



CNSM Evaluation Standards for Lecturers

AY 2026-2027

Mission

The College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics is a center of scientific learning in Long Beach offering excellent educational opportunities. Our student-centered instructional and research environment fosters equity, diversity, and access, mentors students for lifelong success by elevating character, skills, and mindset; creates scientific knowledge through research; and promotes science and mathematics in our community.

The College's vision is to educate the next diverse generation of scientists and mathematicians, as well as a science-literate citizenry, through inclusive teaching and research programs within the departments of Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Earth Science, Mathematics and Statistics, Physics and Astronomy, Science Education, and the Environmental Science and Policy program.

1. Guiding Principles

This document articulates college-wide standards of excellence and accompanying evaluation criteria for periodic evaluation of lecturers. Lecturer evaluations must be appropriate to the lecturer's position description and actual work assignment and must be conducted in accordance with the [Periodic Evaluation of Lecturers - Evaluation Procedures and Criteria](#) issued annually by CSULB Academic Affairs.

CNSM values diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. This policy and all department lecturer evaluation policies should reflect these values. CNSM recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. This policy and all department lecturer evaluation policies should be structured and interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities.

2. Evaluation Standards

All CNSM faculty are expected to be effective teachers of our diverse student body at CSULB and provide evidence of this effectiveness in their files. Faculty members are expected to maintain currency and exhibit mastery of the subject matter in their instruction and instructionally related materials. In addition, faculty members are expected to reflect thoughtfully upon their teaching practices and on ways to assess the effectiveness of their instruction on student learning. Instructional methods and approaches should be consistent with course/curriculum goals and should be designed to be student-centered.

Assessment of teaching effectiveness shall be based on a careful reading of the candidate's narrative, evaluation of appropriate materials in the candidate's file, peer observations of teaching, and on student course evaluation forms for all courses taught during the evaluation period. The evaluation of teaching

effectiveness should be based on the quality of teaching performance across all courses assigned to the candidate, with particular attention paid to progress and improvement.

2.1. Reflective Narrative

Reflective Narrative should provide an overview of candidate's teaching philosophy as applied to courses taught during the evaluation period and should demonstrate candidate's efforts to foster student-centered instructional environment.

Effective instructors remain up to date not only with their course content, but also with pedagogical practices designed to help all students achieve course learning goals. Effective instruction requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with educating a diverse student population.

The candidate should demonstrate thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward a continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This should be described by the candidate in the narrative and supported with relevant evidence. This may include activities such as: classroom visitations, consultations on course improvement, involvement in pedagogical professional development programs, participation in teaching seminars or conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities that contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness. Ideally, the narrative will include multiple examples of how participation in such activities led to specific changes in instruction.

Evaluators should examine the narrative for:

- 1) Candidate's overall teaching philosophy with emphasis on equity and student-centered teaching,
- 2) the candidate's response to suggestions for improvement from prior periodic evaluations (if available),
- 3) comments on any changes in teaching evaluation scores,
- 4) explanations of circumstances that might mitigate unfavorable evaluations or student responses,
- 5) description of candidate's efforts to improve learning environment in courses taught during the evaluation period, especially for courses with history of challenges in completion and equity, and
- 6) any additional information provided that may be of assistance in evaluating the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

2.1.1. Pedagogical Approach and Methods

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) effective instructional strategies for student learning. The scholarly content of the courses should be comparable to the same or similar courses taught in the discipline. Course policies and grading practices should be

clearly conveyed to students. The results of grading practices (i.e., GPAs and DFW rates) should be reasonably consistent with departmental norms for the same or comparable courses.

If the candidate teaches courses which have high DFW rates (>20%), it is recommended that they address these rates and describe their efforts to reduce these rates in their narrative. A variety of factors outside of the candidate's direct control (e.g., nature of course material, course meeting time, actions by course-associated TAs) can influence DFW rates and the evaluation committees should consider these rates in that light.

2.2. Instructional Materials, Including Course Syllabi and Samples of Representative Assignments and Assessment Tools

Emphasis in the peer evaluation of a candidate's course materials and content should be based on the quality of the materials and on their value in facilitating the learning process. Materials submitted by a candidate in her/his file should include at least course syllabi and assessment materials. Teaching materials, such as samples of student work with instructor feedback, should also be submitted when available. Course materials and teaching methods should reflect currency in the field, be appropriate to the topic, and be of value in facilitating learning. If the course serves as a prerequisite for later courses, it should be well-aligned with the expected academic background for those courses. Course materials should clearly convey to the students the learning goals for the course, and the relationship of the course to the major and to the broader discipline. Course policies and grading practices should be clearly conveyed to students. The syllabi and other materials must conform to CSULB policy.

2.3. Summary of Grade Distributions for Each Course

Evaluators should critically assess grading standards as well as the scholarly content of courses taught. The frame of reference shall be the same or similar courses taught by tenured/probationary faculty members. Typically, this involves the use of average GPAs or DFW rates, but recognition should be made that some aspects of courses outside of the instructor's control may influence these. Such factors may include, but are not limited to, the difficulty or desirability of the material (e.g., pre-requisites for other majors), class meeting times (e.g., early mornings or Fridays), class size (e.g., large lecture vs small discussion), or semester (e.g., spring GPAs are lower campus-wide than fall GPAs).

2.4. Summary Reports of Student Evaluation of Instructor

Course SPOT summary pages must be included for all courses evaluated during the period under review. Candidates are expected to address aspects of their SPOT score summaries in their narrative, especially with regard to changes over time or differences between courses. Candidates should describe actions taken to improve student perceptions. Importantly, these evaluations alone do not provide complete or sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. It has been established that a variety of factors outside of the candidate's direct control (e.g., gender, ethnicity, course material desirability, course meeting time, actions by course-associated TAs) can influence SPOT scores and the Evaluation Committee should consider these scores in that light. Nevertheless, some attention to SPOT score evaluations should be present in the candidate's narrative.

2.5. Reports from Class Visitations

The periodic evaluation might include class visits. The candidate will receive notice of at least five days prior to the start of classroom visits. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits his/her class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. The candidate may submit course syllabi or otherwise notify the evaluators when tests or other activities are scheduled to permit the committee or department chair to choose most appropriate days for visits.

The committee members' evaluations of the candidate in the classroom should address factors such as instructional clarity, communication with the students, student engagement, presentation style, effective use of classroom time, currency and mastery of subject matter, effectiveness of course materials, and, if used, audiovisual and electronic media or demonstrations. If the candidate provides syllabi or other course materials, these should be reviewed to provide context for classroom activities. Reports based on class visits must be included in the candidate's file and shared with the candidate. The signed reports must include times and dates of the visits.

2.6. Additional Materials

Lecturers may submit additional materials documenting their accomplishments in service, advising, or research if required by their job description. The emphasis in the evaluation of professional service, shall be on the quality and significance of the activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes to the missions of the university, the college, and the department and the extent and level of the candidate's involvement. Assessment of the service to both the university and community shall be based on information described in the candidate's narrative, as well as on supporting evidence, which may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda acknowledging the quality of the contribution, or printed programs.

If the candidate engages in formal student advising and receives assigned time for this activity, he/she should provide the peer-committee or the department chair with evidence of this effort and should address in her/his narrative the effectiveness of this advising in meeting student needs.