Official Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty for the

Department of Human Services

Approved by Dr. Pamella H. Oliver, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, on 9/4/2019 for implementation in the Spring 2020 semester

Verified and posted online at www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/husr2020lecturer.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.

Table of Contents

I. Preamble

The Department of Human Services (hereafter called the "Department") is committed to providing the highest quality programs possible. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs is the instructional faculty and seeks to promote excellence in the areas of teaching. Adequate communication, especially regarding personnel policies, is of utmost importance to the maintenance and enhancement of a high-quality lecturers and, thus, a viable University. With this objective, the Department shall institute the following procedures for assessing lecturers and providing their evaluations. The Department takes the position that the evaluated faculty may be aided in their respective roles by having available to them as clear and as objective a statement as is reasonably possible of the Department's expectations. Furthermore, the Department specifically affirms their position that the best interests of the University, the College, the Department, and their many students are served when the faculty represent a wide diversity of interests and activities.

II. Department Structure

The Department is coordinated by a Department Chair, selected according to UPS 211.100. The Department Chair has the responsibility of communicating the standards and criteria for reappointment to all Department faculty members. The Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) is an elected committee comprised of tenured faculty members. In the Department of Human Services, this committee has the same membership as the Department Personnel Committee. The DPRC is guided by UPS 210.070. Lecturers are evaluated by the Department Chair and DPRC while full-time lecturers are additionally evaluated by the Dean. Part-time lecturers with an annual evaluation resulting in a less than "Satisfactory" performance by the DPRC or Department Chair shall be forwarded to the Dean. All lecturers undergoing six-year comprehensive evaluations or a three-year periodic evaluation shall be evaluated by the DPRC, the Department Chair, and the Dean.

III. Mission and Philosophy Statements of the Department of Human Services

Mission Statement
Through the application of theory, research, and self-reflection, the Human Services Department prepares students to serve diverse individuals, families, and communities.

Philosophy Statement
As an applied paraprofessional program, the Human Services major is based on a synthesis of knowledge from the biological sciences, the social sciences, the applied methodologies of prevention, and the direct practice of interventions. It brings together a humanistic and generalist orientation through specific practical skills and methods acquired through "hands-on" experiential learning and increased self-awareness. Through the four interrelated components of the core curriculum, a graduate of the Human Services Department will: (1) understand the theoretical foundations of intervention strategies, (2) be familiar with various client populations and know the importance of cultural diversity, (3) incorporate research and evaluation in their understanding of programs, and (4) develop skills through direct experience in the field and through exploration within oneself. It is accredited by the Council for Standards in Human Service Education, the field's premier accrediting body.

IV. Evaluation of Lecturers: Criteria and Weighting

A. Teaching performance
The philosophy of the College of Health and Human Development (HHD) and Department mission statement guides the primary responsibility of lecturers, which is teaching. Each lecturer shall establish a teaching environment where student learning is central, expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in the organization, content of course syllabi and class

materials, and students are provided opportunities to develop the learning abilities, competencies, and skills necessary to contribute to society. A successful faculty member demonstrates mastery and currency in one's discipline, teaches effectively, and helps students to learn both within and outside the classroom. Lecturers shall also demonstrate compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.

B. Evaluating teaching performance

The following mandatory indicators shall be used in evaluating teaching performance and shall be included in the WPAF. In addition to the mandatory and optional indicators specified below, all lecturers shall submit FAR's checklist form, a table of contents listing all of the items included in the Working Personnel Action File, and a copy of the approved Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty (this document).

1. **Curriculum Vitae:** Faculty shall include a current curriculum vitae or resume. This should be updated every evaluation period and include current and past teaching experience, relevant job history, and other related information such as pedagogical training, discipline related trainings, and continuing education. Current clinical license and certifications should also be included.

2. **Narrative Summary:** A comprehensive self-assessment of no more than 1500 words shall include a reflective review of a) the faculty member's approach to establishing courses environments conducive to learning; b) how instructional methods are conceived and implemented; and c) how appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study are implemented, and how the faculty maintains pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching. The faculty member should discuss comments from Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQS) and data from the grade distributions as related to a-c above.

3. **Course Syllabi:** Faculty shall include all course syllabi for the period of evaluation.

4. **Currency in Field:** Provide evidence that demonstrates how the faculty member is remaining current in the field of study and teaching methods. This can include evidence of professional achievement or activities, active scholarship and research activities, professional trainings and certifications, curricular innovations or other relevant instructional material, consistent with the Department and the College of HHD.
Faculty shall include any documentation related to continuing education, pedagogical trainings, and other evidence of maintaining currency in the discipline and in teaching.

