



FACULTY AFFAIRS AND RECORDS

**Official Department Standards for Lecturers for the
Division of Politics, Administration, and Justice**

Approved by Dr. Kari Knutson Miller, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, on 2/14/2018 for implementation in the 2018-2019 Academic Year

[Verified and posted online at www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/paj2018lecturer.pdf](http://www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/paj2018lecturer.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.

Division of Politics, Administration, and Justice Policy on the Evaluation of Lecturers

I. Preamble

The Division of Politics, Administration, and Justice (PAJ) shall evaluate its lecturers according to UPS 210.070, Evaluation of Lecturers. Pursuant to Section IX.A. of UPS 210.070, the Division of Politics, Administration, and Justice further elaborates its policy on the evaluation of lecturers as laid out in sections II – VII. These standards below define both qualitative and quantitative criteria by which faculty under review shall be judged. This Division policy shall be provided to each lecturer member within fourteen days of their initial appointment and again when changes to policy occur.

II. Qualifications of Lecturers

In order to be considered for a teaching assignment in PAJ, a lecturer must be either:

Academically qualified: A lecturer is academically qualified by virtue of holding a Ph.D. (or achieving ABD status with an expected graduation date), D.P.A., J.D. or MA/MS in a field related to their specific teaching responsibilities and maintaining scholarship activities to support their teaching. If the faculty member received their degree more than 5 years ago, they need to demonstrate currency in the field, particularly related to their specific teaching responsibilities.

Professionally qualified: A lecturer can be professionally qualified by virtue of having a record of outstanding professional experience directly relevant to their teaching assignment. A professionally qualified faculty member will have a graduate degree as well as professional experience in a field related to their specific teaching responsibilities. Additionally, professionally qualified faculty will engage in professional and/or community service in an area that supports their specific teaching responsibilities. Professionally qualified faculty may also publish professional, practice-relevant writing related to their areas of teaching. All professionally qualified faculty will use class syllabi that demonstrate current knowledge and technique.

The minimum level of education required to teach at the 100-300 level is a master's degree or ABD (even without a master's degree) in a relevant field. In order to teach a course at the 400-level and graduate level, lecturer must have a terminal degree in their field (Ph.D., D.P.A., and J.D. are considered terminal degrees for courses taught in PAJ). In cases of exigent curricular circumstances, departure from these requirements may be made at the discretion of the Division chair in consultation with the department coordinator(s).

III. Classroom Observations

Classroom observations should be conducted by a member of the full-time tenured (Associate Professor/Professor) faculty as assigned by the Division chair. These are required during the 1st semester of teaching (for new hires), at year 5 and/or at least once every six years for continuing faculty and once per evaluation cycle for faculty with three year appointments. Additional observations may be requested by the chair or Division Personnel Committee (DPC). Lecturers may request additional observations outside of the required timeframe, which may be included in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) at the discretion of the lecturer.

Per UPS 210.070, a lecturer shall be notified a minimum of five days in advance of any classroom observation. A copy of the report from the classroom observation shall be provided to the faculty member within ten working days of the observation.

Classroom observations shall use the following five criteria: 1) Is the course content appropriate for the course observed; 2) Is the rigor of the course material appropriate for the level of the course observed; 3) Did the instructor effectively communicate the material during the class; 4) Did the instructor demonstrate a mastery of the content needed for the course; and 5) Were the students engaged during the class. Classroom observations should also include a brief narrative from the observer detailing any significant strengths and/or deficiencies observed.

IV. WPAF Contents

UPS 210.070 and/or the Collective Bargaining Agreement require that lecturer review files include the following:

1. Table of contents
2. Approved departmental standards
3. CV
4. Summary of teaching responsibilities for review period
5. Narrative summary
6. Other supporting materials that are directly related to teaching performance
7. Evidence of currency in the field
8. Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ) for all terms evaluated
9. SOQ summary reports for all terms evaluated
10. Grade distributions for all courses taught for all terms evaluated

As evidence of other supporting materials that are directly related to teaching performance, WPAFs for PAJ must also include:

- All course syllabi, all examinations, a representative sample of assignments, and a representative sample of supporting class materials, such as handouts, lists of films used, lists of guest speakers, etc.
- All classroom observation reports

Per UPS 210.070, if required documents are missing from the WPAF, they shall be provided in a timely manner and placed in the WPAF by the Department Chair.

