

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
CRITERIA FOR THE PERIODIC EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY
2022/2023 Academic Year

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION	1
I.1. Definitions.....	1
SECTION II – PROCEDURES.....	2
II.1. Full-time and Part-time Temporary Faculty (not Y-3)	2
II.2. Three-Year Appointment (Y-3).....	2
II.3. Department Procedures.....	3
II.4. Student Evaluation of Teaching	3
II.5. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	4
III.1. Elements of Performance and Evaluation	5
III.2. Evaluation Timeline	6
SECTION IV. APPENDICES	7
Appendix A. Student Evaluation Form	7
Appendix B. Peer Evaluation Form	9

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

The periodic evaluation of temporary faculty members is an important faculty responsibility. The evaluation process is the mechanism by which we ensure the quality and promote the development of our temporary faculty, and thereby assure educational quality for our students. It is the department faculty who are in the best position to provide clear expectations, create an environment conducive to achieving expectations, and render the most informed evaluation of the faculty member. The Department Criteria for Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty Document communicates department expectations and procedures to the department faculty, faculty candidates, and the Dean of the College. It has been developed using the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and the University Manual (UM). Should there be a discrepancy at any point between this document and the CBA and/or the university manual, the language of the CBA takes precedence followed by the UM. Departmental documents may only supplement and may not conflict with these policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes first precedence and university policies take second precedence over departmental policies.

Temporary faculty member shall be provided a copy of this document, including procedures and timelines, within 14 days of the start of their first semester at Cal Poly Pomona. It is recommended that department criteria be maintained on the department web page so that they are available to candidates for faculty positions. The primary purpose of this document is to articulate clearly what the department expects of its temporary faculty members. These expectations must be stated with sufficient clarity and specificity that the faculty member under review is able to plan his/her activities around them. Department criteria should be consistent with department and college mission, vision, goals, and accreditation standards.

I. Definitions.

Section 305 of the University Manual provides an overview of evaluation procedures. Some of the more important definitions are provided here.

- a) The Civil Engineering Department Periodic Evaluation Committee (PEC) is responsible for the periodic evaluation of temporary faculty members. Members of the Periodic Evaluation Committee must be full-time tenured faculty members and are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty of the department. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) may serve if elected and willing. The Civil Engineering Department RTP Committee shall act as the Civil Engineering Department Periodic Evaluation Committee for the evaluation of temporary faculty members.
- b) Criteria are the expectations articulated in this document and in Section 305.15 of the University Manual.
- c) Student evaluation of teaching is governed by Policy 1329 of the University Manual.
- d) Peer evaluation of teaching includes a classroom visit; review of course syllabus, outlines, handouts, exams, and other teaching materials; and a written report. The PEC is responsible for ensuring the completion of the required peer evaluations and may assign peer evaluations to any tenured or tenure-track faculty in the department.
- e) The faculty member under evaluation shall use the department criteria in effect at the time of his/her initial appointment. Current procedures and policies apply.

SECTION II – PROCEDURES

Section 305 of the University Manual and CBA Article 15 describe the evaluation process.

II.1. Full-time and Part-time Temporary Faculty (not Y-3)

- Evaluation of full-time temporary faculty members appointed for two or more semesters, regardless of break in service shall include student evaluations of teaching performance for those with teaching duties and/or evaluation other assigned duties specifically defined and described in the letter of appointment or contract, peer review, and evaluations by the Dean (Article 15.23).
- Evaluation of part-time temporary faculty members appointed for two or more semesters, regardless of break in service shall include student evaluations of teaching performance for those with teaching duties and/or evaluation other assigned duties specifically defined and described in the letter of appointment or contract, evaluations by the Dean and/or Department Chair and an opportunity for peer inputs from the PEC (Article 15.24).
- Full-time and part-time faculty members appointed for two or more semesters, regardless of break in service, shall be evaluated once each year.
- Temporary faculty members appointed for less than two semesters shall be evaluated at the discretion of the Department Chair, the Dean, or PEC. The faculty may request that an evaluation be performed (Article 15.25).
- A written record of periodic evaluation shall be placed in the faculty's Personnel Action File (PAF). The temporary faculty member shall be provided a copy of the written record of the evaluation.

