



January 17, 2023

To: Adam Woods, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Geological Sciences

Marie Johnson, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

From: Carolyn Thomas, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: **Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty for the Department of Geological Sciences**

The proposed Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty from the Department of Geological Sciences have been reviewed. The document is in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement and UPS 210.070. In accordance with the recommendations of the Department, the College Personnel Standards Review Committee, and the Dean, I approve these standards for implementation commencing with the 2023-2024 Academic Year.

I would like to express my appreciation to all involved for their efforts in this task.

CT:mc

cc: Dr. Kristin Stang, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Support
Dr. Nicole Bonuso, College Personnel Standards Review Committee
Dr. Matthew Kirby, Chair of the Department Personnel Committee
Faculty Affairs and Records

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

Department of Geological Sciences

Policy on the Evaluation of Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty (DSLFF)

Approved 01/17/2023

[These approved standards will be implemented starting AY 2023-2024]

DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL STANDARDS FOR LECTURER

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. PREAMBLE – 3
- II. PEER REVIEW EVALUATIONS – 3
- III. WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE (WPAF) CONTENTS – 4
- IV. SUBMISSION OF THE WPAF AND ADDED MATERIALS POLICY – 6
- V. OTHER RELEVANT EVIDENCE – 6
- VI. NARRATIVE SUMMARY DETAILS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR THE CSUF DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES – 6
- VII. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TEACHING DUTIES – 7
- VIII. DETAILS OF THE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TEACHING DUTIES BY BOTH THE DPRC AND THE CHAIR – 8
- IX. EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR THE CSUF DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES CHAIR AND DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE – 11
- X. EVALUATION PROCESS, OUTCOMES, AND RANGE ELEVATION CONSIDERATION – 17
- XI. FREQUENCY OF EVALUATIONS – 18

APPENDICES

- 1. EXAMPLE SUMMARY TABLE FOR CLASSES TAUGHT
- 2. GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES LECTURER EVALUATION FORM
- 3. CLASSROOM PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE FORM – 19

Policy on the Evaluation of Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty (DSLFF) (09/07/22)

I. Preamble

The Department of Geological Sciences shall evaluate its lecturers according to UPS 210.070, Evaluation of Lecturers. Pursuant to Section VII.A. of UPS 210.070, the Department of Geological Sciences elaborates on the evaluation of lecturers in the sections below. The standards below define both *qualitative* and *quantitative* criteria by which faculty under review shall be evaluated. This policy shall be provided to each lecturer within fourteen days of their initial appointment and again when changes to policy occur.

Qualifications of Lecturers

To be considered for a teaching assignment in the Department of Geological Sciences, a lecturer must be academically qualified.

Academically qualified: A lecturer is academically qualified by virtue of holding a Ph.D. (or achieving ABD status with an expected graduation date) or a MA/MSc in Earth Sciences or a related field. If the lecturer received their degree more than 5 years prior to their appointment, the Department Chair may request that the prospective lecturer provide information (e.g., professional experience, professional licensing, publications, etc.) that demonstrates currency in the field as it may relate to their specific teaching responsibilities.

II. Peer Review Evaluations

Peer review evaluations can include both in-person classroom visitations or virtual lecture attendance. Peer review evaluations should be conducted by a tenured or tenure track faculty member. Peer review evaluations are required during the 1st semester of teaching and at least once every year for continuing lecturers. Additional observations may be requested by the Chair or the Department Personnel Review Committee (DPRC). 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 calendar days in advance of any peer review evaluation. The written evaluation report shall be provided to the lecturer within ten working days of the observation. The peer review evaluation report shall be added to the Working Personnel Action file by the candidate.

The peer review evaluation criteria are shown on the *CLASSROOM PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE* form appended to this document.

III. Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) Contents

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

1. Working Personnel Action File Table of Contents.
2. Approved Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty.
3. Updated C.V. covering 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 by UPS 210.070.

4. A Summary of Assigned Duties, including (for instructional faculty) a list of teaching assignments for each semester, including number of students per class (see example in Appendix 1). 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) 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.

The Narrative shall address all six criteria listed in Section VI with supporting evidence in the order as presented and as numerated sections. All mention of supporting evidence shall provide a clear indication of where the evidence is located within the portfolio.

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 peer 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, participation in professional activities offered by groups such as FDC (Faculty Development Center), NAGT (National Association of Geoscience Teachers), SERC (Southern California Research Center), FOP (Friends of the Pleistocene), PS-SEPM (Pacific Section, Society for Sedimentary Geology), *et cetera*.

d. Lecturers have the option to include their experiences of cultural taxation in their WPAF Narrative. Evaluators shall give this due consideration during the evaluation process.

