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# Template for Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty

Date: September 2025

## Why department standards:

1. For specifying department-specific expectations
2. Shape behavior and level of performance that will benefit the university and students
3. Functional for disputes with evaluations
4. For DPRC evaluators
5. For lecturers to understand their evaluations

## Why this document:

1. To provide a template for your department to use when creating department standards.
2. To provide language and charts you may copy and use.

Note: This is a living document serving as a template for crafting/authoring/drafting DSLF. FAR welcomes feedback for continuous improvement. Document authors were:

* Christina Barbieri, 2025-2026 FAR Faculty Fellow, cbarbieri@fullerton.edu
* Mark Carrier, FAR Executive Director, mcarrier@fullerton.edu
* Alison Marzocchi, 2025-2026 FAR Faculty Fellow, amarzocchi@fullerton.edu

## List of terms:

For consistency across documents, we request the use of the following terms:

* **FAR** - acronym for **F**aculty **A**ffairs and **R**ecords
* **UPS** - acronym for **U**niversity **P**olicy **S**tatement
* **DSLF** - acronym for **D**epartment **S**tandards for **L**ecturer **F**aculty
* **Lecturer** - throughout the document, use the term **lecturer** without any modifiers to align with UPS 210.070 (in other words, terms such as part-time lecturer, FTL, or temporary faculty should not be used).
* **Expectations** - **expectations** broadly refer to the body of standards for evaluating faculty
* **Overall ratings** - UPS 210.070 specifies three **overall ratings**: satisfactory, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory
* **Evaluation Criteria** - **evaluation criteria** are the larger buckets for evaluation, specified in section 5 in the UPS, including “Establishment of a conducive learning environment for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population,” “Creation of a course linking methods of assessment to student learning outcomes,” etc.
* **Examples** - **examples** demonstrate that evaluation criteria are met (note a minimum of two examples are required for each evaluation criterion); examples are supported by evidence
* **Evidence** - **evidence** is used to support examples that a particular evaluation criterion is met; evidence includes documentation like syllabi, classroom observation reports, narrative summary, examples of student work, etc.

## Potential items

### 1. Table of contents OPTIONAL

Departments may choose to include a table of contents for readability.

### 2. Department preamble/intro

Throughout the department standards, references to UPS 210.070 eliminate the need to copy language from the document. Department standards enhance and explain the process detailed in UPS 210.070.

For example: For timelines and explanations of when evaluations occur as well as documents required for each review, standards should refer faculty to UPS 210.070 and the [FAR website](https://www.fullerton.edu/far/).

Note that the DSLF must mirror DPS teaching standards for tenured/tenure-track faculty and cannot be set higher. Department standards must be in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Note that a function of the DSLF is to set expectations for the evaluation of lecturer faculty. It is *not* recommended to tie these expectations to specific personnel decisions. Departments that are addressing issues related to accreditation and lecturer standards should consult with FAR.

Departments may choose to include a statement of purpose or description of their department. Consider the following statements from UPS 210.070:

* “CSUF strives for inclusive, equitable, and anti-racist teaching and learning environments where student learning is central. In this anti-racist, non-discriminatory, equitable, and inclusive environment, expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in the organization, content, review of their materials, and students are provided opportunities to develop the learning abilities, competencies, and skills to contribute to society.”
* “A successful lecturer demonstrates mastery and currency in the discipline, teaches effectively, and enables students to learn.”
* “The evaluation shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the lecturer, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.).”
* “The evaluation also shall take into account any efforts to improve teaching performance.”
* “The evaluation should also take into account evidence of cultural taxation.”

Consider the following statements from UPS 100.007 Diversity, Inclusion, Equity, and Social Justice at CSUF:

* “CSUF is committed to having an inclusive, equitable, and socially just campus culture.”
* “We aim to eradicate inequity from our practices, policies, and procedures so that social identity is no longer a predictor of success for members of our campus community.”
* “The curriculum and pedagogy shall support the success of our diverse community of learners through the creation of environments, inside and outside of the classroom, that foster equal access to learning while incorporating the values of diversity, inclusion, equity, and social justice.”
* “In our classrooms, we shall be aware of and responsive to the histories and lived experiences of marginalized and socially disempowered groups whose legitimacy has been and is still challenged in academia and society.”
* “Faculty will teach from an asset perspective, rather than deficit perspective, highlighting the attributes students bring with them from their communities.”
* “In our classrooms, we shall be aware of privilege, or lack thereof. We shall adopt pedagogies which treat students equitably and aid in the dismantling of systems that create social privilege.”

