Official Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty for the

Department of
Information Systems and Decision Sciences

Approved by Dr. Carolyn Thomas, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, on 11/16/2021 for implementation in the Spring 2022 semester

Verified and posted online at www.fullerton.edu/far/dsl/isds2022lecturer.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.

DEPARTMENT STANDARDS FOR LECTURER FACULTY

Department of Information Systems & Decision Sciences

1. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this document is to establish guidelines to assist lecturers in preparing their Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) and to facilitate the evaluation of lecturers in the Department of Information Systems and Decision Sciences. These guidelines are prepared in accordance with the requirements of the University Policy Statement "Evaluation of Lecturers," UPS 210.070 and supplements this policy in accordance with the expectations of the ISDS department. Faculty need to be aware that the entire text of UPS 210.070 latest edition is hereby incorporated by reference into this document. All lecturers are required to read the most recent version of UPS 210.070 in conjunction with this document before preparing their WPAF.

2. DEPARTMENT PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (DPRC)

The DPRC is composed of three main members elected by the department. A fourth member is also elected as an alternate. Members of the DPRC shall be tenured faculty and not be on any planned leave during the academic year of service. With the President's approval, Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) participants who are employed in both fall and spring semesters of the same academic year may be eligible to serve in the DPRC. However, no more than two of the committee members can be FERP faculty.

The main functions of the DPRC are carried out by the three main members. The role of the alternate member is to only evaluate when a main committee member is ineligible to serve, for example in instances such as an unexpected leave, or nepotism.

3. TYPES OF EVALUATION & LEVELS OF REVIEW

- **Six Year Comprehensive Evaluation:** Lecturers who are in their sixth consecutive year of service will undergo a comprehensive evaluation in that year to determine eligibility for an initial three-year appointment. This evaluation shall involve a cumulative review of the lecturer's performance for the entire six-year service period. The period of review shall be defined as the time period between the start of the beginning of the six-year service as a lecturer, and the file's due date. Faculty shall be evaluated by the DPRC, the Department Chair, and the Dean.

- **Three Year Periodic Evaluation:** A lecturer holding a three-year appointment will undergo a three-year periodic evaluation in the third year of the appointment. The period of review shall be defined as the time period between the start of the beginning of the three-year appointment and the file's due date. Faculty shall be evaluated by the DPRC, the Department Chair, and the Dean.

- **Annual Periodic Evaluation:** Lecturers not undergoing a six-year or a three-year evaluation as outlined above will undergo an annual periodic evaluation, beginning with their second semester of employment. The period of review shall be defined as the time period between the start of the semester in which the last review file was submitted and the current file's due date.

  Part-time lecturers undergoing annual periodic evaluations shall be evaluated by at least two levels of review: the DPRC and the Department Chair. Part-time lecturers may be reviewed by the Dean at the Dean's discretion. Evaluations resulting in less than "Satisfactory" rating (see four ratings on page 5) by the DPRC or the Department Chair shall be forwarded to the Dean. Full-time lecturers undergoing annual periodic evaluation shall be evaluated by the DPRC, the Department Chair, and the Dean.

- **One Semester or New Hire Evaluation:** For lecturers in appointments with one semester only, evaluation of the first semester is at the discretion of the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair. Newly hired lecturers shall be evaluated during the second one-semester appointment (whether consecutive or not). For a first evaluation, the period of review shall be defined as the time period between the date of the initial appointment and the current file's due date. Faculty shall be evaluated by at least two levels of review: the DPRC and the Department Chair. Evaluations resulting in less than "Satisfactory" rating (see four ratings on page 5) by the DPRC or the Department Chair may be forwarded to the Dean.

- **Range Elevation Evaluation:** Faculty who are eligible and apply for range elevation undergo an evaluation that results in a determination for or against range elevation. The Range Elevation Evaluation is separate from, and does not replace any other required evaluations. Evaluation for range elevation considerations shall involve a review of the lecturer's performance in the current range, but because the timing can be extensive, the evaluation should pay particular attention to the most recent five years. The period of review shall be defined as the time period between the start of the academic year five years prior to the current academic year and the date when the file is submitted. Faculty shall be evaluated by the DPRC, the Department Chair and the Dean. The Provost shall make the final determination on range elevations.

