



FACULTY AFFAIRS AND RECORDS

**Official Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty for the  
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering**

Approved by Dr. Carolyn Thomas, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, on 2/1/2022 for implementation in the Fall 2022 semester

[Verified and posted online at www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/cee2022lecturer.pdf](http://www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/cee2022lecturer.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.

**Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering**

**Policy on the Evaluation of Lecturers**

**Table of Contents**

<b>I. Preamble.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>II. Definition .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III. Classroom Visitation .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>IV. WPAF Contents .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>V. Evaluation Criteria and Summative Ratings of Teaching Performance .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>A. Qualitative Measure for SOQ .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>B. Evaluation Criteria and Summative Rating .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>C. Guidelines for Rating .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>VI. Evaluation Process and Outcomes.....</b>	<b>6</b>

## **Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering**

### **Policy on the Evaluation of Lecturers**

#### **I. Preamble**

The Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering (CEE) shall evaluate its lecturers according to UPS 210.070, Evaluation of Lecturers. Pursuant to Section VII.A. of UPS 210.070, the CEE Department further elaborates its policy on the evaluation of lecturers as laid out in sections II – V. These standards below define qualitative criteria by which faculty under review shall be judged. This department policy shall be provided to each lecturer member within fourteen days after their initial appointment and again when changes to policy occur.

#### **II. Definition**

In this document, the term “lecturer” or “faculty” refers to all unit 3 employees who are identified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement as “temporary faculty,” that is they are not tenured or probationary (tenure-track).

#### **III. Classroom Visitation**

The principal purpose of classroom visitations is to observe the faculty member in the classroom and provide timely advice on improving their teaching performance. The Department Chair or its designee shall be responsible for performing classroom visitation in accordance with UPS 210.080. The observer shall discuss the visit and expectations with the faculty member before the visit and provide written feedback to the faculty within one week of observation. A classroom visitation report must be included in the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) where required below.

All faculty are encouraged to include classroom visitation for annual reviews. Classroom visitation reports are required for faculty undergoing first evaluation, three-year periodic reviews, six-year comprehensive reviews, and cases where the prior cycle review recommends classroom visitations.

#### **IV. WPAF Contents**

The lecturer is responsible for providing information/documentation in the WPAF as outlined in Section VI.A of UPS 210.070.

As evidence of supporting material for teaching performance, the WPAF must also include all course syllabi, all examinations, representative samples of all assignments/projects, examples of graded student work on each assignment/project, and supporting class materials such as handouts, lecture slides, and documentation indicating effective Learning Management System (Canvas) course page organization. Faculty must also include documentation indicating that they have completed accreditation-related assessments specific to the courses.

#### **V. Evaluation Criteria and Summative Ratings of Teaching Performance**

##### **A. Qualitative Measure for SOQ**

When Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) ratings are used as evidence, the following scale system shall be used to evaluate the faculty.

- Very high - 85% As and Bs with a minimum of 50% As;
- High - 74-84% As and Bs;
- Low - below 74% As and Bs

## **B. Evaluation Criteria and Summative Rating**

A composite rating of teaching effectiveness is derived based on the following six areas.

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 a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.
4. Effective use of instructional methods.
5. Establishment of 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.

Based on a composite of the ratings of the six areas described above, the reviewers shall render a summative rating of teaching performance as "**Exceeds Expectations**," "**Satisfactory**," "**Needs Improvement**", or "**Unsatisfactory**".

**Exceeds Expectations:** Faculty must be rated Satisfactory in area 1. Faculty is rated Exceeds Expectations in all five remaining areas of evaluation.

**Satisfactory:** Faculty must be rated Satisfactory in area 1. Faculty is rated at least Satisfactory in at least three remaining areas of evaluation. Faculty must not be rated Unsatisfactory in any areas.

**Needs Improvement:** Faculty must not be rated Unsatisfactory in area 1. Faculty is rated at least Satisfactory in two remaining areas of evaluation.

**Unsatisfactory:** Faculty are rated Unsatisfactory if they do not meet the requirements of the above three ratings.

## **C. Guidelines for Rating**

The evaluation for each area shall be based on the provided evidence in the faculty's WPAF. Evaluators are expected to use their best professional judgment in assessing how well the established criteria have been met. Following are the guidelines for rating teaching performance in each of the six areas.

