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Executive Summary:
We recommend that all Part-Time Faculty receive an annual evaluation by their academic unit. In addition, we recommend that each Part-Time Faculty member receive special evaluations at two critical points in his/her LMU careers. Evaluations for Part-Time Faculty will thus fall into three categories: 1) “Level 1” annual evaluations which apply to all Part-Time Faculty that are employed on an “at will” or semester contract basis, 2) “Level 2” evaluations which should take place at the time that a Part-Time Faculty member becomes eligible for a 1-year contract (Lecturer II status), and which are also used to assess Lecturer II and Adjunct status Part-Time Faculty on a periodic basis, and 3) “Level 3” evaluations which should occur specifically for the purposes of assessing Part-Time Faculty that are eligible for promotion to Adjunct Faculty status.

During AY 2015-16, annual evaluations must include at least the following:

Basic Materials:
- Student Evaluations – including teacher reflection on evaluations
- Duties check sheet filled out by Chair (see appendix)
- Course documents (syllabus and other appropriate documents as determined by academic unit).
- CV/Resume

We recommend that latest by the end of the 2015-16 Academic Year, academic units have established formal evaluation policies that have been approved by the appropriate Dean, that such policies include formal written guidelines/rubrics for the evaluations, that evaluations are shared with those being evaluated and should include a written explanation in cases where the teaching is deemed less than satisfactory, and that each year the units submit a report on all evaluations to the Dean’s office.

We strongly recommend including at least one of the additional items below.

Starting in Academic Year 2016-17, all Part-Time Faculty members who are in their first year should have evaluations including the Basic Materials and at least one additional item (see below):

Additional Items:
- Classroom Observation (typically by other LMU Faculty)
- Sample representative student work plus reflection on the nature of the student work and/or effectiveness of the assignment selection of samples
- Reflection on student evaluations
• Written review of syllabus and assignments by other LMU Faculty
• Written response to instructor’s self-assessment of assignment(s), student work, and instructor feedback.
• Other appropriate item as approved by the Dean’s office.

We further recommend that in order for Faculty to be promoted to 1-year contract status (Lecturer II status), they must successfully undergo a higher level of review (called Level 2) that includes a classroom observation, and in order to be promoted to Adjunct status Part-Time Faculty must undergo an even higher level of review (called Level 3) that also includes a reflection on samples of graded student work.

Introduction

The charge of this task force was to present a plan for a formal teaching evaluation process for Part-Time Faculty. In conceiving of such a plan, we note that the teaching evaluation process of Part-Time Faculty serves the purpose of

• facilitating student learning through excellent teaching and student engagement,
• allowing academic goals, standards, and policies to be implemented consistently and regularly reviewed,
• enabling fair and equitable assessment of teaching and resulting hiring and promotion decisions,
• providing Part-Time Faculty members with peer guidance and the opportunity to develop their teaching,

In addition, it is important to keep in mind that

• evaluations have to be done conscientiously, consistently, and in a timely manner to be effective and fair,
• careful evaluations are time-consuming and require open-mindedness, sensitivity, and experience and/or training,
• a limited number of Faculty members are available who can do peer observations and that the number of Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty members varies widely across academic units.

Part-time Teaching Evaluation Process:

Any process that LMU implements should be phased in so that we can develop an appropriately responsive and effective system through resource development, revision, and adaptation. Moreover, every effort should be made to consider diverse disciplines and types of Part-Time Faculty to insure the final model of evaluation
offers sufficient uniformity to be equitable and sufficient flexibility to be effective and responsive to the multiple units across the University.

Final implementation of any process should be vetted by appropriate University groups and committees including the Deans Council, the Faculty Senate, Chairs Councils, and appropriate committees.

Our guiding principle is that the evaluation procedures and policies should be practical and implementable, transparent, equitable, and just. Moreover, such procedures should provide both professional development as teachers for our Part-Time Faculty and provide documentation of their performance.