Lecturers may be evaluated more frequently at their request or at the request of the Department Chair or the Dean.

4. THE WPAF & PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE

It is essential that the faculty member consult the performance evaluation and the summary of requirements described in this document and UPS 210.070 while preparing his/her WPAF (also referred to as portfolio in this document). Personnel recommendations shall be based solely on evidence in the WPAF.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to collect and include all supporting evidence which is to be evaluated. ***Lecturers should carefully check the completeness and organization of the WPAF prior to submission.*** Once the WPAF is submitted to the Department Chair and the due date has passed, the evaluation cycle begins. After this date, a lecturer may add materials only under the following circumstances:

a) If required documents are missing from the WPAF, they shall be provided in a timely manner and placed in the WPAF by the lecturer. ***Failure to complete the file within a timely manner may impact the DPRC's assessment in the category for which the documents are missing.***

b) If material that documents a substantial change in the status of an activity becomes available after the WPAF due date, this material may be added with the permission from the DPRC. The DPRC shall approve addition of material only if the material was not available to the lecturer prior to the file submission date, and it is judged to be relevant to the review in progress.

Required Evidence to be Included in the WPAF by the Faculty Member:

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to prepare, organize and submit all required material in the WPAF. All lecturers are required to include the following material in the WPAF:

1) **Working Personnel Action File Table of Contents** (Sample available in Appendix B and also from FAR website under Evaluations)

2) **Approved Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty** (this document)

3) **Current Curriculum Vitae** (covering the entire academic and professional employment history)

4) **A list of all teaching assignments** over the review period *in reverse chronological order*. The list can be organized in a table similar to the sample provided in Appendix C. For each course taught during the review period, this list or table should include the year and semester, course name, Section number, number of students in the course, class mode (e.g., face to face or online), the SOQ scores, and class GPA.

5) **Teaching Narrative** (not to exceed 1500 words):

   a) The narrative is a self-assessment of your performance in assigned teaching duties and professional accomplishments. Proper references to the documents provided in the remainder of the portfolio and explanation about their significance/role should be made in the narrative as needed.

   b) All statements and explanations needed in the portfolio should be combined in this single narrative.

   c) If the WPAF includes evidence not directly related to the primary assigned duties, the narrative shall explain the relevance of such evidence to the assigned duties.

   d) The narrative may be supplemented by an additional 500 words to address any weakness or problem areas that have been identified either by earlier reviews or the lecturer themselves during the review period (e.g. in SOQs, class GPA, AACSB Qualification, …). The narrative shall include any plans, or prior efforts to address these areas and the results from those efforts (if known).

   e) The narrative may be supplemented by an additional 500 words to include any justification or explanation needed on material listed in the AACSB Qualification table to determine faculty's AACSB Status of either "Scholarly Academic", "Scholarly Practitioner", "Practice Academic" and "Instructional Practitioner". In the event that faculty does not meet any of these statuses, this section of narrative can be used to explain plans in becoming AACSB qualified in a timely manner.

   f) For Range Elevation evaluations, the narrative shall also summarize the ways in which the lecturer has developed as an instructor and as a professional while in the current range.

6) **Summary Statistics reports of Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs)** (obtained from portal) for all courses taught during the review period *in the same order of list of teaching assignments*. A file naming convention can be used that notes semester, year and course name for easier identification and ordering of files in the portfolio.

7) **Summary Statistics reports of SOQs for the Department** (obtained from portal) for all semesters over the review period in reverse chronological order. A file naming convention can be used that notes semester, year and course name for easier identification and ordering of files in the portfolio.

8) **Comments reports of Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs)** (obtained from portal) for all courses taught during the review period *in the same order of list of teaching assignments*. A file naming convention can be used that notes semester, year and course name for easier identification and ordering of files in the portfolio.

9) **Official Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions** (obtained from the Faculty Dashboard on Titan Online) for all courses taught during the review period *in the same order of list of teaching assignments*. The official grade distributions should include the overall course GPA, and should not include student names and their individual grades. A file naming convention can be used that notes semester, year and course name for easier identification and ordering of files in the portfolio.

