

# **POLICY FOR EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY (LECTURERS)**

**Department of Biological Science  
College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics  
California State University, Fullerton**

**Revision of a document previously approved by:**

**Department (11 November 2005)**

**Vice President Academic Affairs (23 November 2005)**

**Revised and approved by the Departmental Personnel Committee on  
March 8, 2015, and approved by the Department of Biological Science  
on March 20 and 27, 2015**

## Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION.....	3
I.A.    Program Excellence .....	3
I.B.    Goals and Expectations for Lecturers .....	3
II. Teaching Performance.....	3
II.A.   Purpose of Evaluation .....	3
II.B.   Evaluation of Teaching Performance .....	4
II.B.1.  Self Evaluation .....	4
II.B.1.a.  Classroom Teaching Performance .....	4
(i) Documentable Teaching Activities .....	4
(ii) Teaching Dynamic .....	4
II.B.1.b.  Development of Curriculum .....	5
II.B.1.c.  Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher and Maintenance of Currency in the Discipline .....	5
II.B.2.  Student Opinion of Teaching Performance .....	5
II.B.2.a.  Types of SOQs .....	5
II.B.2.b.  Levels of Performance on SOQs.....	5
II.B.2.c.  Lecture SOQs .....	6
II.B.2.d.  Laboratory SOQs .....	6
II.B.2.e.  Seminar SOQs.....	6
II.B.3.  Peer Evaluation by the DPC .....	6
II.B.3.a.  Class Visitation.....	6
II.B.3.b.  Quality of Course Materials .....	6
II.B.3.c.  Grade Distributions .....	6
II.B.3.d.  Reading and Evaluating the Teaching Performance Narrative .....	6
II.B.3.e.  Additional Peer Reviews .....	6
II.B.4.  Additional Materials.....	7
III. EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY (LECTURERS) .....	7
III.A.  Eligibility .....	7
III.B.  Teaching Performance.....	7
III.C.  Research and Other Scholarly and Creative Activity.....	9
III.D.  Professional, University, and Community Service .....	9
III.E.  Levels of Evaluation .....	10
III.E.1. <i>Exceeds Expectations</i> .....	10
III.E.2. <i>Satisfactory</i> .....	11
III.E.3. <i>Needs Improvement</i> .....	11
III.E.4. <i>Unsatisfactory</i> .....	12
III.F.  ACTIONS .....	12
IV. RANGE ELEVATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY (LECTURERS) .....	12
IV.A.  Eligibility .....	13
IV.B.  Evaluation for Range Elevation.....	13

## **I. INTRODUCTION.**

The procedures adopted by the Department of Biological Science of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics for evaluating and recommending temporary faculty (hereafter referred to as lecturers) for reappointment and range elevation, and other personnel matters, conform with policies outlined in the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA; see especially Articles 12 and 15) and University Policy Statements (UPS) 210 (see especially 210.070). Each lecturer shall meet the requirements detailed in this document, the CBA and UPS. Thus, the Department Chair shall inform each new lecturer about each document, as well as about the goals of assigned courses. Lecturers shall be responsible for examining the current version of each document as they prepare documentation (Working Personnel Action Files, or Portfolios) for periodic reviews by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) and Department Chair.

Throughout this document the word “shall” indicates mandatory action, the words “may” or “should” indicate permissive action, but “should” includes an element of expected action.

### **I.A. Program Excellence.**

The Department of Biological Science is committed to the goal of establishing and maintaining an academic program of the highest quality for the purpose of providing the students of the University with an excellent education in biological science. The Department recognizes that the key to a quality program is faculty excellence as expressed individually and collectively. Thus, a high level of competency and collaboration in teaching from all faculty members is expected.

### **I.B. Goals and Expectations for Lecturers.**

The most important concern for lecturers is a Teaching Performance that contributes to the teaching goals and objectives of the Department and that strives for excellence inside and outside the classroom. Lecturers will teach using the approved student learning outcomes for each course. Moreover, it is expected that teaching methodologies will include some active-learning strategies and pedagogical approaches that enhance student learning.