A secondary guiding principle is that Faculty (both Part- and Full-Time) and administrators are professionals who aspire to the best for our students, and any evaluation system needs to recognize this.

We note here that the subcommittee was split on whether to recommend that all Part-Time Faculty have a classroom observation required in their first year (2 semesters) of teaching (see Appendix 6 for further discussion of this). While classroom observations are clearly a useful tool for both summative and formative evaluation, it is also clear that requiring such observations in the first year of teaching and regularly thereafter is difficult and potentially costly to implement.

We recommend that for the purposes of applying the timelines below, Part-Time Faculty members who have been teaching at LMU for multiple semesters should be grandparented into the system in regards to the first-year review.

Academic Units (Colleges and Schools) should establish their own guidelines on what makes up an evaluation and during which term(s) evaluations should be conducted. Each academic unit should develop written guidelines for evaluation that will be made available to Part-Time Faculty upon the start of their contract period. The following pages list minimum criteria that the evaluations of all units should satisfy. Additionally, units must flesh out the guidelines to define what is appropriate for their own unit. Finally, we recommend strongly that units consider classroom observations and other alternative evaluations methods in addition to those required here as best fits their discipline's student learning outcomes, professional development for Faculty, and resources.

The subgroup further recommends that the University assure that in coordination with the Committee on Excellence in Teaching and through the Center for Teaching Excellence appropriate support and opportunities to discuss effective and manageable ways to do evaluations of Part-Time Faculty be provided.
Process
Academic Units will conduct reviews of Part-Time Faculty on an annual basis. In exceptional cases, Dean's approval will allow exemption from an annual review. For the majority of Part-Time Faculty (those who are not yet eligible for Lecturer II or Adjunct status), these reviews will consist of a Level 1 review (see below), which will be conducted annually for each professor. To be “promoted” to Lecturer II or Adjunct rank, more stringent reviews will be required (Level 2 and Level 3 reviews, respectively), and to maintain those ranks, Part-Time Faculty at these ranks or status should then be reviewed periodically (less frequently than annually) using a Level 2 review. Each unit should determine whether reviews will primarily occur in the fall or the spring term, as well as how often the periodic reviews of higher ranks should be conducted. This committee recommends that the higher-level periodic reviews (Level 2 reviews) happen on a time line of no less than once every 3 years for Lecturer II rank and no less than once every 5 years for Adjunct rank.

Ratings:
Units should establish clear written guidelines for ratings in the following four categories:

(3) Outstanding
(2) Satisfactory
(1) Needs Improvement
(0) Unacceptable

Each unit should establish a procedure for identifying who conducts the evaluation (Chair, committee of Full-Time Faculty, or other committee that reports to the Chair). These ratings should be given in writing (with explanation for ratings below Satisfactory) to the Faculty member reviewed. The written evaluation will be made a part of the Faculty member's personnel file in the Dean's Office, and Departments/Programs will report on evaluations to the appropriate Dean's office.

Review materials (minimum)
Level 1 review (annual review of all Part-Time Faculty):

Basic Materials:
- Student Evaluations – including teacher reflection on evaluations
- Duties check sheet filled out by Chair (see appendix)
- Course documents (syllabus and other appropriate documents as determined by academic unit).
- CV

First Year Faculty evaluations shall also include at least one of the following additional materials
- Classroom Observation – Evaluator (selected in consultation with Faculty member under review) uses agreed-upon classroom observation procedure and documents,
- Collection of sample representative student work plus reflection on the nature of the student work and/or effectiveness of the assignment selection of samples – Evaluator uses unit-developed rubric,
- Faculty self-reflection on student evaluations – Evaluator uses unit-developed rubric,
- Written review of syllabus and assignments – Evaluator uses unit-developed rubric,
- Written response to instructor's self-assessment of assignment(s), student work, and instructor feedback – Evaluator uses unit-developed rubric,
- Other appropriate item as approved by the Dean's office.