10) **Additional Evidence of Teaching Performance & Approach:** Supporting materials shall include the following:

    a. Syllabus for each course offered
    b. Exams (midterms and final exam) for each course offered
    c. Sample assignments (homework assignments, quizzes, etc.) for each course offered
    d. Sample writing assignment (if appropriate)
    e. Other teaching materials, if appropriate (for example: curricular innovations, additional lecture notes or handouts, evidence of grading practices, classroom visitation reports, instructor-initiated student feedback, signed letters or sample emails from students, etc.)

    Links to courses on the university LMS (e.g., Canvas) for presentation of supporting material are not acceptable as they do not work without additional permission. Instead, copies of those material with clear outlines and descriptions should be included in the WPAF.

    If teaching more than one section of the same course, and any of the above material has not changed significantly, a sample from the latest section would suffice. But if a considerable change in approach or content has taken place in any type of supporting material, samples before and after the change should be included. Also, an explanation of why the change was made and a summary of outcomes in order to assess the impact (as applicable/known) should be included in the portfolio narrative.

11) **Evidence of pedagogical and disciplinary currency in field** as demonstrated by for example, published research work (such as, journal article, book chapter, etc.), presentations in relevant conferences, attendance in teaching-related workshops, curricular innovations, relevant degree or certification obtained, professional achievements or activities, and relevant and recent consulting or employment. Supporting documents to evidence such activities should also be included in the WPAF (e.g., copy of published paper, copy of a certificate, conference acceptance, confirmation of attendance in workshops or events, etc.). If publishing in a journal outside of the College journal list, evidence regarding the quality of the journal (impact factor, acceptance rate, etc.) and its review process (e.g. double blind, single blind, etc.) needs to be included as well.

12) **AACSB Qualification table** (obtained from "Faculty Qualification Table" from the reports section of Watermark): This is a different report than Faculty Status Report generated for Assigned Time purposes and should state the faculty member's AACSB status. Faculty needs to read the "AACSB Faculty Qualifications Policy" on "CBE Faculty Community page" on the university LMS (currently Canvas) for guidelines about the college policies on AACSB status. A copy of the faculty qualification table obtained from Watermark must be included in the portfolio along with any needed supporting documents (like published papers, talks, service and consulting experience, etc.). Failure to include this table may impact the DPRC's assessment.

13) **(Full time faculty only) Supporting material to evidence service activities** in the department, college, university, student clubs, or community outreach on behalf of the college, as indicated, for example, by an official committee membership list, written report of committee chair, by materials or policies created by the committee, and student evaluation or feedback.

14) **(Range Elevation only) Supporting material to evidence development as an instructor and a professional** during the time given in range.

<u>Documentation provided by the Department Chair:</u>

It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to assess that the faculty member has included all required material (outlined in items 1-14 above) in the WPAF and notify/remind faculty of any material missing before forwarding the WPAF to the DPRC. If available, the Department Chair is also responsible to forward to the DPRC any additional evidence (additional to those outlined above) that is solely in possession of the department chair and needed for evaluation.

5. OVERALL EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

UPS 210.070 and CBE AACSB Faculty Status Policy require lecturers to be evaluated based on the following main criteria:

- **"Educational performance"** which includes teaching performance, disciplinary and pedagogical currency, and AACSB faculty status for CBE faculty. The principal evaluation criterion for lecturers exclusively assigned to teaching is educational performance.
- Full-time lecturers are additionally evaluated based on **"service activities"**.
- Faculty undergoing range elevation should additionally demonstrate **"development as an instructor and as a professional"** during the review period.

The DPRC evaluates only based on the evidence contained in the WPAF. The type of evidence and the standards that are applied to each category to evaluate that evidence are outlined in subsequent sections. The DPRC may use a table similar to Appendix A to summarize the ratings in each category.

The overall evaluation would result in one of the following four ratings:

Exceeds Expectations – Performance in assigned duties is better than satisfactory

Satisfactory – Performance meets expectations

Needs Improvement – Performance does not meet expectations

Unsatisfactory – Performance is seriously deficient

Note that an evaluation that finds a lecturer's performance to be "Satisfactory" or better is not an offer of work, nor is it a reappointment; the appropriate administrator responsible for assigning work will take the evaluations from prior levels of review, as well as other information into consideration.