II.2. Three-Year Appointment (Y-3)

- Temporary faculty members **holding a three-year appointment** shall be evaluated at least once during the term of their appointment and may be evaluated more frequent upon the request of either the employee or the President (Article 15.26).
- Faculty members holding a three-year appointment must be evaluated in the third year of the appointment. A faculty member eligible for a three-year appointment must be evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of a three-year appointment.
- Evaluation for both groups shall include student evaluations of teaching performance for those with teaching duties and/or evaluation other assigned duties specifically defined and described in the letter of appointment or contract, peer review, and evaluations by the Dean.
- The evaluation shall rate the faculty member as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Satisfactory rating may include narrative comments including constructive suggestions for development.
- A written record of periodic evaluation shall be placed in the faculty's Personnel Action File (PAF). The temporary faculty member shall be provided a copy of the written record of the evaluation.
- The periodic evaluation shall consider the employee's cumulative work performance

(three years for faculty with a three-year appointment, entire qualifying period for the new appointment).

- A three-year appointment shall be issued if the faculty member is determined by the Dean to have performed in a satisfactory manner in carrying out the duties of his or her position. The determination shall be based on the contents of the Personnel Action File (PAF). Where the Dean determines that a temporary faculty member has not performed his or her duties in a satisfactory manner, then the reasons for his or her determination shall be reduced to writing and placed in the PAF.

II.3. Department Procedures

The CE Department RTP Committee (DRTPC) will act as the Periodic Evaluation Committee (PEC) for the evaluation of temporary faculty members. The Chair of the DRTPC will act as the Chair of the PEC, who shall assume primary responsibility for ensuring compliance with the various provisions of this document and Section 305 of the University Manual. These responsibilities specifically include:

- Initial Appointment:
 - Ensures that faculty members have a copy of this document. This document includes the applicable departmental criteria used for performance evaluation.
- Throughout the year:
 - Ensures that peer evaluations are conducted for all eligible faculty members under evaluation. Ensures that peer evaluation reports are provided to candidates in a timely manner—within 2 weeks of a classroom visit—and that the reports are complete.
 - Ensures that faculty members receive Student Evaluation Forms. Student evaluations must be conducted in each class, each semester.
- First Week of Spring Semester:
 - Requests each of the eligible faculty members to submit by the end of fifth week of the Spring semester a self-evaluation consisting of a one-page statement and all supporting documents including peer evaluation reports and student evaluation results.
- Eighth Week of Spring Semester:
 - Prepares the department evaluation based upon the self-evaluation, student input, peer evaluation and in adherence to the criteria described in this document. The timeline for this evaluation is presented in section III.2.
 - Forwards the department evaluation to the Dean's office.

II.4. Student Evaluation of Teaching.

Solicited Cal Poly Pomona in-class student evaluations, unsolicited student comments (when available) and students grade distribution for each course taught will be used as one of the performance metrics for assessing the level of teaching effectiveness for faculty members under

review.

DESIGN - The Civil Engineering Department will utilize a standardized computer tabulated questionnaire of its own design (see an example in Appendix A). Although individual faculty members may design and administer their own evaluation instruments, those cannot be used in place of, or as a supplement to, the required standardized departmental questionnaire. The results of any such informal evaluation are entirely for the use of the individual faculty member and cannot be placed in his/her Personnel Action File (PAF) or included in the evaluation of a temporary faculty member.

ADMINISTRATION - CE 4000, 4990, as well as senior project series with less than 10 students are not eligible courses for this purpose. Lecture and laboratory sections of a particular course are considered as separate courses for this evaluation process. Student evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with Policy 1329 of the University Manual. Under the current CBA, each faculty member is required to conduct a student evaluation in each class, every semester, and is solely responsible for ensuring that they are properly administered and that the results are forwarded to the CE Department.