5. **Grade Distributions:** The University-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each semester of the period of review must be provided. If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair two weeks prior to submitting the portfolio.

Rigor in courses shall be considered when faculty are being evaluated. Faculty should strive for Grade Point Averages consistent with Department averages. Most courses should be in the 2.9-3.4 range. However, certain courses may have higher GPAs. Faculty shall address grades in their narratives, especially when they exceed 3.4. Patterns across various semesters shall also be considered in evaluating the appropriateness of grade distributions. Faculty shall list the grade distributions for each course taught in Table 1 in the Appendix.

6. **List of Teaching and other Workload Assignments:** A semester by semester listing of all courses taught throughout the period of review shall be provided using the format identified in Table 1 from the Appendix.

7. **Previous Reviews:** Lecturers who have not yet earned an entitlement shall include all previous annual evaluations by the DPRC and Department Chair. Those undergoing a three-year periodic review shall include the previous evaluations from the cycle leading to the three-year appointment.

8. **Summary Reports of SOQs:**
   The University-provided statistical summaries for all courses during the period of review must be included. If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair two weeks prior to submitting the portfolio.
   The printed individual Student Opinion Questionnaires shall be included for each course taught at CSUF for academic credit during the period of review. If data are missing, a written explanation must be provided and verified by the Department Chair two weeks prior to submitting the portfolio. All SOQ ratings for each course must be inserted in Table 1 from the Appendix. Faculty must provide on that table the percentage of A and B ratings and the percentage of A ratings for each course taught.

   Student comments shall be included. Faculty should address these comments in their narrative.

9. **Other:** Any of the following optional indicators may be discussed in the Narrative Summary, documentation is encouraged.

   A. Peer review of teaching following classroom visitations, lectures, or seminars.
   B. Sample assignments, projects, exams, etc.
   C. Documentation and evaluation of teaching activities in colleagues' classes.
   D. Development of instructional technology strategies to enhance student learning.
   E. Development and evaluation of alternative strategies for assessing student learning.
   F. Publications about scholarly work or teaching.
   G. Evidence of additional training in teaching or collaborative teaching activities, such as completion of teaching modules and trainings given through the CSUF Faculty Development Center.
   H. Video or audio recordings of lessons taught.
   I. Independent study projects produced by students supervised by the faculty member.
   J. Evidence of professional certifications, professional licensure, and advanced clinical training in the field.
   K. Evidence of developing activities that lead to student involvement in community activities that advocate for social justice and equity.
   L. Providing trainings or workshops to develop student skills or knowledge.

   Faculty members are encouraged to solicit other reviews of teaching performance to be included in the Portfolio at the time of submission. For example, classroom observations by Department colleagues may provide additional information regarding teaching effectiveness and interaction with students. Classroom observations by departmental colleagues require a written report and will be conducted in accordance with UPS 210.080 and Article 15.14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Written reports of such visits shall address clarity of presentation, communication with students, student interaction, effective use of classroom time, and appropriateness of presentation methods. Assessments by external evaluators such as faculty from other departments or other universities may also be included.

C. Guidelines for Rating Teaching Performance

A composite rating of teaching effectiveness is arrived at based on six factors. The mandatory and optional indicators described above shall be the source for this evaluation. When SOQ ratings are used as evidence, the following scale shall be used to evaluate faculty: Very high- 85% As and Bs, 50% As; High- 74-84.99% As and Bs; Low below 74% As and Bs.

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

Satisfactory- Faculty member meets required office hours on a regular basis, gives final exams on assigned days and syllabi are HHD 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 HHD 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 HHD 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 inquiry, 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 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.

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.

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.

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.

4. **Effective use of a variety 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, Very High SOQ ratings about these factors, syllabi and the Narrative Summary address these issues clearly.

   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, syllabi and Narrative Summary address these issues.

   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, syllabi and Narrative Summary fail to address these issues

   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. 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, grade distributions, and other course materials. Grade distributions range between 2.8-3.45.

   Satisfactory- Faculty demonstrates appropriate academic rigor as evident by grade distributions, student comments, and Narrative Summary discussion of remedial efforts when prior evaluations rated grading needed to be more rigorous. Overall grade distributions range between 2.9-3.5.

Needs Improvement- Faculty fails to demonstrate appropriate academic rigor as evidenced by grade distributions and student comments. The Narrative Summary fails to thoroughly address remedial efforts. Overall grade distributions range between 3.51-3.84.

Unsatisfactory- Faculty fails to demonstrate academic rigor as evidenced by grade distributions and student comments. The Narrative Summary fails to address remedial efforts and overall grade distributions range between 3.85-3.95.

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 disciplinesuch as maintaining clinical licensure, acquiring certifications, participating in continuing education, and other trainings related to teaching and/or the field of teaching. 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.

D. **Composite Rating of Teaching Performance**

   In evaluating a faculty member's teaching performance, the various levels of review are to assess the entire period of review but place greater emphasis on the three most recent years of a faculty member's teaching when reviewing six years for consideration of a three-year contract. This view is to allow the evaluators to evaluate a faculty member's development as a teacher and trace progress over time.

   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 is rated Exceeds Expectations in at least three areas of evaluation And the remaining areas be at least Satisfactory.

   Satisfactory: Faculty is rated at least Satisfactory in at least four areas of evaluation

   Needs Improvement: Faculty is rated Exceeds Expectations or Satisfactory in three or fewer areas of evaluation.

   Unsatisfactory: Faculty is rated Exceeds Expectations or Satisfactory in two or fewer areas of evaluation.

V. Lecturers assigned other duties

Some lecturers are assigned other duties, such as advisement, outreach, scholarly projects, grants, or special projects. When this is the case, these faculty shall describe their performance of said duties in their narrative and provide documentation when appropriate. Evaluators shall address the performance of these duties in their evaluation when appropriate.

When faculty assigned other duties also teach, they will be evaluated as described above on their teaching.

APPENDIX

Table 1   Teaching load, SOQ ratings, and Grade Distribution

Course Number and Name	Semester taught	SOQ ratings (As and Bs combined and As alone)	Grade Distribution for the class

Table 2. CSUF Department of Human Services (HUSR) Lecturer Evaluation Form

Name: _____   Date of Review: _____

Evaluation Type:	Work Assignment	Sources of evidence:	
☐ Annual	☐ Teaching	☐ Curriculum Vitae	☐ List of Teaching / other Workload Assignments
☐ Six-Year Comprehensive			
☐ Three-Year Periodic	☐ Service	☐ Narrative Summary	☐ Previous Reviews
☐ Range Elevation	☐ Scholarly Activity	☐ Course Syllabi	☐ Summary Reports of SOQs
		☐ Currency in Field	☐ SOQs
		☐ Grade Distributions	☐ Other

	Exceeds Expectations	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable
EVALUATION OF TEACHING 1. Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements. Example: maintains office hours, gives final exam on assigned day, syllabi are HHD compliant Source of evidence: Syllabi, SOQ comments		☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning. Example: Provides a means for students to contribute to the course learning by encouraging inquiry, provides a coherent structure for course meetings which is understood by the students Source of evidence: Syllabi, SOQs, comments from observations, Narrative Summary, examples of student work/projects/assignments	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes. Example: 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 Source of evidence: Syllabi, SOQs, examples of student work/projects/assignments, Narrative Summary	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Effective use of a variety of instructional methods. Example: Instructional methods are appropriate to course goals, technology appropriate to the field, such as clickers, or blogs, is used to enhance student participation Source of evidence: Syllabi, Narrative Summary, SOQs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study. Example: Academic rigor appropriate to the course, effectiveness, fairness, and timeliness of testing, other assessments, and grading procedures are evident Source of Evidence: Syllabi, narrative Summary, Grade Distributions, Student Writing and Projects	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. Pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching. Example: Course content emphasizes students' acquisition of knowledge and skills that are currently valued in the discipline, pedagogical methods are current in relation to the discipline and subject matter, continuing professional engagement in the discipline and/or professional development as relevant to teaching assignment Source of Evidence: Syllabi, Examples of Student Work/Projects/Assignments, Narrative Summary, SOQs, Classroom observations, FDC Workshops, CV	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. **Evaluation criteria for other Assigned duties** Example: Effectiveness of advisement as indicated by student progress towards degree, completed paperwork, advisement materials developed by the lecturer under review, student evaluations, awards Example: Effective course coordination and assessment as indicated by written report of the Chair or other person with knowledge of this performance Example: Effective committee service as indicated by written report of committee Chair or materials or policies created by the committee Example: Original scholarly and creative activity as evidenced by publications or presentations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Overall Rating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