review to supplement TFEC's review and assess if the faculty's performance was 'Satisfactory' or 'Unsatisfactory' and merits reappoint to the next year. For cumulative reviews, the Dean's office will conduct their own evaluation based on the TFEC's review and the temporary faculty evaluation package and will decide if the performance is 'Satisfactory' or 'Unsatisfactory.' If the decision is that performance has been unsatisfactory, the contract will not be extended.

SECTION III. TEMPORARY FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation of temporary faculty's performance for reappointment and range elevation shall be based on the following criteria:

- a) Teaching philosophy and pedagogical methodologies used in classes taught as reflected in the faculty self-narrative document. The template for self-narrative is provided in Appendix B.
- b) Activities and efforts performed for professional development, as reflected in the faculty self-narrative document (Appendix B).
- c) Alignment with the courses' Extended Course Outlines (ECOs).
 - 1) The syllabus, textbook, and the content of classes taught shall conform to the corresponding Expanded Course Outline (ECO).
 - 2) This item will be evaluated based on the candidate's self-narrative document (Appendix B), peer observation, and the input received from the corresponding course coordinator.
- d) For each class taught during the evaluation period, average of student evaluation scores across all the sections taught for that class should be:
 - 1) Less than or equal to 2, for temporary faculty who have been teaching the same subject for the IME department for more than three semesters.
 - 2) Less than or equal to 2.5, for temporary faculty who have been teaching the same subject for the IME department for three or less than three semesters.
 - 3) Student evaluation survey questions for both lecture and lab classes are available in Appendix C and Appendix D.
- e) Peer observation for at least 80% of the criteria listed (and evaluated) in the Temporary Faculty Peer Observation Form (Appendix A) should be "Meets Expectation" or better.
- f) Regular office hours shall be maintained according to the university Office Hours Policy.
- g) The temporary faculty shall be responsive to and cooperative with the IME department. It is expected that the faculty respond to all department and students' inquiries within two working days during the semesters that they have assignments.

Appendix A: Temporary Faculty Peer Observation Form
Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering Department

Name of Temporary Faculty Member: _____ Course Number: _____

Evaluator's Name: _____ Date and Time of Observation: _____

IME Department Peer Observation Criteria	Exceeds Expectation	Meets Expectation	Improvement Needs	No opportunity to Judge	Comment
Knowledge of the subject matter being taught					
Course material organization on Canvas					
Assessment and evaluation methods used for measuring students' knowledge					
Organization of course materials presented in class (organization of lecture and activities)					
Connecting the subject being taught to the real-world applications					
Being able to explain the concepts clearly					
Proper utilization of class time					
Using the board and other visual aids to teach the concept clearly (in online teaching this will be features of online teaching)					
Properly addressing students' questions and comments					
Facilitating class discussion and involving all students					
Maintaining a respectful and professional atmosphere in the class					
Conveying enthusiasm for teaching and for the subject matter					
Compliance of the course content and syllabus with Expanded Course Outline (ECO)					

*** If you choose any rating other than "Meets Expectation" for any criteria, please provide an explanation in the Comment column.

If you have any additional comments, please add it below:

Appendix B: Temporary Faculty Member Self-Narrative
Industrial and Manufacturing Department

Temporary Faculty Member Name: _____ Date: _____

Temporary Faculty Member Signature: _____

- a) Please elaborate on your teaching philosophy and any new/innovative pedagogical methodologies and technologies that you may have implemented in your classes during the evaluation period. (Maximum two pages)
- b) Please elaborate on activities and efforts that you have performed for your professional development. (Maximum 500 words)
- c) Please list all the classes taught during the evaluation period. For each class indicate the percentage of students who completed the official University Instructional Assessment Form as well as the average assessment score.

Year	Semester	Course Catalog Number	Course Title	% of Students who Completed the Assessment Form	Average Score

- d) Please discuss your compliance to Extended Course Outline (ECO) and the breadth/depth of the content taught. (Maximum 100 words per course)
- e) Statistical summaries of student survey scores from the current evaluation period for all courses taught during the period of evaluation, as defined in Policy #1329.
- f) Any responses to written student input, as defined by Policy #1329, received by the department during the evaluation period.
- g) Syllabi of all courses taught during the evaluation period.

Appendix C: Student Evaluation Survey Questions - Lecture

Class Climate	CPP - College of Engineering - Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering - Student Evaluation	
TERM:	CLASS NBR:	
INSTRUCTOR:		
COURSE:		

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

		<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very Poor</i>	<i>Not Appropriate</i>
1.1	How effectively does the instructor organize and structure the course?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	How well did the instructor define and meet the objectives of the course?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	How well does the instructor, arouse interest and transmit enthusiasm in the subject matter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4	How well does the instructor demonstrate knowledge of the subject?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5	How effectively does the instructor answer student questions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6	How effectively are the board and other visual aids and technology aids used?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.7	How available is the instructor to students during office hours?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8	How well was the course material paced?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.9	How accurately does the instructor's grading reflect what the student has learned?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.10	How would you rate this instructor compared to other instructors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

YOU MAY SUBMIT SIGNED COMMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT AT ANY TIME DURING THE QUARTER. THE COMMENTS MADE ON THE BACK OF THIS FORM ARE SEEN BY THE INSTRUCTOR ONLY.



Appendix D: Student Evaluation Survey Questions - Lab

Class Climate	CPP - College of Engineering - Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering - Student Evaluation - LAB	
TERM:	CLASS NBR:	
INSTRUCTOR:		
COURSE:		

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

		<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very Poor</i>	<i>Not Appropriate</i>
1.1	How well did the instructor prepare for the lab?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	How well did the instructor define and meet the objectives of the lab?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	How well does the instructor, inspire interest in the lab?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4	How helpful and available is the instructor for consultation during the lab and office hours?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5	How would you evaluate the knowledge you gained by conducting lab experimentations and writing lab reports?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6	"Lecture/Lab combo classes" How well did the lab coordinate with and reinforce the lecture?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.7	How clearly were the experimental procedures/directions written?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8	Were graded lab reports returned in a timely fashion for future use/feedback?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.9	How would you rate this instructor compared to other instructors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

YOU MAY SUBMIT SIGNED COMMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT AT ANY TIME DURING THE QUARTER. THE COMMENTS MADE ON THE BACK OF THIS FORM ARE SEEN BY THE INSTRUCTOR ONLY.