INTERPRETATION AND UTILIZATION - The computer tabulation of numerical averages serves as an adequate quantitative summary of each student evaluation. As part of each evaluation, the PEC will provide a written interpretation of these summaries characterizing the level of performance in terms of departmental standards and expectations. In this summary, any perceived deficiencies, or areas of concern, as well as suggestions for remediation and/or improvement, will be specifically identified.

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY- Although individual student comments are welcomed at any time, such submissions must be entirely unsolicited and cannot be anonymous. In no case shall an individual faculty member selectively solicit such input.

II.5. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.

Peer evaluations will be used as a tool for assessing the level of teaching effectiveness. Full-time and part-time temporary faculty members selected for peer evaluation as described in sections II.1 and II.2 shall have one peer evaluation done during their evaluation period as described in sections II.1 and II.2. More than one peer evaluation may be done at the discretion of the PEC, Department Chair, or the Dean.

The individual faculty unit employee being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five (5) days that a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place. All such evaluations will include a classroom visit of no less than 50 minutes, and an examination and review of the course syllabus as well as other pertinent teaching materials such as student assignments, handouts, and visual aids. The peer evaluation must be summarized in a written report to be discussed with the faculty member within two weeks of the classroom visit. The faculty member must sign the evaluation form and has the right to respond in writing to the peer evaluation within five working days of receiving the evaluation. It is the responsibility of the PEC Chair to forward the peer evaluation, and the faculty member's response, to the Department Office and Dean's office for placement in the candidate's PAF. The evaluation form used for the peer evaluation process is attached in Appendix B.

II.6. Self-Evaluation

A self-evaluation should include a one-page statement and all supporting documents including peer evaluation reports and student evaluation results. The statement should address how the faculty has performed with respect to the criteria for evaluation given in Section III.

SECTION III – CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

III.1. Elements of Performance and Evaluation

The temporary faculty member under review must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching as a necessary pre-requisite for any positive evaluation or personnel action. Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated based on items such as the following:

- a) Knowledge of the subject matter being taught, and the relationship of this subject to other courses, as evidenced by such metrics as peer and student evaluations.
- b) Standards and evaluation methods consistent with the expectations of the CE Department.
- c) Attainment of course objectives as described in the Expanded Course Outline.
- d) Classroom and laboratory performance, including clarity, organization, method of presentation, student interaction and rapport, reaction to questions, use of homework, and the use of the Canvas, examples, and teaching aids, as evidenced by such metrics as peer and student evaluations.
- e) Maintenance of students' interest in the subject material, and use of real-world applications and examples in lectures.
- f) Availability to students outside of class through the maintenance of regular office hours in accordance with current university requirements.
- g) Updating existing courses by incorporating new information, presenting new analytical methodologies, and/or implementing new teaching methodologies.
- h) Demonstration of continued improvement in course preparation and presentation. Both peer and student evaluations should be used to assess the effectiveness of improvement.
- i) Demonstrated progress from the previous reviews. Temporary faculty should discuss and demonstrate that recommendations made in previous reviews and actions taken have led to improved teaching performance.

Faculty members renewing their three-year appointment or are eligible for a three-year appointment will also be evaluated based on items such as

- a) Receipt of an outstanding teacher award and/or significant contributions to teaching which have received formal recognition.
- b) Demonstrable evidence of incorporation of research in the curriculum
- c) Curricular development and enhancement
- d) Participation and presentations in conferences, seminars, and workshops, which enhance teaching effectiveness.

- e) Project advising, and thesis committee membership at the graduate level.



For faculty members with duties specifically defined and described in the letter of appointment or contract, the success, and the extent to which these duties are carried out will also be evaluated.

III.2. Evaluation Timeline

All eligible faculty members shall submit a self-evaluation to the PEC by the end of fifth week of the Spring semester. The PEC shall prepare the university standard Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty Form (Appendix 27B of the University Manual) by the end of the eighth week of the Spring semester. This form documents the faculty member's performance according to the evaluation criteria described above. This form shall be forwarded to the Department Chair for review and comment by the end of the tenth week of the Spring semester. It will then be forwarded to the Dean for review and comment by the end of the thirteenth week of the Spring semester. At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, faculty unit employees shall be given a copy of the recommendation and the written reasons, therefore. The faculty unit employee may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation within ten (10) days following receipt of the recommendation. It will then be placed in the faculty member's Personnel Action File. Materials for evaluation submitted by a faculty unit employee shall be deemed incorporated by reference in the Personnel Action File, but need not be physically placed in the file.

SECTION IV. APPENDICES

Appendix A. Student Evaluation Form (Lecture)

Class Climate	CPP - College of Engineering - Civil 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. Instructor

	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory Good</i>	<i>Very Poor Poor</i>	<i>Not Appropriate</i>
1.1 How effectively does the instructor organize and structure the course (e.g: course objectives, grading policy, textbook and/or reference materials, office hours, number of exams and schedule of exam times)?	<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"/>
1.3 How well does the instructor demonstrate knowledge of the subject?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 How effective is the instructor in explaining the concepts of the course?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5 How effectively does the instructor communicate with the class (e.g., speaks clearly, writes legibly, uses appropriate visual aids, listens effectively.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6 How well does the instructor stimulate and/or encourage appropriate class discussions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.7 How effectively does the instructor answer student questions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8 How available is the instructor for student consultation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.9 How well do the instructor's assignments facilitate student learning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.10 How well do the exams reflect the concepts of the course?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.11 How effective is the instructor in giving timely and constructive feedback on student work (e.g., timely return of homework assignments and exams.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.12 How would you rate this instructor compared to other instructors in the University?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Course



2.1 How good is the quality of the textbook and/or handouts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2 Has this course been a valuable learning experience for you?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 What is your overall rating of this course?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

F1631U1346719227P1PL1V0

05/10/2018, Page 1/1



Student Evaluation Form (Laboratory)

Class Climate	CPP - College of Engineering - Civil 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 prepared for the lab does the instructor appear?	<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 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 arouse interest and transmit enthusiasm 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 rate this lab instructor as compared to other lab instructors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6 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 experiments written?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8 How well did the range, accuracy and dependability of the lab equipment support the experiments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>too few</i>	<i>just right</i>	<i>too many</i>	<i>N/A</i>		
1.9 Was the number of students per bench about right so that no value was lost from the experiments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<i>too little</i>	<i>about right</i>	<i>too much</i>	<i>N/A</i>		
1.10 Was the time spent outside the lab period for written and experimental work about right for this lab?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

PLEASE SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR SPACE FOR SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS



Appendix B. Peer Evaluation Form

CE Department Peer Evaluation Form

Instructor to be evaluated:
 Instructor performing evaluation/time/date:
 Course (CRN, Semester/year, Course Code/Name):
 Course schedule (e.g. T/Th 1:00-1:50)/Building/Room:

Question	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Comments / Suggestions for improvements
Is the class syllabus complete (e.g., Clear course syllabus to include: course objectives, grading policy, textbook and/or reference materials, office hours, number of exams and schedule of exam times.)?					
How well does the instructor demonstrate knowledge of the subject?					
How effective is the instructor in explaining important concepts of the course?					
How effectively does the instructor communicate with the class (e.g., speaks clearly, writes legibly, uses appropriate visual aids, listens effectively.)?					
How well does the instructor stimulate and/or encourage appropriate class discussions?					
How effectively does the instructor answer student questions?					
How well do the instructor's assignments facilitate student learning? (Answer this only after consultation with the instructor).					

*Correlation with the question numbers on the student "Instructional Assessment" form.

Extensions to evaluator comments made above, and/or other comments the evaluator wishes to make, may be included on additional pages

Signature of Evaluator and Date

Signature of Instructor and Date