



FACULTY AFFAIRS AND RECORDS

## **Official Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty for the School of Accountancy**

Approved by Dr. Carolyn Thomas, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, on 11/16/2021 for implementation in the Spring 2022 semester

[Verified and posted online at www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/acct2022lecturer.pdf](http://www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/acct2022lecturer.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.

## SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY POLICY FOR EVALUATION OF LECTURERS

Part-time lecturer faculty performance reviews will be done by a *Department Personnel Committee* (DPC) (one review), with a second review done by the Department Chair (one review). Those who are eligible for or are currently in a three-year contract also must be evaluated by the Dean. All full-time lecturers are evaluated by the DPC, Chair, and Dean. Range elevation evaluations are also evaluated by the Provost. The DPC are comprised of three tenured faculty elected by the School of Accountancy in accordance with the School's Constitution and Bylaws.

### Definitions

#### Lecturer

Lecturers are defined by the University as Temporary Employees. They are hired on a temporary basis on 1-year or 3-year contracts. See below for schedule and definitions of periodic reviews necessary to renew or initiate 1-year or 3-year contracts. There are different categories of temporary employees (lecturers) hired:

1. Full-time lecturers. These temporary employees have a five-course teaching load, but may be appointed to perform service to reduce that to a lower course load. Full-time lecturers who receive course reductions for performing service are additionally evaluated for their service performance as discussed in this policy standard.
2. Part-time lecturers. These temporary employees teach fewer course than five course (part-time). There is no service component to the evaluations of these lecturers.

The standards herein apply to all lecturer categories.

### UPS 210.070 EVALUATION RATINGS

Four rating categories specify the overall evaluation of part-time and full-time lecturers.

- **Exceeds Expectations** – Performance in assigned duties is better than satisfactory;
- **Satisfactory** – Performance meets expectations;
- **Needs Improvement** – Performance does not meet expectations; or
- **Unsatisfactory** – Performance 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.

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 specify those areas in which improvement is needed and should be addressed during the next

appointment period, if reappointed. The School of Accountancy DPC 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.

UPS 210.070 FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED

UPS 210.070 specifies evaluation criteria when reviewing the performance of lecturers. Faculty members exclusively assigned to teaching shall be evaluated based on teaching performance and disciplinary and pedagogical currency. Examples and sources of evidence in the tables below are for illustrative purposes and are not comprehensive lists. Criteria for educational performance includes the first six criteria below. *The seventh criterion only applies to lecturers with full-time appointments who are assigned service responsibilities.*

Criteria
<p>1. Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.</p> <p>Examples: Gives final exam on date/time assigned by the University; maintains office hours; maintains AACSB Qualification; fulfills other department requirements</p>
<p>2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning.</p> <p>Examples: Provides means for students to contribute to course learning by encouraging inquiry; provides coherent structure for course meetings which is understood by students</p>
<p>3. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.</p> <p>Examples: Learning goals made clear to students at start of course; assessments and grading practices are clearly related to learning goals</p>
<p>4. Effective use of a variety of instructional methods.</p> <p>Examples: Instructional methods are appropriate to course goals; Technology (e.g., response clickers, blogs, discussion boards), are used to enhance participation</p>
<p>5. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.</p> <p>Examples: Academic integrity is stressed in the course; effectiveness, fairness and timeliness of testing, other assessments and grading procedures are evident</p>
<p>6. Pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.</p> <p>Examples: 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 developing as relevant to teaching assignment.</p>

7. *Service (full-time lecturers with service assignments only). Examples: Service on department, college or university committees; community outreach in the service of the department, college or university; student advising or mentoring.*

Faculty members will receive an overall rating, based on six (seven for full-time) specific evaluation items: 1) student evaluations (statistical summaries); 2) student evaluations (open-ended comments); 3) class GPAs; 4) course design; 5) effective use of a variety of instructional methods; 6) AACSB qualification; 7) service. The scores on each evaluation item are based on the compliance to the UPS 210.070 criteria. The table below links each evaluation item with its corresponding UPS criteria and sources of evidence used to assess faculty. The Appendix contains a sample evaluation form that covers these evaluation items. This sample evaluation form will be used to evaluate part-time and full-time lecturers. Part-time lecturers will be evaluated on teaching only. Full-time lecturers will be evaluated on teaching and service.

	<b>Evaluation Item</b>	<b>UPS 210.070 Criteria</b>	<b>Source of Evidence</b>
1	Student Evaluations (Statistical summaries)	2	SOQs
2	Student Evaluations (Open Ended Comments)	2, 4, 6	SOQs
3	Class Grade Point Average	5	Narrative summary, grade distribution reports
4	Course Design: (Stated objectives in course syllabus, relevancy of assignments, supplemental course materials/readings)	1, 3, 4, 5, 6	Syllabus, narrative summary, class materials
5	Effective Use of a Variety of Instructional Methods (Use of technology, data analytics, real-world data, and writing assignments)	1, 4	Syllabus, narrative summary, example of course projects
6	AACSB Qualification	1	CV, Watermark Report
7	<i>Service (full-time lecturers with service assignments only) (Service on department, college or university; community outreach; student advising or mentoring.</i>	7	CV, narrative summary, service records, and digital measures

### **Guidelines for Each Evaluation Item**

<b>1.Student Evaluations (Statistical Summary)</b>	
<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
Mean SOQ scores fall within the following range: 3.3-4.0	Mean SOQ scores fall within the following range: 2.8-3.29
<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Mean SOQ scores fall within the following range: 2.2-2.79	Mean SOQ scores are below 2.2.

Review of student evaluations (statistical summary) also may take into account department average ratings, variability of ratings, trends in ratings over time, class size, inclusion in honors program, online versus face-to-face format, and ratings on individual criteria (e.g., ability to communicate, overall teaching effectiveness, helpfulness to students).

<b>2. Student Evaluations (Open Ended Comments)</b>	
<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
Substantial majority of positive statements.	Generally positive statements.
Student comments demonstrate faculty member developed an exceptional environment conducive to learning and used varied instructional methods.	Student comments suggest faculty member developed a satisfactory environment conducive to learning and used somewhat varied instructional methods.
<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Generally more negative statements than positive ones.	Substantial preponderance of negative statements.
Student comments demonstrate faculty member developed a limited environment for learning, with limited but varied instructional methods, and limited use of timely topics.	Student comments indicate faculty member failed to develop an environment conducive to learning, did not use varied instructional methods, or did not teach timely topics.

Review of student evaluations (open-ended comments) also may take into account consistency in patterns of positive or negative responses, and trends in responses over time.

<b>3. Class Grade Point Average (GPA)</b>	
<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
All Class GPAs fall within the department suggested grade ranges specified in Appendix 1, tend to converge towards midpoint of range, and are not clustered at either endpoint of range without compelling justification (e.g., honors class).	All Class GPAs fall within the department suggested grade ranges specified in Appendix 1, but tend to deviate from midpoint of range, or cluster at either endpoint without compelling justification.
<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Class GPAs are not consistently within the department suggested grade ranges specified in Appendix 1, or consistently cluster at either endpoint without compelling justification.	Class GPAs consistently fall outside of the department suggested grade ranges specified in Appendix 1.

Review of class GPA also may take into account variation in grading. E.g., a class with 95% Cs and 5% Bs may fall within range, but may be considered overly punitive or not consistent with an expected normal distribution of student performance.

<b>4. Course Design</b>	
<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The faculty member is effectively accomplishing all of the items below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.</li> <li>2. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.</li> <li>3. Pedagogical and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.</li> <li>4. Relevancy of assignments and supplemental course materials/readings.</li> </ol>	<p>The faculty member shows minor limitations in the following items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.</li> <li>2. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.</li> <li>3. Pedagogical and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.</li> <li>4. Relevancy of assignments and supplemental course materials/readings.</li> </ol>
<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<p>The faculty member shows substantial limitations in several of the items below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.</li> <li>2. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.</li> <li>3. Pedagogical and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.</li> <li>4. Relevancy of assignments and supplemental course materials/readings.</li> </ol>	<p>The faculty member fails to adequately accomplish the items below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.</li> <li>2. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.</li> <li>3. Pedagogical and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.</li> <li>4. Relevancy of assignments and supplemental course materials/readings.</li> </ol>

<b>5. Effective Use of a Variety of Instructional Methods</b>	
<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The faculty member is effectively accomplishing all of the items below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use of technology.</li> <li>2. Use of data analytics</li> <li>3. Use of real-world data</li> <li>4. Use of writing assignments</li> </ol>	<p>The faculty member shows minor limitations in the following items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use of technology.</li> <li>2. Use of data analytics</li> <li>3. Use of real-world data</li> <li>4. Use of writing assignments</li> </ol>
<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<p>The faculty member shows substantial limitations in the following items below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use of technology.</li> <li>2. Use of data analytics</li> <li>3. Use of real-world data</li> <li>4. Use of writing assignments</li> </ol>	<p>The faculty member fails to adequately accomplish the following items below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use of technology.</li> <li>2. Use of data analytics</li> <li>3. Use of real-world data</li> <li>4. Use of writing assignments</li> </ol>

**6. Is Faculty Member AACSB Qualified?**

In accordance with AACSB accreditation requirements, faculty are expected to be classified as either 1) scholarly academic (research active with a doctoral degree or doctoral candidacy or earned in last 5 years); 2) practice academic (doctoral degree with relevant consulting or professional work experience); 3) scholarly practitioner (graduate degree and research active); 4) instructional practitioner (graduate degree with relevant consulting and/or professional experience). These categories are based on some combination of doctoral degree candidacy or recent completion of a doctoral degree in a relevant field, and/or publications and/or presentations in scholarly or professional meetings, and/or professional development, and/or consulting or work experience in a relevant field. The combination of these criteria should lead to classification in one of the above four categories. Instructors not meeting criteria for any of the four categories are classified as “additional.” Instructors classified as “additional” normally are not reappointed unless approved by the Department Chair and Dean. Watermark reports must be completed annually to ensure AACSB qualification criteria are met. For further information, please refer to AACSB Faculty Qualification Policy and Faculty Qualifications Table available on the online CBE Faculty Community/AACSB Faculty Status Qualifications.

**7. Service Criteria for Full-time lecturers with service assignments only**

Lecturers with full-time appointments may be required to provide service to the department, college or university by being an engaged citizen of their department, participating in committee work, advising and mentoring students, and engaging in outreach to the community on behalf of

the college (e.g., professional associations). This evaluation may include but not be limited to materials based on service records, narrative summary, digital measures, and CV

<b>Service (Lecturers with Full-time appointments with service assignments only)</b>	
<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
Faculty member attends and is actively engaged in department meetings, is an engaged member of multiple department, college or university committees, provides substantial student advising, and engages in outreach on behalf of department, college or university.	Faculty member attends and is actively engaged in department meetings, is an active member of at least one department, college or university committee, provides substantial student advising, and engages in some outreach on behalf of department, college or university.
<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Faculty member sporadically attends department meetings, is an inactive member of a department, college or university committee, provides minimal student advising, and does not engage in any outreach on behalf of department, college or university.	Faculty member does not attend department meetings, is not a member of any department, college or university committees, provides minimal or no student advising, and does not engage in any outreach on behalf of department, college or university.



**APPENDIX**  
**School of Accountancy**  
**Suggested Grade Ranges**

Course Level	Low	High
200	1.7	2.25
300	1.8	2.6
400	2.2	2.8
500	2.7	3.5

**School of Accountancy**  
**Sample Faculty Evaluation Form for Part-time Lecturers**

**Name of Faculty Member:**

**Additionally, rate the following:**

Teaching Performance	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Exceeds Expectation	Not Applicable
1. Student Evaluations (Statistical Summary)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Student Evaluation (Open Ended Comments)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Class Grade Point Average	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Course Design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Effective Use of a Variety of Instructional Methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Is Lecturer AACSB Qualified (refer to item 6 above)? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>					
*7. Service to the School	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments:**

(Please comment on strengths, weaknesses, areas in need of improvement, and any other issues that may be relevant in assessing the Faculty Member's performance.). \*Note: Item 7 applies to full-time lecturers only.



Mark as shown:      Please use a pencil or a dark pen to mark an X inside the box of your choice.

Correction:      If you make a mistake, erase or completely fill in the box with the wrong answer and mark an X for the correct answer.

### 1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

#### Evaluate your instructor's...

	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
1.1 Organization of the course	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 Knowledge of course content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 Preparation for class	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 Ability to communicate subject material	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5 Willingness to help students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6 OVERALL teaching effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.7 Course content challenged me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8 I would recommend this INSTRUCTOR to other students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please continue to page 2. DO NOT write in the space below.



2. Comments

2.1 What aspects of the course contributed the most to your learning experience?

2.2 Please give suggestions on how this class can be improved.

2.3 Please give feedback on what you liked about the instructor.

2.4 Additional comments:





Mark as shown:      Please use a pencil or a dark pen to mark an X inside the box of your choice.

Correction:      If you make a mistake, erase or completely fill in the box with the wrong answer and mark an X for the correct answer.

### 1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

#### EVALUATE YOUR INSTRUCTOR'S . . .

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
1.1 Organization of the course	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 Knowledge of course content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 Quality of materials conveyed over the web	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 Effective delivery of course material	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5 Willingness to help students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.6 Indicate your overall learning experience in the course	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

#### Indicate your level of agreement with the following statement

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.7 I would recommend this instructor to other students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



## 2. Comments

2.1 What grade do you expect in this online class?

2.2 What did the instructor do well?

2.3 What could the instructor do to improve the class?

2.4 Additional Comments:

