



FACULTY AFFAIRS AND RECORDS

**Official Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty for the
Department of Counseling**

Approved by Dr. Kari Knutson Miller, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, on 12/3/2018 for implementation in the Spring 2019 semester

[Verified and posted online at www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/cou2019lecturer.pdf](http://www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/cou2019lecturer.pdf)

According to Article 15.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement: Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty unit employee during the evaluation process.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
I. Preamble.....	1
II. Philosophy of the College of Health and Human Development.....	1
III. Department Structure.....	1
IV. Department Mission Statement	1
V. Evaluation of Lectures: Criteria and Weighting.....	2
A. Teaching performance	2
B. Evaluating teaching performance	2
1. Mandatory Indicators.....	2
2. Additional Indicators	3
C. Guidelines for Rating Teaching Performance	4
1. Pedagogical approach and methods.....	4
2. Evaluation of instruction	5
D. Ratings and Relationship of Evaluative Terms to Reappointment Decisions	7

I. Preamble

The Department of Counseling (hereafter called the “Department”) is committed to providing the highest quality programs possible. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs is the instructional faculty and seeks to promote excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, professional activities, and service to the Department, College, University, and Community. Adequate communication, especially regarding personnel policies, is of utmost importance to the maintenance and enhancement of a high-quality faculty and, thus, a viable University. With this objective, the Department shall institute the following procedures for assessing Portfolios for the purposes of faculty evaluation. The Department takes the position that the evaluated faculty may be aided in their respective roles by having available to them as clear and as objective a statement as is reasonably possible of the Department’s expectations. Furthermore, the Department specifically affirms their position that the best interests of the University, the College, the Department, and their many students are served when the faculty represent a wide diversity of interests and activities.

II. Philosophy of the College of Health and Human Development

We believe that knowledge is evolving and socially constructed and that learning is produced through an interaction of different perspectives that enable students to connect their education to their own experience. Thus, in our educational practice, we aim:

1. To create classroom communities where learning is interactive and dynamic.
2. To engage in reflective teaching and learning that draws attention to the process through which knowledge is produced and content learned.
3. To encourage all students to voice their perspectives and experiences.
4. To model various approaches to knowledge construction and learning for our students.
5. To enable students to understand the implications for their practice of differences and similarities related to culture.
6. To expand learning beyond the classroom to the broader societal and institutional contexts where students will engage in their practice.
7. To empower students to shape communities that are more humane.

III. Department Structure

The Department is coordinated by a Department Chair, selected according to UPS 211.100. The Department Chair has the responsibility of communicating the standards and criteria for reappointment to all Department faculty members. The Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) is an elected committee comprised of tenured faculty members. In the Department of Counseling this committee has the same membership as is the Department Personnel Committee. The DPRC is guided by UPS 210.070. Part-time Lecturers are evaluated by the Department Chair and DPRC while full-time Lecturers are additionally evaluated by the Dean. Part-time lecturers with an annual evaluation resulting in a less than “Satisfactory” performance by the DPRC or Department Chair shall be forwarded to the Dean. All lecturers undergoing six-year comprehensive evaluation or a three-year periodic evaluation shall be evaluated by the DPRC, the Department Chair, and the Dean.

IV. Department Mission Statement

The faculty in the Department of Counseling are committed to training competent professionals who are eligible for licensure as Marriage and Family Therapists and Professional Clinical Counselors in clinical mental health settings in the state of California. We work with students from diverse cultural and economic backgrounds who are committed to improving the quality of life for children and adults in the community. We utilize an integrated approach in prevention,

assessment, conceptualization, treatment planning, and research. Practice-based student learning is constructed through partnerships with non-profit agencies in diverse communities. Students are expected to engage in reflective practice, to consistently apply ethical standards, to practice cultural sensitivity, and to take responsibility for social change. We collaborate with students as they develop cultural competence and professional identities that incorporate a dedication to service and life-long learning. We strive to create an education that is guided by relevant community needs and research on learning.

V. Evaluation of Lectures: Criteria and Weighting

A. Teaching performance

The philosophy of the College of Health and Human Development (HHD) and Department mission statement guides the primary responsibility of Department faculty, which is teaching. Each faculty member shall establish a teaching environment where student learning is central expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in the organization, content, and review of the curricula and the counseling degree; and students are provided opportunities to develop the learning abilities, competencies, and skills necessary to contribute to society. A successful faculty member demonstrates mastery and currency in one's discipline, teaches effectively, and helps students to learn both within and outside the classroom.

B. Evaluating teaching performance

Evaluation of teaching performance includes evaluation of the following: a) pedagogical approach and methods; b) evaluation of instruction. Faculty members are encouraged to solicit other reviews of teaching performance to be included in the Portfolio at the time of submission. For example, classroom observations by Department colleagues may provide additional information regarding teaching effectiveness and interaction with students. Classroom observations by departmental colleagues require a written report and will be conducted in accordance with Article 15.14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Written reports of such visits shall address clarity of presentation, communication with students, student interaction, effective use of classroom time, and appropriateness of presentation methods. Assessments by external evaluators by faculty from other departments or other universities may also be included.

The following indicators shall be used in evaluating teaching performance:

1. Mandatory Indicators

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

- 1) Working Personnel Action File Table of Contents
- 2) Approved Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty
- 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 in UPS 210.070.

- 4) A Summary of Assigned Duties

A semester by semester listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review shall be provided. The list shall include the semester and year, the course name and number, and the unit value.

5) Narrative Summary

A comprehensive self-assessment of no more than 1500 words shall include a reflective review of the faculty member's teaching pedagogical approach, philosophy and performance as well as methods, goals and direction of the faculty member's future teaching. It shall address the faculty member's teaching with respect to the Department's mission and the HHD Philosophy when appropriate. In addition, the faculty member is encouraged to discuss their contributions to student learning in the comprehensive self-assessment.

6) Additional Evidence of Teaching Performance

The file shall include a representative selection of course syllabi and appropriate supplementary materials such as tests and study aids prepared by the faculty member to promote student learning.

7) Summary Reports of Student Opinion Questionnaires

The University-provided statistical summaries for all courses during the period of review must be included. This section should include a summary table of all SOQ summary information in the front. If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair.

8) Completed Student Opinion Questionnaires

The printed individual Student Opinion Questionnaires shall be included for each course taught at CSUF for academic credit during the period of review. If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair.

9) Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions

The University-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each semester of the period of review must be provided. This section should include a summary table of all grade distributions in the front. If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair.

10) Evidence of Pedagogical and Disciplinary Currency

Provide indicators that demonstrate how the faculty member is remaining current in the field of study and instruction. This can include evidence of professional achievement or activities, active scholarship and research activities, professional trainings and certifications, curricular innovations or other relevant instructional material, consistent with the Department and the College of HHD.

2. Additional Indicators

The faculty member may submit other evidence that demonstrates teaching effectiveness, contributions to student learning, and ongoing professional development in the discipline and as a teacher, such as, but not limited to, the following:

1. Peer review of teaching following classroom visitations, lectures, or seminars.
2. Documentation and evaluation of teaching activities in colleagues' classes.

3. Documentation of fieldwork coordination, academic advisement, or mentoring activities.
4. Development of instructional technology strategies to enhance student learning.
5. Development and evaluation of alternative strategies for assessing student learning.
6. Publications about scholarly work or teaching.
7. Evidence of additional training in teaching or collaborative teaching activities, such as completion of teaching modules and trainings given through the CSUF Faculty Development Center.
8. Video or audio recordings of lessons taught.
9. Independent study projects produced by students trained or directed by the faculty member.
10. Evidence of professional certifications, professional licensure, and advanced clinical training in the field.
11. Promotion of student involvement in community activities that promote social justice and equity.
12. Providing trainings or workshops to develop student skills or knowledge.

C. Guidelines for Rating Teaching Performance

A composite rating of teaching effectiveness is arrived at based on two factors defined below:

1. Pedagogical approach and methods

Pedagogical approach and methods includes a self-assessment of the faculty member as a teacher. Self-assessments shall address the faculty member's pedagogical approach, philosophy of teaching, and teaching performance highlighting strengths and areas for growth in teaching. Methods, goals, and direction of future teaching shall also be discussed. Course syllabi and samples of course materials (e.g., Power Point presentations, lecture notes, course materials, multi-media created for courses, sample activities, exams, or completed papers or projects from students) shall also be included. The Committee shall rate pedagogical approach and methods as "**exceeds expectations**," "**satisfactory**," "**needs improvement**," or "**unsatisfactory**" according to the following criteria:

Exceeds Expectations -- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate outstanding teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, and relevancy of assignments.

Satisfactory -- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate clearly acceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments.

Needs Improvement -- Self-assessment and course syllabi and materials included in the Portfolio demonstrate marginally acceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments.

Unsatisfactory -- Self-assessment and course materials demonstrate unacceptable teaching effectiveness as judged by breadth and depth of course content for the level of the course(s) taught, currency in topics covered, relevancy of assignments.