An evaluation of "Needs Improvement" does not preclude the Dean from reappointing a lecturer in an appointment of two-years or shorter duration to a subsequent appointment of a similar duration. If a lecturer's performance is evaluated as "Needs Improvement" the evaluation should specify those areas in which improvement is needed and should be addressed during the next appointment period, if reappointed. The DPRC or Department Chair or Dean should make recommendations for professional development activities in their evaluations. Subsequent evaluations of "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" shall normally lead to a decision not to reappoint the instructor. An evaluation of "Unsatisfactory" shall typically result in a decision not to reappoint the instructor.

For a comprehensive six-year evaluation or a three-year periodic evaluation, the Dean's review shall result in an overall rating of either "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" and include the reasons for the rating. A satisfactory rating in this case may also include comments including constructive suggestions for professional development.

A lecturer shall be offered a three-year temporary appointment following a comprehensive six-year evaluation or three-year periodic evolution, where there is a determination by the appropriate administrator that a lecturer has performed the duties of their position in a satisfactory manner, and absence of documented serious conduct problems.

6. EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL PERFORMANCE

A successful lecturer demonstrates mastery and currency in the discipline, teaches effectively, and helps students learn. UPS 210.070 specifies the following six evaluation criteria when reviewing educational performance of lecturers. Faculty are encouraged to consider the following points in their portfolio (narrative and documentation) as appropriate or needed. Examples and sources of evidence in the tables below are for illustrative purposes and are not comprehensive lists.

UPS 210.070 Criteria for Educational Performance
1. Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements. Examples: Gives final exam on date/time assigned by the University; maintains office hours.
2. Establishment of a course environment conducive to learning. Examples: Provides means for students to contribute to course learning by encouraging inquiry; provides coherent structure for course meetings which is understood by the students.
3. Effective implementation of a course syllabus clearly linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes. Examples: Learning goals made clear to students at the start of course; assessments and grading practices are clearly related to learning goals.

4. Effective use of a variety of instructional methods.
Examples: Instructional methods are appropriate to course goals; technology (e.g., response clickers, blogs, discussion boards) is used to enhance participation.
5. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.
Examples: Academic rigor appropriate to the course, academic integrity is stressed in the course; effectiveness, fairness and timeliness of testing, other assessments and grading procedures are evident.
6. Pedagogical currency and disciplinary currency as related to teaching.
Examples: 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 developing as relevant to teaching assignment.

Faculty member's educational performance will receive an overall rating based on following specific evaluation items: 1) SOQ (statistical summaries); 2) SOQ (open-ended comments); 3) grade distribution; 4) teaching approach and material; 5) pedagogical and disciplinary currency; and 6) AACSB qualification. The scores on each evaluation item are based on the compliance with the UPS 210.070 criteria. The table below links each evaluation item with its corresponding UPS criteria and sources of evidence used to assess faculty. Appendix A contains a sample evaluation form that covers these evaluation items.

	Evaluation Item for Assessment of Educational Performance	UPS 210.070 Criteria	Source of Evidence
1	SOQ (Statistical summaries)	2	Narrative, SOQs (Summary Statistics reports)
2	SOQ (Open Ended Comments)	2, 4, 6	Narrative, SOQs (Comments report)
3	Grade Distribution	5	Narrative, Grade Distribution reports
4	Teaching approach & Material	1, 3, 4, 5, 6	Narrative, Syllabus, sample exams, assignments, projects and the like, any of curricular innovations, reports of classroom visitations, and/or student letters if available
5	Pedagogical and Disciplinary Currency	6	CV, Narrative
6	AACSB Qualification	1	AACSB Qualification Table, CV, Narrative

Guidelines for Evaluation Item 1: SOQ (Statistical Summary)

A "satisfactory" rating in this category corresponds to SOQ scores that are generally in the range of <u>*2.75 and 3.5*</u>*. SOQ ratings that are consistently above this range while the class GPAs generally remain within a satisfactory range (outlined below) would obtain the rating of "exceeds expectations".*

Review of SOQ scores may also take into account department average ratings, variability of ratings, trends in ratings over time, class size, inclusion in honors program, online versus face-to-face format, quantitative or qualitative nature of the course offered, ratings on individual criteria (e.g., ability to communicate, overall teaching effectiveness, helpfulness to students), or any special situation that may arise in a specific course or semester. Considerable deviations from the department standards outlined above need to be discussed in the portfolio narrative.

Guidelines for Evaluation Item 2: SOQ (Open Ended Comments)

A "satisfactory" rating in this category corresponds to s*tudent statements that are g*e*nerally positive. The student comments suggest that the faculty member developed a satisfactory environment conducive to learning and used somewhat varied/effective instructional methods.*

Review of student evaluations (open-ended comments) may also take into account consistency in patterns of positive or negative responses, trends in responses over time, the faculty's experience in teaching that course, and any exceptional situations arising in a specific course or semester. In cases of an exceptional situation that (positively or negatively) impacts student comments, the faculty is expected to address the situation as part of the portfolio narrative, and, if appropriate, outline the steps taken or planned to be taken to address it.

Guidelines for Evaluation Item 3: Class GPAs

A "satisfactory" rating in this category corresponds to grade distributions and Class GPAs that generally conform to department standards below:
- *The distribution of grades needs to show some differentiation in student grades (e.g. not all grades to be A, or not all C).*
- *The department standard of overall class GPA for courses offered in the department are provided in the table below.*

Course	Standard Range of GPA	Historical Average GPA
ISDS 351	2.6 – 3.3	2.98
ISDS 361A	2.2 – 3.1	2.66
ISDS 361B	2.1 – 3.0	2.55
Other 300-level courses	2.4 – 3.1	
400-level courses	2.7 – 3.4	
500-level courses	Appropriate to course content & level	

As a reference, historical average class GPAs for the three core courses are included in the table above as well, noting that class GPAs closer to the two end values of the standard range typically happen less

frequently. Faculty can consult the corresponding course coordinator or department chair for any additional guidelines on course GPAs for any specific course, if needed.

Review of class GPAs may also consider factors such as consistency or pattern of class GPAs over time, the type of class (online vs face-to-face), quantitative or qualitative nature of the course offered, inclusion in honors program (that typically result in higher GPAs), or any special situation that may arise in a specific course or semester. Considerable deviations from the department standards need to be discussed in the portfolio narrative.

Guidelines for Evaluation Item 4: Teaching Approach & Material

To obtain "satisfactory" rating in this category, the following shall be evident in course materials and approach:

- Syllabus and required elements are complete.
- Student learning objectives are clearly defined and implemented in the course.
- The material is overall in alignment with the approved course syllabus.
- The course contains some well-defined contemporary assignment(s) or project(s) in alignment with course learning objectives.
- Assignments and exams are implemented in the course and have the level of rigor in alignment with course level and objectives.
- Textbook and/or readings are relevant and contemporary. Some effort to provide supplemental material or readings as appropriate.
- The course syllabus, schedule, and components are in overall alignment with a standardized course structure, if applicable (like ISDS 361A).

Guidelines for Evaluation Item 5: Pedagogical Currency and Disciplinary Currency

To obtain "satisfactory" rating in this category, faculty are expected to show evidence of some training or other activities within the last three years (from the portfolio due date) on pedagogy development and/or professional expertise.

Examples of such activity include but are not limited to:

- Recent published research work or book chapter
- Presentation in related conferences
- Attendance in teaching-related workshops
- Implementation of curricular innovations
- Implementation of new assessment practices
- Obtaining relevant degree or certification
- Professional achievements or activities
- Relevant and recent consulting or employment

Guidelines for Evaluation Item 6: AACSB Qualification

In accordance with AACSB accreditation requirements, *faculty are expected to qualify for one of the following four AACSB statuses*:

1) *Scholarly Academic* (research active with a doctoral degree, or doctoral degree earned within the last 5 years);

2) *Practice Academic* (doctoral degree with relevant consulting or professional experience);

3) *Scholarly Practitioner* (graduate degree and research active);

4) *Instructional Practitioner* (graduate degree with relevant work and/or consulting and/or professional experience).

Overall, each status type is based on some combination of doctoral degree candidacy or recent completion of a doctoral degree in a relevant field, and/or publications and/or presentations in scholarly or professional meetings, and/or professional development, and/or consulting or work experience in a relevant field. Instructors not meeting criteria for any of the four statuses are classified as "additional."

Faculty must read the "AACSB Faculty Qualifications Policy" on "CBE Faculty Community page" on university LMS (currently Canvas) for guidelines about the college policies on AACSB status, details of each category and the type of activities that need to be documented to qualify for that category.

AACSB "Faculty Qualification Table" from Watermark must be completed and included in the WPAF, along with relevant supporting documentation included in the WPAF, to ensure AACSB qualification criteria is met.

7. EVALUATION OF SERVICE (for Full-time Lecturers Only)

Lecturers with full-time appointments (12 WTUs per semester) who are assigned service responsibilities (3 WTUs per semester) are evaluated based on their service activities.

Full-time lecturers are expected to attend department meetings on a regular basis, and provide service to the department, college, and/or university by being an engaged citizen of their department in at least one substantial service activity.

Examples of such service activities include but not limited to:
- Participating in committee work (department, college, and/or university level)
- Substantial advising and student mentoring
- Substantial course coordination and assessment
- Advising student clubs
- Engaging in outreach to the community on behalf of the college (e.g., professional associations).

The evaluation of service may include but is not limited to materials on service records, narrative, AACSB Qualification table, and CV. Faculty members are encouraged to provide as much details about the service activities as needed in their narrative, especially if they engage in any activity that is different from the traditional ones as outlined above or as commonly known in the department/college.

8. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION FOR RANGE ELEVATION

Evaluations for Range Elevation consideration shall involve a review of the lecturer's performance in the current range, but because the time in range can be extensive, the lecturer is expected to highlight the most recent five years while in range when preparing the WPAF for review. However, a lecturer under review will normally document in his/her CV all accomplishments over the entire period in the current range. If a lecturer wishes to include in the WPAF evidence of performance outside this five-year period, evidence shall be limited to: a) material that is relevant to performance while in the current range, and b) material that provides evidence of performance that cannot otherwise be documented within the most recent five-year period.

Lecturers requesting for Range Elevation, should demonstrate *educational performance* and *activities in service* (if applicable) as outlined earlier as part of their WPAF. In addition, they shall demonstrate that *they have both developed as an instructor and as a professional during the time in a given range*. Therefore, evidence of this development during the period in range should also be provided for Range Elevation consideration.

Development as an instructor may be demonstrated by a variety of activities over the review period, including but not limited to:
- The refinement and quantifiable improvement of instructional and assessment materials
- Substantial revision of course content and materials based on assessment activities
- Substantial creation of new course materials (such as texts, student study guides, and the like) aimed at increasing student success
- The refinement and improvement of teaching and professional practices, accompanied by some indication of the efficacy of those changes
- Self-reflection and self-assessment that lead to changes in practice, accompanied by some indication of the efficacy of those changes
- Collaborative teaching or collaborative research/scholarly/creative activity that has led to new or innovative content or methods of instruction
- Adaptation of new/varied pedagogical strategies to reach diverse student populations
- Participation in teaching-related workshops or trainings (e.g., FDC, CSU Chancellor's office) and certifications (e.g., IMPACT certificate)

Development as a professional may be demonstrated by a variety of activities over the review period, including but not limited to:

- Publication or other dissemination of original contributions to the discipline or to discipline-based pedagogy
- Obtaining a new degree, e.g. obtaining a PhD in a related field
- Organizing and/or chairing a session at a national or an international conference/meeting
- Academic article referee/reviewer
- Professional certifications (e.g., PMP, SAP, AWS, etc.) or participation in professional trainings
- Development of software and (mobile and/or web) applications
- Organization of conferences or professional meetings
- Obtaining grants

- Presentation in related conferences
- Professional achievements or awards

The activities listed above 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, and they may develop relatively more in one category (i.e., as an instructor or as a professional) compared to another. Rather it is expected that individuals will engage in some of these activities, as appropriate to their assignments and to their disciplines.