V. Evaluation Criteria

The Division of PAJ recognizes that effective teaching is central to the learning process. It expects its lecturers to teach courses that are academically challenging and reflective of relevant scholarship. Course content and the instructional material used must be directly relevant to the course descriptions and learning goals set by each department in the Division. Course syllabi should meet the standards set forth by UPS 300.004 Policy on Course Outlines.

Evaluations of teaching performance shall be based on examination of course outlines, exams and assignments, course materials, grade distributions, and SOQ data. In examining this quantitative and qualitative material, the DPC and Division chair will look for evidence that the course content is up-to-date, current, academically rigorous, organized, and that assignments and examinations are appropriate.

Section VII.A. of UPS 210.070 states six criteria for the evaluation of a lecturer's educational performance:

1. Compliance with University, College, and Departmental policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.
2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning.
3. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.
4. Effective use of a variety of instructional methods.
5. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.
6. Pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.

VI. Evaluation Process and Outcomes

Lecturers are evaluated by the DPC. The five members of the committee are selected from full-time tenured faculty members in accordance with Division by-laws. Evaluations are conducted according to timelines set forth by Faculty Affairs and Records and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Evaluations of lecturers will result in evaluation scores based on the following definitions according to the CBA and UPS 210.070:

Exceeds expectations: Describes performance in assigned duties that is better than satisfactory

Satisfactory: Describes performance that meets expectations

Needs Improvement: Describes performance that does not meet expectations

Unsatisfactory: Describes performance that is seriously deficient

Lecturers shall be evaluated by the DPC and the chair on the six criteria above based upon the contents of the WPAF. The DPC and the chair will also provide lecturers with a narrative review highlighting the strengths in their teaching performance and recommendations for future improvement, if any.

Reappointment decisions related to these evaluations will follow the guidelines set forth by UPS 210.070 and the CBA.

VII. Frequency of Evaluations

Lecturers may be appointed to one-semester, one-year, or multi-year appointments. PAJ requires that all lecturers be reviewed by the Division Chair after their first semester of employment. The Division Chair will review course syllabi, the classroom observation report and, when available, SOQ and grade distribution data. After two one-semester appointments (whether consecutive or not), a faculty member must undergo a formal evaluation in accordance with university and Division policy. All lecturers in one-year or two-year appointments shall undergo an evaluation annually. Faculty members in three-year appointments shall undergo an evaluation during the third year of their appointment.



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. Student Opinion Questionnaire

- | | | | | | | | | |
|------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1.1 | Was the course material covered in an understandable way? | most positive evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> | most negative evaluation |
| 1.2 | Were course readings and other assignments appropriate to the class? | most positive evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> | most negative evaluation |
| 1.3 | How heavy was the workload, compared to other courses at this level? | most positive evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> | most negative evaluation |
| 1.4 | Was the professor available to help students outside of the classroom? | most positive evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> | most negative evaluation |
| 1.5 | Were tests and/or assignments thoroughly evaluated by the professor? | most positive evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> | most negative evaluation |
| 1.6 | Did this course encourage you to think? | most positive evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> | most negative evaluation |
| 1.7 | Did the professor encourage students to express their ideas? | most positive evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> | most negative evaluation |
| 1.8 | Was the professor enthusiastic about the subject matter? | most positive evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> | most negative evaluation |
| 1.9 | Has the classroom experience been stimulating, overall? | most positive evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> | most negative evaluation |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 1.10 | Regardless of whether you "liked" the class, how much did you learn? | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 1.11 | Overall, how would you rate this professor's performance? | | <input type="checkbox"/> |

almost nothing
a little
something
quite a bit
a lot

fail
passing
barely
adequate
good
excellent

Please Continue on Page 2

2. Comments

2.1 What were the strongest features of this class?

2.2 What suggestions for improvements do you have?

2.3 Other comments: