

2023-2024 Temporary Faculty Evaluation

Chair/Director Review

This form is used by the Department Chair or Program Director to review a part-time temporary faculty member with a one semester or one academic year appointment. It may also be used to provide an independent review for temporary faculty being reviewed by a committee of tenured faculty.

*The highlighted rubrics are aligned with CNSM EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR LECTURERS and are intended as a guide to be used at the discretion of evaluators.*

Employee Name: Click here to enter text.

# Teaching Performance

## Review of Student Evaluation and Grading

## This section is for analysis of SPOT materials and grading practices, as well as discussion of classroom visit observations if performed.

### CLASSROOM VISIT OBSERVATIONS\*

Peer classroom visitation(s) indicate effective instruction. [ ]  YES [ ]  NO

\*Please attach peer observation memo if available

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments / formative feedback:** |

### Course Completion

Average course completion rates [ ]  >80% [ ]  75%-80% [ ]  70-75% [ ]  <70%

Are Course Completion rates, taken in context of other information available to evaluators, indicative of effective learning and equity?

[ ]  YES [ ]  NO

|  |
| --- |
| **Context/Comments/formative feedback:** |

### SPOT RATINGS

*Student ratings of instruction should be compared with department and college means and taken in context with all other criteria, such as difficulty of course concepts and material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and course rigor.*

Are SPOT ratings, taken in context of other information available to evaluators, indicative of effective learning?

[ ]  YES [ ]  NO

Are ratings on question 4 (*The instructor responded respectfully to student questions and viewpoints*) generally consistent with ratings on other questions?

 [ ]  YES [ ]  NO

Are ratings on question 5 (*The instructor was effective at teaching the subject matter*

*in this course*) generally consistent with ratings on other questions?

 [ ]  YES [ ]  NO

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments / formative feedback:** |

### REFLECTIVE NARRATIVE

Reflective Narrative should provide an overview of candidate’s teaching philosophy as applied to courses taught during the evaluation period and should demonstrate candidate’s efforts to foster student-centered instructional environment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Professional Narrative / Candidate Reflection on their Teaching** | **Rating** |
| Narrative describes candidate’s teaching philosophy as applied to courses taught during the evaluation period. | [ ]  Excellent [ ]  Good [ ]  Needs Attention |
| Candidate’s Narrative and other materials indicate commitment to equity and student-centered learning. | [ ]  Excellent [ ]  Good [ ]  Needs Attention |
| The candidate describes efforts to improve student learning, particularly in courses with history of challenges in equity and completion. | [ ]  Excellent [ ]  Good [ ]  Needs Attention |
| The candidate takes an active role in improving his/her teaching effectiveness and maintaining currency of teaching materials | [ ]  Excellent [ ]  Good [ ]  Needs Attention |
| The candidate responded to suggestions from previous evaluations (if available) | [ ]  Excellent [ ]  Good [ ]  Needs Attention |
| Reflection on candidate’s SPOT ratings and other student feedback (as applicable) | [ ]  Excellent [ ]  Good [ ]  Needs Attention |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments / formative feedback:** |

## Instructional Materials

## Review information and materials relevant to instruction, if submitted. Constructive comments for improving instructional material are permissible in all rating categories but are required if the rating is unsatisfactory.

[ ]  Excellent [ ]  Proficient [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Unsatisfactory (Comments must be provided)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Instructional Materials / Teaching Methods / Assessment Approaches** | **Rating** |
| Curriculum goals / student learning outcomes are clearly stated in syllabus / other course materials and reflected in assessment materials | [ ]  Excellent [ ]  Good [ ]  Needs Attention |
| Candidate’s teaching approaches are responsive to diverse needs and/or preparation of CSULB students. | [ ]  Excellent [ ]  Good [ ]  Needs Attention |
| Candidate’s grading practices are clearly stated in course materials and reasonably consistent with department expectations. | [ ]  Excellent [ ]  Good [ ]  Needs Attention |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments / formative feedback:** |

## Service to Students

## Provide the information requested below. If appropriate, comment on other service to students provided by the instructor outside of class.

Number of office hours scheduled per week: Click here to enter text.

Are office hours scheduled at times which are reasonably convenient to students in assigned courses?

[ ]  Yes [ ]  No (Explain in comments)

Are office hours held as scheduled with rare exceptions?

[ ]  Yes [ ]  No (Explain in comments)

Comments: Click here to enter text.

# Overall Rating of Teaching

# On the basis of the evidence provided in Sections A, B, and C above, rate the instructor’s overall teaching. Constructive comments for improving performance are permissible in all rating categories, but are required for ratings of unsatisfactory.

[ ]  Excellent [ ]  Proficient [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Unsatisfactory (Comments must be provided)

Comments: Click here to enter text.

# Professional Growth & Development

# This section includes scholarly or creative activities and pedagogical contributions to the profession.

[ ]  Required: The assigned duties go beyond teaching responsibilities.

[ ]  Optional: The employee does not have specific assignments in addition to instruction but has chosen to submit evidence of their professional growth and development for evaluation.

Comments: Click here to enter text.

# University & Community Service

# This section includes service to professional organizations.

[ ]  Required: The assigned duties go beyond teaching responsibilities.

[ ]  Optional: The employee does not have specific assignments in addition to instruction but has chosen to submit evidence of their University or community service for evaluation.

Comments: Click here to enter text.

# Overall Performance Rating

On the basis of the evidence presented above, rate the faculty member’s overall performance.

[ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Unsatisfactory (Comments must be provided)

Comments: Click here to enter text.

# Certification

[ ]  By checking this box I certify that I am Click here to enter text., the Department Chair/Program Director for the employee named above and that I have completed this review on Click here to enter text..