**Level 2 review** (necessary to become eligible for 1-year contracts and periodically as determined by the units thereafter to continue 1-year contract eligibility)
- All Level 1 materials, plus
- Teaching philosophy and narrative of LMU teaching (reflection on development of teaching approaches and outcomes, provided documentation, annual reviews, discussion of standards of excellence, etc.)
- Compilation of all previous annual reviews (at least 1 satisfactory annual review required)
- Sample assignments and exams
- Summative classroom observation by other LMU Faculty

**Level 3 review** (necessary for promotion to "Adjunct" as defined in Faculty Handbook)
- All Level 2 materials, plus
- Compilation of all previous annual reviews (at least one satisfactory Tier 2 review required, and at least 3 total satisfactory prior reviews),
- Collection of sample representative student work plus rationale for selection of samples,
- Summative classroom observation, and
- Additional evidence of teaching excellence and engagement as appropriate.

**Additional elements:**
Academic units are strongly encouraged to include additional assessments to be included in all reviews. In addition, units are strongly encouraged to consider periodic classroom observations (including one in the first year) as part of the review process even for Faculty in the Lecturer I rank. These additional elements must be part of the unit's approved written standards.

**Formative assessment:**
We strongly recommend that the academic units strive to make available formative assessments as early as possible for Part-Time Faculty members. Ideally, during the first two semesters of teaching, Part-Time Faculty should have formative feedback, including appropriate feedback on their syllabus as soon as possible.
Response:
A Faculty member may submit a written response to be attached to the rating they receive. The response and rating will be included in the Faculty member’s personnel file in the Dean’s Office.

Request for Observation:
In their fourth semester of teaching and once every 6 semesters of teaching thereafter, Part-Time Faculty may request of their unit that they receive a classroom observation. If the request is made in the first four weeks of the semester, the unit should see that the assessment is completed barring exceptional circumstances.

Phase-In:
The phase-in of any evaluation model may require time. This is particularly true if units choose to conduct classroom observations in the first year of Part-Time Faculty member’s teaching.

Current Part-Time Faculty will need to be placed at a “contract level” in the system, and those at more than 3 years experience will need to be placed into cohorts regarding evaluations that occur every 3- (or 6-, in cases where Faculty members only teach one semester per year) years to avoid too many evaluations in one year.

Moreover, we consider it imperative that whatever Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Plan is recommended be fully vetted by the Faculty Senate and reviewed by appropriate committees.

Periodic Review:
Every three years this process should be reviewed by a multi-disciplinary panel, including representation from the Part-Time Faculty, for effectiveness and workability.

Other Considerations:
- Formative evaluations to help Part-Time Faculty in their professional development as teachers are critical, and should be part of unit obligations. (not just outsourced to the CTE).
- Academic units can increase the effectiveness of formative and summative evaluations through conversations and participation in workshops, etc.
- Annual evaluation of Part-Time Faculty will create greater workload issues for already overwhelmed Department Chairs/Program Directors and may disproportionately affect Chairs and Directors.
- We should look at ways to move qualified Part-Time Faculty into Adjunct level quickly.
- We need to respect the professionalism of Part-Time Faculty and be sure that requirements look comparable to those for Full-Time Faculty and are appropriate to the course and discipline.
• Non-traditional class modalities (community engagement classes, flipped classes, workplace classes, etc.) may require different types of evaluations.
• The University should address what happens when evaluations do not happen as recommended/required. This may potentially be a risk management issue.
Appendix 1

Duties Check Sheet*

- Syllabus meets expectations.
- Grades turned in on time (exceptions approved by Dean’s office)
- Minimal course grade changes.
- Follow departmental and College procedures and guidelines as communicated.
- Mid-term deficiencies completed.
- Classes met appropriately (class cancellations, days of significantly early dismissals cleared with Chair, etc.)
- Appropriate office hours.
- Appropriate final exam or similar artifact (as determined by unit) submitted to the Chair to be kept on file for one year.
- Evaluations handed out.
- Reasonable grade distributions and grading standards
- Timely responses to departmental and student communications.

