


Cal State Fullerton

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

657-278-2614 | officeofprovost@fullerton.edu | fullerton.edu/acadaffairs

July 11, 2023

TO: Lisa Kirtman, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Education

FROM: Amir Dabirian, Ph.D. 
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: College Policy on Evaluation of Lecturers for the College of Education

The proposed College Policy on the Evaluation of Lecturers from the College of Education has been reviewed. The document is in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement and UPS 210.070. In accordance with the recommendations of the Departments, the College Personnel Standards Review Committee, and the Dean, I approve this policy for implementation commencing with the 2023-2024 Academic Year.

Please note that, “Any Department or College policy governing the evaluation of lecturers shall be provided to each lecturer within fourteen days of their initial appointment and again when changes to policy occur” (UPS 210.070, section VII.A). Additionally, the policy must be transmitted regularly to lecturers undergoing evaluation in the college, at least 30 days prior to the due date for submission of evaluation files, per UPS 210.070, section VI. A.

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

AD:mc

cc: Dr. Carol Lundberg, College Personnel Standards Review Committee
Faculty Affairs and Records

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
LECTURER TEACHING NARRATIVE STANDARDS**

Directions: Within a total word limit of 1500 words (as noted in UPS 210.070), the faculty member must provide a narrative that discusses the following teaching standards. An additional 500 words is acceptable for addressing any areas of concern regarding SOQs.

Please organize the narrative using the heading and numbers below.

Supervisors only: Must complete #1, #2 (with the exemption of a structured course), #5, and #6.

Coordinators/Administrative only: Must complete #1, 5 and 8.

Instructors only: Must complete #1-7

Please Note:

- 1) *If you have roles that fall in multiple categories, you must address all that are relevant to your work. You must include the max number of examples in each category to receive an “exceeds expectations”, but including the maximum number does not guarantee a particular rating. Refer to the Standards rubric for the number of examples to include aligned with ratings (exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, does not meet expectations/unsatisfactory).*
- 2) *Please review UPS 210.070 for additional information and specifics on range elevations.*
- 3) **Please review UPS 210.080 regarding classroom observations. Classroom observations must be conducted according to this UPS.*
- 4) *** For more information on JEIE principles discussed below go to this site <https://ed.fullerton.edu/jeie/>*

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TEMPORARY FACULTY MEMBERS
RUBRIC**

1

Provide evidence of compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.

4: Exceeds Expectations

- Faculty member provides clear evidence of compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.
- Narrative summary clearly addresses this evaluation criteria.
- Faculty member includes a maximum 3 examples of strong, relevant, and varied evidence that meet this evaluation criteria.

3: Meets Expectations

- Faculty member provides evidence of compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.
- Narrative summary addresses this evaluation criteria.
- Faculty member includes 2 examples of evidence that meet this evaluation criteria.

2: Needs Improvement

- Faculty member provides minimal evidence of compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and

Potential evidence:

- Syllabi
- SOQs
- Maintains office hours/on-time for supervision visits
- Offers flexible office hours to meet students' needs
- Gives final exam on the date/time assigned by the University
- Timely communication with students (emails

<p>University Policy Statements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Narrative summary minimally addresses this evaluation criteria. ● Faculty member provides 1 example of evidence to meet this evaluation criteria. <p>1: Does Not Meet Expectations (Unsatisfactory)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member does not provide evidence of compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements. ● Narrative summary does not address this evaluation criteria. 	<p>within 24 hours M-F, feedback on assessment before next assignment is due)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Other relevant evidence
<h2 style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">2</h2> <p>Provide evidence of an established course environment conducive to learning, including creating a safe and positive learning environment, meeting students’ social emotional needs, and providing a clear and structured course. This category reflects the alignment between course requirements, learning objectives, content, and instructional strategies, considering all class modes (face-to-face, hybrid, or online).</p>	
<p>4: Exceeds Expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member provides evidence of an established course environment conducive to learning, including creating a safe and positive learning environment, meeting students’ social emotional needs, and proving a clear and structured course. ● Narrative summary clearly addresses this evaluation criteria including implementation of SEL and meeting social emotional needs of students. ● Faculty member includes a maximum of 3 examples of strong, relevant, and varied evidence that meet this evaluation criteria. <p>3: Meets Expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member provides evidence of an established course environment conducive to learning, including creating a safe and positive learning environment, meeting students’ social emotional needs, and providing a clear and structured course. ● Narrative summary addresses this evaluation criteria. ● Faculty member provides 2 examples of evidence that meet this evaluation criteria. <p>2: Needs Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member provides minimal evidence of an established course environment conducive to learning, including creating a safe and positive learning environment, meeting students’ social emotional needs, and providing a clear and structured course. ● Narrative summary minimally addresses this evaluation criteria. 	<p>Potential evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Syllabi ● SOQs ● Lessons ● Comments from observations * ● Examples of student work/projects/ assignments, learning management system (LMS, e.g. Canvas) pages, ● Personal emails ● Screenshot of Canvas course demonstrating a

