



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 or higher 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. When a lecturer is notified of an upcoming evaluation and fails to submit their Working Personnel Action File 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 Working Personnel Action File to each (these need not be the same file since assignments will differ between departments).

II. Definitions

In this document, the term "lecturer" refers to all unit 3 employees who are identified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement 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 Collective Bargaining Agreement 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 Collective Bargaining Agreement 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 Working Personnel Action File (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 recommendations. It is expected that lecturer performance is at a satisfactory or higher level (see section IV for Range Elevation Evaluation).

A. *Types of Periodic Evaluation*

Annual Periodic Evaluation: Lecturers not undergoing a six-year or three-year evaluation will undergo an annual periodic evaluation. Lecturers at CSU Fullerton undergo annual periodic evaluation beginning with 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 Periodic Evaluation: A lecturer holding a three-year appointment will undergo a *three-year periodic evaluation* in the third year of the appointment.

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 their request or at the request of the Department Chair or an appropriate administrator. Lecturers should be employed at the University during the semester that they are evaluated.

C. Period of Review

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

Annual 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 annual 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 Periodic Reviews

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

D. Levels of Review

Annual 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 Department Peer Review Committee and typically the Department Chair. Part-time lecturers may be reviewed by the Dean at the Dean's discretion. Annual evaluations resulting in a less than "Satisfactory" performance by the Department Peer Review Committee or Department Chair shall be forwarded to the Dean.

Annual Reviews - Full-Time Lecturer

Full-time lecturers undergoing annual periodic evaluation shall be evaluated by the appropriate Department Peer Review Committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean.

Six-Year Comprehensive or Three-Year Periodic Reviews

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

E. Ratings and Relationship of Evaluative Terms to Reappointment Decisions

A periodic evaluation of a lecturer by the Department Peer Review Committee and Chair shall 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.

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 be accompanied by the WPAF that includes 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 he or she was

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 Department Peer Review Committee, 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" or better shall be required for a positive recommendation for range elevation.

Range elevation shall be accompanied by a salary increase of at least 5%, 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 Collective Bargaining Agreement. 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 Collective Bargaining Agreement. The applicant must rely on the Working Personnel Action File and shall not introduce new evidence at the time of the appeal hearing except as in accordance with this policy and the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The Panel shall allow for appellants to make a presentation to the Panel and to be represented by CFA 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*

It is expected that lecturers shall establish a teaching environment where student learning is central, expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in the design, organization, and content of their materials, and students are provided opportunities to develop their learning abilities, competencies, and skills to contribute to society. A successful lecturer demonstrates mastery and currency in the discipline, teaches effectively, and helps students to learn.

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 comprehensive lists.

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. 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 on the date/time assigned by the University.	Syllabi
Maintains office hours.	Syllabi, SOQs

2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning.

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Provides a means for students to contribute to the course learning by encouraging inquiry.	Syllabi, SOQs, comments from observations, Narrative Summary, examples of student work/projects/assignments, effective LMS pages
Provides a coherent structure for course meetings which is understood by the students.	Syllabi, SOQs, examples of student work/projects/assignments, effective LMS pages

3. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Learning goals of the course are made clear to students at the start of the course.	Syllabi, SOQs, examples of student work/projects/assignments
Assessments and grading practices are clearly related to course goals.	Syllabi, SOQs, examples of student work/projects/assignments, Narrative Summary

4. Effective use of instructional methods.

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Instructional methods are appropriate to course goals.	Syllabi, Narrative Summary, SOQs
Technology appropriate to the field, such as clickers or blogs, is used to enhance student participation.	Syllabi, Narrative Summary, SOQs

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

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
Academic rigor 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

6. Pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.

Examples	Potential Sources of Evidence
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
Pedagogical methods are current in relation to the discipline and subject matter.	Syllabi, Classroom Observations, Examples of Student Work/Projects/Assignments, FDC Workshops
Continuing professional engagement in the discipline and/or professional development as relevant to teaching assignment.	CV, Narrative Summary, FDC Workshops

When evaluating the lecturer's teaching performance and disciplinary and pedagogical currency through the application of the criteria listed above, departments may vary in how they use evidence in the WPAF. The review of evidence must be comprehensive and not solely based on one element. 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. Quantitative evidence (e.g. SOQs and Grade Distributions) shall only be used in combination with other evidence of teaching performance. Grade distributions shall not be used to determine academic rigor. While use of standardized Student Opinion Questionnaires 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.

Student Opinion Questionnaires 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 provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. 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 Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty specify SOQ score ranges that characterize instruction as “exceeds expectations,” “satisfactory,” etc., then they shall also detail how other measures of teaching effectiveness are identified and assessed, including peer evaluations, quality of teaching materials and assessments, self-reflections, etc. This is to avoid the cognitive bias that over-weighs quantitative measures relative to qualitative measures.

It is important to note that for SOQ ordinal scales, frequency distribution (e.g., percent A and B responses) 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, etc. Faculty members who feel their student ratings do not completely represent their teaching should carefully explain their scores, and offer an explanation of discrepancies and patterns. These explanations should be considered by the reviewers.

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.

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.

C. 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. This 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.

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 at least thirty 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 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.

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.

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 or UPS 210.070 if there are no approved department standards.
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 Summary of Assigned Duties, including (for instructional faculty) a list of teaching assignments for each semester, including number of students per class. For those with non-instructional duties such as course coordination or assessment activities, the summary shall indicate expected activities and/or products associated with the assignment.
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. 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.
6. 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 expected to be professionally active and/or engaged in scholarly or creative activity as part of their work assignment, the narrative shall summarize those professional, scholarly, or creative activities. For example, lecturers working in colleges or departments with accreditation standards may be required to be professionally active and/or engaged in scholarly or creative activity. All lecturer faculty in the College of Business and Economics are expected to meet AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) accreditation standards as implemented by the College; narratives provided by lecturers in MCBE shall include the information needed to determine whether the AACSB standards are met.
7. 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.
8. Student Opinion Questionnaire Comment Reports from all courses (when applicable).
9. Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions (when applicable; Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty may specify that they are not required).
10. Additional Evidence of Teaching Performance - Other supporting materials that are directly relevant to teaching performance (or performance as librarian or professional counselor). 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, and (where available) signed letters from students. Supporting materials shall emphasize quality and representativeness over quantity.

11. 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.
12. If appropriate to the work assignment, supporting materials that evidence professional, university, and community service and/or scholarship or creative activity.

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 Department Peer Review Committee. 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 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

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. Such 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 Department Peer Review Committee 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. 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 Department Peer Review Committee.

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 Faculty Affairs and Records 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 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 Department Peer Review Committees. Reviewer responsibilities include (but are not limited to) the following:

1. Careful review of this policy, Evaluation of Lecturers, which is the governing document for CSU Fullerton;
2. Careful review of 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 Department Peer Review Committee to give careful consideration to each file under review;
5. Attending meetings of the Department Peer Review Committee;
6. Drafting evaluation documents for review by the Department Peer Review Committee;
7. Protecting the privacy of the faculty under review, by keeping all discussion about the review within the personnel committee process; and
8. Providing, where appropriate, constructive feedback to the Department Peer Review Committee 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: June 3, 2021

Supersedes: UPS 210.070 dated 4-6-21
and ASD 21-40