




CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

P.O. Box 6850, Fullerton, CA 92834-6850 / T 657/278-2614 / F 657/278-5853

April 1, 2015

To: Jim Hofmann, Chair
Department of Liberal Studies

From: José Luis Cruz, Ph.D. 
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Professor of Computer Engineering

Subject: **Liberal Studies Department Policy on the Evaluation of Temporary Faculty**

I have reviewed the proposed evaluation policy for the Liberal Studies department and approve it for implementation commencing with the 2015/2016 Academic Year. I'd like to express my appreciation to you and to the Department Personnel Committee members for your efforts in this task.

Please send to Faculty Affairs and Records an electronic version and a clean hard copy of your newly edited standards within the next two weeks. Be sure to note the approval date on the clean version.

JLC: pc

cc: Shari McMahan, Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs
Sheryl Fontaine, College Dean
Mark Fischer, Chair, Department Personnel Committee
John Patton, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
Faculty Affairs and Records

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Bakersfield / Channel Islands / Chico / Dominguez Hills / East Bay / Fresno / Fullerton / Humboldt / Long Beach / Los Angeles / Maritime Academy
Monterey Bay / Northridge / Pomona / Sacramento / San Bernardino / San Diego / San Francisco / San Jose / San Luis Obispo / San Marcos / Sonoma / Stanislaus

**Office of the
Provost/Vice President**
APR 01 2015
Academic Affairs

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON
DEPARTMENT OF LIBERAL STUDIES

**DEPARTMENT POLICY ON
THE EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY**

I. PREAMBLE

The Department of Liberal Studies shall evaluate its temporary faculty according to UPS 210.070, Evaluation of Temporary Faculty. Pursuant to Section IX.A. of UPS 210.070, the Department of Liberal Studies further elaborates its policy on the evaluation of temporary faculty as laid out in paragraphs II-VI. This policy supersedes the "Guidelines for Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty," dated 2/28/2014, and the "Liberal Studies Department Class Observation Policy," dated 9/20/2002.

II. EXPECTATIONS

A. The Department of Liberal Studies recognizes that effective teaching is central to the learning process. It expects its temporary faculty to teach courses that are interdisciplinary, academically challenging, organized in a coherent fashion, and reflective of relevant scholarship. Course content and the instructional material used must be directly relevant to the course goals set by the Department.

B. The Department expects temporary faculty to prepare well-developed syllabi that meet the standards set by UPS 300.004 Policy on Course Outlines and consequently present the course objective, student learning goals, course materials, course policies (e.g., attendance, extra credit, academic integrity violations), course requirements (e.g., assignments, exams), grading methods, and subject matter in a clear and organized manner. Further, syllabi must contain course schedules, which are chronologically organized tables that clearly and completely state the topics and assignments for each class meeting or, at a minimum, for each week of instruction.

C. In the classroom, temporary faculty members are expected to establish a course environment conducive to learning. In particular, the Department expects temporary faculty members to present materials clearly, to engage the students effectively, to facilitate class discussion where appropriate, to make efficient use of class time, and to demonstrate mastery of the course content.

D. Grading and assessment practices need to be clear, efficient, fair, and appropriately rigorous. Class meetings and office hours shall be maintained in a punctual manner.

III. PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE

The peer review committee responsible for the evaluation of temporary faculty shall be the Department Personnel Committee.

IV. FREQUENCY OF EVALUATION

According to UPS 210.070, Section IV.A,

Temporary faculty members may be appointed to one-semester, one-year, or multi-year appointments. For those faculty members in appointments of one semester only, evaluation of the first semester is at the discretion of the College Dean in consultation with the Department Chair, or as specified in departmental policy. After two one-semester appointments (whether consecutive or not), a faculty member must undergo evaluation. All temporary faculty members

in one-year or two-year appointments shall undergo evaluation annually. Faculty members in three-year appointments shall undergo evaluation during the third year of the appointment.