7. Statistical Summary Reports of Student Opinion Questionnaires if applicable to the assignment.

8. Student Opinion Questionnaire Comment Reports from all courses.

9. Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions.

10. Evidence of Teaching Performance must include a syllabus for each course taught, a representative graded assessment (e.g., exam or project) for each course taught, and peer review evaluations. Additional materials may include class assignments, sample papers and/or exams, other instructional material, evidence of grading practices (e.g., rubrics), and unsolicited feedback from students (e.g., letters, emails, etc.). Supporting materials shall emphasize quality and representativeness over quantity.

11. Evidence of Currency in the Field. Examples may include 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 demonstrate professional, university, and community service and/or scholarship or creative activity may be included.

*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.

IV. 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 Department Chair; 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 the 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.

V. 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.

VI. Narrative Summary Details and Expectations for the CSUF Department of Geological Sciences

The Narrative Summary shall consist of a self-assessment based on the six criteria below, in the order as presented below and as numerated sections (see Section VIII for details). All mention of supporting evidence shall provide a clear indication of where the evidence is located within the portfolio.

Criteria for Narrative Summary Self-Assessment:

1. Compliance with University, College, and Department 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 learning goals (as described in course syllabi) to methods of assessment and student outcomes.
4. Effective use of instructional methods.

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

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

VII. 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 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.

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 the broader scope 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 student 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.

Lecturers who feel their student ratings do not adequately represent their teaching should carefully explain their scores and offer an explanation of discrepancies and patterns. These explanations should be considered by the reviewers.

VIII. Details of the Evaluation Criteria for Teaching Duties by both the DPRC and the Chair

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

<u>Examples</u>	<u>Potential Sources of Evidence</u>
Gives final exam on the date/time assigned by the University.	Syllabi
Maintains office hours.	SOQs

2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning.

<u>Examples</u>	<u>Potential Sources of Evidence</u>
Provides a means for students to contribute to the course through active learning.	Syllabi, SOQs, comments from peer reviews, Narrative Summary, examples of student work/projects/assignments, effective Learning Management System (LMS) pages, field exercises
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

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

4. Effective use of instructional methods.

<u>Examples</u>	<u>Potential Sources of Evidence</u>
Instructional methods are appropriate to course goals.	Syllabi, Narrative Summary, SOQs, field exercises
Technology appropriate to the field 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.

<u>Examples</u>	<u>Potential Sources of Evidence</u>
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.

<u>Examples</u>	<u>Potential Sources of Evidence</u>
Course content emphasizes students' acquisition of knowledge and skills that are currently valued in the discipline.	Syllabi, examples of student work/projects/assignments, field trips, conferences, Narrative Summary
Pedagogical methods are current in relation to the discipline and subject matter.	Syllabi, peer evaluations, examples of student work/projects/assignments, field exercises, workshops (e.g., FDC, conference workshops), conference attendance/presentations
Continuing professional engagement in the discipline and/or professional development as relevant to teaching assignment.	CV, Narrative Summary, workshops (e.g., FDC, conference workshops), conference attendance/presentations, professional licensing

IX. Evaluation Rubric for the CSUF Department of Geological Sciences Chair and Department Personnel Committee

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

<u>Examples</u>	<u>Potential Sources of Evidence</u>
Gives final exam on the date/time assigned by the University.	Syllabi
Maintains office hours.	Syllabi, SOQs

Exceeds Expectations - Meets conditions for Satisfactory plus, for example, syllabus includes inclusive language, holds extra review sessions, holds tutorials, *et cetera*.

Satisfactory - Narrative Summary provides evidence that meets UPS 300.004 syllabus requirements and holds required number of office hours; gives final exam on the date/time assigned (UPS 300.005) by the University.

Needs Improvement - Only partially meets UPS 300.004 syllabus requirements or does not hold required number of office hours; Gives final exam on the date/time assigned by the University.

Unsatisfactory – Faculty member under review failed to provide evidence in the Narrative Summary and supporting documentation for Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.

2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning.

<u>Examples</u>	<u>Potential Sources of Evidence</u>
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, field exercises
Provides a coherent structure for course meetings which is understood by the students.	Syllabi, SOQs, examples of student work/projects/assignments, effective LMS pages

Exceeds Expectations - Meets conditions for Satisfactory plus overall excellent average for Peer Reviews and positive unsolicited comments; Includes inclusive language in syllabi,

Satisfactory - Narrative Summary provides examples of a course environment conducive to learning. Satisfactory average for Peer Reviews, Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ) indicates a course environment conducive to learning,

Needs Improvement - Narrative Summary provides insufficient examples of a course environment conducive to learning. Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic concern regarding the course learning environment.

Unsatisfactory – Faculty member under review failed to provide evidence in the Narrative Summary and supporting documentation for 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

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

Exceeds Expectations - Meets conditions for Satisfactory plus provides evidence for adapting to assessment outcomes of student learning.

Satisfactory - Narrative Summary, syllabi, and Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate effective course implementation clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.

Needs Improvement - Narrative Summary provides insufficient examples of linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes. Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic concern regarding assessment misalignment with stated learning goals.

Unsatisfactory - Faculty member under review failed to provide evidence in the syllabi and supporting documentation for effective implementation of a course clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.

4. Effective use of instructional methods.

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

Exceeds Expectations - Meets conditions for Satisfactory plus implemented innovative instructional methods.

Satisfactory - Narrative Summary, syllabi, and Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate effective use of instructional methods.

Needs Improvement - Narrative Summary provides insufficient evidence for effective use of instructional methods. Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic concern regarding instruction misalignment with stated learning goals.

Unsatisfactory - Faculty member under review failed to provide evidence in the syllabi and supporting documentation for effective use of instructional methods.

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

<u>Examples</u>	<u>Potential Sources of Evidence</u>
Academic rigor appropriate to the course.	Syllabi, Narrative Summary, Peer reviews, assignment details, examples of graded student work, rubrics
Effectiveness, fairness, and timeliness of testing, other assessments, and grading procedures are evident.	Syllabi, Narrative Summary, Peer Reviews, student writing and projects

Exceeds Expectations - Meets conditions for Satisfactory plus offers opportunities for student learning that exceed course learning goals.

Satisfactory - Narrative Summary, syllabi, peer reviews, and graded student work demonstrate appropriate academic standards and student accountability.

Needs Improvement - Narrative Summary provides insufficient evidence for establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study. Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ) indicate a systematic concern regarding inappropriate standards or accountability.

Unsatisfactory - Faculty member under review failed to provide evidence in the syllabi and supporting documentation regarding 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.

<u>Examples</u>	<u>Potential Sources of Evidence</u>
Course content emphasizes students' acquisition of knowledge and skills that are currently valued in the discipline.	Syllabi, examples of student assignments, field trips, conference attendance/presentations, Narrative Summary
Pedagogical methods are current in relation to the discipline and subject matter.	Syllabi, Narrative Summary, Peer reviews, examples of student assignments, field trips, professional workshops (e.g., FDC, conference workshops), conference attendance/presentations
Continuing professional engagement in the discipline and/or professional development as relevant to teaching assignment.	CV, Narrative Summary, workshops (e.g., FDC, conference workshops), conference attendance/presentations, professional licensing

Exceeds Expectations - Meets conditions for Satisfactory plus a leadership or other active role in pedagogical and/or disciplinary activities.

Satisfactory - Narrative Summary, CV, and supporting documents provide evidence for recent pedagogical and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.

Needs Improvement - Narrative Summary provides insufficient evidence for pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.

Unsatisfactory - Faculty member under review failed to provide evidence in the syllabi and supporting documentation for pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.

X. Evaluation Process, Outcomes, and Range Elevation Consideration

Part-time lecturers due for an annual review are evaluated by both the DPRC and Department Chair. Those undergoing three-year periodic evaluations, six-year comprehensive evaluations, and all full-time lecturers in Years 1-6 must also be evaluated by the Dean. Eligible lecturers applying for optional range elevation must be evaluated by the DPRC, Chair, Dean and Provost.

The DPRC is an elected committee of tenured faculty members who meet the criteria in UPS 210.070 VII.B. As stated above, in the Department of Geological Sciences, the Department Personnel Committee will also serve as the DPRC. Evaluations are conducted according to timelines published by Faculty Affairs and Records and the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

Evaluations of lecturers will result in evaluation scores based on the definitions below. The DPRC and the Chair will also provide lecturers with a narrative review highlighting strengths in their teaching performance and recommendations for future improvement, as necessary. Reappointment decisions related to these evaluations will follow the guidelines set forth by UPS 210.070 and the CBA.

Range elevation consideration requires an overall rating of Satisfactory or better.

Exceeds Expectations - Describes performance in assigned duties that is greater than satisfactory

For an overall rating of **Exceeds Expectations**, the faculty member must **Exceed Expectations** in **at least 4 categories**. Performance must be **at least satisfactory** in the **remaining 2 categories**.

Satisfactory - Describes performance that meets expectations

For an overall rating of **Satisfactory**, the faculty member must be **at least Satisfactory** in **all 6 categories**.

Needs Improvement - Describes performance that does not meet expectations

For an overall rating of **Needs Improvement**, the faculty member must have a minimum of **Needs Improvement** in **1 category**.

Unsatisfactory - Describes performance that is seriously deficient

For an overall rating of **Unsatisfactory**, the faculty member must have a minimum of **Unsatisfactory** in **1 category**.

XI. Frequency of Evaluations

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.

Appendix 1

Example Summary Table for Classes Taught

AY	Semester	Course Number	Sched. #:	Units	Number Enrolled	Mean SOQ score:	Grade Distributions:
21-22	Spring	GEOL 101	18823	3.0	124	3.15±0.52	2.72±0.35
21-22	Spring	GEOL 321	18924	4.0	17	3.64±0.91	2.89±0.61
21-22	Fall	GEOL 510T-1	18421	3.0	7	3.89±0.13	4.0±0.00

Appendix 2. Geological Sciences Lecturer Evaluation Form

Name: _____
 Review: _____

Date of

Evaluation Type:

- Annual
 Six-Year
 Comprehensive
 Three-Year
 Periodic
 Range Elevation

Sources of Evidence:

- Curriculum Vitae
 Narrative
 Summary
 Course Syllabi
 Currency in Field
 Grade
 Distributions
 List of Teaching
 Assignments
 Previous Reviews
 SOQ Summary Reports
 SOQs
 Other

	Exceeds Expectations	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable
Evaluation of Teaching 1. Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements. <u>Examples:</u> Gives final exam on the date/time assigned by the University; Maintains office hours <u>Evidence:</u> Syllabi, SOQs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning. <u>Examples:</u> Provides a means for students to contribute to the course through active learning; provides a coherent structure for course meetings which is understood by the students. <u>Evidence:</u> Syllabi, SOQs, comments from peer reviews, Narrative Summary, examples of student work/projects/assignments, effective Learning Management System (LMS) pages, field exercises	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>3. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.</p> <p><u>Examples:</u> Learning goals of the course are made clear to students at the start of the course; assessments and grading practices are clearly related to course goals.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Syllabi, SOQs, examples of student work/projects/assignments, field exercises Narrative Summary</p>	□	□	□	□	□
<p>4. Effective use of instructional methods.</p> <p><u>Examples:</u> Instructional methods are appropriate to course goals; technology appropriate to the field to enhance student participation.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Syllabi, Narrative Summary, SOQs, field exercises</p>	□	□	□	□	□
<p>5. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.</p> <p><u>Examples:</u> Academic rigor appropriate to the course; effectiveness, fairness, and timeliness of testing, other assessments, and grading procedures are evident.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Syllabi, Narrative Summary, assignment details, examples of graded student work, rubrics, student writing and projects</p>	□	□	□	□	□
<p>6. Pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.</p> <p><u>Examples:</u> Course content emphasizes students' acquisition of knowledge and skills that are currently valued in the discipline; pedagogical methods are current in relation to the discipline and subject matter; continuing professional engagement in the discipline and/or professional development as relevant to teaching assignment.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Syllabi, Narrative Summary, CV, peer evaluations, examples of student work/projects/assignments, field exercises, workshops (e.g., FDC, conference workshops), conference attendance/presentations, field trips, professional licensing.</p>	□	□	□	□	□
<p>Overall Rating:</p>	□	□	□	□	□

CLASSROOM PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Instructor _____ Course No. & Title _____

Major/non-major _____ No. of Students _____ Lab/Lec/Sem/Field _____

Visit Duration _____ mins Visitation Date _____ Conference held on _____

THE INSTRUCTOR:	*E	*S	*I	N/A	Comments
1. Was well prepared					
2. Demonstrated knowledge of course material					
3. Presented material in an organized and clear manner					
4. Taught with an academic rigor that was challenging for the students					
5. Clarified material well with examples and/or illustrations					
6. Taught with an effective pace of instruction					
7. Encouraged student participation					
8. Dealt with students in a fair, impartial manner					
9. Response and handling of student questions					
Overall rating					

Things the instructor did especially well:

B. Things the instructor could do to improve his/her teaching, classroom environment, etc.

C. Additional Comments:

*E=Excellent, *S=Sufficient, *I=Insufficient Evaluator: _____