



FACULTY AFFAIRS AND RECORDS

## **Official Department Personnel Standards for the Department of Human Communication Studies**

Approved by Dr. Anil K. Puri, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, on 12/15/2017 for implementation in the 2018-2019 Academic Year

[Verified and posted online at www.fullerton.edu/far/dps/hcom2018.pdf](http://www.fullerton.edu/far/dps/hcom2018.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.

According to University Policy Statement 210.000 (3/26/18 version), Section V.C.: ▪ Each department shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that department. These standards... shall indicate the specific range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion, and tenure decisions.

▪ Approved Departmental Personnel Standards are controlling documents in all personnel decisions. ▪ All Departmental Personnel Standards require the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Vice President for Student Affairs for counselor faculty). ▪ Approved Departmental Personnel Standards shall be reviewed by the department as part of each program performance review. ▪ Student Opinion Questionnaire forms must be included as an attachment to Departmental Personnel Standards.

# DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL STANDARDS

## DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN COMMUNICATION STUDIES

Department approved: 18 October 2017  
College approved: 30 October 2017  
Provost approved: 15 December 2017

The guidelines and procedures contained in this document apply to the faculty of the Human Communication Studies Department for use in determining recommendations for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) is elected annually by the tenured and tenure-track faculty and consists of three tenured Associate or Full Professors within the Department plus one tenured Associate or Full Professor within the Department to serve as an alternate as needed.

Each faculty member under review is responsible for preparing a Portfolio ensuring that the file is consistent with the most recent UPS 210.000.

### Table of Contents

I. Prospectus.....	02
II. Teaching .....	03
III. Scholarly and Creative Activity .....	06
IV. Service and Professional Activity .....	09
V. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion .....	12
VI. Criteria for Early Tenure or Early Promotion .....	12
VII. Appendix I: Expected Grade Distributions .....	13

## I. Prospectus

Probationary faculty make progress toward retention, tenure, and promotion according to the Department Personnel Standards, UPS 210.000, and a Prospectus as described below.

### **Prospectus**

Probationary faculty will prepare a Prospectus during their first year of employment, as prescribed in UPS 210.000, III-A. The Prospectus shall include narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service, not to exceed 500 words each. The narratives identify the faculty member's professional goals, teaching and research interests, resources required, and expectations in each of the three areas to meet the approved Department Personnel Standards and/or UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion. The due date for the Prospectus is set by the University per UPS 210.000. The Prospectus has no formal approval process but is reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean who will each provide written feedback prior to May 1.

The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member's Portfolio for all Full Performance Reviews. The Prospectus is in addition to and separate from retrospective, self-assessment narratives that are part of the Portfolio. In subsequent years, the Prospectus may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.

### **Faculty Mentor**

It is recommended, but not required, that a probationary faculty member, in consultation with the Chair, choose a faculty member to serve as a mentor to the probationary faculty member in writing the Prospectus. The mentor and/or the chair may offer informal advice regarding the RTP process. A new faculty mentor can be chosen at any time if the probationary faculty member makes such a request.

### **Evaluation and Recommendation**

Each faculty member shall be evaluated in each of the three categories prescribed by UPS 210.000 (Teaching; Scholarly and Creative Activities; and Professional, University, and Community Service). When an accomplishment could conceivably fit in multiple evaluation categories, the faculty member is expected to submit the accomplishment under one category only and make the case for that category (i.e., no double-dipping). It is the faculty member's responsibility to make a clear, convincing case for retention, tenure, or promotion. The faculty member shall provide sufficient reasons, evidence, and documentation of her or his accomplishments during the review period. The DPC will evaluate the Portfolio and make a recommendation with clear and specific reference to the approved department guidelines. Evaluators may make qualitative judgments whenever appropriate in each category. All evaluators will focus on the narratives provided by the faculty member and will evaluate the congruence of claims with the data provided as support. Evaluations and recommendations shall follow the requirements in UPS 210.000 IV-A.

## II. Teaching

Teaching is the most important activity of faculty and, therefore, the most important criterion for retention, tenure, and/or promotion (UPS 210.000, II-A.-1.-c). Each faculty member is responsible for including the following materials in the Portfolio or the Review File: (1) a concise narrative, not to exceed 1,000 words, addressing teaching performance and an explicit articulation of pedagogical approach and methods; (2) evaluators' comments from classroom visitation(s) of teaching; (3) statistical summaries of all responses on Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) forms administered to classes taught during the review period; (4) statistical summaries of grade distributions for all classes taught during the review period; and (5) other materials that provide evidence of teaching performance (these materials should be referenced in the narrative and included in an appendix). All materials used as evidence in support of teaching performance should be summarized in the narrative.

Classroom peer visitations should be completed on a regular basis by a faculty peer (at least two classroom visitations every full performance review period). Evaluators' comments should address issues such as the following: (1) course content, e.g., relationship of class session to course syllabi and assigned readings; the degree to which the content of the presentation is relevant to the subject, reflects current thinking in the discipline, and includes relevant viewpoints; appropriate level of difficulty of the material presented; (2) organization of the presentation, e.g., logical sequence of topics; pace of presentation, inclusion of summaries and syntheses, effective time management; (3) clarity of presentation, e.g., explains ideas and information clearly, provides relevant examples and illustrations, answers students' questions clearly; (4) style of teaching, e.g., stimulates students' critical thinking, engages students in problem solving, demonstrates professional and ethical behavior; and (5) instructor-student interaction, e.g., engages class members in interaction, creates a healthy and stimulating classroom atmosphere, allows students to respond to each other, and creates an atmosphere in which mutual respect is demonstrated.

### **Mandatory Indicators for Evaluation of Teaching Performance**

1. Course Content
  - a. Most current syllabus for each different course taught during the review period, including learning objectives, assignments and requirements, and grading criteria.
  - b. Selected examples of assignments, handouts, reading lists, exams, and quizzes.
2. Classroom Teaching
  - a. All Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs), including the statistical summaries, collated qualitative comments, and raw data forms.
  - b. Reports of classroom visitations by department colleagues.
3. Grading Practices
  - a. Statistical summary of grade distributions from all classes taught at CSUF during the review period.
  - b. Rationale for grading practices in accordance with expected department grade distributions (see Appendix I).

4. Non-Classroom Teaching: evidence of involvement in student advising and formal or informal mentoring.

### **Optional Indicators for Measuring Teaching Effectiveness**

1. Classroom Teaching: materials such as teaching awards; unsolicited, signed student letters; attendance at professional development seminars; and/or receipt of certifications specifically related to teaching.
2. Teaching Innovations
  - a. Information regarding instructional grants.
  - b. Specific tools, instruments, devices, workbooks, and methods of instruction implemented in the classroom.
  - c. New course proposals.
3. Non-Classroom Instruction
  - a. Information regarding involvement with Master's theses and/or graduate-level directed research.
  - b. Information regarding directed independent studies.

### **Criteria for Evaluating Teaching Performance**

Evaluation of teaching shall be based upon the total evidence reflected by Student Opinion Questionnaires and other mandatory and optional indicators. The reviewers shall render a composite rating of teaching effectiveness as either: "Superior," "Excellent," "Satisfactory," or "Unsatisfactory." The composite rating shall incorporate both SOQs and qualitative measures. In the assessment of qualitative and quantitative information, qualitative information will be given primacy. Faculty members' teaching performance is evaluated as a composite of all standards listed below.

1. Qualitative indicators of instruction: All teaching indicators (mandatory and optional) shall be qualitatively assessed and evaluators shall render a rating of "Superior," "Excellent," "Satisfactory," or "Unsatisfactory" using the criteria below:
  - a. Course content is of appropriate depth and breadth for the course level and topic, and the content reflects recent trends in the discipline.
  - b. Teaching strategies are effective, and there is evidence of significant successful effort to continuously improve teaching effectiveness.
  - c. Students' comments, questions, and concerns expressed in SOQs are addressed as appropriate.
  - d. Evaluation of student learning is both rigorous and valid, and in accordance with expected department grade distributions (see Appendix I).
  - e. Breadth is shown through the ability to teach a variety of courses.
2. Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ). Department-approved student opinion questionnaires utilize a five-point rating scale ranging from "A" (4) to "E" (0). Student ratings of instruction contribute to the evaluation of faculty members' teaching effectiveness but shall not be used as the sole measure. Overall patterns for the duration of the evaluation period shall be considered more informative than isolated

course evaluations. The following table will be used to evaluate instructor effectiveness based on the statistical summaries:

<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Overall Mean SOQ</b>		<b>Overall Percentages</b>
<b>Superior</b>	3.50 or higher	and	80% A's or B's with at least 50% A's
<b>Excellent</b>	3.20–3.49	and	70% A's and B's
<b>Satisfactory</b>	2.90–3.19	and	50% A's and B's
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	below 2.90	and	Fewer than 50% A's and B's

**This rating system is used as a guideline:** written student comments included on the rating forms will be used as an aid to interpret quantitative reports of student opinions. The evaluation shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, mode, and level, required or elective, experimental vs. traditional pedagogy, major vs. G.E., etc.). The evaluation shall also take into account the faculty member's overall level of experience and his or her efforts to improve teaching performance.

### **III. Scholarly and Creative Activity**

Scholarly and creative activity is the second most important criterion for evaluating faculty for purposes of retention, promotion, and/or tenure. It is expected that all tenure-track and tenured faculty will actively engage in an ongoing, systematic program of scholarly research that makes a meaningful contribution to their discipline. Faculty members shall demonstrate ongoing development in scholarly and creative activities in two ways: (1) evidence of a systematic research program, and (2) progression from third-level and second-level activities to first-level scholarly and creative activities as described below. Scholarly activities may encompass a variety of approaches and methods.

Scholarly/creative efforts may be published in traditional print form or equivalent electronic publication format. Scholarly activities that are published or presented digitally, online, or in open access journals will be evaluated in the same way as traditional publication outlets. Foreign-language publications count toward retention, tenure, and promotion. English translations of works published in non-English outlets must be included in the Appendix. Documentation of the quality, rigor, and prestige of non-English publications should be provided just as for English-language publications.

Faculty members shall provide evidence of the value or importance of their scholarly and creative contributions to the field by including the following indicators as available and appropriate: (1) relative prestige of journals in which one's work appears; (2) acceptance/rejection rates of journals, paper panels, or interest groups at conferences; (3) competitive rankings of work accepted for publication or presentation, where such rankings are available; (4) honors or awards bestowed on one's work; (5) frequency with which one's work is cited by other scholars; (6) book reviews of one's work; (7) letters from journal editors or associate editors acknowledging the value of one's work; (8) affiliation with a national scholarly or professional organization; (9) circulation relative to other journals; (10) quality/prestige of editorial board; and (11) other relevant indicators of quality. These indicators should be used by the faculty member to support the case for assigning each activity to the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, or 3<sup>rd</sup> level.

The Department also recognizes the value of creative scholarly activities, provided such activities contribute to the development or application of knowledge in the field and are directly related to the study of communication theory and process. Self-published works, vanity publications, and/or publications in pseudo-journals or predatory journals (i.e., where all publication costs are borne by the author and/or require payment in exchange for publication with little or no peer review) do not count as scholarly activity. Credible journals with reasonable publication fees are not considered predatory. The faculty member has a responsibility to evaluate the credibility and legitimacy of any publication outlet before submitting a manuscript.

Each faculty member shall include a concise narrative of creative and scholarly activity and how the work contributes to a systematic program of research. The narrative, which shall not exceed

1,000 words, should include: (1) a list of work that has been published, presented, or accepted during the review period (see UPS 210.000, II-B-2-b-1); (2) a written evaluation of each work; and (3) a description of work in progress. In the case of multiple authors, the faculty member's evaluation of the work shall include an assessment of her or his contribution and/or the faculty member shall submit the multiple author forms or their equivalents (via a co-author disclosure form). It is expected that the faculty member's narrative will summarize her or his scholarly and creative activity agenda(s). The common theme(s) running through the faculty member's work shall be identified in the narrative. The narrative must be organized according to first-level, second-level, and third-level activities. Each faculty member shall clearly delineate under which level an activity is categorized.

### **First-Level Scholarly Activities**

1. Peer-reviewed scholarly journal article ("accepted" for publication).
2. Scholarly book or monograph that presents original theories, models, or research (in press or accepted for publication, not under revision or review; in a university press or scholarly publisher).
3. Externally-funded research grant that advances knowledge in the field, makes a meaningful contribution to society, or enhances the department's prestige. The grant must be open to public scrutiny (funded/accepted; not under evaluation).
4. Published scholarly works that receive significant honors or awards from professional associations (not including doctoral dissertations).
5. Editor of a scholarly book or editor of a special issue of a scholarly journal.
6. Peer-reviewed paper presented on a top-paper panel at a professional conference (presented during the review period).
7. Book chapter, encyclopedia chapter, or reference work competitively selected and reviewed by the editor(s) or referees (in press or accepted for publication in a university press or from a scholarly publisher).

### **Second-Level Scholarly Activities**

1. Peer-reviewed article that does not meet the criteria for a first-level publication, based on the criteria set forth in the prologue to this section ("accepted" for publication).
2. Peer-reviewed (by editor, board, or panel) article in a published conference proceeding ("accepted" for publication).
3. Textbook that offers an original perspective or includes original research, and is not purely derivative in nature.
4. Competitive conference paper or poster presentation (via selection process).
5. Invited book chapter, encyclopedia chapter, or reference work ("accepted" for publication).
6. A published academic, scholarly journal forum piece, roundtable, interview, or similar.
7. Intramural or internally-funded grants.
8. Competitively-selected research fellowship.



### **Third-Level Scholarly Activities**

1. Book reviews.
2. Panel participant or invited paper or poster presentation at a conference.
3. Invited lecture or presentation of scholarly activity.
4. Hosting a town hall or public forum discussion.
5. Public communication that promotes civic engagement or community involvement.
6. Published commentary, critique, or opinion piece that is discipline-related.
7. Completion of data collection for a research project (interviews, surveys, transcripts, archival materials, etc.).
8. Material completed but not yet submitted for publication.
9. Submitted externally-funded research grant proposal (under review or rejected).

### **Evaluation of Scholarly Activity**

A faculty member should not assume the value of her/his research contribution is self-evident. It is expected that a faculty member will make a case for the significance of her/his scholarly contributions. The evaluation of scholarly activity will be based on both the quality and quantity of research activity. For all non-refereed works, the faculty member must indicate how the work was selected (for example, by invitation), whether there was any editorial scrutiny or review, and provide evidence of the importance of the work to the discipline.

### **Criteria for Evaluating Scholarly and Creative Activity**

Using the scale of ratings “Superior,” “Excellent,” “Satisfactory,” and “Unsatisfactory,” scholarly and creative activities shall be evaluated using the three criteria listed below. Overall performance in scholarly and creative activities shall be based on a composite of the following individual ratings: (1) continuous and systematic progression of activity from one level to the next (e.g., conference papers to publications, grant proposals to funded grants); (2) achievement that includes high quality, peer-reviewed scholarly publications; and (3) evidence that scholarly and creative activities contribute to the discipline.

A rating of “**Superior**” shall be given for 10 first-level and/or second-level activities during the RTP review period. These activities must include at least five first-level activities, at least three of which are first authorship on peer-reviewed journal articles.

A rating of “**Excellent**” shall be given for seven first-level and/or second-level activities during the RTP review period. These activities must include at least three first-level activities, at least two of which are first authorship on peer-reviewed journal articles.

A rating of “**Satisfactory**” shall be given for five first-level and/or second-level activities. These activities must include first authorship on at least two peer-reviewed journal articles.

A rating of “**Unsatisfactory**” shall be given for scholarly activity judged to be of insufficient quality and/or quantity.

## IV. Service and Professional Activity

Faculty members shall demonstrate continuous service. Some of the indicators of the level of involvement include: (1) the amount of time devoted to professional organizations and committee assignments; (2) the amount of responsibility or degree of prestige associated with service; and (3) the degree of visibility afforded the individual, the department, the college, or the university through the faculty member's service; and (4) the amount of leadership or initiative involved in service activities.

The faculty member under review shall prepare a concise narrative, not to exceed 1,000 words, that evaluates and summarizes service, including a complete listing of service activities and the level at which each activity belongs. The narrative should include a careful presentation of evidence for assigning activities to the first-level and second-level. The narrative must be organized according to first-level, second-level, and third-level activities. Each faculty member shall clearly delineate under which level an activity is categorized.

The narrative should summarize how service and professional activities contribute to the faculty member's professional growth and to professional organization(s). As part of the narrative, a complete list of activities with accompanying dates and places should be provided. Documentation of the amount of time and effort devoted to each activity and the quality of the activity should be included wherever possible.