## **II. Teaching Performance.**

### **II.A. Purpose of Evaluation.**

The Department seeks continuous improvement in Teaching Performance among faculty at all levels. Each faculty member should provide evidence of high academic standards in her or his classroom and currency in the subjects being taught. In addition, all faculty members should have clearly articulated goals and objectives for teaching and learning. These goals should reflect the lecturer’s efforts to deal with new developments in biology, the educational process in general, and advancements in classroom presentation and pedagogical tools. The goals should also be sensitive to

student retention and the changing patterns of the student body with respect to preparation and background. These goals should be expressed in the Portfolio Teaching Narrative. The lecturer's success in addressing these goals and objectives shall be assessed as described below.

## **II.B. Evaluation of Teaching Performance.**

The level of Teaching Performance shall be determined by evaluation of a Portfolio which shall include materials for appraisal of documentable teaching activities (e.g., course materials, student evaluations, classroom observation reports, products of participation in teaching collaboratives, etc.), various qualitative factors (collectively referred to herein as the dynamic of teaching or teaching dynamic as defined below), evidence of ongoing professional development as a teacher, and maintenance of currency in the discipline, for the period under review. (See **Sections III.B., III.C., and III.D.** for the list of items to be included for evaluation in the Portfolio.)

An individual's teaching dynamic is dependent upon characteristics like vitality and enthusiasm, communication between teacher and student, sensitivity to various learning styles and cultures, involvement with students and direct participation in their mastery of information, and concern for students' learning success, as evidenced by self-reflection and outcome assessment. The teaching narrative is expected to provide evidence of characteristics of teaching dynamic, and the DPC shall look for evidence of these attributes as part of the peer review process.

In order for teaching performance to be evaluated, the Portfolio shall include: (1) a self evaluation, (2) student evaluations and (3) classroom observation reports, along with necessary supporting materials as prescribed by this document. *A priori*, no one of these three components is intended to dominate the overall evaluation.

**II.B.1. Self Evaluation.** The Teaching Performance Narrative is the primary form of self evaluation. During preparation of the narrative the lecturer shall take time to reflect on successes and any areas of concern during the review period, revise goals and objectives for future classes, and respond to previous evaluations of teaching performance by the DPC and Department Chair.

**II.B.1.a. Classroom Teaching Performance.** The self-evaluation narrative shall consider the following two areas:

(i) **Documentable Teaching Activities.** An appraisal of documented teaching activities is an assessment of the degree to which course goals and objectives have been met. Copies of syllabi, samples of exams and assignments, results of peer-review of classroom performance, summaries of grade distributions and student ratings of instruction shall be included in the Portfolio, and these should be referred to in the Narrative. The use of teaching resources, such as technology, equipment, library holdings, personnel and facilities may also be addressed. *The following questions reflect the kinds of issues that could be addressed in the narrative and shall not be construed by any reviewer as requirements for each and every Teaching*

*Performance Narrative:* How have I met my course goals and objectives? How do I encourage students to become self-directed learners? What evidence do I have that students met the course objectives? What is my response to comments on the student rating of instruction forms and the classroom observation reports? What are my goals for the next review period?

(ii) Teaching Dynamic. The Narrative should illustrate the dynamic of teaching (defined above) as supported by selected comments from students, classroom observations, personal perceptions, and any other information that may help the DPC understand achievements in this important area of teaching. *Again, the following questions reflect the kinds of issues that could be addressed in the narrative and shall not be construed by any reviewer as requirements for each and every Teaching Performance Narrative:* How do I share my excitement for biology with my students? How have I diversified my teaching styles to accommodate diverse learning styles? How have I engaged my students in active learning? How did I make the class more conducive to learning?

II.B.1.b. Development of Curriculum. Another important area of Teaching Performance is the development of new courses, modification of existing courses, and development or revision of course components like SLOs. Teaching Performance Narratives should discuss the pedagogical importance of such modifications developed during the review period. *The following questions reflect the kinds of issues that could be addressed in the narrative and shall not be construed by any reviewer as requirements for each and every Teaching Performance Narrative:* How does the course enhance the departmental curriculum? What important aspect of biology does it explore? What innovations will be employed in the course? How do modifications made to existing courses strengthen the goals of the course and Department?