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

**Satisfactory-** Faculty member meets required office hours, is on-time for classes on a regular basis, gives final exams on assigned days and syllabi are UPS300.004 compliant as evidenced by student comments, high SOQ ratings for this factor and syllabi.

**Needs Improvement**—Faculty member misses office hours occasionally, sometimes gives exams on unassigned days, misses classes and arrives late occasionally, and/or some of the syllabi are not UPS300.004 compliant as evidenced by student comments, low SOQ ratings for this factor, and syllabi.

**Unsatisfactory-** Faculty member fails to keep office hours, misses classes and is late regularly, fails to give final exam on assigned days, and/or syllabi are not UPS300.004 compliant as evidenced by student comments, low SOQ ratings for this factor, and syllabi.

## **2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning.**

**Exceeds Expectations-** Provides a means for students to contribute to the course learning by encouraging inquiries, providing a coherent structure for course meetings which is understood by the students as evidenced by many positive student comments, Very High SOQ ratings for these factors, syllabi, comments from observations, Narrative Summary, examples of student work/projects/assignments all indicating organization and clear presentation of materials.

**Satisfactory-** Faculty member receives mostly positive comments from students about providing clear and organized structure for course meetings. SOQ ratings are High related to course structure and learning. Syllabi and student assignments indicate encouragement of inquiry by students and the faculty member addresses these issues in the Narrative Summary.

**Needs Improvement-** Faculty member receives many student comments indicating lack of structure, lack of organization, and unclear teaching processes. SOQ ratings are Low as related to those factors. Syllabi are poorly organized, assignments are unclear, and faculty fails to address student comments in the Narrative Summary.

**Unsatisfactory-** Faculty member fails to provide proper structure and clearly organized course assignments as evidenced by mostly negative student comments and Low SOQ ratings in these areas. Faculty fails to address these issues in the Narrative Summary.

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

**Exceeds Expectations-** 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 as evidenced by student comments, SOQ ratings, syllabi, and faculty includes several examples of student work/projects/assignments, and Narrative Summary clearly discusses these factors. The documentation provided by faculty indicates that they have completed the accreditation-related assessment as it applies to their courses.

**Satisfactory-** Faculty member describes course objectives and learning goals and regularly meets those goals. Grading practices are clearly related to course goals and students are usually clear about assessment and grading practices as related to these learning goals as evidenced by student comments, SOQ ratings, syllabi, and faculty includes at least one example of student work. The documentation provided by faculty indicates that they have completed the accreditation-related assessment as it applies to their courses.

**Needs Improvement-** Faculty member provides learning goals but does not make clear how they are related to assessment and grading practices as evidenced by syllabi, student comments, SOQ ratings, and lack of student work examples. The documentation provided by faculty indicates that they have completed the accreditation-related assessment as it applies to their courses.

**Unsatisfactory-** Faculty member provides inappropriate learning goals and assessment and grading practices. Syllabi do not reflect appropriate learning goals and grading is not related to course objectives. Faculty fails to include student work. Student comments and SOQ ratings reflect a lack of

clarity in student learning goals and assessment practices. The faculty did not complete the accreditation-related assessment as it applies to their courses.

#### **4. Effective use of instructional methods.**

**Exceeds Expectations-** Faculty demonstrates that instructional methods are appropriate to course goals, technology is appropriate to the field, and methods of instruction are valued by students and enhance student participation as evidenced by many positive student comments and Very High SOQ ratings about these factors. Classroom visitation reports, Syllabi and Narrative Summary clearly demonstrate appropriate use of instructional methods.

**Satisfactory-** Faculty demonstrates the use of methods of instruction that is valued by students and enhance student participation as evidenced by many positive comments and High SOQ ratings about these factors. Classroom visitation reports, syllabi, and Narrative Summary demonstrate appropriate use of instructional methods.

**Needs Improvement-** Faculty demonstrates some appropriate instructional methods but fails to demonstrate strong student participation and fails to demonstrate appropriate use of technology as evidenced by student comments and Low SOQ ratings. Classroom visitation reports, syllabi, and Narrative Summary fail to demonstrate appropriate use of instructional methods.

**Unsatisfactory-** Faculty fails to demonstrate the use of appropriate instructional methods and fails to create student participation as evidenced by negative comments and Low SOQ ratings. Classroom visitation reports, syllabi, and Narrative Summary fail to demonstrate appropriate use of instructional methods.

