

MEMORANDUM

Date: Monday, December 9, 2024

To: Matthew Jarvis
Academic Senate Chair

From: Ronald S. Rochon
President



Subject: ASD 24-106 Revisions to UPS 210.070 Evaluation of Lecturers

I approve the revisions to UPS 210.070 Evaluation of Lecturers with the following adjustment:

Remove lines 565-57:

A tabular Summary of Assigned Duties, **produced and distributed by the appropriate dean's office**, that includes (for instructional faculty) a list of teaching assignments for each semester, including a number of students per class, and FTEF generated A Summary of Assigned Duties, including (for instructional faculty) a list of teaching assignments for each semester, including a number of students per class. For those with non-instructional duties such as course coordination or assessment activities, the summary shall list these activities (e.g., advisement, mentorship).

The Office of the Dean's do not have the resources to provide this information, and this task needs to be achieved by the Lecturers.

Faculty Affairs and Records and Information Technology will provide instructions for lecturers on how to get the teaching assignment and FTES generated (not FTEF).

Cc: Amir Dabirian, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs

Mark Carrier, Executive Director for Faculty Affairs and Records



University Policy Statement

UPS 210.070 EVALUATION OF LECTURERS

I. Overview

Evaluations provide lecturers with an occasion for formal reflection on their performance and, if necessary, with constructive feedback for improvement or for guiding their professional development. Evaluations also inform the appointing authority of the lecturer's performance in order to facilitate decisions regarding reappointment and range elevation; in this way, the evaluation process ensures that lecturers meet University, College, and Department expectations of satisfactory performance of their assigned duties. This process, in turn, serves to further the University's mission and its commitment to student success.

In every case, the evaluation of a lecturer shall be appropriate to their work assignment and based on the lecturer's performance of the essential duties of the position. At the time of appointment or reappointment, lecturers shall receive from the appointing authority (i.e., the appropriate administrator, typically the Dean) a clear written statement of the work assignment upon which the lecturer will be evaluated under the policy articulated herein. A copy of this statement of the work assignment shall be appended to the offer of appointment, reissued each time the work assignment changes, and entered into the lecturer's Personnel Action File.

Evaluation of lecturers is required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). When a lecturer is notified of an upcoming evaluation and fails to submit their Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) by the established deadline, barring circumstances beyond a lecturer's control, subsequent appointments should not normally be issued. Lecturers appointed in multiple departments shall be evaluated by each respective department and must submit a WPAF to each (these need not be the same file since assignments will differ between departments).

The evaluation process helps develop and retain high-quality and diverse faculty. The CBA does not recognize staffing flexibility as a reappointment consideration. Evaluations should be sufficiently thorough for fulsome consideration, but processes should be implemented in a way that is mindful of the workload involved in creating and reviewing the materials. The effort required by the evaluation process shall not create an excessive workload.

II. Definitions

In this document, the term "lecturer" refers to all Unit 3 employees who are identified in the CBA as "temporary faculty," that is they are not tenured or probationary (tenure-track). This term includes lecturers (temporary instructional faculty), temporary (contract) library faculty, and temporary counselor faculty. Where provisions in this policy differ for lecturers, counselors, and librarians, these differences will be explicitly noted. While coaches are in the faculty bargaining unit, their performance evaluations are governed by policies within the Division of Athletics.

The term "evaluation" refers to the document produced by each level of review that shall contain the candidate details (name, department, and type of evaluation), the name(s) of the evaluators, the date the evaluation was completed, the overall rating of the candidate, and a written statement on the candidate's performance of their assigned job duties.

Some aspects of this policy distinguish between full-time and part-time lecturers. For the purpose of this policy, “full-time” shall refer to the time base to which one is entitled under the terms of the academic-year or multi-year contract. Some lecturers with part-time entitlements are intermittently appointed to full-time status (e.g., for one semester during an academic year, or for one year during a three-year term); for the purpose of this policy, these intermittent full-time assignments shall *not* be construed as making one a full-time lecturer.

The term “entitlement” refers to the time-base to which the lecturer should be reappointed. For detailed information, refer to the Article of the CBA that addresses appointments.

The term “range elevation” refers to an increase in a lecturer’s salary by movement from one range to the next (e.g., movement from lecturer range B to C). Refer to the CBA and Salary Schedules for more information. Lecturers must be eligible in order to apply for a range elevation.

The term “Dean” refers to College Deans and their equivalents in other units, including the Dean of the Library, and the Vice President for Student Affairs.

For the purpose of this policy, the terms “Department,” “Division,” and “School” shall be considered equivalent.

For the purpose of this policy, the terms “Department Chair,” “Division Chair,” and “School Director” shall be considered equivalent.

For the purpose of this policy, the term “Department Peer Review Committee” (DPRC) refers to an elected Department committee of tenured faculty. The DPRC shall be comprised of at least two faculty members. This may be the Department Personnel Committee, which also evaluates probationary and tenured faculty, or one or more separate committees created to evaluate only lecturers.

The term “period of review” normally refers to the fall and spring terms since the last evaluation.

The “Personnel Action File” is the one official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or actions regarding a faculty member. Any material identified by source may be placed in the Personnel Action File; identification shall indicate the author, the committee, the campus office, or the name of the officially authorized body generating the material.