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member provides 1 example of evidence to meet this evaluation criteria. <p>1: Does Not Meet Expectations (Unsatisfactory)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member does not provide any evidence of an established course environment conducive to learning, including creating a safe and positive learning environment, meeting students’ social emotional needs, and providing a clear and structured course. ● Narrative summary does not address this evaluation criteria. 	<p>coherent structure for course meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Other relevant evidence
---	---

3

Provide evidence of effective implementation of course syllabi clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes. In addition, provide evidence of establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.

<p>4: Exceeds Expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member provides evidence of effective implementation of course syllabi clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes. This includes ensuring learning goals of the course are made clear to students at the start of the course and utilizing assessments and grading practices that are clearly related to course goals. ● Narrative summary clearly addresses this evaluation criteria. ● Faculty member includes a maximum of 3 examples of strong, relevant, and varied evidence that meet this evaluation criteria. <p>3: Meets Expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member provides evidence of effective implementation of course syllabi clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes. This includes ensuring learning goals of the course are made clear to students at the start of the course and utilizing assessments and grading practices that are related to course goals. ● Narrative summary addresses this evaluation criteria. ● Faculty member provides 2 examples of evidence that meet this evaluation criteria. <p>2: Needs Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty member provides minimal evidence of effective implementation of course syllabi clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes. This includes ensuring learning goals of the course are made clear to students at the start of the course and utilizing assessments and grading practices that are related to course goals. 	<p>Potential evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Syllabi ● SOQs ● Examples of student work/projects/ assignments ● Student comments (SOQ and Informal feedback) ● Scoring guides or rubrics (and/or exemplars) ● Grading practices ● Other relevant evidence ●
---	--

- Narrative summary minimally addresses this evaluation criteria.
- Faculty member provides 1 example of evidence to meet this evaluation criteria.

1: Does Not Meet Expectations (Unsatisfactory)

- Faculty member does not provide evidence of effective implementation of course syllabi linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.
- Narrative summary does not address this evaluation criteria.

4

Provide evidence of use of various instructional methods (including technology to enhance student learning and the inclusion of just, equitable, inclusive education (JEIE) principles).**

4: Exceeds Expectations

- Faculty member provides clear evidence of various instructional methods to enhance student learning including technology and JEIE principles.
- Narrative summary clearly addresses this evaluation criteria.
- Faculty member includes a maximum of 3 examples of strong, relevant, and varied evidence that meet this evaluation criteria.

3: Meets Expectations

- Faculty member provides evidence of various instructional methods to enhance student learning including technology and JEIE principles.
- Narrative summary addresses this evaluation criteria.
- Faculty member provides 2 examples of evidence that meet this evaluation criteria.

2: Needs Improvement

- Faculty member provides limited evidence of various instructional methods
- Narrative summary minimally addresses this evaluation criteria.
- Faculty member provides minimal evidence that meet this evaluation criteria.

1: Does Not Meet Expectations (Unsatisfactory)

- Faculty member provides no evidence of various instructional methods.
- Narrative summary does not address this evaluation criteria.

Potential evidence:

- Syllabi
- SOQs
- Teaching narrative
- Screenshot of slides
- Current JEIE practices
- JEIE related assignments
- Current educational technology application examples
- Student engagement examples (active/engaged learning)
- Student work samples demonstrating application of education technology

- Canvas or classroom observations*
- Other relevant evidence

5

Provide evidence of current pedagogical and disciplinary practices as related to teaching. Address current professional development related to just, equitable, and inclusive education principles.

4: Exceeds Expectations

- Faculty member provides a maximum of 3 examples of strong, relevant, and varied evidence of pedagogical and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.
- Faculty member provides a minimum of 1 professional development training related to JEIE principles.
- Narrative summary clearly addresses this evaluation criteria.

3: Meets Expectations

- Faculty member provides 2 examples of strong, relevant, and varied evidence of pedagogical and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.
- Faculty member provides a minimum of 1 professional development training related to JEIE principles.
- Narrative summary addresses this evaluation criteria.

2: Needs Improvement

- Faculty member provides 1 example of evidence of pedagogical and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.
- Faculty member provides a minimum of 1 professional development training related to JEIE principles.
- Narrative summary minimally addresses this evaluation criteria.

1: Does Not Meet Expectations (Unsatisfactory)

- Faculty member does not provide evidence of pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.
- Narrative summary does not address this evaluation criteria.

