



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

SP 12-10 Policy on Lecturer Evaluation

SP 12-10 supersedes SP 09-06

SP 09-06 superseded SP 08-02

SP 12-10 Drafted By: Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) 2012-2013: Nancy Mozingo (Chair), Bob Bleicher, Minder Chen, Beatrice de Oca, Dennis Downey, Matthew Furmanski, Monica Pereira

Applicability: All CI Lecturers

Purpose: To establish policy on the evaluation of lecturer

Policy On Lecturer Evaluation, CSU Channel Islands

Index

- A. Philosophy
- B. Purpose
- C. Definitions
- D. General
- E. Full-time lecturers
- F. Part-time lecturers
- G. Lecturers holding or eligible for a 3-year contract
- H. Lecturers hired for one semester or less
- I. Portfolio
- J. Evaluations
- K. Criteria for Evaluation

A. Philosophy

California State University Channel Islands is committed to providing high quality, student-centered instructional programs to all constituencies. Excellent faculty members, dedicated to continued intellectual and professional growth, are essential to fulfilling our commitment. All elements and standards of lecturer unit periodic evaluation recognize the University's Mission, including:

- placing students at the center of the educational experience;
- providing undergraduate and graduate education that facilitates learning within and across disciplines through integrative approaches;
- emphasizing experiential and service learning; and graduating students with multicultural and international perspectives.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

SP 12-10 Policy on Lecturer Evaluation

B. Purpose

1. This document establishes policies for the periodic evaluation of lecturer unit employees in alignment with the CBA.
2. The document takes into the account the need to:

Comply with Board of Trustees policies; the California Administrative Code, Title 5; California Education Code; the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA); and other applicable State and Federal laws.

Be consistent with the terms outlined in the appointment letter issued to the lecturer unit employee by CSU Channel Islands.

Be consistent with the mission and established teaching standards at CSU Channel Islands.

Provide lecturer unit employees with feedback to improve teaching and student learning.

Provide appropriate administrators with materials to make re-appointment decisions.

C. Definitions

1. A lecturer is a full-time or part-time unit 3 employee appointed for one or more semesters. Full-time means an appointment totaling fifteen units in a semester, within one program. A person with 2 appointments in 2 different programs that total 15 units has 2 part-time appointments. Part-time means an appointment or appointments totaling less than fifteen units in a semester.
2. A semester or equivalent means an academic semester or a four month appointment.
3. The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), called the Portfolio in this policy, shall be defined as that file specifically generated for use in a given evaluation cycle. That file shall include all required forms and documents, all information specifically provided by the employee being evaluated. It shall also include all faculty and administrative level evaluation recommendations from the current cycle, and all rebuttal statements and responses submitted. (Article 15.8 of the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement). The WPAF materials are incorporated by reference into the Personal Action File (PAF). (Article 15.9 of the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement).



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

SP 12-10 Policy on Lecturer Evaluation

4. The PAF shall be defined as “the one (1) official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee.” (Article 11.1 of the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement)
5. Throughout this document, the word ‘shall’ indicates mandatory action; the word ‘may’ indicates voluntary action.

D. General

1. At the time of appointment, the Faculty Affairs Office shall give to each lecturer a copy of the Policy on Lecturer Evaluation. The program chair or equivalent shall be responsible for giving each lecturer whose primary job responsibility is not teaching or whose job involves responsibilities in addition to teaching, evaluation criteria at the time of appointment.
2. The Faculty Affairs Office shall publish a timeline for lecturer evaluation each year, including deadlines for submission of the portfolio and a target date of the end of the 11th week of the semester for completion of lecturer evaluations. Each Spring semester the Faculty Affairs Office shall give to program chairs and their equivalent a list of lecturers appointed in their program areas, including their entitlements (if any).
3. Evaluations must be completed and in the lecturer’s PAF before review of candidates for reappointment for the next academic year.
4. All reviews for reappointment shall be based only upon evidence in the lecturer faculty’s PAF, which also incorporates the contents of the portfolio. All written evaluations made in reviews shall be placed in the lecturer faculty’s PAF.
5. Any personnel decision with respect to any lecturer faculty shall be based on his/her PAF.
6. Only tenured faculty can serve on peer review committees. Probationary faculty may provide peer input, but may not engage in deliberations or make recommendations.
7. Lecturer faculty with appointments in more than one program shall be evaluated by each program in which they have an appointment.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

SP 12-10 Policy on Lecturer Evaluation

E. Full-time lecturers: Two Stage Written Review

1. Full-time lecturers who do not hold a 3-year contract shall be evaluated every second semester, regardless of a break in service. The evaluation period is the period of service since the last evaluation. The ratings are either satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
2. There shall be at least one peer observation of teaching from the period being reviewed and student evaluations in the PAF. Peer observers are encouraged to meet with the lecturer faculty member prior to and post-observation.
3. The Portfolio as described in section I below shall be submitted by the faculty member under review and shall be incorporated by reference into the PAF.
4. The review shall be based only upon evidence in the lecturer faculty's PAF which incorporates the contents of the portfolio. Prior to the beginning of the review process, the chair shall advise lecturer faculty of the potential contents of the portfolio as outlined in I below.
5. The review will have two stages:

Stage one: The first stage of review will be by a committee of tenured faculty appointed according to the program's by-laws. The program chair, if tenured, may be a member of the committee. A committee shall have between 2 and 5 members. The committee, after reviewing the PAF (which incorporates the contents of the portfolio) and each member signing the PAF after review, shall provide a written evaluation with reasons for the evaluation, including evidence on which the evaluation is based, of the lecturer faculty being reviewed. A copy of the written evaluation shall be given to the lecturer faculty being evaluated. S/he shall have ten days to respond and/or request a meeting. Optional: If the program chair is not a member of the committee, s/he, if tenured, may write a separate evaluation. A copy of the written evaluation shall be given to the lecturer faculty being evaluated. S/he shall have ten days to respond and/or request a meeting.

Stage two: The appropriate administrator, after reviewing and signing the PAF, shall provide a written evaluation with reasons for the evaluation, including evidence on which the evaluation is based of the lecturer faculty being reviewed is based. A copy of the written evaluation shall be given to the lecturer faculty being evaluated. S/he shall have ten days to respond and/or request a meeting.

6. A copy of the evaluations shall be put in the lecturer faculty's PAF.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

SP 12-10 Policy on Lecturer Evaluation

F. Part-time Lecturers: One Stage Review

1. Part-time lecturers who do not hold a 3-year contract shall be evaluated every second semester, regardless of a break in service. The evaluation period is the period of service since the last evaluation. The ratings are either satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
2. The review shall be based only upon evidence in the PAF, which will include the contents of the Portfolio for part-time lecturers who choose to prepare one. Otherwise, the review will be based solely on the PAF. The chair, prior to the beginning of the review process, shall advise part-time lecturers that they have the option to create a Portfolio and of its potential contents as outlined in H below. Part-time lecturers should turn in a signed form stating whether they wish their evaluation to be based on materials in their PAF or if they wish to submit a Portfolio. Part-time lecturers wishing to submit a Portfolio should submit materials as identified in I below to their Chair according to the lecturer faculty evaluation schedule.
3. There shall be at least one peer observation of teaching from the period being reviewed and student evaluations of teaching in the PAF. Peer observers are encouraged to meet with the lecturer prior to and post-observation.
4. The chair or equivalent, after reviewing the PAF (which includes the contents of the portfolio if one exists) and signing the PAF, shall provide a written evaluation with reasons for the evaluation, including evidence on which the evaluation is based of the lecturer faculty being reviewed. A copy of the written evaluation shall be given to the lecturer being evaluated. S/he shall have ten days to respond and/or request a meeting.
5. A copy of the evaluation shall be placed in the lecturer's PAF.
6. Discretionary second stage: The appropriate administrator may, at his or her discretion, also provide a written evaluation with reasons for the evaluation.

G. Lecturers holding or eligible for a 3-year contract : Two Stage Written Review

1. Lecturers (full-time and part-time) who are eligible for a 3-year contract shall be evaluated in the year preceding the issuance of a 3-year contract. The evaluation shall consider the entire qualifying period for the 3-year appointment. The ratings are either satisfactory or unsatisfactory.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

SP 12-10 Policy on Lecturer Evaluation

2. Lecturers (full-time and part-time) holding a 3-year contract shall be evaluated in the 3rd year of the appointment, but may be evaluated more frequently. The evaluation shall consider the entire 3-year appointment period. The ratings are either satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
3. There shall be at least one peer observation of teaching from the period being reviewed and student evaluations in the PAF. Peer observers are encouraged to meet with the lecturer faculty member prior to and post-observation.
4. The Portfolio as described in section I below shall be submitted by the faculty member under review and shall be incorporated by reference into the PAF.
5. The review shall be based only upon evidence in the lecturer faculty's PAF which incorporates the contents of the portfolio. Prior to the beginning of the review process, the chair shall advise lecturer faculty of the potential contents of the portfolio as outlined in I below.
6. The review will have two stages:

Stage one: The first stage of review will be by a committee of tenured faculty appointed according to the program's by-laws. The program chair, if tenured, may be a member of the committee. A committee shall have between 2 and 5 members. The committee, after reviewing the PAF (which incorporates the contents of the portfolio) and each member signing the PAF after review, shall provide a written evaluation with reasons for the evaluation, including evidence on which the evaluation is based, of the lecturer faculty being reviewed. A copy of the written evaluation shall be given to the lecturer faculty being evaluated. S/he shall have ten days to respond and/or request a meeting. Optional: If the program chair is not a member of the committee, s/he, if tenured, may write a separate evaluation. A copy of the written evaluation shall be given to the lecturer faculty being evaluated. S/he shall have ten days to respond and/or request a meeting.

Stage two: The appropriate administrator, after reviewing and signing the PAF, shall provide a written evaluation with reasons for the evaluation, including evidence on which the evaluation is based of the lecturer faculty being reviewed is based. A copy of the written evaluation shall be given to the lecturer faculty being evaluated. S/he shall have ten days to respond and/or request a meeting.

7. A copy of the evaluation shall be placed in the lecturer faculty's PAF.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

SP 12-10 Policy on Lecturer Evaluation

H. One Semester or Less

A lecturer appointed for one semester or less shall be evaluated at the discretion of the program chair or equivalent, or at the discretion of the appropriate administrator. The lecturer may request that an evaluation be performed. When an evaluation is performed, the evaluation process shall follow that described above for part-time lecturer faculty appointed for two semesters.

I. Portfolio

1. The Portfolio is required for all full-time lecturers being evaluated, and optional, at the discretion of the lecturer, for part-time lecturers being evaluated. For part-time lecturer faculty who choose not to prepare a Portfolio, the review will be based on the PAF.
2. For the purposes of the review, the Portfolio for teaching faculty shall include:
 - Current curriculum vitae
 - Student evaluations (already included in PAF; additional copies not needed)
 - At least one peer evaluation of teaching from the period being reviewed
 - All syllabi for courses taught during the period of review
3. For the purposes of the review, the Portfolio for lecturers whose primary duties are not teaching shall include material relevant to their performance of their job responsibilities.
 - Current curriculum vitae
 - At least one peer evaluation of performance from the period being reviewed
4. For the purposes of the review, the Portfolio may include:
 - Course materials (examinations, assignments, cases, etc.)
 - A self-assessment with respect to the duties of the appointment of no more than 500 words.
 - Evidence of scholarly and or creative activities and/or service relevant to the duties of the appointment.
 - Any other evidence relevant to the duties of the appointment.

J. Evaluations

1. Evaluations must be completed and in the PAF before review of candidates for reappointment for the next academic year.
2. Only tenured faculty can serve on peer review committees. Probationary faculty may provide peer input, but may not engage in deliberations or make recommendations.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

SP 12-10 Policy on Lecturer Evaluation

3. Lecturers with appointments in more than one program will be evaluated by each program in which they have an appointment.

K. Criteria for Evaluation

1. The principal criterion for the evaluation of lecturers hired to teach courses is teaching effectiveness. Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include (not listed in order of importance):
 - Currency in field and subject matter competence as measured by advanced degrees, evidence from syllabi, exams, and assignments, and other appropriate elements (which may include professional activities and service)
 - Grading practices
 - Lecturer's own statement and self-evaluation
 - Peer evaluations of teaching
 - Specialized criteria appropriate to the individual field
 - Student evaluations
 - Teaching awards
 - Teaching portfolios
2. In most cases, lecturers hired to teach do not have scholarship, creative activities or service as part of their job duties, and scholarship, creative activities or service should only be considered if they are directly tied to the lecturer's currency in the field and subject matter competence with respect to the actual courses being taught.