APPENDIX A: SAMPLE EVALUATION FORM FOR LECTURERS

Faculty Name:
Department: ISDS
Review Period:
Courses Taught:
Date:

AACSB QUALIFICATION:				
Evaluation Item	**Unsatisfactory**	**Needs Improvement**	**Satisfactory**	**Exceeds Expectations**
SOQ (Statistical Summary)				
SOQ (Open Ended Comments)				
Grade Distribution				
Teaching Approach & Material				
Pedagogical and Disciplinary Currency				
Service Activities (Full Time Faculty Only)				
Development as an Instructor & as a Professional (Range Elevation Only)				
Overall…………………………..………				

Department Peer Review Committee Comments:

(Comment on strengths, weaknesses, areas in need of improvement, and any other issues that may be relevant in assessing the Faculty Member's performance)

APPENDIX B: SAMPLE TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR WPAF

<table>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
FULLERTON™</td>
<td>**LECTURER EVALUATION**
WPAF TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
</tr>
</table>

The Working Personnel Action File shall contain the required items listed below as mandated by UPS 210.070. The items marked as optional (*) may be required in some individual cases when appropriate to the work assignment.

Please edit this document and list the exact items within specific categories. For example, list the semester and course title for each document within the SOQ categories.

WPAF of _____   _____
                          Name   Department

1. Working Personnel Action File Table of Contents (this document)

2. UPS 210.070 or Approved Department Standards for Lecturer Faculty

3. Curriculum Vita

4. Summary of Assigned Duties and List of Teaching Assignments

5. Narrative Summary

6. Summary Reports of Student Opinion Questionnaires (Statistical Reports)

    a. *<List documents here>*

7. Completed Student Opinion Questionnaires from all Courses (Raw Data)

    a. *<List documents here>*

8. Statistical Summaries of Grade Distributions (Graded Class lists)

    a. *<List documents here>*

9. Additional Evidence of Teaching Performance

    a. *<List documents here>*

10. Evidence of Currency in Field

    a. *<List documents here>*

11. If Appropriate to Work Assignment: Evidence of Scholarly/Creative Activities*

    a. *<If applicable to work assignment, list documents here>*

12. If Appropriate to Work Assignment: Evidence of University, College, Dept/Division, & Community Service*

    a. *<If applicable to work assignment, list documents here>*

APPENDIX C: SAMPLE TABLE OF TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS

Year & Semester	Course Name, Section #	Class mode (F2F/ online/ hybrid)	# students registered	SOQ score Table 1	SOQ score Table 2 (if available)	Class GPA
Spring 2021	ISDS XXX section X	F2F				
Spring 2021	ISDS XXX section X	Online				
Fall 2020	ISDS XXX section X	Online				
Summer 2020	ISDS XXX section X	Hybrid				

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
FULLERTON

Mark as shown: ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ Please use a pencil or a dark pen to mark an X inside the box of your choice.

Correction: ☐ ■ ☐ ☒ ☐ If you make a mistake, erase or completely fill in the box with the wrong answer and mark an X for the correct answer.

1. Student Opinion Questionnaire - pt. 1

EVALUATE YOUR INSTRUCTOR'S...

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
1.1 Organization of the course	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.2 Knowledge of course content	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.3 Preparation for class	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.4 Ability to communicate subject material	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.5 Willingness to help students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.6 Overall teaching effectiveness	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Student Opinion Questionnaire - pt. 2

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statement

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2.1 I would recommend this instructor to other students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2.2 What percentage of classes did you attend?   ☐ 80-100%   ☐ 60-80%   ☐ 40-60%   ☐ 20-40%   ☐ 0-20%

Please continue to page 2. DO NOT write in the space below.

3. Comments

3.1 What grade do you expect in this class?

3.2 What did the instructor do well?

3.3 What could the instructor do to improve the class?

3.4 Additional Comments:

| Class Climate | Information Systems & Decision Sciences - Online | SCANTRON. |

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
FULLERTON

Mark as shown: ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ Please use a pencil or a dark pen to mark an X inside the box of your choice.

Correction: ☐ ■ ☐ ☒ ☐ If you make a mistake, erase or completely fill in the box with the wrong answer and mark an X for the correct answer.

1. Student Opinion Questionnaire - pt. 1

EVALUATE YOUR INSTRUCTOR'S . . .

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
1.1 Organization of the course	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.2 Knowledge of course content	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.3 Quality of materials conveyed over the web	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.4 Effective delivery of course material	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.5 Willingness to help students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.6 Indicate your overall learning experience in the course	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Student Opinion Questionnaire - pt. 2

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statement

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2.1 I would recommend this instructor to other students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. Comments

3.1 What grade do you expect in this online class?

3.2 What did the instructor do well?

3.3 What could the instructor do to improve the class?

3.4 Additional Comments: