



CNSM EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR LECTURERS

AY 2020-2021

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 "CSULB Periodic Evaluation of Lecturers Evaluation Procedures and Criteria" issued annually by CSULB Academic Affairs.

2. Evaluation Standards

All CNSM faculty are expected to be effective teachers. This includes maintaining currency in the subject matter in their instruction. Moreover, a thoughtful, ongoing reflection upon their teaching practices and effectiveness of their instruction is expected.

2.1. Reflective Narrative

Reflective Narrative should provide an overview of candidate's teaching philosophy as applied to courses taught during the evaluation period. There should be evidence that the candidate takes an active role in improving his/her teaching effectiveness and maintains currency of teaching materials. These activities should be based on student evaluations, peer reviews, and/or other methods adopted by the candidate. The candidate should make thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward a continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This record may include interactions with colleagues on pedagogy, classroom visits, consultations on course improvement, involvement in programs of the Faculty Center for Professional Development, participation in teaching seminars or conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, reading articles and other materials concerning pedagogy of the discipline, and other activities that contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness. Evaluators should examine the narrative for 1) the candidate's response to suggestions for improvement from prior periodic evaluations (if available), 2) comments on any changes in teaching evaluation scores, 3) explanations of circumstances that might mitigate unfavorable evaluations or student responses, and 4) any additional information provided that may be of assistance in evaluating the candidate's teaching effectiveness

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. The teaching methods and approaches should be consistent with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate individual student learning styles. The scholarly rigor of the courses should be comparable to the same or similar courses taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty or/and lecturers in the discipline. Course materials and teaching methods should reflect currency in the field, be appropriate to the topic, and be of value in facilitating learning. Course materials should clearly convey to the students the learning goals 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 must conform to CSULB policy (see PS 11-07).

2.3. Summary of grade distributions for each course

The results of grading practices should be reasonably consistent with department norms for the same or comparable courses taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty or lecturers. Any significant deviations from departmental norms for grading practices (including class GPA and completion rate) should be explained in the candidate's Narrative.

2.4. Summary Reports of Student Evaluation of Instructor for classes taught during the evaluation period

Students' ratings of instruction shall be used as one of the components of the assessment of candidate's teaching effectiveness. Course evaluation summary pages must be included for all courses evaluated during the period under review. Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of assessing student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Student ratings of instruction should be compared with department and college means and taken in context with all other criteria, such as difficulty of course concepts and material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and course rigor. These numerical ratings, and other student input to the evaluators, reflect the effectiveness of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to student needs.

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 evaluations of the candidate in the classroom should address such factors 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. Written reports based on class visits must be placed in the candidate's evaluation file with a copy to 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.