The Department of Liberal Studies requires evaluation of all temporary faculty members after a first semester of employment. This “interim evaluation” shall be carried out by the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair during the week following the last day of classes for the semester under review. The sources of evidence for this interim evaluation shall include a current curriculum vitae and, for each course taught, a course syllabus, a classroom observation report, and all administered student opinion questionnaires. These sources of evidence shall be compiled by the Department. In addition, during the week following the last day of classes for the semester under review, the temporary faculty member may submit to the Department Chair a narrative summary providing a self-assessment of teaching accomplishments as well as other supporting materials relevant to teaching performance. If submitted, these shall be included in the evaluation process by the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair. The evaluation criteria and rating scale for interim evaluations shall be the same as for other periodic reviews, as stipulated in UPS 210.070.

Annual periodic evaluations of temporary faculty are carried out during the spring semester of each academic year. New hires who taught both preceding semesters, as well as other temporary faculty who do not have 1AY or 3AY contracts and who taught as returning 1-semester hires, shall receive an annual periodic evaluation.

Interim evaluations and other periodic evaluations result in evaluations but not recommendations. Comprehensive evaluations take place for temporary faculty in year 6 of continuous employment (teaching at least one semester per year). These comprehensive evaluations result in both evaluations and recommendations by the DPC and Chair with respect to an initial 3AY appointment. 3AY lecturers in year 1 or year 2 of an appointment are not evaluated unless an evaluation is requested by the lecturer or the Dean; they undergo a periodic evaluation in year three of their appointment. The required evaluations for temporary faculty are summarized below and will include any summer or intersession teaching carried out during the period of review.

Contract Status	Period of Review	Type of Evaluation
3AY lecturers in year 3	preceding 6 semesters	periodic
1AY lecturers in year 6	preceding 11 semesters	comprehensive
1AY lecturers in years 1-5	preceding 2 semesters	periodic
Returning 1-semester hires in years 1-5	preceding 2 semesters	periodic
Returning 1-semester hires in year 6	preceding 11 semesters	comprehensive
New hires	first teaching semester	interim

V. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RATINGS

Section VII.A. of UPS 210.070 states six criteria for the evaluation of a temporary faculty member’s educational performance:

1. Compliance with University, College, and Departmental policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.
2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning.
3. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.
4. Effective use of a variety of instructional methods.
5. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.
6. Pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.

The Department of Liberal Studies elaborates these UPS criteria into a number of more specific criteria and relates them to ratings by means of the evaluation rubric stated below. The sources of evidence that enter the judgments that issue in ratings shall include syllabi, class observation reports, grade distributions, written student comments on the Liberal Studies Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs), the instructor’s narrative summary, and the

frequency distribution of responses marked “A,” “B,” “C,” “D,” or “E” to the twelve topics on the Liberal Studies SOQs if available.

The topics on the Liberal Studies SOQs are as follows:

1. Please rate your instructor on how well he or she communicated the objectives of the course.
2. Please rate your instructor on how well he or she communicated the objectives of the course requirements.
3. Please rate your instructor on how well he or she communicated the subject matter of the course.
4. Please rate your instructor on how well he or she directed class discussions and student participation appropriate to the subject matter.
5. Please rate your instructor on the extent to which his or her course content was academically challenging.
6. Please rate your instructor on how knowledgeable he or she was about the course subject matter.
7. Please rate your instructor on how well he or she presented the course content in a well-organized manner.
8. Please rate your instructor on how punctual he or she was in meeting and conducting class sessions.
9. Based upon your direct personal knowledge, please rate your instructor on how punctually he or she maintained office hours.
10. Please rate your instructor on how well prepared he or she was for class sessions.
11. Please rate your instructor on how well he or she provided appropriate feedback on your work for this course.
12. Please rate your instructor on how well he or she made a positive contribution to your learning the subject matter of this course.

The responses are marked according to the following rating scale:

- A excellent
- B above average
- C average
- D below average
- E poor

The frequency distribution of responses on the Liberal Studies SOQs shall be used as one indicator of teaching performance but shall never be the sole or main criterion for evaluating teaching performance. The following numerical intervals are applicable to each of the 12 topics; they provide guidelines and are not intended to be rigid criteria.

Frequency Distribution of Responses	Partial Ratings
At least 75% of responses are A or B	Exceeds expectations
At least 65% of responses are A or B and at least 80% of responses are A or B or C	Satisfactory
At least 40% of responses are A or B and at least 55% of responses are A or B or C	Needs Improvement
Less than 40% of responses are A or B or less than 55% of responses are A or B or C	Unsatisfactory

Liberal Studies Evaluation Rubric for Temporary Faculty

UPS 210.070 Criteria	Relevant Materials	Specific Liberal Studies Criteria	Partial Ratings			
			Exceeds Expectations	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
1. Compliance with University, College, and Departmental policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements	SOQ #1, SOQ #2, SOQ #8, SOQ #9, SOQ # 12; Syllabi	Compliance of syllabus with departmental expectations as stated under II.B.	Complies fully in a particularly effective manner	Complies fully	Fails to comply in some instances	Largely fails to comply
2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning	SOQ #3, SOQ # 4, SOQ # 5, SOQ #7, SOQ #11, SOQ #12; Classroom observation reports; Narrative	Presentation of course materials	Perfectly clear and systematically organized	Generally clear and organized	Unclear in a number of instances; some organizational flaws	Largely unclear and disorganized
		Engagement of students	Addresses students in a particularly inviting manner; consistently uses various and ingenious means to invite active engagement with the material	Addresses students in an inviting manner; frequently asks students to actively engage the material through such means as group work or in-class exercises	Rarely asks students to actively engage the material	Provides no encouragement for student engagement
		Facilitation of class discussion where appropriate	Asks numerous open-ended questions that encourage students to interact; responses to students are attentive and elicit further discussion	Asks some open-ended questions that encourage students to interact	Questions are seldom open-ended and seldom encourage student interaction	Instructor lectures and does not encourage discussion

		Use of class time	Develops all major and minor points in well-organized lesson plan	Develops major points within allotted time and avoids unproductive digressions	Fails to fully develop essential points within allotted time and digresses in unhelpful ways	Fails to focus student attention on central points within allotted time
		Mastery of course content	Has specialized knowledge of the material	Has sufficient background knowledge to support class presentation	Lacks background knowledge of some course content	Serious lack of background knowledge of course content
3. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes	SOQ #1, SOQ #2, SOQ # 11, SOQ # 12; Syllabi	Linkage of learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes in syllabus	Liberal Studies learning goals are listed verbatim near the beginning of the syllabus; requirements and grading practices are related back to learning goals in a precise and detailed manner	Liberal Studies learning goals for the course are listed verbatim near the beginning of the syllabus; requirements and grading practices are related back to learning goals in a general manner	Learning goals are stated but do not correspond precisely to approved Liberal Studies goals; requirements and grading practices are not related to learning goals	No learning goals are stated in the syllabus
		Implementation	Learning goals and linkages are indicated to students throughout the course; requirements and grading practices precisely follow the syllabus	Learning goals and linkages are made clear to students at beginning of course; requirements and grading practices generally follow the syllabus	Learning goals and linkages are mentioned but not made clear; a number of requirements and grading practices deviates from the syllabus	No learning goals are indicated to students

4. Effective use of a variety of instructional methods	SOQ #3, SOQ #4, SOQ #7, SOQ #12; Class visitation reports; Syllabi; Narrative	———	Uses a great variety of instructional methods— e.g., lecture, group work, discussion, visual aids, videos—to excellent effect	Uses a number of instructional methods— e.g., lecture, discussion, visual aids—to good effect	Uses only lecturing as instructional method	Lectures poorly and fails to use any other methods
5. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study	SOQ #5, SOQ #11, SOQ #12; Syllabi; Grade distributions	Assessment and grading practices are clear, efficient, and fair	Efficient and fair grading practice is clearly stated in tabular form indicating the weight given to assignments	Grading practice is fair and stated fairly clearly	Grading practice is fair but either overly complex or confusingly vague	Grading practice is logically flawed or unfair
		Grading practices are appropriately rigorous	Grade distribution shows rigor appropriate to the course on all grade levels	Grade distribution shows rigor appropriate to the course on most grade levels	Grade distribution suggests lack in academic rigor	Grade distribution is clearly lacking in academic rigor
		Assignments are appropriately rigorous	All assignments are exceptionally well designed and appropriately rigorous	Design of assignments is acceptable and appropriately rigorous	Some assignments are poorly designed or insufficiently rigorous	Most assignments are not appropriately rigorous or demanding
		Academic integrity	Academic integrity statement is complete (including detailed and precise penalties)	Academic integrity statement is complete (including penalties)	Academic integrity statement is incomplete (e.g., lacking penalties)	No academic integrity statement in syllabus

6. Pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching	SOQ #5, SOQ #6, SOQ #10, SOQ # 12; Curriculum vitae; Syllabi; Classroom observation reports; Narrative	Currency of pedagogical methods	Applies the latest results of educational research	Methods are fairly current (e.g., prompting students to actively engage material)	Methods are not entirely current (e.g., pure lecturing)	Lack of awareness and practice of effective pedagogical methods
		Academic preparation for course(s) taught	Graduate degree in the subject matter of the course	Graduate degree that enables instructor to sufficiently master the course content	Undergraduate degree that relates to the subject matter of the course	Education is unrelated to subject matter of the course
		Course content covers knowledge and skills that are valued in the discipline	All course content is relevant to the teaching assignment; cutting edge knowledge is covered	All course content is relevant to the teaching assignment	Some course content is not relevant to the teaching assignment	Majority of the course content is not relevant to the teaching assignment
		Professional engagement in discipline(s) relevant to teaching assignment	Attends conferences; publishes peer-reviewed articles or books; is engaged in professional service	Some professional engagement in discipline(s) relevant to teaching assignment	Some professional engagement in discipline(s) not relevant to teaching assignment	No professional engagement

The Department Personnel Committee shall turn the partial ratings obtained by applying the above rubric into ratings for each of the six UPS 210.070 criteria by collective judgment based on shared deliberation. Collective judgment based on shared deliberation shall also be used to turn the ratings for the six UPS 210.070 criteria into an overall rating.

The Department Chair shall independently make a cumulative judgment to turn the partial ratings obtained by applying the above rubric into ratings for each of the six UPS 210.070 criteria. The Chair shall also make an independent judgment to turn the ratings for the six UPS 210.070 criteria into an overall rating.

VI. CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

As a general rule, the classrooms of temporary faculty members shall be observed once a year. There are four exceptions to this rule: (1) Whenever a temporary faculty member teaches a particular course for the first time, he or she shall be observed teaching that course and a classroom observation report shall be issued. (2) The classrooms of temporary faculty members whose teaching performance has been rated overall as “exceeds expectations” in the two most recent annual evaluations, whether periodic or comprehensive, may subsequently be observed only once every third year. (Temporary faculty members who were rated overall as “outstanding” or “very good” in 2013 shall be considered to have been rated as “exceeds expectations” in this regard.) (3) The classroom of any

temporary faculty member shall be observed during any semester upon request of the Department Chair or by decision of the Department Personnel Committee. (4) The classroom of any temporary faculty member shall be observed once in any semester upon request of the temporary faculty member.

Classroom observations shall be scheduled and performed and classroom observation reports shall be prepared by members of the Department Personnel Committee. Classroom observations normally shall take place during the fall semester.

As set forth in Section IX.A. of USP 210.070, "the temporary faculty member shall be provided notice of at least five days that a classroom observation is to take place. In all cases, the classroom observation report shall be given to the faculty member within ten working days after the observation has been conducted."

The temporary faculty member shall provide the observing member of the Department Personnel Committee with a copy of the course syllabus prior to the observation.

Classroom observation reports shall assess teaching performance with regard to the following categories: (1) clarity of presentation, (2) communication with students, (3) student participation, (4) effective use of classroom time, (5) appropriateness of presentation methods, and (6) demonstration of mastery of course content. Assessments shall be made in the context of the level, format, and objectives of the course.

Approved 1 April, 2015