Potential evidence:

- Syllabi
- Workshops
- Conferences
- Webinars
- Professional development related to JEIE principles**
- Professional development related to educational technology
- Classroom/Canvas observations by colleagues*
- Other relevant evidence

6

Provide evidence of reflection on Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs), including SOQ comments and SOQ ratings. This category reflects the students' perspectives on the faculty members' instruction. In the narrative summary, the faculty members must reflect on:

- a. Student comments
- b. Pattern of statistical ratings during the period under review
- c. SOQs of concern (course ratings of C, 70-79% and D, 60-69%), including explanation and plan of action for improvement.

4: Exceeds Expectations

- Faculty member reflects on SOQ ratings in the Narrative Summary, including area(s) of concern (ratings of C, 70-79% and D, 60-69%) for the period under review.
- Faculty member receives an average rating of 90% or better in A and B rating for the period under review.

3: Meets Expectations

- Faculty member reflects on SOQ results in the Narrative Summary, including any area(s) of concern (ratings of C, 70-79% and D, 60-69%) for the period under review.
- Faculty member receives an average rating of 80-89% or better in A and B rating for the period under review.

2: Needs Improvement

- Faculty member reflects on SOQ ratings in the Narrative Summary, including any area(s) of concern (ratings of C, 70-79% and D, 60-69%) for the period under review.
- Faculty member receives an average rating below 70 to 79% in A and B rating for the period under review.

1: Does Not Meet Expectations (Unsatisfactory)

- Faculty member does not reflect on the SOQ comments in the Narrative Summary.
- Faculty member receives an average rating below 70% in A and B rating for the period under review.

Evidence Required:

- SOQs statistical report for the period under review
- SOQs student comments for the period under review
- Narrative summary (consider addressing patterns/anomalies in SOQ qualitative and quantitative data)
- Other relevant evidence

review.

7

Provide evidence of additional indicators of teaching that must demonstrate progress to improve teaching and learning.

- a. These indicators must provide evidence of improvements in teaching and learning.
- b. If appropriate to work assignment, discuss university/college/department/community service (if applicable), including coordinator roles, supervisory roles; describe responsibilities and duties as well as professional development (which must be connected to the [College Strategic Plan](#) that are above and beyond your current role or enhance your current work.
- c. This must be new evidence not included in the other Evaluation Criteria sections.

4: Exceeds Expectations

- Faculty member provides 3 additional indicators of teaching, including a reflective explanation in the Narrative Summary that meets the criteria listed.
- Faculty member includes a maximum of 3 examples of strong, relevant, and varied evidence that meet this evaluation criteria.
- Each indicator must clearly be connected to improved teaching and learning.

3: Meets Expectations

- Faculty member provides 2 additional indicators of teaching, including a reflective explanation in the Narrative Summary that meet the criteria listed.
- Faculty member includes evidence from additional indicators of teaching.
- Each indicator must clearly be connected to improved teaching and learning.

2: Needs Improvement

- Faculty member provides 1 additional indicator of teaching, including a reflective explanation that meet the evaluation criteria listed.
- Faculty member includes evidence from 1 additional indicator of teaching.
- The indicators are not clearly connected to teaching.

Potential Evidence (This must be new evidence, not evidence included in other sections):

- Professional development connected to the strategic plan
- Peer observations
- University/College/Department/Community Services

1: Does Not Meet Expectations (Unsatisfactory)

- Faculty member includes no evidence of additional indicators of teaching.

- Innovative Teaching/Scholarly/Creative Activities
- Teaching narrative
- Other relevant evidence

8

Coordination or other administrative release time: Provide a list of your assigned duties and evidence for each assigned duties demonstrating the completion of the task.

If you ONLY serve in a non-teaching or non-supervisory role, please include a list of your assigned duties and present examples of evidence for each assigned duty demonstrating the completion of the task. If you have teaching/supervision and non-teaching responsibilities, please complete this section in addition to other sections.

4: Exceeds Expectations

- Includes a list of assigned duties (with brief descriptions) and presents a maximum of 2 examples of strong evidence per task indicating that the faculty member completed the work and made improvements on the processes for each assigned duty demonstrating the completion of the task.

3: Meets Expectations

- Includes a list of assigned duties (with brief descriptions) and presents 1 example of evidence for each assigned duty demonstrating the completion of the task.

2: Needs Improvement

- Includes a list of assigned duties (with brief descriptions) and presents 1 example of evidence for some assigned duty demonstrating the completion of the task.

1: Does Not Meet Expectations (Unsatisfactory)

- Does not include a list of assigned duties and/or presents limited or no evidence of assigned duties demonstrating the completion of the task.