### 3. Overall ratings

Note UPS 210.070 specifies only three overall ratings: Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory. DSLF that previously specified additional ratings (e.g., Above Satisfactory, Exceeds Expectations) must be revised to have only the three overall ratings of Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory. Evaluation guidelines for previous ratings must be included within the three specified overall ratings (in other words, previous evaluation guidelines for a rating such as Exceeds Expectations must now be captured within Satisfactory).

* Satisfactory – This rating includes both “exceeds expectations” and “satisfactory.”
* Policy on “Needs Improvement” evaluation – explain your departmental procedure for this rating.
  + What is your plan to reevaluate and address issues brought forward?
* Policy on “Unsatisfactory” evaluation – explain your departmental procedure for this rating.

### 4. List of evaluation criteria (VA.2 Criteria for assessing teaching performance) as outlined by UPS 210.070 (comprehensive reviews)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Establishment of a conducive learning environment for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population. |
| 2 | Creation of a course linking methods of assessment to student learning outcomes. |
| 3 | Effective use of a variety of instructional methods and learning modalities. |
| 4 | Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the discipline of study. |
| 5 | Building and enhancing currency in the relevant discipline(s) and pedagogical developments as related to teaching. |
| 6 | Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements. |

### 5. List of additional evaluation criteria as decided by department OPTIONAL

Optionally, departments can specify additional department-specific evaluation criteria. Keep in mind that lecturers exclusively assigned to teaching shall be evaluated solely on the basis of educational performance, which includes teaching performance and disciplinary and pedagogical currency.

Example: Liberal Studies faculty may be required to demonstrate an interdisciplinary approach to course design

(Note that departments have historically added additional criteria that could have been captured within the UPS criteria above. Before adding additional criteria, please verify that the additions are not already captured in a criterion above.)

### 6. Individual charts explaining the evaluation of each criterion

Departments should construct charts to communicate examples and evidence for each evaluation criteria.

UPS 210.070 specifies that each criteria requires two examples: “Each criteria will be considered completely addressed by the inclusion of two examples from each of criteria 1-6.”

* Consult the examples in the tables found in UPS 210.070 and include those relevant for your department.
  + Keep in mind from the UPS: “The examples and sources of evidence provided in the tables below are for illustrative purposes and are not meant to be required or comprehensive.”
* Indicate the sources of evidence for each example
* Explain how the evaluation results map onto to each potential rating (S, NI, US)
* Some illustrative but non-exhaustive example charts are provided below; departments will specify their own evaluation charts with examples, evidence, and ratings.

In this table, your department explains the overall rating by discussing examples and different sources of evidence. This table potentially allows reviewers to set standards on evidence sources.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Establishment of a conducive learning environment for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population.\* (evidence in italics) |
| Satisfactory |
| 1. *Narrative* and *List of Courses Taught* accurately reflect teaching assignments.  2. *Narrative* and *Syllabi* and *sample course materials* indicate…  3. *SOQ* qualitative responses point to…  4. *LMS pages* suggest….  5. *Recorded lectures* show…  \*This chart is discussing five examples to better assist departments in writing standards; however, the UPS states “The criteria will be considered completely addressed by the inclusion of two examples from each of criteria 1-6.” |
| Needs Improvement |
|  |
| Unsatisfactory |
|  |

Alternative Table Format, guided by UPS 210.070 V.A.2

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Establishment of a conducive learning environment for a diverse student body and historically marginalized student population. (examples are numbered and evidence is in italics) |
| Satisfactory |
| 1. Provides a means for students to contribute to the course learning by encouraging inquiry, as evidenced by:   * Relevant statements contained in the *syllabus* * Relevant explanations in the *narrative summary* * Relevant examples of *student work/projects/assignments* * Relevant excerpts from *student opinion questionnaires* * Relevant screen captures from *LMS pages*   2. Provides a coherent structure for course meetings which is understood by the students, as evidenced by:   * Course meeting structure provided in the *syllabus* * Relevant excerpts from *student opinion questionnaires* * Relevant screen captures from *LMS pages*   (Etc. for additional examples and sources relevant to your department) |
| Needs Improvement |
|  |
| Unsatisfactory |
|  |

### 7. Policy on SOQs OPTIONAL

Although departments will specify the use of SOQs as evidence in the charts above, departments can additionally choose to elaborate upon the use of SOQs for evaluation. Departments must consider that UPS 210.070 states, “If departmental personnel documents specify SOQ score ranges then they shall also detail how other measures of teaching effectiveness are evaluated, including peer evaluations, quality of teaching materials and assessments, self-reflections, etc.”