The WPAF is the electronic file specifically generated for use in a given evaluation cycle. It shall include all required forms and documents, all information specifically provided by the employee being evaluated, and information provided by faculty unit employees, students, and academic administrators. It shall also include all faculty and administrative level evaluation recommendations from the current cycle, and all rebuttal statements and responses submitted. During the evaluation cycle, the WPAF shall be incorporated, by reference, into the Personnel Action File but need not be physically placed in the file.

III. Periodic Evaluations

All periodic evaluations will be recorded and provided to the lecturer. The evaluation and any response or rebuttal are entered into the Personnel Action File and included when the lecturer is given careful consideration for reappointment or when the WPAF is passed on to an additional level of review. Periodic evaluations do not result in guarantees of reappointment or future appointment. It is expected that lecturer performance is at a satisfactory level (see section IV for Range Elevation Evaluation).

A. *Types of Periodic Evaluation*

Initial Comprehensive Evaluation: Lecturers at CSU Fullerton will undergo an evaluation during their second semester of employment.

Six-Year Comprehensive Evaluation: Lecturers who are in their sixth consecutive year of service in the same department undergo a comprehensive evaluation in that year to determine eligibility for an initial three-year appointment. This evaluation shall involve a cumulative review of the lecturer's performance for the entire six years of service.

Three-Year Comprehensive Evaluation: Lecturers holding a three-year appointment that have applied for range elevation and lecturers holding one-year appointments that are in their third year of service shall undergo comprehensive reviews.

Abbreviated Periodic Evaluation: Lecturers holding one-year appointments not undergoing a comprehensive evaluation shall undergo abbreviated periodic evaluations. Lecturers holding three-year appointments shall undergo an abbreviated periodic evaluation in the third year of their appointment. These are detailed in Section VI-D.

B. *Frequency of Evaluation*

Lecturers may be appointed to one-semester, one-year, or multi-year appointments. For those lecturers in appointments of one semester only, evaluation of the first semester is at the discretion of the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair, or as specified in departmental policy. Newly hired lecturers shall be evaluated during the second one-semester appointment (whether consecutive or not). Typically, the evaluation shall occur in the spring semester. For lecturers with a continuous appointment whose initial evaluation occurs in fall, the following evaluation will occur in spring of the next academic year. All lecturers in one-year or two-year appointments shall undergo evaluation annually. Lecturers in three-year appointments shall undergo evaluation during the third year of the appointment. Any lecturer may be evaluated more frequently at the request of the lecturer or Department Chair or an appropriate administrator. Lecturers should be employed at the University during the semester that they are evaluated.

Lecturers with one-year appointments shall undergo abbreviated evaluations in years two, four, and five, unless requested to complete a comprehensive review by either the department chair or dean. Lecturers with three-year appointments will undergo an abbreviated evaluation every three years, unless they are requesting range elevation. An abbreviated evaluation is the norm in these circumstances; if a comprehensive review is requested by the department chair or an appropriate administrator, the reasons for the more extensive review will be explicitly stated in writing and placed in the Personnel Action File.

C. *Period of Review*

Periodic evaluations shall involve a review of the lecturer's performance during a specific period.

Abbreviated Reviews

If the lecturer is undergoing a first evaluation, the period of review shall be defined as the time period between the date of initial appointment and the current file due date. The period of review for all other abbreviated periodic evaluations (beyond the first) shall be defined as the time period between the start of the semester in which the last review file was submitted and the current file due date.

Six-Year Comprehensive Reviews

The period of review for the sixth-year evaluation shall be defined as the time period between the start of the first qualifying appointment (i.e., the beginning of the six-year service period as a lecturer) and the file due date.

Three-Year Comprehensive Reviews

The period of review for three-year comprehensive evaluations shall be defined as the beginning of the three-year appointment period and the file due date.

D. *Levels of Review*

Abbreviated Reviews - Part-Time Lecturer

Part time-lecturers undergoing annual periodic evaluation shall be evaluated by at least two levels of review, which must include the appropriate DPRC and typically the Department Chair. Part-time lecturers may be reviewed by the Dean at the Dean's discretion. Abbreviated evaluations resulting in a less than "Satisfactory" performance by the DPRC or Department Chair shall be forwarded to the Dean.

Abbreviated Reviews - Full-Time Lecturer

Full-time lecturers undergoing abbreviated periodic evaluation shall be evaluated by the appropriate DPRC, the Department Chair, and the Dean.

Six-Year Comprehensive or Three-Year Comprehensive Reviews

All lecturers undergoing a six-year comprehensive evaluation or a three-year comprehensive evaluation shall be evaluated by the appropriate DPRC, the Department Chair, and the Dean.

E. *Ratings and Relationship of Evaluative Terms to Reappointment Decisions*

A periodic evaluation of a lecturer by the DPRC and Chair shall result in an overall rating of:

Satisfactory - describes performance that meets or exceeds expectations and may include constructive suggestions,

Needs Improvement - describes performance that does not meet expectations, or

Unsatisfactory - describes performance that is seriously deficient.

Note that an evaluation that finds a lecturer's performance to be "Satisfactory" is not an offer of work, nor is it a reappointment; the appropriate administrator responsible for assigning work will take the evaluations from prior levels of review, including commentary on strengths and weaknesses as appropriate as well as other information, into consideration.