2. Evaluation of instruction

The evaluation of a faculty member's instruction shall be demonstrated through multiple means. Whereas faculty members are required to submit their Student Opinion Questionnaires, they shall not be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. The quantitative and qualitative data from Student Opinion Questionnaires is to be presented along with other methods of evaluation.

a.) Student Opinion Questionnaires

Student Opinion Questionnaires contribute to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated comments or courses. The following scale shall be applied when rating the statistical summaries of student opinions of each class:

Exceeds Expectations	-- 89.5% or more A and B ratings with at least 60% A
Satisfactory	-- 74.5 to 89.4% A and B ratings
Needs Improvement	-- 59.5 to 74.4% A and B ratings
Unsatisfactory	-- less than 59.4 % A and B ratings

Student comments from the Student Opinion Questionnaires are also to be considered. These comments can contextualize the quantitative ratings and provide other insight into student evaluation of teaching. Faculty should reflect on themes in the student comments and how the faculty member has worked to address any concerns raised by students.

b.) Grade Distributions

Grade Distributions contribute to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. Though primarily a graduate department, undergraduate and graduate course grade distribution should be evaluated following the same criteria: considering the level of the course (100 level versus a 300 level course), the rigor of the course assignments, and the type of course being evaluated (such as clinical, content, or research courses).

Grade Distributions should accurately reflect students' level of mastery of course content. It would be expected, for example, that average distributions for content courses would be in the B range, and clinical courses (those where letter grades are given) would have more B+'s and A-'s than A's. Practicum courses typically have 100% of students with a rating of Credit, although some semesters a student may earn a No Credit. It is understood that some classes might have higher than average Grade Distributions due to teaching excellence, or the particular composition of the students in a class. However, a consistent pattern of high grades across all courses could be a cause for concern.

Patterns across various semesters shall also be considered in evaluating the appropriateness grade distributions. Lectures are expected to grade with the same level of rigor as tenure-track faculty.

c.) Professional Development as a Teacher, in the Discipline, and Additional Considerations

The overall evaluation of instruction portion of Teaching Effectiveness can be further enhanced with additional considerations in regards to professional development and additional professional activities. One method of evaluating instruction is for faculty members to submit peer evaluations of their actual classroom teaching. Faculty members can also demonstrate growth by attending workshops or conferences that enhance their professional development as practitioners or as teachers. Other professional or service activities may inform teaching and can be included for consideration of teaching effectiveness. A suggested but not exhaustive list of examples is included above in Section V, B2.

Composite Rating of Teaching Performance

In evaluating a faculty member's instruction, the Committee is to assess the entire period of review but places greater emphasis on the three most recent years of a faculty member's teaching when reviewing six years for consideration of a three-year contract. This view is to allow the Committee to evaluate a faculty member's development as a teacher and trace progress over time.

Based on a composite of the ratings of the three areas described above, the reviewers shall render a summative rating of teaching performance as "**exceeds expectations**," "**satisfactory**," "**needs improvement**," or "**unsatisfactory**" according to the following criteria:

Exceeds Expectations – The majority of courses overall are excellent as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings and/or composite ratings of SOQ, grade distributions, effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures reflect an outstanding performance in evaluation of instruction. Ongoing professional development as a teacher exceeds expectations and shows active and consistent efforts for professional development.

Satisfactory – The majority of courses overall are good or above as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings and/or composite ratings of SOQ, grade distributions, effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures reflect a good performance in evaluation of instruction. Ongoing professional development as a teacher meets expectations and shows some engagement in professional development activities.

Needs Improvement --The majority of courses overall are fair or above as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings, and/or composite ratings of SOQ, grade distributions, effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures reflect a fair performance in evaluation of instruction. Ongoing professional development as a teacher does not expectations and shows little engagement in professional development.

Unsatisfactory -- The majority of courses overall are poor as demonstrated by actual SOQs ratings and/or composite ratings of SOQ, grade distributions, effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures reflect a poor performance in evaluation of instruction. Ongoing professional development as a teacher is non-existent.

D. Ratings and Relationship of Evaluative Terms to Reappointment Decisions

A periodic evaluation of a lecturer by the Department Peer Review Committee and Chair will result in an overall rating of:

Exceeds Expectations – describes performance in assigned duties that is better than satisfactory,

Satisfactory – describes performance that meets 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" or better 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, as well as other information into consideration.

An evaluation of "Needs Improvement" does not preclude a Dean 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," the evaluation should articulate those areas in which improvement is needed and should be addressed during the next appointment period, if reappointed. The Department Peer Review Committee or Department Chair or Dean should make recommendations for professional development activities in their evaluations. Subsequent evaluations of "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" shall normally lead to a decision *not to* reappoint. An evaluation of "Unsatisfactory" shall typically result in a decision not to reappoint.

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



Mark as shown: Please use a #2 pencil and COMPLETELY FILL IN THE BOX of your answer.

Correction: Please completely erase or completely fill in the wrong answer AND PLACE AN 'X' IN THE BOX OF YOUR ANSWER.

1. Section I

SECTION I: RATE EACH OF THE STATEMENTS BELOW USING THE FOLLOWING RATING SCALE:

A= EXCELLENT, B= VERY GOOD, C= SATISFACTORY, D= WEAK, E= VERY WEAK

- | | A | B | C | D | E |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1.1 I rate the professor's knowledge in the subject matter or process(es) for this course as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.2 I rate the professor's demonstrated interest in students as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.3 I rate the degree to which the professor accepts and respects me as a person as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.4 I rate the professor's preparation for class meetings as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.5 I rate the professor's availability to students for consultation as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.6 I rate the clarity and connection of assignments and class process to the course as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.7 I rate the clarity and consistency of the grading criteria in this course as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.8 I rate the usefulness of the professor's feedback as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.9 I rate the professor's contribution to my own growth and learning as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.10 Overall, I rate the professor's teaching in this course as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |

2. Section II

SECTION II: Disregard the A,B,C,D,E scale for the items below. Answer these items by marking the appropriate response for each item. Add any comments on the back of the page.

- 2.1 The amount of work I did for this course was:
- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> very great | <input type="checkbox"/> great | <input type="checkbox"/> moderate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fair | <input type="checkbox"/> poor | |
- 2.2 The quality of my work for this course was:
- | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> very good | <input type="checkbox"/> good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fair | <input type="checkbox"/> poor | |
- 2.3 My contribution to this class was:
- | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> very good | <input type="checkbox"/> good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fair | <input type="checkbox"/> poor | |
- 2.4 My openness to supervision in class was:
- | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> very good | <input type="checkbox"/> good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fair | <input type="checkbox"/> poor | |
- 2.5 The subject matter, methods, and skills learned in class will be:
- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> very useful | <input type="checkbox"/> useful | <input type="checkbox"/> somewhat useful |
| <input type="checkbox"/> of little use | <input type="checkbox"/> not useful | |

3. Comments

3.1 Please write any comments you would like to add in the box below.



Mark as shown: Please use a #2 pencil and COMPLETELY FILL IN THE BOX of your answer.

Correction: Please completely erase or completely fill in the wrong answer AND PLACE AN 'X' IN THE BOX OF YOUR ANSWER.

1. Section I

SECTION I: RATE EACH OF THE STATEMENTS BELOW USING THE FOLLOWING RATING SCALE:

A= EXCELLENT, B= VERY GOOD, C= SATISFACTORY, D= WEAK, E= VERY WEAK

- | | A | B | C | D | E |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1.1 I rate the degree to which the professor accepts and respects me as a person as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.2 I rate the usefulness of the professor's feedback as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.3 I rate the degree to which the professor provides suggestions for developing my counseling skills as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.4 I rate the contribution of the course to my level of awareness of professional issues as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.5 I rate the contribution of the course to my development as a counselor as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.6 I rate the degree to which the professor helps me formulate professional goals for myself during the practicum experience as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.7 I rate the degree to which the professor helps me define and maintain ethical behavior in counseling as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.8 I rate the degree to which the professor helps me formulate a theoretical rationale of human behavior as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.9 I rate the degree to which the professor offers resource information as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.10 I rate the clarity and consistency of the professor's application of the departmental grading criteria as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.11 Overall, I rate the professor's teaching in this course as: | <input type="checkbox"/> |

2. Section II

SECTION II: Disregard the A,B,C,D,E scale for the items below. Answer these items by marking the appropriate response for each item. Add any comments on the back of the page.

- 2.1 The amount of work I did for this course was:
- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> very great | <input type="checkbox"/> great | <input type="checkbox"/> moderate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fair | <input type="checkbox"/> poor | |
- 2.2 The quality of my work for this course was:
- | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> very good | <input type="checkbox"/> good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fair | <input type="checkbox"/> poor | |
- 2.3 My contribution to this class was:
- | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> very good | <input type="checkbox"/> good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fair | <input type="checkbox"/> poor | |
- 2.4 My openness to supervision in class was:
- | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> very good | <input type="checkbox"/> good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fair | <input type="checkbox"/> poor | |

3. Comments

3.1 Please write any comments you would like to add in the box below.