

COVER SHEET FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO DEPARTMENT/COLLEGE
PERSONNEL PROCEDURES (PART TIME FACULTY)

CECS
COLLEGE

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
DEPARTMENT

In order to facilitate a complete and expeditious review by the Personnel Planning and Review Committee (PP&R) of the change(s) you propose to your personnel procedures, please adhere to the format described below, and also fill out the Background Information. Attach this memo as a cover sheet for the written material you submit to PP&R. PP&R assumes that the initiating Department or College Committee has determined that the proposed new or revised procedures are consistent with Section 600 and with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

FORMAT: Please use a complete copy of your existing procedures as the starting point for the proposed revisions that you submit to PP&R for approval. Strike over any text that you wish to have deleted from your written procedures, and/or underline any text that you wish to have added to your written procedures.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

- Are proposed changes those of College ☐ or Department ☒ procedures? (check one)
- Date that current proposed changes were sent forward NOVEMBER 10, 2016
- Department or College initiating proposed changes MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
- Describe briefly the general reason(s) for your proposed change(s) (e.g., "proposed changes were initiated by the Department in response to a request from the College Personnel Committee, which felt that existing promotion criteria were too rigorous").

RECEIVED
CSUN

DEPARTMENT CURRENTLY ON SECTION 600

APR 07 2017

Office of
Faculty Affairs

- For Department Personnel Procedures, list the date the department faculty voted to approve the proposed changes: 10/21/2016
- For College Personnel Procedures, list the date the college faculty voted to approve the proposed changes:

FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL PROCEDURES: (Sign & Print Name)

J. Michael Kato J. MICHAEL KATO 10/27/16
Chair, Department Personnel Committee Date
Hamid Jonari HAMID JONARI 10/27/16
Department Chair Date

FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL PROCEDURES & COLLEGE PERSONNEL PROCEDURES:

Robert Conner 4/07/2017
Chair, College Personnel Committee Date
J. K. Kato 4/7/17
College Dean Date
Sheikh Grant 6/5/17
Chair, Personnel Planning and Review Committee Date

(for PP&R use only)

S'17
Approval Date

F'17

F'20 Effective Date (change in criteria)
Effective Date (see attached)

F'21

Date of Next Review

Revised 10.16

n forms personnel procedures cover

DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

1. INTRODUCTION

The Mechanical Engineering Department aspires to be California's best regionally focused program. We want to be recognized for our focus on building educational programs of excellence for both undergraduate and graduate students.

The evaluation procedures for temporary faculty are set forth in section 700. In addition, the Department Chair, Department Course Coordinators and other faculty may be actively involved, as appropriate, with each temporary lecturer candidate by providing guidance and support on an ongoing basis.

2. PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

The appropriate terminal degree will be the Master of Mechanical Engineering (MME)/Master of Science (MS) or doctoral degree in Mechanical Engineering or related field in order to be hired for a lecturer position. Other fields may be considered for specific instructional topics. The Department also recognizes that engineers with exceptional professional stature and/or specialized expertise may be eligible for appointment as lecturers and thus for meeting the degree requirements expected for the delivery of quality instruction to our students even without the MME/MS or doctorate degree. Equivalencies to the terminal degree shall be stated in the position description and advertisement for the lecturer position as well as requirements, if any, for promotion beyond the degree at the time of appointment.

3. PEER EVALUATION

The primary method of evaluation is through class visit. A class visit will be made during the first semester a lecturer is employed in a teaching assignment. Subsequent visits shall be made for every 24 units taught by the lecturer or at least once every three years, whichever comes sooner. For each lecturer who is to be evaluated during an academic term, the Department Chair, or designee, shall meet with the candidate to arrange the schedule for class visits. The class visits are scheduled by mutual consent and confirmed by the visiting faculty at least 5 days before the visit. Class visits shall be made by the Department Chair or their designee selected from among the tenured faculty in the department. The report of the class visit should be prepared on the form (for lecture or laboratory class as appropriate) approved by the Mechanical Engineering Department that is attached to this document. The Department Chair shall determine the number of courses to be evaluated during a single semester. The class visit report will be provided to the faculty under review within 14 days of the class visit. The candidate may request a meeting to discuss the report and/or submit a written rebuttal statement within ten (10) calendar days before it is placed in the Personnel Action File (PAF). Procedural details will be followed as specified in Sections 700 of the Administrative Manual.

❖ *Additional Factors Regarding Teaching Effectiveness*

Sample materials such as the syllabi, exams, handouts and class related websites should be made available to the reviewers for the courses being evaluated prior to the class visit. Candidate must provide evidence, to the satisfaction of the evaluator(s), of a strong commitment to high quality instruction. Demonstrations of this commitment may include, but are not limited to:

- a. Development of innovative teaching methods or improved instructional material.
- b. Development or supervision of hands-on projects for senior design culminating experience.

4. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Standardized student evaluations will be administered in each class that receives a visit by the Department Chair or his/her designee. These will be administered and processed using the normal procedures used for the student evaluations of tenure track faculty. Depending on the frequency of class visits, additional written student evaluations may be included to satisfy the requirement for at least two such evaluations annually. The results of the lecturer's evaluations will be provided to the lecturer after the semester grades have been assigned and a summarized copy placed in the lecturer's Personnel Action File.



Instructor's Name: _____

Course No &
Title: _____

Visitor's Name: _____

Date of Visit: _____

	No Basis / Not Applicable	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Above Average
1. Has stage presence, good speaker				
2. Has command of the subject				
3. Presents material in an organized manner				
4. Important ideas are clearly explained				
5. Is sensitive to the response of the class				
6. Encourages appropriate student participation				
7. Welcomes questions and discussion				
8. Quickly grasps what a student is asking or telling them.				
9. Is careful and precise in answering questions				
10. Emphasizes ways of solving problems rather than solution				
11. Appears to enjoy teaching				
12. Enthusiastic about the subject				
13. Makes the course material interesting				
14. How would you rate this instructor in comparison with others in your college?				
15. How would you rate this instructor in comparison with others in the university?				
16. Do you believe that your visit was at a time when you were able to fairly judge the nature and tenor of the lecture process?			YES / NO	
17. Was the instructor aware of your visit in advance?			YES / NO	
18. Where did the instructor excel? What were their strong points?				
19. Where were they weak and in need of improvement?				
20. Comments				



Department of Mechanical Engineering Laboratory Visit Report

Instructor's Name: _____

Course No &
Title: _____

Visitor's Name: _____

Date of Visit: _____

	No Basis / Not Applicable	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Above Average
1. Demonstrates an ability to communicate with students				
2. Has an ability to create interest in lab projects				
3. Lab assignments are clearly outlined				
4. Instructor is prepared for the laboratory projects				
5. Instructor demonstrates knowledge of the subject				
6. Demonstrates knowledge of equipment/computer systems				
7. Welcomes questions and discussion				
8. Quickly grasps what a student is asking or telling them.				
9. Is careful and precise in answering questions				
10. Demonstrates good "one-on-one" student interaction in lab				
11. Was there sufficient time for completion of lab assignment?				
12. Enthusiastic about the subject				
13. Instructor has control of the laboratory environment				
14. How would you rate this instructor in comparison with others in the college?				
15. How would you rate this instructor in comparison with others in the university?				
16. Do you believe that your visit was at a time when you were able to fairly judge the nature and tenor of the laboratory process?	YES / NO			
17. Was the instructor aware of your visit in advance?	YES / NO			
18. Where did the instructor excel? What were their strong points?				
19. Where were they weak and in need of improvement?				
20. Comments				