Upon receiving an evaluation of "Needs Improvement" from the DPRC and/or Department Chair, a Dean is not precluded from reappointing a lecturer in an appointment of two-years or shorter duration to a subsequent appointment of a similar duration. If a lecturer's performance is evaluated as "Needs Improvement" by the DPRC and/or Department Chair, the evaluation should articulate those areas in which improvement is needed and should be addressed during the next appointment period, if reappointed. The DPRC or Department Chair or Dean should make recommendations for professional development activities in their evaluations. Evaluations of "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" shall normally lead to a decision *not to* reappoint.

For a comprehensive six-year evaluation or a three-year comprehensive evaluation, an evaluation from the DPRC or Department Chair of "Needs Improvement" *shall not* be considered "Satisfactory."

An evaluation of a lecturer by the Dean shall result in an overall rating of:

Satisfactory - describes performance that meets or exceeds expectations and may include constructive suggestions, or

Unsatisfactory - describes performance that is seriously deficient.

The Dean's review shall result in an overall rating of performance of the lecturer over the review period as either "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory" and include the reasons for the rating. A "Satisfactory" rating may include narrative comments including constructive suggestions for professional development.

A lecturer shall be offered a three-year temporary appointment following a comprehensive six-year evaluation or three-year evaluation, where there is a determination by the appropriate administrator that a lecturer has performed the duties of their position in a satisfactory manner, and absent documented serious conduct problems.

IV. Range Elevation Evaluation (Optional):

In a *range elevation evaluation*, the lecturer's performance while in the current range is evaluated in order to determine whether a range elevation is warranted. During this process, the lecturer's performance is evaluated, and the evaluation recorded and provided to the lecturer and entered into the personnel action file, as above. In addition, reviewers shall, at all levels of review prior to the final one, provide a recommendation concerning range elevation. The rationale for the recommendation shall be incorporated into the evaluation itself. This type of evaluation is only carried out when the lecturer is eligible and requests a range elevation. The Range Elevation Evaluation is separate from, and does not replace, any other required evaluations. For further clarification, contact the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records.

A. Period of Review

Evaluations for range elevation consideration shall involve a review of the lecturer's performance in the current range, but because the time in range can be extensive (e.g., up to a decade or more), a range elevation evaluation should focus particular attention on the most recent five years. A lecturer under review will normally document in their C.V. all accomplishments over the entire period in the current range. The period of review for range evaluation consideration shall be defined as the time period between the start of the academic year five years prior to the current academic year and the date on which the file is submitted. The lecturer will be expected to highlight the most recent five years when preparing the WPAF for review.

If a lecturer wishes to include in the WPAF evidence of performance outside this five-year period, they shall limit such additional material to material that (a) is relevant to performance while in the current range and (b) provides evidence of performance or accomplishments that cannot otherwise be documented within the most recent five-year period.

Applications for range elevation shall consist of the Range Elevation Declaration and WPAF. The WPAF shall include evidence of effective instructional performance as well as evidence of currency in the field, consistent with the lecturer's work assignment. It is also expected that a lecturer will have developed as an instructor and as a professional during the time in a given range. Therefore, evidence of this development during the period in range should also be provided for range elevation consideration. A terminal degree (or equivalent) may not be required of a lecturer for range elevation unless explicitly required for the position when they were initially appointed, required by an external accrediting body, or otherwise required by Department or College policy.

B. Range Elevation Evaluation Process

Lecturers under consideration for range elevation shall be evaluated by the appropriate DPRC, the Department Chair, and the Dean. The appropriate Vice President, as the President's designee, shall make the final determination on range elevation.

Annually, at least sixty days before the file due date, the Faculty Affairs and Records office shall publish a list of, and notify, all lecturers eligible for range elevation. In addition, the Faculty Affairs and Records office shall notify all lecturers that the period for range elevation consideration is open and inform them whom to contact if they are unsure of their eligibility. Those lecturers who wish to be considered for range elevation shall submit the WPAF (as described below) to the Department Chair by the published due date. On that date, the file shall be considered closed for the purpose of the evaluation. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs may extend this deadline under extraordinary circumstances.

At all levels of review in the evaluation process, reviewers are responsible for evaluating the lecturer's performance of assigned duties based on the materials presented in the WPAF and other relevant information and documentation outlined in Section VI and for making a recommendation regarding range elevation in light of the specific criteria (outlined below) and any approved College or Department policies on range elevation. An evaluation of "Satisfactory" shall be required for a positive recommendation for range elevation.

Range elevation shall be accompanied by a salary increase of at least 5% or the minimum base of the new range, whichever is higher, effective at the beginning of the academic year following the range elevation review.

Lecturers considered for range elevation shall be notified of the Vice President's decision no later than June 30 of the current academic year. Range elevation decisions are subject to appeal, as outlined in the CBA. Appeals shall be due in the office of Faculty Affairs and Records by the first Tuesday in September (i.e., shortly after the start of the following semester). A Peer Review Panel will consider appeals. The Peer Review Panel shall consist of five tenured faculty elected annually by the Academic Senate, no three of whom may be from the same college and will adhere to the process described in the CBA. The applicant must rely on the WPAF and shall not introduce new evidence at the time of the appeal hearing except as in accordance with this policy and the CBA. The Panel shall allow for appellants to make a presentation to the Panel and to be represented by the California Faculty Association if so desired. The Peer Review Panel shall convene and review the case within thirty (30) days. The Panel shall render a decision within thirty (30) days of hearing the case. The decision of the Peer Review Panel shall be final and binding on the parties.

V. Evaluation Criteria

Work assignments may vary among lecturers and the criteria for their evaluation shall be appropriate to their work assignment. Therefore, material submitted by faculty shall be evaluated as it pertains to the work assignment. Evaluation of the lecturer's performance shall be made solely on the basis of the evidence provided in the WPAF and other relevant information and documentation. For all lecturer evaluations, performance shall be determined based on approved Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty, or, in the absence of such standards, the criteria below in this document.

A. Evaluation Criteria for Teaching Duties

Lecturers exclusively assigned to teaching shall be evaluated solely on the basis of educational performance, which includes teaching performance and disciplinary and pedagogical currency. Criteria for educational performance should address numbers 1 to 6 below. The examples and sources of evidence provided in the tables below are for illustrative purposes and are not meant to be required or comprehensive lists. These criteria shall not apply to librarians or counselors unless they are assigned classroom instructional duties.

Each level of review shall evaluate the WPAF according to the criteria that follow. Rather than relying largely on a single measure, written evaluations at all levels of review shall be based on and include commentary on multiple criteria of performance in teaching.

Faculty members belonging to traditionally underrepresented groups (such as women and faculty of color) may experience additional demands on their time over and above the usual demands made of all faculty members. For example, female students may seek out female faculty members over male faculty members for mentorship or advice. This phenomenon has been termed "cultural taxation." As part of its ongoing dedication to diversity, equity, and inclusion, CSUF is committed to recognizing cultural taxation when it occurs. Faculty members shall have the option to include their experiences of cultural taxation in their WPAF. Evaluators shall give this due consideration during the evaluation process.

Please see section VI for materials that are required in the WPAF. Departments may require additional materials as well as those listed in section VI.

1. General Guidelines for Assessing Teaching Performance

CSUF strives for inclusive, equitable, and anti-racist teaching and learning environments where student learning is central. In this anti-racist, non-discriminatory, equitable, and inclusive environment, expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in the organization, content, and review of their materials, and students are provided opportunities to develop the learning abilities, competencies, and skills to contribute to society.

A successful lecturer demonstrates mastery and currency in the discipline, teaches effectively, and enables students to learn.

Approved Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty shall address how teaching will be considered in the evaluation process, the criteria that will be used to assess teaching performance, and potential sources of evidence that can be used to assess performance in each criterion. The evaluation shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the lecturer, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation also shall take into account any efforts to improve teaching performance. The evaluation should also take into account evidence of cultural taxation.

All evidence shall be included in the WPAF and Appendices.

2. Criteria for Assessing Teaching Performance

A lecturer's teaching performance should be assessed using the criteria below. The examples and sources of evidence provided in the tables below are for illustrative purposes and are not meant to be required or comprehensive. The criteria will be considered completely addressed by the inclusion of two examples from each of criteria 1-6.

Establishment of a conducive learning environment for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population.

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Provides a means for students to contribute to the course learning by encouraging inquiry.	Syllabi, classroom observation reports (see UPS 210.080), narrative summary, examples of student work/projects/assignments, student opinion questionnaires, LMS pages
Provides a coherent structure for course meetings which is understood by the students.	Syllabi, examples of student work/projects/assignments, student opinion questionnaires, LMS pages
Sets clear communication guidelines with students (UPS 300.004)	Narrative summary, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses, syllabi
Manages class time well	Classroom observation reports, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses
Creates a classroom environment that encourages student interaction and engagement	Classroom observation reports, narrative summary, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses, LMS pages, high impact practices (HIPS)

Clarity of presentation	Classroom observation reports, sample slide presentations, recorded lectures, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses, LMS pages
Creates a classroom environment that contributes to equitable learning for all students	Syllabi, classroom observation reports, LMS pages

1. Creation of a course linking methods of assessment to student learning outcomes.

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Course objectives and learning goals are clearly defined and made clear to students at the start of the course.	Syllabi, examples of student work/projects/assignments, student opinion questionnaires
Assessments and grading practices are clearly related to student learning outcomes.	Syllabi, examples of student work/projects/assignments, narrative summary, student opinion questionnaires
Class time is well organized and effectively used to meet goals	Syllabi, classroom observation reports, narrative summary, student opinion questionnaires
Course content emphasizes students' acquisition of knowledge and skills that are currently valued in the discipline.	Syllabi, examples of student work/projects/assignments narrative summary, peer review
Syllabus is understandable and comprehensive	Syllabi; peer review

2. Effective use of a variety of instructional methods and learning modalities.

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Uses a variety of appropriate teaching/learning strategies in the classroom.	Classroom observation reports, narrative summary
Instructional methods and approaches are appropriate to student learning outcomes.	Syllabi, narrative summary, peer reviews
Accessible technology appropriate to the learning experience is used to enhance student participation.	Syllabi, narrative summary, peer review, student opinion questionnaires
Assignments help advance student learning outcomes.	Project/assignment details, examples of student work/projects/assignments, peer review
Pedagogical methods are current in relation to the discipline and subject matter and consider student needs.	Syllabi, classroom observations, examples of student work/projects/assignments, FDC workshops, peer review

- Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Academic goals, expectations, and/or competencies appropriate to the course.	Syllabi, narrative summary, assignment details, examples of graded student work, rubrics
Effectiveness, fairness, and timeliness of testing, other assessments, and grading procedures are evident.	Syllabi, narrative summary, student writing and projects, student opinion questionnaire comments
Grading system is fair, transparent, and conducive to learning.	Assignment details, examples of graded student work, rubrics, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses

- Building and enhancing currency in the relevant discipline(s) and pedagogical developments as related to teaching.

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Familiarity with pedagogical developments	CV, narrative summary
Engages in some form of continuous improvement of teaching	Narrative summary
Actively solicits and uses student feedback in course development and revision	Narrative summary, student opinion questionnaire qualitative responses
Addressing weaknesses identified in past evaluations via concrete plans	Narrative summary

- Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Gives final exam or project, if required by the instructor, on the date/time assigned by the University (see UPS 300.005).	Syllabi
Maintains office hours (see UPS 230.020).	Syllabi, student opinion questionnaires
Syllabus meets university and college requirements (see UPS 300.004).	Syllabi

When evaluating the lecturer's teaching performance and currency through the application of the criteria listed above, departments may vary in how they use evidence in the WPAF. Where quantitative evidence is used in the application of criteria for teaching performance and disciplinary and pedagogical currency, departments should strive to maintain an appropriate balance between quantitative and qualitative evidence.

3. Student Opinion Questionnaires

Consistent with the CBA, SOQs must be included in the WPAF. While use of standardized Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs) is required as part of the evaluation process, any data gathered from SOQs must be considered within a broader constellation of artifacts and should follow evidence-based guidelines and best practices.

SOQs are designed to solicit student feedback regarding instructors and course content. While they may reveal valuable trends in student perception, research indicates they are neither valid nor reliable measures of teaching effectiveness. Moreover, both qualitative and quantitative data gathered on SOQs can be

impacted by racial, gender, and linguistic bias, suggesting that individual students' comments – as well as trends within SOQs themselves – must be interpreted cautiously and contextually. Additionally, CSUF recognizes that impactful teaching may create discomfort for students, affecting trends in course evaluations, and that not all students will respond to learning in the same way. Importantly, any single item on the SOQ – or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information – does not measure teaching effectiveness, but rather gathers student opinions on teaching performance. Overall, patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments.

If departmental personnel documents specify SOQ score ranges then they shall also detail how other measures of teaching effectiveness are evaluated, including peer evaluations, quality of teaching materials and assessments, self-reflections, etc. This is to avoid the cognitive bias that overweighs quantitative measures relative to qualitative measures.

It is important to note that for SOQ ordinal scales frequency distribution and dispersion are more appropriate measures than averages. Any analysis of SOQ ranges should take into account unique characteristics of courses such as level, class size, format, content, as well as SOQ response rates, etc. Lecturers who believe their student ratings do not completely represent their teaching are encouraged to carefully explain their scores, and offer an explanation of discrepancies and patterns. These explanations should be noted by the reviewers.

4. Grade Distributions

Lecturers are expected to maintain high standards regarding student achievement in all courses taught as evidenced by their syllabi, assignments, samples of graded student work etc. Grade distributions shall not be used to determine academic rigor. Academic rigor shall be assessed based on readings, assignments, samples of student work, rubrics, etc.

B. Evaluation Criteria for Other Assigned Duties

When a lecturer is appointed to a position that involves responsibilities other than classroom instruction, evaluations shall be based on performance criteria relevant to assigned duties. Because additional, non-instructional duties vary widely by department and discipline, criteria for evaluation of such assignments may be established in Department Personnel Policy documents. Some examples of such criteria for particular assignments (and the kinds of evidence that a lecturer might produce to document each) include:

1. Effectiveness of advisement, as indicated, for example, by student progress towards degree, completed paperwork, advisement materials developed by the lecturer under review, student evaluations (where available), and the like;
2. Effective course coordination and assessment, as indicated by written report of the Department Chair or other person with knowledge of the lecturer's performance of these duties;
3. Effective committee service, as indicated, for example, by written report of the committee Chair, by materials or policies created by the committee, and the like;
4. Original scholarly and creative activity, as evidenced by publications, conference presentations, participation in juried competitions, performances, and the like.
5. Continuing professional engagement in the discipline and/or professional development as relevant to teaching assignment(s);
6. Developing new courses;
7. Organization of pedagogical workshops;
8. Supervision of student research and other forms of mentorship;

9. Developing service learning opportunities, community-engaged learning opportunities, and/or semester abroad courses.

C. Counselors and Librarians

Note that temporary counselors and temporary librarians will typically have assigned duties specific to their units. Where possible, the standards and criteria for the evaluation of their performance of assigned duties should parallel the model outlined above for lecturers assigned non-instructional duties (see one, three, and four above). Evaluations of professional counselors shall take into consideration factors such as the counselor's mastery of and currency in a variety of counseling modes and assessment methods, effective communication with students, adherence to accepted clinical standards and practices (including timeliness of charting and mandated reporting), and effective use and understanding of psychological assessment and research. Evaluations of temporary librarians shall take into consideration factors such as the librarian's expertise and knowledge of trends in librarianship and higher education (appropriate to the assignment), understanding of and implementation of best practices in librarianship, and use of technology to enhance services, as appropriate to the assignment.