Service activity falls into one of three levels depending on the amount of time and effort, the level of skill or leadership, and the degree of benefit to the department, school, university, profession, or community. Faculty may emphasize one or more domains of service (e.g., community, department, college, university, or disciplinary). Faculty may also choose how to balance their on-campus service activities among the department, college, or university.

### First-Level Service Activities

An activity at the first-level generally requires more time, responsibility, visibility, or leadership than does an activity at the second-level. Such activities bring exceptional benefits and/or prestige to the department, college, university, profession, or community. Community service that brings more recognition or other benefits to the department, college, or university than to the faculty member (e.g., organizing conferences, elected chair of a university committee) is at the first-level. Listed below are selected examples of first-level service:

1. Elected office holder in a professional association (high time, effort, responsibility).
2. Editor of an international, national or regional first-level or second-level scholarly journal (as defined in the prologue to section III).
3. Chairing or leading a program performance review.
4. Receiving an honor or an award from a professional association (high prestige).
5. Keynote address, plenary speaker, or other high-profile presentation.
6. Election to an active university committee.
7. Member or chair of a tenure-track or administrative search committee.

8. Chair of a lecturer search committee.
9. Developing, administrating, and/or contributing to outreach effort that serves the community through application of knowledge of the discipline (e.g., holding town hall meetings, hosting on-campus speech and debate tournaments).
10. Any external grant for activities construed as service.
11. Professional service: organizing conferences and conference sessions, program planning, serving on elected organizational boards and committees, being a respondent to presented papers.
12. Chairing an active, ad-hoc, or standing department or college-level committee.
13. Serving on Academic Senate.
14. Serving on a university committee (high time, effort, responsibility).
15. National/international task force, commission, or selected board.
16. Peer-reviewing research article or book for scholarly journal or publisher.
17. Peer-reviewing proposal for national or international external grantor.
18. Serving as Director of Forensics will count as two first-level activities.
19. Participation in external program performance review (e.g., for another institution).

### **Second-Level Service Activities**

An activity at the second-level generally requires more time than does an activity at the third-level or involves significantly more responsibility and leadership. Community service that brings more recognition to the individual faculty member than to the Department, College, or University (e.g., public lecture or public office) is at the second-level. Listed below are selected examples of second-level service:

1. Serving on an active, ad-hoc, or standing department or college-level committee.
2. Serving on a university committee (moderate time, effort, responsibility).
3. Member of a lecturer search committee.
4. Peer-reviewing for conference.
5. Program performance review participant.
6. Hosting short course or preconference at conference.
7. Invited speech, lecture, or presentation.
8. Statewide/regional task force, commission, or selected board.
9. Advising student group.
10. Producing non-scholarly publication (e.g., for public affairs, university advancement, development or fundraising).
11. Pro-bono consulting with community or private group.
12. Developing digital or online media designed to increase the department's presence or outreach.
13. Recruitment effort to attract and retain majors and minors.
14. Providing testimony to governmental or regulatory body.
15. Editorial board member or Associate Editor for a scholarly journal.

### **Third-Level Service Activities**

Third-level activities typically involve membership or service on committees; but not leadership positions. Listed below are selected examples of third-level service:

1. Participation on department, college, or university committee.
2. Attendance at professional meeting, workshop, or other professional development.
3. Association committee member.
4. Association member.
5. Subject of mass media interview regarding the field and its applications.
6. Attendance at faculty meetings.

### **Criteria for Evaluating Service**

A rating of **“Superior”** shall be given for exemplary performance in depth and/or breadth of service: generally, at least 10 first-level and/or second-level activities during the RTP review period. The activities must include at least three first-level activities and sustained involvement in third-level activities. For associate professors, superior service should include participation in University-wide service.

A rating of **“Excellent”** shall be given for a sufficient amount of service judged to be of high quality: generally, at least six first-level and/or second-level activities during the RTP review period. The activities must include at least two first-level activities and sustained involvement in third-level activities.

A rating of **“Satisfactory”** shall be given for a sufficient amount of service judged to be of satisfactory quality: generally, at least four first-level and/or second-level activities during the RTP review period. The activities must include at least one first-level activity and sustained involvement in third-level activities.

A rating of **“Unsatisfactory”** shall be given for service activity judged to be of insufficient quality and/or quantity.

## V. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Faculty members shall normally be considered for tenure during their sixth probationary year, regardless of the rank at which they were appointed. Assistant Professors shall normally be considered for promotion to Associate Professor during their sixth probationary year. Associate Professors shall normally be considered for promotion to Professor after their fourth year in rank. For promotion and/or the granting of tenure, a faculty member must be evaluated as “Excellent” or “Superior” in both Teaching and Scholarly and Creative Activity and at least “Satisfactory” in Service. Accomplishments documented for the promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor.

## VI. Criteria for Early Tenure or Early Promotion

Probationary faculty members may apply for tenure at any time after their first year of appointment. Early tenure refers to the granting of tenure prior to a faculty member’s sixth probationary year, regardless of the rank at which she or he was appointed. Early promotion refers to promotion prior to an Assistant Professor’s sixth year in rank, or prior to an Associate Professor’s fifth year in rank. Early tenure and early promotion are separate decisions and the DPC will vote on each action separately. Probationary faculty who do not receive early tenure may be reappointed to probationary status. Accomplishments documented for the promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor.

### **The following criteria are established for early tenure or early promotion to the rank of Associate Professor:**

A faculty member must be rated “Superior” in scholarly and creative activities or teaching performance and at least “Excellent” in all other categories. Performance in all categories shall have ample evidence to suggest that the ratings are reliable.

### **The following criteria are established for early tenure for untenured Associate Professors or Professors:**

A faculty member must be rated “Superior” in scholarly and creative activities or teaching performance and at least “Excellent” in all other categories. Performance in all categories shall have ample evidence to suggest that the ratings are reliable.

### **The following criteria are established for early promotion for a tenured Associate Professor to the rank of Professor:**

A faculty member must be rated “Superior” in scholarly and creative activities or teaching performance and at least “Excellent” in all other categories. Performance in all categories shall have ample evidence to suggest that the ratings are reliable.

## Appendix I: Expected Grade Distributions

The Department of Human Communication Studies reaffirms its commitment to the principles of consistent grading practices among members of its faculty.

Grade Point Averages that fall within the following ranges will be considered normal practice for courses in the department:

Course	GPA
lower-division	2.30—2.70
300-level	2.55—2.95
400-level	2.55—3.15
500-level	3.25—3.65

These guidelines for grade distribution recognize three assumptions:

1. The process of natural selection will account for students in graduate courses earning higher grades than students enrolled in upper-division courses; it also will account for students in upper-division courses earning higher grades than students enrolled in lower-division courses.
2. No single class can be assumed to represent perfectly the abilities and motivation levels of the general student population, but most classes will approximate those characteristics among students enrolled in similar courses at similar levels.
3. Although the application of consistent grading practices will produce some variation from class to class, such differences will be within fairly narrow limits (we regard .40 as a reasonable range) except when special identifiable circumstances cause a departure from normal practice.

Faculty members will be asked to explain why their grading practices fall outside these ranges whenever they submit a file for retention, promotion, or review of tenured faculty.

On a semester-by-semester basis the Department Chair will counsel with faculty members who exceed the upper limit of these ranges.

California State University, Fullerton

First Last Name

Human Communications Studies

HCOM 300-01 - MW 1000AM - 1115AM



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

	<i>strongly agree</i>	<i>moderately agree</i>	<i>neutral</i>	<i>moderately disagree</i>	<i>strongly disagree</i>
1.1 The instructor stimulated my learning in this course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 The instructor made the course intellectually challenging.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 The instructor demonstrated an understanding of broader areas of knowledge relevant to the subject matter.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 The instructor is knowledgeable in the subject area of this course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5 The instructor demonstrated respect for students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6 The instructor encouraged students to think for themselves.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.7 The instructor fostered a favorable learning climate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8 The instructor evaluated student work fairly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.9 The instructor evaluated my work objectively.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.10 The instructor presented the subject matter effectively.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.11 The instructor presented course content clearly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.12 The instructor attempted to promote interest in the content of this course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.13 The instructor made assignments and requirements explicit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.14 Overall, the instructor provided a valuable learning experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PLEASE CONTINUE ON PAGE 2 - DO NOT WRITE IN THE SPACE BELOW



2. Comments

2.1 Please write any comments in the box below.

