

# Cal State Fullerton


Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

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

May 11, 2023

To: James Hussar, Ph.D.  
Chair, Department of Art

Arnold Holland, Ed.D.  
Dean of the College of the Arts

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

Subject: **Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty for the Department of Art**

The proposed Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty from the Department of Art have been reviewed. The document is in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement and UPS 210.070. In accordance with the recommendations of the Department, the College Personnel Standards Review Committee, and the Dean, I approve these standards for implementation commencing with the 2023-2024 Academic Year.

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

AD:mc

cc: Dr. Kristin Stang, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Support  
Lisa D. Long, College Personnel Standards Review Committee  
Joseph Biel, Chair of the Department Personnel Committee  
Faculty Affairs and Records

# Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty

California State University, Fullerton

Department of Art

Approved March 8, 2023

## I. Preamble

These Department of Art Standards for Lecturer Faculty set forth expectations and procedures for personnel evaluations for Department of Art lecturer faculty as well as for evaluators at all levels. Personnel evaluations inform decisions on reappointment and range elevation.

## II. Department of Art Standards and UPS 210.070

The Department of Art shall evaluate its lecturers according to UPS 210.070. Pursuant to UPS 210.070, the Department of Art further elaborates its evaluation criteria herein. These standards define both qualitative and quantitative criteria by which lecturers shall be assessed. This standards document shall be provided to each lecturer within fourteen days of their initial appointment and again when changes to the document occur.

## III. Levels of Evaluation

A. The Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) is an elected committee comprised of tenured faculty members. In the Department of Art, this committee includes the members of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) and the area lead of the concentration in which the lecturer faculty teaches.

B. Annual Periodic Reviews. Lecturers are evaluated by the DPRC and the Department Chair while full-time lecturers are additionally evaluated by the Dean. Part-time lecturers may be evaluated by the Dean at the Dean's discretion. Evaluations of part-time lecturers assigned a "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" rating shall be forwarded to the Dean.

C. Six-Year Comprehensive Reviews and Three-Year Periodic Reviews. All lecturers undergoing six-year comprehensive reviews or three-year periodic reviews shall be evaluated by the DPRC, the Department Chair, and the Dean.

D. Range Elevations. Lecturers under consideration for range elevations shall be evaluated by the DPRC, the Department Chair, and the Dean. The appropriate Vice President shall make the final determination on range elevation.

## IV. 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
- Department of Art Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty
- Curriculum Vitae covering the entire academic and professional employment history
- Summary of Assigned Duties, including a list of teaching assignments for each semester during the period under review, including the number of students per class
- Narrative Summary (not to exceed 1,500 words) that provides a self-assessment of accomplishments in all aspects of assigned duties during the period under review. The lecturer may summarize or highlight significant achievements, 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 toward addressing any equity gaps in their courses over time. In the narrative summary, the lecturer shall report frequency distributions (% of "A" + "B" responses) in SOQs across all classes taught during the period under review.
- The Narrative Summary may be supplemented for any of the reasons outlined in UPS 210.070 Section VI.A.6.a-c. Each supplemental area shall increase the word limit by up to 500 words.
- Statistical Summary Reports of Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs) for each course during the period under review
- Student Opinion Questionnaire Comment Reports for each course during the period under review
- Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions
- Additional Evidence of Teaching Performance
- Evidence of Currency in the Field
- If appropriate to the work assignment, supporting materials that evidence professional, university, and community service and/or scholarship or creative activity

#### V. Evidence of Teaching Performance

Evaluators shall consider the following kinds of evidence as indicators of the quality of the faculty member's teaching performance.

A. Primary Indicators of Teaching Performance

1. Narrative Summary
2. Clear and well-organized course syllabi
3. Sample teaching materials. Materials may include but are not limited to:
  - a. Class handouts or exercises
  - b. Project and assignment details
  - c. Quizzes and tests
  - d. Rubrics
  - e. LMS pages
  - f. Slide presentations
  - g. Recorded lectures and demos
4. SOQ statistical summaries
5. SOQ written comments
6. Grade distribution statistical summaries
7. Evidence of currency in the visual arts in the faculty member's area of expertise.
8. Anonymous examples of student artwork (from studio courses) or research/essay papers (from lecture courses)

B. Supporting Indicators of Teaching Performance that may be presented:

1. Evidence of professional recognition of students and/or former students: grants, honors, awards, or commissions
2. Course development and innovation
3. Research or creative activities related to teaching the discipline
4. Optional peer observations of teaching performance by tenured or tenure track colleagues in the Department of Art. The evaluations may include classroom visitations that assess pedagogical approach and methods, student response to instruction, and course requirements. The choice of the evaluator(s) and the nature, frequency and procedures of the visitation(s) shall be the responsibility of the faculty member, in consultation with the Department Chair. Peer observations must be conducted in a way consistent with UPS 210.080.
5. Unsolicited written comments from students
6. Other evidence relevant to teaching assignments

VI. Evidence of Currency in the Field

Evaluators shall consider the following kinds of evidence as indicators of pedagogical and disciplinary currency as related to teaching assignments:

- A. Syllabi
- B. CV
- C. Narrative Summary
- D. SOQ statistical summaries

- E. SOQ written comments
- F. Teaching materials (LMS pages, slide presentations, recorded lectures, class handouts or exercises, etc.)
- G. Anonymous examples of student work with instructor feedback
- H. Professional Development (for example, FDC workshops or other training)
- I. Comments from optional peer observations
- J. Scholarly or creative activity if applicable

## VII. Evaluation of Evidence of Performance

A. Evaluators shall assign an overall rating of “Exceeds Expectations,” “Satisfactory,” “Needs Improvement,” or “Unsatisfactory.”

B. Reappointment and range elevation decisions related to these ratings will follow the guidelines set forth by UPS 210.070 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

C. The DPRC shall determine the rating it assigns by majority vote of its members. However, the evaluation report shall incorporate a discussion of all points of view held by members of the DPRC.

D. Evaluators shall base their ratings of the contents of the WPAF on the following criteria:

1. Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements.
2. Establishment of an equitable environment conducive to learning for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population
3. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes
4. Fair and transparent grading system
5. Effective use of a variety of instructional methods
  - a. Pedagogical methods consider student needs
  - b. Use of technology is accessible and appropriate to the learning experience
  - c. May include service-learning opportunities, community-engaged learning opportunities, or other high-impact practices
  - d. May include a variety of learning modalities
6. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study
7. Pedagogical and disciplinary currency as related to teaching assignments

E. Interpretation of SOQs

1. While use of standardized SOQs is required as part of the evaluation process, any data gathered from SOQs shall be considered within a broader constellation of indicators included in the WPAF.

### 2. SOQ Quantitative Data

Evaluations of SOQ quantitative data shall be based on frequency distributions for the period under review. Frequency distributions and corresponding ratings are subject to interpretation. Generally, SOQ quantitative data shall correspond to ratings according to the following scale:

Rating	Frequency distributions during period under review
Exceeds Expectations	90% or higher A + B responses
Satisfactory	70% or higher A + B responses
Needs Improvement	60-69% A + B + C responses
Unsatisfactory	0-59% A + B + C responses

### 3. SOQ Qualitative Data

Evaluators shall review SOQ student comments. Generally, SOQ qualitative data shall correspond to ratings as follows:

Rating	Description
Exceeds Expectations	The predominant tone of student comments is positive
Satisfactory	The tone of student comments is mostly positive with occasional negative comments
Needs Improvement	Combination of positive comments and patterns of negative comments
Unsatisfactory	The predominant tone of student comments is negative

### F. Grade Distributions

Evaluators shall comment on whether or not the grade distributions appear to be appropriate depending upon the level and types of courses that have been taught. However, grade distributions shall not be used to determine academic rigor. Academic rigor shall be assessed based on the supporting documents and materials included in the WPAF (assignments, examples of student work, rubrics, etc.).

### VIII. Assignment of Overall Ratings

Evaluators shall assign overall ratings as follows:

Rating	Description
Exceeds Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rated “Exceeds Expectations” in Criterion 2: Establishment of an equitable environment conducive to learning for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population</li> <li>• Rated “Exceeds Expectations” in Criterion 5: Effective use of a variety of instructional methods</li> <li>• Rated “Exceeds Expectations” in at least one remaining criterion (1, 3, 4, 6, 7) in Section VI.D, above</li> <li>• Rated at least “Satisfactory” in all remaining criteria (1, 3, 4, 6, 7) in Section VI.D, above</li> </ul>
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rated at least “Satisfactory” in Criterion 2: Establishment of an equitable environment conducive to learning for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population</li> <li>• Rated at least “Satisfactory” in Criterion 5: Effective use of a variety of instructional methods</li> <li>• Rated at least “Satisfactory” in two or more remaining criteria (1, 3, 4, 6, 7) in Section VI.D, above</li> <li>• No more than one “Unsatisfactory” rating in any remaining criterion in Section VI.D, above</li> </ul>
Needs Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rated at least “Needs Improvement” in Criterion 2: Establishment of an equitable environment conducive to learning for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population</li> <li>• Rated at least “Needs Improvement” in Criterion 5: Effective use of a variety of instructional methods</li> <li>• Or rated “Needs Improvement” in any three remaining criteria (1, 3, 4, 6, 7) in Section VI.D, above</li> <li>• Or rated “Unsatisfactory” in any two remaining criteria (1, 3, 4, 6, 7) in Section VI.D, above</li> </ul>

Rating	Description
Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="824 241 1416 422">• Rated “Unsatisfactory” in Criterion 2: Establishment of an equitable environment conducive to learning for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population</li><li data-bbox="824 430 1416 499">• Rated “Unsatisfactory” in Criterion 5: Effective use of a variety of instructional methods</li><li data-bbox="824 508 1416 611">• Or rated “Unsatisfactory” in any three remaining criteria (1, 3, 4, 6, 7) in Section VI.D, above</li></ul>



# Department of Art Evaluation Guide for Lecturer Reviews

## Type of Review

- Annual Periodic
- Six-Year Comprehensive
- Three-Year Periodic
- Range Elevation

## Period of Review:

Semester/Year-Semester/Year

## Department Peer Review Committee Rating

- Exceeds Expectations
- Satisfactory
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

## Please include the following content in your written evaluation:

- Details for each section below.
- Specific examples of how lecturers are meeting the standards.
- Specific examples corresponding to the rating assigned.
- Potential or necessary areas of improvement.
- Specific suggestions that are concrete and measurable.

## Basis for Evaluation and Potential Sources of Evidence

1. Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements
  - a. Syllabi
  - b. SOQs: Frequency distributions (% of "A" and "B" responses) and patterns of student comments
2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning
  - a. Syllabi
  - b. SOQs: Frequency distributions (% of "A" and "B" responses) and patterns of student comments
  - c. Comments from optional peer observations
  - d. Narrative Summary

- e. Explanations of projects and assignments
  - f. Anonymous examples of student work with instructor feedback
  - g. Teaching materials (LMS pages, slide presentations, recorded lectures, class handouts or exercises, etc.)
  - h. Unsolicited comments from students
  - i. Rubrics
3. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes
    - a. Syllabi
    - b. SOQs: Frequency distributions (% of “A” and “B” responses) and patterns of student comments
    - c. Comments from optional peer observations
    - d. Narrative Summary
    - e. Examples of projects and assignments
    - f. Anonymous examples of student work with instructor feedback
    - g. Rubrics
  4. Effective use of instructional methods
    - a. Syllabi
    - b. SOQs Frequency distributions (% of “A” and “B” responses) and patterns of student comments
    - c. Comments from optional peer observations
    - d. Narrative Summary
    - e. Anonymous examples of student work with instructor feedback
    - f. Teaching materials (LMS pages, slide presentations, recorded lectures, class handouts or exercises, etc.)
    - g. Unsolicited comments from students
  5. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study
    - a. Syllabi
    - b. Narrative Summary
    - c. Grade Distributions
    - d. Examples of projects and assignments
    - e. Examples of quizzes or tests
    - f. Rubrics
  6. Pedagogical and disciplinary currency as related to teaching assignments
    - a. Syllabi
    - b. CV
    - c. Narrative Summary
    - d. SOQs: Frequency distributions (% of “A” and “B” responses) and patterns of student comments
    - e. Comments from optional peer observations
    - f. Anonymous examples of student work with instructor feedback
    - g. Teaching materials (LMS pages, slide presentations, recorded lectures, class handouts or exercises, etc.)
    - h. Professional Development (for example, FDC workshops or other training)
    - i. Scholarly or creative activity if applicable