



FACULTY AFFAIRS AND RECORDS

Official Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty for the Department of Sociology

Approved by Dr. Carolyn Thomas, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, on 2/23/2022 for implementation in the Fall 2022 semester

[Verified and posted online at www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/soci2022lecturer.pdf](http://www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/soci2022lecturer.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.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Department Policy on the Evaluation of Lecturers

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Department Statement

Sociology, inherently multidisciplinary, engages multiple methodologies and diverse theories to describe and explain social facts, and to promote social justice and action. The Sociology Department endeavors to articulate teaching, scholarship, and service in ways that benefit students and enhance the discipline.

B. Preamble

The Sociology Department shall evaluate its lecturers according to UPS 210.070 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement Section 15.3, while drawing from the ethos of Diversity, Inclusion, Equity, and Social Justice (UPS 100.007) when evaluating lecturers and their teaching. The Department Peer Review Committee, composed of tenured faculty, appointed by the Department Chair and affirmed by the full-time faculty, carries out the evaluations of lecturers using these standards and as allowed by UPS 210.070. Pursuant to UPS 210.070 Section VI, the Sociology Department further elaborates its evaluation criteria herein. These standards define both qualitative and quantitative criteria by which lecturers shall be assessed. This department policy shall be provided to each lecturer within fourteen days of their initial appointment and again when changes to policy occur.

II. WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE (WPAF)

As noted in UPS 210.070, the lecturer under review is responsible for submitting evidence of satisfactory performance of assigned duties in the form of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). In the event that Faculty Affairs and Records notifies a lecturer of an upcoming evaluation and the lecturer fails to submit their WPAF by the established deadline, subsequent appointments shall not normally be issued. The WPAF shall include documentation of the lecturer's work assignment during the period under review. Annually, the Faculty Affairs and Records office issues a review calendar that indicates the file due dates. The format and contents of the WPAF are outlined below.

- Working Personnel Action File Table of Contents
- Approved Department Standards for Lecturers

- Curriculum Vitae covering the entire academic and professional employment history
- Summary of Assigned Duties and List of Teaching Assignments that lists assignments for each semester, including the number of students per class
- Narrative Summary (not to exceed 1,500 words) that provides a self-assessment of the ongoing activities of teaching they have engaged in since the hiring date or the last evaluation. Lecturers can discuss the merits of their pedagogy as well as how their experience and standpoint encourages their strong teaching of students. In the narrative summary, the lecturer shall report the total weighted average of % in columns A and B responses in SOQs across all classes taught during the review period. The lecturer may summarize or highlight significant accomplishments, comment on SOQ student evaluations, communicate teaching philosophies, and/or discuss adjustments made based on student feedback or new developments in the discipline. Lecturers are encouraged to comment on their progress of addressing equity gaps in their courses over time. Lecturers may explain formal or informal mentoring of students or other work related to Diversity, Inclusion, Equity, and Social Justice as specified in UPS 100.007.

The narrative summary may be supplemented by 500 words for any of the reasons outlined in UPS 210.070 Section VI. A. 6. a, b, c; each supplemental area shall increase the word limit by 500 words.

- Summary Reports of Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs) including the faculty member's overall semester summaries
- Completed Student Opinion Questionnaires from all Courses
- Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions
- Additional Evidence of Teaching Performance (e.g., those outlined in UPS 210.070)
- All course syllabi, a representative sample of examinations, assignments, and supporting class materials, such as handouts, lists of films and/or guest speakers, etc.
- All classroom observation reports
- Evidence of teaching currency in field

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Sociology Department regards student learning as the most important faculty endeavor. Faculty shall create teaching conditions where students can learn essential sociological knowledge and skills. The Department also expects faculty to regularly assess their pedagogy and teaching strategies to improve student learning.

Teaching performance is evaluated based on mandatory criteria specified in UPS 210.070 and additional indicators listed in this document. Lecturers exclusively assigned to teaching shall be evaluated solely on the basis of educational performance, which includes teaching performance, as well as pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.

For lecturers who receive units for non-teaching duties (e.g., a lecturer appointed for 12 weighted teaching units (WTU) but teaching only 9 WTU or less), evidence submitted shall include an indication of the performance in other areas of assigned duties during the review period, such as non-instructional duties, scholarly/professional activity, and/or service to the department. Where duties include assignments, such as advising, assessment activities, lab or course coordination, and the like, materials submitted shall include evidence of their performance of those duties. See UPS 210.070 V.B.1-4 (page 8) for examples of evidence that may be included to demonstrate effectiveness of other assigned duties.

Classroom observations shall be conducted according to UPS 210.080 by Department tenured and tenure-track faculty. For hybrid and asynchronous courses, observation includes access to the Learning Management System site. New hire lecturers will have classroom observations during the first semester, or at least once during the first year of a lecturer's first 1AY contract. Lecturers who received a "needs improvement" evaluation in their last review, and all lecturers at least once every three years will also have classroom observations. Reports of such observations should address clarity of presentation, communication with students, student interaction, effective use of classroom time, appropriateness of presentation methods, rigor, and alignment of class with syllabus instruction schedule.

Evaluation of teaching performance shall be based on the contents included in the WPAF and other relevant evidence (Section V and VI of UPS 210.070). In examining these materials, the Department Peer Review Committee and the Department Chair will look for evidence in the course content that is current, academically rigorous, and aligned with student learning outcomes.

The Sociology Department adopts the six evaluation criteria in Section V. of UPS 210.070 as well as Student Opinion Questionnaire data using the following rankings.

1. Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in current faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements. Evidence may come from Student Opinion Questionnaire comments data and other materials provided in the WPAF.
 - A. Exceeds Expectations: Complies with no need for any corrective action
 - B. Satisfactory: Complies with need for only minor corrections
 - C. Needs Improvement: Fails to comply in some instances (e.g. tardy to class; frequent cancellation of class, office hours, and/or other professional requirements)
 - D. Unsatisfactory: Largely fails to comply
2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning. Evidence may come from Student Opinion Questionnaire data, classroom visits, and other materials in the WPAF.
 - A. Exceeds Expectations: Course materials are well organized, pedagogy engages students in active learning, well planned lessons with excellent use of class time, including, but not limited to, strong evidence of inclusive learning environment (UPS 100.007).

- B. Satisfactory: Course materials are organized, uses some active learning, lesson plans make good use of class time, some evidence of inclusive learning environment (per UPS 100.007).
 - C. Needs Improvement: Course materials lack clarity, little engagement with students or lesson plans that do not use class time effectively, limited to no evidence of inclusive learning environment.
 - D. Unsatisfactory: Course materials are missing or unorganized, fails to focus students on key points, unsatisfactory learning environment.
3. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.
- A. Exceeds Expectations: Learning objectives clearly linked to assignments and assessments and effectively implemented
 - B. Satisfactory: Learning objectives generally linked to assignments and assessments and implemented
 - C. Needs Improvement: Learning objectives not apparent in the assignments and assessment and somewhat implemented
 - D. Unsatisfactory: Learning objectives not stated, not implemented.
4. Effective use of instructional methods.
- A. Exceeds Expectations: Effectively uses a great variety of instructional methods (lecture, group work, film, presentations, discussion) appropriate to the course level, current discipline standards, and student learning outcomes.
 - B. Satisfactory: Effectively uses some variety of instructional methods appropriate to the course level, current discipline standards, and student learning outcomes
 - C. Needs Improvement: Relies on one or two methods only, may not be appropriate to the course level, current discipline standards, or student learning outcomes
 - D. Unsatisfactory: Lectures ineffectively and does not routinely or effectively use other methods of instruction or not appropriate to the course level, current discipline standards, or student learning outcomes.
5. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.
- A. Exceeds Expectations: Grading practices are clearly stated and fair; assignments are well-designed, creative, and rigorous; grade distributions are appropriate for the course level and consistent with department patterns.
 - B. Satisfactory: Grading practices are clear and fair; assignments are appropriate; grade distributions are appropriate for the course level and consistent with department patterns, or reasonably explained.
 - C. Needs Improvement: Grading practices are overly complex, unclear, or confusing; assignments do not require rigorous application of course material; grade distributions may not be appropriate for the course level or are somewhat inconsistent with department patterns.

- D. Unsatisfactory: Grading practices are unfair, unclear or logically flawed; assignments do not apply course material; grade distributions are not appropriate for the course level or inconsistent with department patterns with no reasonable explanation.
6. Pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency, as related to teaching.
- A. Exceeds Expectations: Offers strong evidence of pedagogical or disciplinary currency, such as use of current texts, films, or case studies, including equitable and inclusive pedagogy (see UPS 100.007).
 - B. Satisfactory: Uses course material, e.g., assigned readings, and assessment practices that reflect current trends in the discipline, and equitable and inclusive pedagogy.
 - C. Needs Improvement: Little evidence of disciplinary currency in teaching or equitable and inclusive pedagogy
 - D. Unsatisfactory: No evidence of currency in the discipline in teaching; inequitable and exclusionary pedagogy
7. In addition, the Sociology Department review considers students' experience of instruction using the following two indicators:
- Qualitative data from SOQs shall be considered as part of the review, specifically student written comments that highlight strengths and weaknesses. As stated in UPS 210.070, "Overall, patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments" pg. 7.
 - SOQ quantitative data are only one criterion of the teaching evaluation, and shall be used in conjunction with other indicators of teaching performance, according to the following scale. Weighted scores are used to reflect the overall pattern of students' ratings.
- A. Exceeds Expectations: Predominantly positive comments and at least 85% or more A and B ratings.
 - B. Satisfactory: Majority positive comments and at least 74% A and B ratings.
 - C. Needs Improvement: A pattern of negative comments or between 65% or more A and B ratings.
 - D. Unsatisfactory: A pattern of negative comments or below 65% A and B ratings.

Note: To calculate weighted average, first calculate for each class a "class rating" = $(\% A + B) \times (\text{number of forms for the course} / \text{number of forms total over all courses})$. The sum of all "class ratings" equals the weighted average.

IV. EVALUATION OUTCOMES

Lecturers are evaluated by the Department Peer Review Committee and the Chair, and as required by the appropriate administrator. Evaluations are conducted according to timelines set forth by Faculty Affairs and Records and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Evaluations of lecturers will result in an overall rating of:

Exceeds expectations: Describes performance in assigned duties that is better than satisfactory

Satisfactory: Describes performance that meets expectations

Needs Improvement: Describes performance that does not meet expectations

Unsatisfactory: Describes performance that is seriously deficient

OVERALL RATINGS OF TEACHING

For an overall rating of **Exceeds Expectations**, the lecturer shall meet the following:

Exceeds Expectations in:

Criteria #2: Establishes environment conducive to learning (as evidenced in qualitative SOQ's—7a, Canvas course, class observation, syllabus, etc.)

Criteria #4: Effective use of instructional methods

Criteria #6: Pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency, as related to teaching,
And Satisfactory or above in all remaining criteria (1, 3, 5, and 7).

For an overall rating of **Satisfactory**, the lecturer shall meet the following:

Satisfactory or above in:

Criteria #2: Establishes environment conducive to learning (as evidenced in qualitative SOQ's—7a, Canvas course, class observation, syllabus, etc.),

Criteria #4: Effective use of instructional methods.

Criteria #6: Pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency, as related to teaching,
And Satisfactory or above in two other criterion (1, 3, 5, or 7).

The Lecturer shall receive an overall rating of **Needs Improvement** when:

Ranked as Needs Improvement in:

Criteria #2: Establishes environment conducive to learning (as evidenced in qualitative SOQ's—7a, Canvas course, class observation, syllabus, etc.)
or Criteria #4: Effective use of instructional methods

Or ranked Needs Improvement in three or more criteria.

Or ranked Unsatisfactory in any one criterion.

The Lecturer shall receive an overall rating of **Unsatisfactory** when:

Ranked as Unsatisfactory in two or more criteria.

Reappointment decisions related to these evaluation scores will follow the guidelines set forth by UPS 210.070 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

V. FREQUENCY OF EVALUATIONS

Lecturers may be appointed to one-semester, one-year, or multi-year appointments. For those faculty members in appointments of one semester only, evaluation of the first semester is at the discretion of the College Dean in consultation with the Department Chair. After two one-semester appointments (whether consecutive or not), a faculty member must undergo evaluation. All lecturers in one-year appointments shall undergo evaluation annually. Faculty members in three-year appointments shall undergo evaluation during the third year of the appointment unless the appointment stipulates annual review (UPS 210.070, Section III.).