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

**Exceeds Expectations-** Faculty demonstrates academic rigor appropriate to the course, effectiveness, fairness, and timeliness of testing. Other assessments and grading procedures are evident, rubrics are included, and academic rigor is clearly addressed in the Narrative Summary. Evidence includes syllabi, student comments, course assignments/projects, graded student work, student comments, and other course materials.

**Satisfactory-** Faculty demonstrates appropriate academic rigor as evident by class assignments/projects, graded student work, student comments. The Narrative Summary discusses remedial efforts when prior evaluations needed to be more rigorous.

**Needs Improvement-** Faculty fails to demonstrate appropriate academic rigor as evidenced by class assignments/projects, graded student work and student comments. The Narrative Summary fails to thoroughly address remedial efforts.

**Unsatisfactory-** Faculty fails to demonstrate academic rigor as evidenced by class assignments/projects, graded student work and student comments. The Narrative Summary fails to address remedial efforts.

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

**Exceeds Expectations-** Faculty provides 3 pieces of evidence demonstrating pedagogical currency and currency in the discipline such as maintaining professional licensure (such as PE), acquiring certifications, participating in continuing education, and other trainings related to teaching and/or the field of study. Syllabi demonstrate currency in topics and instructional methods. SOQ ratings about instructor knowledge are Very High and student comments about this area are predominantly positive.

**Satisfactory-** Faculty demonstrates at least 1 area of discipline and pedagogical currency as evidenced by Narrative Summary, Curriculum Vitae, student comments or continuing education and renewal of license. Syllabi demonstrate currency in topics and SOQ ratings are High related to instructor knowledge. Student comments in this area are mostly positive.

**Needs Improvement-** Faculty fails to demonstrate currency either in the syllabi, or other documentation but does mention it in the curriculum vitae and Narrative Summary. Some student comments mention lack of currency and SOQ ratings are Low in this area.

**Unsatisfactory-** Faculty fails to mention any currency in the Narrative Summary. The Curriculum Vitae and syllabi fail to show currency in topics or readings. Student comments are mostly negative about currency and SOQ ratings are Low in this area.

## **VI. Evaluation Process and Outcomes**

Lecturers are evaluated by the Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC), and the Department Chair. The members of the DPRC are selected from full-time tenured faculty members in accordance with the University policy. Evaluations are conducted according to timelines set forth by Faculty Affairs and Records and the College of Engineering and Computer Science.

Lecturers shall be evaluated by the DPRC and the Department Chair using the evaluation criteria based upon the contents of the WPAF. The DPRC and the Department chair will also provide lecturers with a narrative review highlighting the strengths in their teaching performance and recommendations for future improvement, if any.

Reappointment decisions related to these evaluations will follow the guidelines set forth by UPS 210.070 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

**Classroom Visitation Report**

Name of Observer: \_\_\_\_\_ Number of Students Present : \_\_\_\_\_  
Date and Time of Observation: \_\_\_\_\_ Class Enrollment : \_\_\_\_\_

Did you meet with the instructor prior to the class to discuss the instructor's plan and goals?     Yes     No

Give a brief factual description of the aims and activities of the observed class session:

Rate following indicating on your impressions on class observations

	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>
The material in the lecture was placed in context to previous and subsequent lectures			
The material in the lecture was related to the subject at hand			
Written and spoken material complemented each other			
The instructor used class time effectively			
Instruction methods encouraged student participation			

Comments and constructive suggestions for the instructor:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Observer's Signature

The observer must submit a copy of this report to the instructor and the department chair within a week of observation.



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

**Please rate your instructor on the items below using the following scale:**

- A) Excellent
- B) Good
- C) Mixed Opinion
- D) Below Expectation
- E) Unsatisfactory

	A	B	C	D	E
1.1 Instructor's preparation for the class	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1.2 Clarity and organization of the lectures / lab / class activities	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1.3 Instructor's knowledge of the subject matter	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1.4 Instructor's interest in student's learning	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1.5 Instructor's openness to questions and exchanges of ideas	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1.6 Instructor's effective utilization of class time	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1.7 Consistency and fairness in evaluating student performance	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1.8 Quality of class assignments and exams	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1.9 Instructor's availability and helpfulness during office hours	<input type="checkbox"/>				
1.10 Overall evaluation of the instructor	<input type="checkbox"/>				



## 2. Comments

### 2.1 Which teaching practices of the instructor were effective?

### 2.2 Which teaching practices of the instructor could be improved?

### 2.3 Other Comments?