II.B.1.c. Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher and Maintenance of Currency in the Discipline. To be effective educators, lecturers must strive to improve their classroom performance. In addition, they must maintain currency in biological science and appropriate pedagogy, particularly in those areas that reflect their primary teaching responsibilities. Participation in disciplinary or pedagogical seminars and workshops, collegial support of teaching collaborative activities, attendance at scientific conferences, interactions with colleagues in the discipline, and training in current communications technology that can be incorporated into courses are evidence of such professional development and help demonstrate currency in the field. Narratives should discuss the professional development activities completed, how they relate to courses

taught, what was learned and how information learned has been or will be used to enhance teaching.

**II.B.2. Student Opinion of Teaching Performance.** The primary mechanisms for student evaluation of Teaching Performance are the Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) forms and the statistical summaries of SOQs. The SOQs shall have objective and subjective components. Each shall consist of questions deemed relevant to the different types of classes.

II.B.2.a. **Types of SOQs.** Four types of SOQs are used by the Department: (1) lecture courses, (2) laboratory/field courses or laboratory/field components of courses, (3) lecture/laboratory/field courses and (4) seminar and seminar-like courses.

II.B.2.b. **Levels of Performance on SOQs.** In the objective portion of the SOQs, students shall react to statements about the instructor with "A" = Outstanding, "B" = Very Good, "C" = Good, "D" = Fair, and "E" = Unacceptable. The DPC shall evaluate both the objective and subjective components (see **Section III**).

II.B.2.c. **Lecture SOQs.** SOQs used in lecture courses shall have two components: (1) an objective component where students will evaluate teaching performance, and (2) a subjective component where students will answer open-ended questions about the course and the instructor. Questions shall be relevant to lecture courses.

II.B.2.d. **Laboratory SOQs.** SOQs used in laboratory/field courses shall have an objective and a subjective component also. However, the questions asked shall reflect the specific objectives of a laboratory/field course.

II.B.2.e. **Seminar SOQs.** SOQs used in seminars and similar courses where objectives differ from both lecture and laboratory/field courses, shall reflect the specific objectives of that type of course.

**II.B.3. Peer Evaluation by the DPC.** One of the best ways to evaluate Teaching Performance is through review by other biologists. Such peer review is a critical part of the Teaching Performance evaluation process and should be aimed at determining the overall quality of a lecturer's Teaching Performance. DPC members shall participate as peers in evaluating the teaching effectiveness and the academic standards and expectations of temporary faculty members by: (1) evaluating classroom observations conducted by tenured or tenure-track Biology faculty or other qualified personnel, (2) evaluating course materials, (3) examining grade distributions, and (4) reading and evaluating the Portfolio, including the self evaluation vehicle, the Teaching Performance Narrative.

II.B.3.a. **Class visitation.** Classroom or laboratory visitation is the best way to obtain first-hand knowledge of the lecturer's teaching effectiveness. For lecturers, classroom observations may be conducted by DPC members or their designees (the latter may come from the tenured or tenure-track

faculty or other qualified personnel). During class visitations, observations of the instructor and the classroom environment (the teaching dynamic) will be made (see the *Department of Biological Science Classroom Observation Form*).

- II.B.3.b. **Quality of Course Materials.** The course materials submitted are expected to reflect the nature of the course itself. The items appropriate for this section are among those listed in **Section III.B.1.a.i.** The DPC shall evaluate these materials with a primary focus on how they represent the quality of the course. The Department expects courses to be presented at the highest level of quality with rigor appropriate for the level of the students.
- II.B.3.c. **Grade Distributions.** Grade distributions for each course taught during the review period shall be examined by the DPC.
- II.B.3.d. **Reading and Evaluating the Teaching Performance Narrative.** The DPC shall read and evaluate the Teaching Performance Narrative discussed in **Section II.B.1.**
- II.B.3.e. **Additional Peer Reviews.** Other forms of peer review may be included, as deemed appropriate by the faculty member in consultation with the Chairs of the Department and the DPC. Comments and evaluations by peers outside the Department may be included.

**II.B.4. Additional Materials.** Additional materials defined in **Section III.B.** shall be submitted and listed in the Lecturer Portfolio Table of Contents. If research activity and/or service is prescribed in the hiring agreement as part of the duties of the temporary faculty member then materials to document Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activities (**Section III.C.**) or Professional, University, and Community Service (**Section III.D.**) shall be submitted as part of the portfolio. All faculty members may elect to submit such materials as discussed in **Sections III.B** and **III.C.**

### **III. EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY (LECTURERS)**

#### **III.A. Eligibility**

Lecturers employed full-time or part-time in non-tenure-track positions for one semester shall be reviewed by the Department Chair and DPC Chair before they are hired for another semester. This review shall not involve submission of a Portfolio, but shall include review of student evaluations, classroom observation reports, and class materials. Lecturers appointed for two or more semesters shall be reviewed annually in the Spring semester or as prescribed in the CBA or UPS. For lecturers undergoing an annual periodic evaluation, as defined in UPS 210.070, the period of review shall be the calendar year (Intersession, Spring, Summer, and Fall sessions of the calendar year prior to that of the Portfolio due date). Temporary faculty in a three-year appointment undergo a periodic evaluation during the third year of the three-year appointment, and

the period of review shall be the immediate past three calendar years, including intersession and summer, if applicable. Lecturers members who have been appointed for six consecutive years of service (where a year of service is defined as an appointment of one or more semesters) shall undergo a comprehensive evaluation during the sixth year of service, in order to establish eligibility for an initial three-year appointment. Lecturers may also undergo a Range Elevation evaluation. The comprehensive sixth-year evaluation and the Range Elevation evaluation are distinct from the periodic evaluations described above in that they result in a recommendation by each level of review. Lecturers who do not submit a Portfolio for review are not eligible for rehire.

### **III.B. Teaching Performance**

The most important concern for temporary faculty is Teaching Performance that contributes to the teaching goals and objectives of the Department and that strives for excellence (see **Sections I and II**). Teaching Performance involves all activities that contribute to the facilitation of student learning and includes in-class activities, preparation for classroom activities, development of curricular materials in support of classroom activities, professional activities that impact teaching and learning in the classroom, and any other similar activities. Professional activities that relate to teaching performance, such as participation in teaching collaboratives and contributions to the development of curriculum for courses taught, are expected of all faculty in the department whether tenured, tenure-track or temporary.

As prescribed by the CBA, UPS 210.070, and this document, the Department Chair and the DPC shall evaluate the Teaching Performance by examining the Portfolio submitted by each temporary faculty member. All evaluations, recommendations, responses and rebuttals, if any, and decisions for the most recent review at CSUF, shall be provided by the Department Chair and included in the Portfolio. In addition, the Portfolio shall contain, for the review period, all of the following, organized and numbered according to the Lecturer Portfolio Table of Contents provided by the Department:

- Curriculum Vitae covering the entire academic and professional employment history.
- A self evaluation narrative (limited to 1000 words) of teaching performance that includes teaching philosophy, goals and objectives for each course, teaching methodology, approach to meeting the course goals and objectives, responses to Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ) and classroom observation reports, and responses to previous evaluations of teaching performance at CSUF, and that address the “dynamic of teaching” (see **Sections II.B and II.B.1**). Examples of materials designed to meet course goals and objectives as discussed in the narrative should be provided and clearly referenced (see below). If assigned additional duties related to teaching, such as laboratory coordination, course

management, or curricular development, then reflection on these responsibilities shall also be included in the narrative.

- A list of work assignments (e.g. teaching, laboratory coordination/management, service, or research) for each semester. For teaching assignments include the “Total” SOQ score for each course.
- Syllabus consistent with UPS and Department guidelines, containing student learning outcomes that are aligned with course assessments of student performance and grading criteria, for each course taught during the review period.
- Samples of exams and other assessments, organized by semester and course.
- Samples of writing assignments for each course taught during the review period; include one or two samples of what students submitted for one writing assignment with feedback included.
- Samples of other relevant course materials such as handouts provided to students in support of the course, lecture notes, original study aids, student learning assessments, or evidence of efforts to teach a diverse student population. The course materials and assessments submitted are expected to reflect the teaching narrative’s discussion of goals and objectives and how they are met, for each course taught during the review period. The examples discussed in the narrative should be provided and clearly referenced.
- Evidence of ongoing professional development in subject matter and pedagogy.
- Evidence of curriculum development, if applicable.
- Grade distributions of each course taught at CSUF during the year under review, organized by semester and course.
- SOQ numerical score summaries (hard copy of the SOQ “statistics” file available via the portal), organized by semester and course.
- Classroom observation reports from classroom visits by the DPC or its designees.
- Completed student evaluation forms (SOQ “surveys” file available via the portal) for each course taught during the review period, organized by semester and course, will be provided by the department.

### **III.C. Research and Other Scholarly and Creative Activity**

The performance of Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity is generally not a requirement for Lecturers, but may be used to maintain currency in the field. However, some temporary faculty may have research activity prescribed in their hiring agreement and therefore may be responsible for contributions in this area. If this is true, performance in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity shall be evaluated. In the self-evaluation narrative on research performance (limited to 500 words), the faculty member should clearly indicate what duties were assigned that are related to Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, goals and accomplishments, and how he/she would rate his/her performance. The DPC shall review the narrative and the body of material submitted as evidence of Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, and evaluate these contributions, in the context of

the assigned duties, as “Exceeds Expectations,” “Satisfactory,” “Needs Improvement,” or “Unacceptable.”

### **III.D. Professional, University, and Community Service**

The performance of Service is not a requirement of temporary faculty unless specifically stated in the hiring agreement. If performance of Service is not included in the hiring agreement then a portfolio section on Service is not required.

If performance of Service is included in the hiring agreement, performance in Service shall be evaluated. In the self-evaluation narrative on service performance (limited to 500 words), the faculty member should clearly indicate what duties were assigned that are related to Service, how he/she has performed those duties and how he/she would rate his/her performance. The DPC shall review the narrative and the body of material submitted as evidence of Professional, University and Community Service, and evaluate these contributions as “Exceeds Expectations,” “Satisfactory,” “Needs Improvement,” or “Unacceptable.”

The following are types of evidence of professional, university, and community service. Documentation should include dates and titles of the activities. The list below is a list of possible activities which may not be complete and does not denote any order of importance or value.

- **Service in governance of the Department, College, and University.** Service on standing or *ad hoc* committees or offices involved in the governance of these units.
- **Service in organizing or conducting Department, College, University, or Community functions and activities.** Service on committees or offices involved in planning various functions (e.g., social functions for the Department, Day in Science for the College) or mentoring activities sponsored by the College and University.
- **Participation in department meetings, seminars, and other activities.**
- **Attendance at departmental meetings, seminars, workshops, and other activities.**
- **Service as a sponsor or advisor to student organizations.** This category includes activities such as serving as a reviewer of grants for the Associated Students and mentoring high school students in science participation programs organized by groups outside of the University.
- **Presentations of lectures delivered to community groups or organizations.**
- **Professional service** includes service to professional societies (e.g. service at meetings, service as an officer, conference/symposium organizer, service as a reviewer for a journal or extramural granting agency, or service as an editor or member of an editorial board).

### III.E. Levels of Evaluation.

Lecturers shall be evaluated on assigned duties. Teaching Performance shall be evaluated based on SOQ scores and SOQ written comments, classroom observation reports, the quality of the narrative, and other items listed in **Section III.B**. The Department expects all temporary faculty to perform at a level of at least *Satisfactory*.

Guidelines for all ratings are as follows:

- III.E.1. *Exceeds Expectations*.** *Exceeds Expectations* requires a level of participation in the Department and performance in evaluated activities above and beyond those deemed necessary and sufficient for a *Satisfactory* rating.
- **SOQ Scores and SOQ written comments.** Mean SOQ scores of 3.60-4.00 and written comments judged by the DPC to exemplify highly effective instruction for each course taught during the review period are required.
  - **Classroom Observations.** Classroom Observation reports and other course materials provided must demonstrate that the instructor has excelled at promoting student learning and at creating a classroom environment conducive to learning, and has very effectively meet departmental, collaborative, and individual objectives for the course(s).
  - **Teaching Narrative.** To qualify, the Teaching Narrative shall be evaluated as *Exceeds Expectations* by the DPC based on the overall quality of criteria such as the thoroughness of the narrative, the quality of self evaluation, the responsiveness to student comments, classroom observation reports, and previous reviews, efforts to improve as needed, the dynamic of teaching, and evidence of participation in collaborative teaching activities as appropriate for the course assignment (see **Section I.A.2**).
  - **Evidence of Currency in Subject Matter and Pedagogy.** The faculty member must demonstrate that he or she has actively pursued currency in both subject matter and pedagogy, for all courses taught during the review period. Examples are as follows: participation in teaching conferences or workshops that provide exposure to pedagogical tools, participation above and beyond basic contributing membership in teaching collaboratives or other relevant curricular development groups, performance of independent or collaborative research, and reading scholarly journals related to the subject matter. A clear description or demonstration of how these experiences were integrated into classroom learning is required for an *Exceeds Expectations* rating.
  - **Syllabus, Course Materials, Writing Assignments, Grade Distributions, and Other Materials.** A list of items appropriate for this section can be found in **Section III.B**. The DPC shall evaluate these materials with a focus on how they represent the quality of the course. The Department expects courses to be presented at the highest level of quality with rigor appropriate for the level of the students to achieve an overall rating of *Exceeds Expectations*.

**III.E.2. Satisfactory.** *Satisfactory* requires participation in the Department and in evaluated activities at levels that the Department deems necessary and sufficient for a faculty member to be successful in facilitating the learning of students taking courses taught by the faculty member.

- **SOQ Scores and SOQ written comments.** Mean SOQ scores of 3.00-3.59 and written comments judged by the DPC to exemplify effective instruction for each course taught during the review period are required.
- **Classroom Observations.** Classroom Observation reports and other course materials provided demonstrate that the instructor has promoted student learning, has met departmental, collaborative, and individual objectives for the course(s), and has created a classroom environment conducive to learning.
- **Teaching Narrative.** To qualify, the Teaching Narrative shall be evaluated as *Satisfactory* by DPC members based on the overall quality of criteria such as the thoroughness of the narrative, the quality of self evaluation, the responsiveness to student comments, classroom observation reports, and previous reviews, efforts to improve as needed, the dynamic of teaching, and evidence of participation in collaborative teaching activities as appropriate for the course assignment (see **Section I.A.2**).
- **Evidence of Currency in Subject Matter and Pedagogy.** The faculty member must demonstrate that he or she has maintained currency in both subject matter and pedagogy. Examples are as follows: participation in teaching conferences or workshops that provide exposure to pedagogical tools, being a contributing member of a teaching collaborative or other relevant curriculum development group when requested, performance of independent or collaborative research, and reading scholarly journals related to the subject matter. A clear description or demonstration of how these experiences were integrated into classroom learning is expected for a *Satisfactory* rating.
- **Syllabus, Course Materials, Writing Assignments, Grade Distributions, and Other Materials.** A *Satisfactory* rating of the other items listed in **Section III.B** based on overall quality.

**III.E.3. Needs Improvement.** A rating of *Needs Improvement* results when participation in any evaluated activity is at a level the Department deems insufficient for a faculty member to be successful in facilitating the learning of students taking courses taught by the faculty member. If any criterion listed below is rated as *Needs Improvement*, then the overall rating of the individual under review may be *Needs Improvement*.

- **SOQ Scores and SOQ written comments.** Mean SOQ scores of 2.50-2.99 and written comments that show deficiencies as judged by the DPC for any course taught during the review period may result in a rating of *Needs Improvement*.

- Classroom Observations. Classroom Observation reports and other course materials provided that demonstrate that the instructor has not promoted student learning, has not met departmental, collaborative, and individual objectives for the course(s), or has not created a classroom environment conducive to learning may result in a rating of *Needs Improvement*.
- Teaching Narrative. A Teaching Narrative evaluated as *Needs Improvement* by DPC members based on its overall quality (see **Section I.A.2**) may result in a rating of *Needs Improvement*.
- Evidence of Currency in Subject Matter and Pedagogy. All faculty members are expected to demonstrate currency in both subject matter and pedagogy. Lack of participation in activities that contribute to currency in the field and pedagogy, not being a contributing member of a teaching collaborative or other relevant curriculum development group when requested, or failure to describe how scholarly reading or workshop experiences are integrated into classroom learning will result in a *Needs Improvement* rating in this subcategory.
- Syllabus, Course Materials, Writing Assignments, Grade Distributions, and Other Materials. Any item submitted from the list in **Section III.B** and evaluated as *Needs Improvement* by the DPC based on overall quality may result in a *Needs Improvement* rating.

**III.E.4. Unsatisfactory**. Failure to meet the criteria for *Needs Improvement* shall be deemed *Unsatisfactory*, and the individual under review shall be ineligible for reappointment.

### **III.F. ACTIONS.**

All evaluations of temporary faculty are recorded and provided to the lecturer, entered into the Personnel Action File (PAF), and reviewed when the lecturer is given careful consideration (e.g., for reappointment decisions). Periodic evaluations do not involve recommendations for any particular action. However, if an individual is evaluated by the DPC or Chair as *Needs Improvement*, the Department Chair shall determine the appropriate course of action (e.g., the development of a plan for improvement, recommending against reappointment to the same assignment, etc.). For a comprehensive (sixth-year) evaluation, in addition to the evaluation of performance during the six-year review period, the DPC and Chair shall each provide a recommendation concerning appointment to the initial three-year appointment. The rationale for the recommendation shall be incorporated into the evaluation itself. A faculty member may be recommended for a three-year appointment (including subsequent three-year appointments) only if their overall performance is rated as “Satisfactory” or better.

#### **IV. RANGE ELEVATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY (LECTURERS).**

[Range elevation Policies are subject to the approval of the College Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. See UPS 210.070 and CBA 12.16-12.21.]

The Department considers Range Elevation to be a significant step, recognizing the value of a faculty member's long-term contribution to the academic goals and objectives of the Department and the University. Therefore, the materials submitted for evaluation for Range Elevation shall encompass the previous five years in the Lecturer's current range (the review period for Range Elevation evaluation). The Department expects that faculty members being considered for Range Elevation shall have demonstrated high quality in all aspects of Teaching Performance, and development as an instructor and professional, over the entire five-year period in the current range. For a Range Elevation evaluation, in addition to the evaluation of performance during the five-year review period, the DPC and Chair shall each provide a recommendation for or against Range Elevation. The rationale for the recommendation shall be incorporated into the evaluation itself. A faculty member may be recommended for a Range Elevation only if their overall performance is rated as "Satisfactory" or better, over the entire five-year review period.

##### **IV.A. Eligibility.**

Eligibility for range elevation is specified in the CBA. A lecturer who has no more SSI eligibility in his/her current range and has served a minimum of five years in that range may request range elevation. The University shall notify lecturers when they are eligible for range elevation.

##### **IV.B. Evaluation for Range Elevation.**

Requests to be considered for range elevation shall be addressed to the Department Chair, following standard CSUF procedures. Materials that clearly and concisely document the qualifications of the temporary faculty member for Range Elevation during the five-year period, based on the criteria described in this document, shall be submitted in a Portfolio. These materials shall be evaluated by the DPC, and a recommendation concerning Range Elevation shall be forwarded to the Department Chair, who will also recommend on Range Elevation according to the procedures outlined in this document, the CBA, and UPS 210.070.

To be recommended for Range Elevation a lecturer must have:

- Received overall ratings of *Exceeds Expectations* or *Satisfactory* from the DPC and Department Chair for each previous periodic review during the five-year review period,
- Demonstrated performance that meets or exceeds the criteria for a *Satisfactory* rating over the five-year review period, based on the above evaluation criteria, and as demonstrated in the Portfolio presented for range elevation review,
- Throughout the review period, effectively demonstrated currency in his or her field and in appropriate pedagogy.

- Attended workshops on teaching performance improvement or pedagogy consistently throughout the five-year review period, and
- Made substantive contributions when asked to participate in teaching collaboratives and other appropriate committees, consistently throughout the five-year review period. and
- Demonstrated development as an instructor throughout the review period.

In addition, a lecturer whose hiring agreement specifically includes duties in either or both (1) Research and Other Scholarly and Creative Activities and (2) Professional, University, and Community Service shall present evidence of achieving a level of performance rated as *Satisfactory* or *Exceeds Expectations* based on the Portfolio submitted with the request to be considered for range elevation.