D. Range Elevation

For range elevation consideration, an additional criterion is development as an instructor and, where relevant to the work assignment, as a professional, during the time in a given range. Suggestions for development in previous reviews shall be addressed. Development may be demonstrated by a variety of activities over the review period, including but not limited to:

1. The refinement and improvement of instructional and assessment materials;
2. The revision of course content and materials based on assessment activities;
3. The creation of new course materials (such as texts, student study guides, and the like) aimed at increasing student success;
4. The refinement and improvement of teaching and professional practices as appropriate to the work assignment;
5. Self-reflection and self-assessment that lead to changes in practice, accompanied by some indication of the efficacy of those changes;
6. Collaborative teaching or collaborative research/scholarly/creative activity that has led to new or innovative content or methods;
7. Adaptation of new/varied pedagogical strategies to reach diverse student populations; participation in conferences, workshops, seminars and symposia related to teaching and/or the discipline;
8. When a lecturer is particularly active in the profession, publication or other dissemination of original contributions to the discipline or to discipline-based pedagogy; and
9. The refinement and improvement of items specific to temporary counselors and librarians (e.g. processes, pedagogy, clinical standards and practices).

The activities listed for range elevation consideration are meant to be representative of the kinds of endeavors a lecturer might undertake; it is not expected that all lecturers will engage in all of these activities. Rather, it is expected that individuals will engage in some of these activities, as appropriate to their assignments and to their disciplines.

If a lecturer faculty is eligible for a range elevation per CBA, they may be considered for range elevation simultaneously with a comprehensive evaluation by inclusion of this additional material addressing the range elevation period of review. Please refer to Faculty Affairs and Records and this UPS for guidance regarding information to be included.

VI. The WPAF and Other Relevant Evidence

A. Faculty Preparation of the WPAF

Annually, the Faculty Affairs and Records office publishes a Review Calendar that is issued by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Faculty Personnel Committee. Faculty who will be reviewed should be notified by Faculty Affairs and Records at least sixty (60) days prior to the file due date that they are to submit the WPAF through the electronic portfolio system to the Department Chair. Portfolio collection and administration systems shall be administered by Faculty Affairs and Records and be subject to the review and recommendation of the Faculty Affairs Committee. The notification shall include reference to this evaluation policy and applicable College and Department policies.

The Department Chair shall receive the WPAF upon submission for confirmation. Then, the WPAF shall be forwarded to the Departmental Review stage in which the members of the DPRC and the Department Chair have access. The DPRC is to issue its evaluation in accordance with the published timetable for that academic year and administer a rebuttal period. Then, the Department Chair is to consult the DPRC evaluation and any rebuttal statement as they prepare their evaluation. After issuing their evaluation in accordance with the published timetable, the Department Chair is to administer a rebuttal period. The Department Chair's evaluation and any rebuttal statement submitted in reference to it shall be shared with the DPRC. After the conclusion of the second rebuttal period, the Department Chair is to forward the WPAF to the next stage (the Dean's review level or Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR) processing).

The lecturer under review is responsible for submitting evidence of their performance of assigned duties, in the form of the WPAF (as described below). The WPAF shall include documentation for performance areas under review, as appropriate to the lecturer's work assignment during the review period and to the criteria previously listed.

For lecturers who receive units for non-teaching duties (e.g., a lecturer appointed for 12 weighted teaching units (WTU) but teaching only 9 WTU or less), evidence submitted shall include an indication of the performance in other areas of assigned duties during the review period, such as non-instructional duties, scholarly/professional activity, and/or service to the Department. Where duties include assignments such as advising, assessment activities, lab or course coordination, and the like, materials submitted shall include evidence of their performance of those duties. Lecturers who wish to include evidence of professional achievement and/or service to the University, the profession, or the community may do so insofar as these activities are either assigned or relevant to performance in their assignment.

For comprehensive reviews, the lecturer is responsible for providing the following information/documentation in the WPAF, except for those responsibilities assigned to FAR below, as appropriate to the work assignment:

1. WPAF Table of Contents
2. Approved Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty or UPS 210.070 if there are no approved department standards uploaded by Faculty Affairs and Records. These standards shall be available on the FAR website.
3. Updated C.V. covering the entire academic and professional employment history.

Note: With the exception of the C.V., all documentation below is for the period of review as defined above.

4. A tabular Summary of Assigned Duties, produced and distributed by the appropriate dean's office, that includes (for instructional faculty) a list of teaching assignments for each semester, including number of students per class, and FTEF generated. For those with non-instructional duties such as course coordination or assessment activities, the summary shall list these activities (e.g., advisement, mentorship).

5. A Narrative Summary (not to exceed 1500 words), that provides a self-assessment of accomplishments in all aspects of assigned duties, including the primary assignment (teaching performance or performance as librarian or professional counselor) as well as related activities.

Lecturers should discuss the merits of their pedagogy as well as how their experience and standpoint encourages their strong teaching of students. The lecturer should summarize or highlight significant accomplishments, communicate teaching philosophies, and/or discuss adjustments made based on student feedback or new developments in the discipline. Lecturers should explain formal or informal mentoring of students, pedagogical workshops they have participated in via the Faculty Development Center or other disciplinary/professional associations, or other work related to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

This paragraph clarifies but does not add to the criteria and evidence discussed in Section 5.

6. If the WPAF includes evidence not directly related to the primary assignment(s), the narrative shall explain the relevance of such evidence to those assigned duties. For Range Elevation evaluations, the narrative shall summarize the ways in which the lecturer has developed while in the current range.
7. The narrative may be supplemented for any of the following reasons (a lecturer may choose all that apply); each “supplemental area” shall increase the word limit by 500 words:
 - a. If any weaknesses or problem areas have been identified (either in earlier reviews, in SOQs, or by the lecturer themselves), the narrative shall include any plans or prior efforts to address these areas and (if known) the results of those efforts.
 - b. If the lecturer is expected to render service to the profession, the University, the College, or the Department as part of their work assignment, the narrative shall summarize those service activities.
 - c. If the lecturer is engaged in professional activities and/or scholarly or creative activity, the narrative should summarize those professional, scholarly, or creative activities.
8. Consistent with the CBA, statistical Summary Reports of Student Opinion Questionnaires if applicable to the assignment. For lecturers with non-instructional duties, including librarians and counselors, the WPAF shall include evaluations from students, where available.
9. Consistent with the CBA, student Opinion Questionnaire Comment Reports from all courses (when applicable).
10. Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions (when applicable; Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty may specify that they are not required).
11. Additional Evidence of Teaching Performance - Other supporting materials that are directly relevant to teaching performance (or performance as librarian or professional counselor). See this document and UPS 210.002 for examples. Examples include a representative syllabus for each course taught, class assignments, sample papers and/or exams, other instructional material, evidence of grading practices, classroom visitation reports, screenshots of LMS, and (where available) signed letters from students. Supporting materials shall emphasize quality and representativeness over quantity.
12. Evidence of Currency in the Field, as demonstrated by, for example, professional achievement or activities, curricular innovations or other relevant instructional material, consistent with College and Department policy documents and the lecturer’s work assignment. See this document and UPS 210.002 for examples.
13. If appropriate to the work assignment, supporting materials that evidence professional, university, and community service and/or scholarship or creative activity. See this document and UPS 210.002 for examples.

B. Submission of the WPAF and Added Materials Policy

Lecturers should confirm the completeness of the electronic WPAF prior to submission. Once the WPAF is submitted to the Department Chair and the due date is past, the evaluation cycle begins. After this date, a lecturer may add material only as follows:

1. If required documents are missing from the WPAF, they shall be provided in a timely manner and placed in the WPAF by the lecturer; and
2. If material that documents a substantial change in the status of an activity referenced in the narrative summary described above becomes available after the due date, this material may be added with permission from the appropriate DPRC. The committee shall approve addition of material only if the material is judged to be relevant to the review in progress and the material was not available to the lecturer under review prior to the file submission date. Before consideration at subsequent levels of review, material added to the WPAF shall be returned for review, evaluation, and comment by all previous levels.

C. Other Relevant Evidence

All reviews shall be based not only upon evidence provided by the lecturer in the WPAF, but also upon other relevant information and documentation provided by the Faculty Affairs and Records office, the Dean's office, and the Department office, provided that additions to the personnel action file have been made in compliance with the CBA.

D. Abbreviated Reviews

The lecturer is responsible for providing the following information/documentation in the WPAF, as appropriate to the work assignment. It should include:

1. An updated C.V. covering the entire academic and professional employment history. Note: With the exception of the C.V., all documentation below is for the period of review as defined in section III.
2. A tabular Summary of Assigned Duties, produced and distributed by the appropriate dean's office, that includes (for instructional faculty) a list of teaching assignments for each semester, including number of students per class, and FTEF generated.
3. A Narrative Summary (not to exceed 1500 words), that provides a self-assessment of accomplishments in all aspects of assigned duties, including the primary assignment (teaching performance or performance as librarian or professional counselor) as well as related activities.
4. An optional supplemental narrative (not to exceed 500 words) that documents any issue requiring special emphasis, including academic dishonesty issues or other circumstances that might call into question the validity of SOQ data beyond the normal limitations of SOQs.
5. Consistent with the CBA, all required SOQ and grade distribution data for the period of review. FAR will support and assist faculty in obtaining these data, including loading the necessary reports into any electronic portfolio system and re-naming files as necessary. Submission of the final portfolio is the responsibility of the faculty member.

Lecturers exclusively assigned to teaching shall be evaluated solely on the basis of educational performance, which includes teaching performance and disciplinary and pedagogical currency. Criteria are drawn from but need not address all items in section V. An abbreviated evaluation shall account for the less extensive nature of the review, and the portfolio should address relevant criteria but the narrative need not discuss all items in section V, nor does the WPAF need to document all criteria. Abbreviated reviews should address a preponderance of available evidence and provide a holistic rating and the narrative need only demonstrate satisfactory instruction overall. For example, course syllabi and student work are not required of abbreviated reviews and any standards relying on those materials are not applicable.

Should policy interpretation be required, for abbreviated reviews this section takes precedence over other sections in this document. Per the CBA, this section does not restrict faculty unit employees from including any additional materials they deem relevant for the evaluation process.