Keep in mind the department standards on SOQs for lecturers CANNOT be higher than the department standards for tenured/tenure-track faculty.

Because the weight of the SOQs has significantly diminished with the new UPS policy, here are some additional recommended statements from the UPS to include into department standards:

“While they [SOQs] may reveal valuable trends in student perception, research indicates they are neither valid nor reliable measures of teaching effectiveness.”

“Importantly, any single item on the SOQ – or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information – does not measure teaching effectiveness, but rather gathers student opinions on teaching performance.”

“Overall, patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments.”

From UPS 220.000 Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines for the Administration of Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) Forms: “Studies have shown that student opinions of teaching are often influenced by unconscious and unintentional biases about instructor characteristics such as race, gender, and other characteristics. For instance, women and instructors of color are systematically rated lower in their teaching effectiveness compared to white men, even when there are no actual differences in the instruction or in what students have learned.”

### 8. Policy on Classroom visitation IF APPLICABLE

If classroom visitations are utilized in your department, your policy should reference UPS 210.080, but does not need to copy language from it. For example:

* Classroom observations, if required or done voluntarily, shall be conducted in accordance with UPS 210.080 and scheduled by the Chair (or designee) or DPRC.
* If classroom observations are required by the Department or College Policy, or if the lecturer requests an observation voluntarily, observations shall be conducted in accordance with UPS 210.080 and scheduled by the Chair (or designee) or DPRC.
* Keep in mind the department standards on classroom visitations for lecturers CANNOT be higher than the department standards for tenured/tenure-track faculty.

### 9. Policy on DPRC OPTIONAL

Your department can follow UPS 210.070 to specify the composition of your DPRC. Please note the following, if relevant for your department:

* If your department chooses, it can have separate DPRCs for the three different types of review: Annual Evaluations, Three-Year Evaluations, and Six-Year Evaluations.
* It is an option to use the DPC as the DPRC

### 10. Evaluation Criteria for Non-Teaching Duties RECOMMENDED IF RELEVANT

Your department can specify evaluation criteria for non-teaching duties if relevant to your department. According to UPS 210.070, “When a lecturer is appointed to a position that involves responsibilities other than classroom instruction, evaluations shall be based on performance criteria relevant to assigned duties.” (V4)

Some examples of criteria include:

* Effectiveness of student advisement
* Effective course coordination and assessment
* Effective committee service
* Original scholarly and creative activity
* Continuing professional engagement
* Developing new courses
* Organization of pedagogical workshops
* Supervision of student research and other forms of mentorship
* Developing service learning opportunities, community-engaged learning opportunities, and/or semester abroad courses

### 11. Policy on first semester hire/evaluation OPTIONAL

The department may specify the conditions under which a lecturer with a one-semester appointment in their first semester will be evaluated. UPS 210.070 indicates, “For those lecturers in appointments of one semester only, evaluation of the first semester is at the discretion of the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair, or as specified in department policy.”

### 12. Policy on range elevation OPTIONAL

According to UPS 210.070, departments can elaborate the type of development required for range elevation, “For range elevation consideration, an additional criterion is development as an instructor and, where relevant to the work assignment, as a professional, during the time in a given range.”

For range elevation, UPS 210.070 outlines development activities. Keep in mind: “The activities listed for range elevation consideration are meant to be representative of the kinds of endeavors a lecturer might undertake; it is not expected that all lecturers will engage in all of these activities.”

1. The refinement and improvement of instructional and assessment materials
2. The revision of course content and materials based on assessment activities
3. The creation of new course materials (such as texts, student study guides and the like) aimed at increasing student success
4. The refinement and improvement of teaching and professional practices as appropriate to the work assignment
5. Self-reflection and self-assessment that lead to changes in practice, accompanied by some indication of the efficacy of those changes
6. Collaborative teaching or collaborative research/scholarly/creative activity that has led to new or innovative content or methods
7. Adaptation of new/varied pedagogical strategies to reach diverse student populations; participation in conferences, workshops, seminars and symposia related to teaching and/or the discipline
8. When a lecturer is particularly active in the profession, publication or other dissemination of original contributions to the discipline of the discipline-based pedagogy
9. The refinement and improvement of items specific to temporary counselors and librarians (e.g. processes, pedagogy, clinical standards and practices)