* These are University guidelines; academic units should specify further what is reasonable and appropriate in each category and add items as appropriate for the unit.
Appendix 2
Syllabus evaluation

Evaluation of the syllabus should use the Syllabus Checklist (most important for courses without common syllabi) paying particular attention to

- Course Description appropriate
- Clear Learning Outcomes
  - based on broad conceptual knowledge and adaptive generic skills,
  - focused on student learning rather than instructor teaching,
    describing what student will learn and be able to do,
  - requiring high levels of thinking and learning,
  - focused on application and integration of knowledge and skills,
  - clear and understandable to students and instructors,
  - detailed and specific,
  - measurable, identifiable, and actionable, be realistic (i.e. all students should be able to achieve them), and be a result of learning.
- Assignments sufficiently identified
- Grading appropriate and clear

* These are University guidelines and academic units should specify further what is reasonable and appropriate in each category.
Appendix 3

**LEVEL 1 EVALUATION RUBRIC**

*In the case of “needs improvement” or “unacceptable,” please include additional written comments.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Evaluations</strong></td>
<td>Student evaluations consistently reveal teaching excellence, high expectations, and consistent execution of syllabus.</td>
<td>Student evaluations reveal good teaching, clear expectations, and consistent execution of syllabus.</td>
<td>Student evaluations reveal concerns about the professor’s teaching, expectations, and/or execution of syllabus.</td>
<td>Student evaluations consistently reveal fundamental concerns about the professor’s teaching, expectations, and/or execution of syllabus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duties Checklist</strong></td>
<td>Professor performs duties in a professional and timely manner.</td>
<td>Professor has met all of the duties of the checklist. Professor did these in a timely manner.</td>
<td>Professor has not met all of the duties of the checklist. Professor had unresolved difficulties pertaining to these duties.</td>
<td>Professor has not met the essential duties of the checklist. Professor has serious and/or unresolved difficulties pertaining to these duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syllabus Evaluation Checklist</strong></td>
<td>Syllabi are careful and appropriate to the subject and discipline. Syllabi exemplify LMU syllabus standards.</td>
<td>Syllabi have met all of the items of the checklist. Syllabi meet LMU syllabus standards.</td>
<td>Syllabi have not met all of the items of the checklist. Syllabi, although appropriate for some institutions, fail to meet LMU syllabus standards.</td>
<td>Syllabi have not met the essential items of the checklist. Syllabi are unacceptable as academic documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CV/Resume - Qualifications</strong></td>
<td>Faculty member's qualifications are appropriate for continued teaching in the discipline.</td>
<td>Faculty member's qualifications are not fully appropriate for continued teaching.</td>
<td>CV misrepresents professor's credentials and/or performance record, or credentials are not appropriate for continued teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OVERALL EVALUATION</strong></th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix 4
Classroom Observations*

Classroom observations are a good tool for both formative and summative teaching assessment. However to be valuable, such observations are time-consuming and require open-mindedness, sensitivity, and experience and/or training. We recommend that LMU provide all Faculty (Full and Part-Time Faculty) training workshops for classroom observations during the summer or on weekends during the academic year. Faculty should receive monetary compensation for such workshops.

Optimal classroom observations occur before the last few weeks of class and have the following 5 components

- Pre-observation meeting,
- Observation of a complete class session,
- Draft of written review,
- Post-observation meeting, and
- Final written review submitted to appropriate Department/College/School representative.

We estimate that optimal classroom observations will take at least 5 hours of time for the observer (see the CET website on classroom observations).

---

* These are University guidelines and academic units should specify further what is reasonable and appropriate in each category.
Appendix 5  
Part-Time Faculty (approx.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCLA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFTV</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>181</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>681</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers were culled from documentation of Part-Time Faculty for the 2014-15 Academic Year, but the numbers are not official and may be off. First year part-time faculty denotes part-time faculty that were in their first semester of teaching at LMU in either the fall or spring of 2014.