VII. Department Policies and Reviewer Responsibilities

A. Department Policies

All departments are encouraged to elaborate their expectations of lecturers in their Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty. Department chairs shall communicate teaching standards to lecturers the first week of each semester. The standards for lecturers shall mirror the teaching benchmarks for tenure/tenure track faculty in the department personnel standards; and, in no case shall be set higher. The standards in this UPS shall serve as guidelines for development and interpretation of Department Standards. For those without approved department standards, the standards in this document shall be the basis to evaluate faculty performance. If the Department Standards do not align with this UPS, this UPS shall govern. Appropriate Vice President's approval of a Department Standards shall be withdrawn only after consultation with the appropriate Dean and the College Personnel Standards Review Committee (CPSRC) and only on the grounds that the standards do not conform to university policy. The process for developing and approving Standards is outlined in UPS 210.002.

Department policies, as well as any College policies governing the evaluation of lecturers, shall be bound by the conditions set forth herein. Such policies may specify the DPRC responsible for each of the three types of evaluation outlined herein. Such policies may further elaborate the expectations onto which the evaluative terms set forth in Section V are mapped, but shall employ the overall rating categories in Section III.E. Departments are encouraged to develop an evaluation form as an appendix to their Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty. This evaluation form should reflect the criteria outlined in this UPS. These policies may also include additional criteria for evaluation, such as criteria for the evaluation of non-teaching duties and may elaborate the type of development as required for range elevation consideration; however, in all cases, criteria shall be aligned with expectations appropriate to duties assigned and the department's approved SOQ form(s). These policies may elaborate on the use of various forms of evidence in relation to the criteria for evaluation. However, faculty shall not be prohibited from including evidence relevant to their assignment.

If classroom observations are required by Department or College policy, or if the lecturer requests an observation voluntarily, observations shall be conducted in accordance with UPS 210.080 and scheduled by the Department Chair (or designee) or the DPRC.

Department and College policies on the evaluation of lecturers may elaborate on the relative weight assigned to the evaluation of various types of assigned duties.

Any Department or College policy governing the evaluation of lecturers shall be provided to each lecturer within fourteen days of their initial appointment and again when changes to policy occur. Changes to the policy that are approved by the Provost may be implemented in the following semester. Prior to revising their Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty, departments are encouraged to discuss their proposed document with the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records.

Department or College policies pertaining to the evaluation of lecturers shall be approved by the Department Personnel Committee, the Department, College Personnel Standards Review Committee (CPSRC, see UPS 210.002) and the Dean prior to submission to the Provost for approval. The primary purpose of review by the CPSRC is to ensure that the standards conform to the standards of the college, this document, the CBA, and to check for coherence and precision. If the CPSRC does not approve the standards, the CPSRC shall meet with the Chair of the Department to suggest revisions. Upon approval by the CPSRC, the Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty shall be forwarded to the appropriate Dean for review and approval. The Dean shall forward their recommendation to FAR for transmission to the appropriate Vice President. If the Dean or appropriate Vice President recommend modifications or

disapproval, the Department will be given the opportunity to submit suitably revised standards following the same process above. The Provost has final approval authority for all personnel policies. Lecturer standards must be submitted to the CPSRC no later than October 31. Standards must be submitted to the Provost from the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records no later than May 1 at 5 pm.

B. Eligibility to Participate in the Evaluation of Lecturers

Untenured faculty shall not serve on the DPRC. Since there are separate fall and spring lecturer evaluation cycles, departments may have different DPRCs for each semester. No faculty member shall serve on the DPRC when that person will be on any type of leave during that semester. The department may make a request to the President that Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) participants who are employed in that semester may be eligible to run for election to the DPRC. However, the committee cannot be comprised solely of FERP faculty. Other CSUF or CSU policies may impact the ability of individuals to participate in the personnel process (e.g., CSU Nepotism Policy).

The Department Chair review level shall be skipped in any department with an untenured Department Chair and the cases shall be evaluated by the Dean.

C. Reviewer Responsibilities

The evaluation of lecturers is a critical process and a very important responsibility of the tenured faculty who serve on DPRCs. Reviewer responsibilities include (but are not limited to) the following:

1. Careful review of and adherence to this policy, Evaluation of Lecturers, which is the governing document for CSU Fullerton;
2. Careful review of and adherence to Department standards and guidelines used in the evaluation process;
3. Review and analysis of the WPAF and other evidence outlined in Section VI;
4. Consultation with colleagues on the DPRC to give careful consideration to each file under review;
5. Consult with FAR as needed;
6. Attending meetings of the DPRC;
7. Drafting evaluation documents for review by the DPRC;
8. Protecting the privacy of the faculty under review, by keeping all discussion about the review within the personnel committee process; and
9. Providing, where appropriate, constructive feedback to the DPRC on the performance of the lecturer under review.

VIII. Lecturer Right to Rebuttal or Response

At all levels of review, before evaluations are forwarded to a subsequent level of review, lecturers shall be given a copy of their evaluation. The lecturer may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the evaluation within ten (10) days following receipt of the evaluation. The exercise of the right to rebut or respond shall not require that evaluation timelines be extended. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the WPAF and also be sent to all previous levels of review.

Source: Academic Senate Executive Committee

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 16, 2024

Supersedes: UPS 210.070 dated 6-3-2021
and ASD 21-83