

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

Wednesday, December 5, 2012

1 – 2:50 p.m. (approx.)

Commons 206

- I. Approval of agenda
- II. Approval of minutes of November 7th meeting
- III. Chair's report: [Jackie Trischman](#)

Referrals to committee: LATAAC Intellectual Property policy revision: define "extraordinary support"
SAC Determine what strategies are employed when athletes and other students are a few units short
- IV. [President's](#) report: Karen Haynes
- V. [Provost's](#) report: Emily Cutrer
- VI. VP [Student Affairs'](#) report: Eloise Stiglitz
- VII. [ASCSU](#) report: [Brodowsky/Meilich](#)
- VIII. [CFA report](#): [Don Barrett](#)/Garry Rolison
- IX. [ASI](#) report: Cipriano Vargas
- X. [Standing Committee](#) reports: *written reports for all committees are forthcoming*
- XI. Consent Calendar *Pending EC action. The following items are presented to the Senate for a single vote of approval without discussion. Any item may be removed for particular consideration by request of a senator prior to vote.*

UCC Course & program change proposals
- XII. Action items *These are items scheduled for a vote, including second reading items.*

A. FAC College of Science and Mathematics RTP policy
B. FAC University RTP policy revision
- XIII. Discussion items *Pending EC action. These are items scheduled for discussion, including first reading items.*

A. FAC Department Chair Selection policy (cnav@csusm.edu)
B. BLP/UCC CoBA Healthcare Information Technology (HIT) certificate program (ysun@csusm.edu)
C. FAC Lecturer Evaluation policy (cnav@csusm.edu)
- XIV. Presentation

Proposal for an Academic Excellence & Student Success fee - Oberem/Rees ***Time certain 1:45 pm***
- XV. Senators' concerns and announcements

*Spring Academic Assembly: January 17th
Next Senate meeting: February 6th*

Standing Committee Reports

APC

No report.

BLP

P-form Reviews: We have submitted reviews for several P-forms to the Senate's Executive Committee, including the proposed Minor in Geospatial Studies (CHABSS) and the proposed certificate in Health Information Technology (COBA). COBA'S Health Information Technology (HIT) proposal is on today's Senate agenda. We will shortly begin reviewing P-forms for a proposed Master's in Social Work (MSW) and Master of Public Health (MPH), both from CEHHS.

A-form Reviews: A-form reviews are conducted by BLP to make recommendations about whether new majors or graduate programs should be added to the University Academic Master Plan (UAMP). Additions to the UAMP ultimately require approval from the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Trustees before they become official. BLP's positive recommendation serves as an invitation for proposers to put forward a full-blown program proposal (P-form), which includes a full curriculum and breakdown of anticipated student demand and resource needs. BLP has recommended that the following programs be added to the UAMP:

M.S. in Kinesiology (CEHHS): This will be proposed as self-support program. At the proposers' request, BLP has recommended that the Provost support launching this as a "pilot" program. This status allows a program to be launched and operated for 5 years before the Chancellor's Office or Board of Trustees makes a decision about authorizing an ongoing program. Using the pilot status route should allow the program to launch as early as Fall 2013. It should be noted that, while rules from the Chancellor's Office are not entirely clear on this point, there may be a limit on the number of "pilot" programs that can be launched or run on a given campus at any one time. After reviewing all submitted 3-year rolling plans and data collected by the Dean of CEHHS, BLP is unaware of any other pending programs that anticipate requesting "pilot" status at this time.

B.A. in Theatre (CHABSS): This program was placed on the Academic Blueprint in AY 2005-2006. BLP has recommended that the program be placed on the UAMP as a state-supported program, with a projected launch date of Fall 2015.

B.S. in Communicative Sciences & Disorders (CEHHS): BLP has recommended that this program be placed on the UAMP as an upper-division, self-support program. Initially proposed as the first 4-year self-support program to be offered at the CSUSM campus, our recommendation was to add the program to the UAMP, subject to the proposer's agreeing to launch as a upper-division transfer program. Proposer Suzanne Moineau agreed to this suggestion via correspondence with the BLP chair. The projected launch date is Fall 2014.

Review of Three-Year Rolling Plans in Academic Affairs: All units reporting to the Provost submitted proposals for 3-year rolling strategic plans and budget projections that lay out possible new programs, positions, equipment purchases, etc. All plans are available for review at BLP's webpage. BLP members met with the Provost's direct reports (all members of the Academic Affairs Leadership Council, or AALC) on November 19 to begin discussing the plans and to explore common themes and possible areas of collaboration among units that can be moved forward despite ongoing state budget constraints. We will meet again with AALC on December 13 to discuss common themes and possible collaborations to develop recommendations regarding the prioritization of proposals for the Provost's review. **NOTE:** The programmatic planning information in these 3-year rolling plans provide input for the LAMP task force's discussions of possible new program proposals.

FAC

Other than the business on the agenda, FAC's most pressing issue is the need for a representative from HHS.

GEC

Courses reviewed and approved:

- WMST 300-17, The Politics of Motherhood, Area DD
- ANTH 360, Indigenous Anthropology, Area DD

Other activity:

- **60-unit/UDGE Rule:** Worked with Student Services to address the issues surrounding the 60-unit/UDGE rule. This rule requires students to have completed 60 units prior to enrolling in an upper division general education course. However, since this has been softly enforced (through advising), some students have slipped through and taken their UDGE courses prior to reaching 60 units. GEC has approved giving credit to this group of students to ensure their timely graduation. The larger issue of how to enforce this is still under discussion.

LDGE Forms: With the approval of the LDGE GELOs last year, the forms are being revised to reflect the changes. GEC has reviewed and approved Area A1 form (oral communication) and is currently working on a matching forms for the other areas. Once these forms are completed, we'll move on to the UDGE areas.

LATAC

LATAC has reviewed recent communications regarding Cal State Online, recent developments in online education, and the status of online instruction at CSUSM. We have identified a number of questions relating to these areas and are preparing a mid year report for Senate.

NEAC

No report.

PAC

PAC has continued to work and nearly completed it's response and recommendations for the School of Nursing B.S. Program Review.

SAC

We have been assigned to work on separate policies for Field Trips and Internship, per an Executive Order. At this point, we are gathering information from around campus as to how this is already handled. Any input/feedback from folks would be appreciated.

UCC

Work completed in November 2012: After careful review and extensive discussion with the originators and among UCC members, UCC approved Healthcare Information Technology Certificate Program with six courses. In addition, UCC approved ANTH 375, 379, BRS P-2 Minor in Border Studies, CHEM 021, HIST 331, LING 355 and NURS 493

Healthcare Information Technology Certificate program was launched in AY 2012-13 as a not-for-credit certificate program. It is currently being taught through Extended Learning. This proposal would, once approved by the Academic Senate, allow the program to be for-credit program through EL.

The program includes six 2-units courses:

- HIT 500 - Healthcare Systems: Structure and Process
- HIT 510 - Data Management for Healthcare Decision Support
- HIT 520 - Electronic Health Records
- HIT 530 - Data Communication and Security for Healthcare
- HIT 540 - Managing Healthcare System Change
- HIT 550 - Project Management and Process Improvement for Healthcare

The program emphasizes information technology, application of analytical methods, re-engineering, innovation, and change management. The program has support from healthcare professionals throughout the nation as well as faculty from CoBA, Computer Science and School of Nursing. All of the courses for the certificate programs have already been developed and half of them have been taught in fall semester 2012. The curriculum received inputs from an advisory board consisting of clinicians and healthcare professionals.

Continuing Work: UCC will continue the review of the new C form template. UCC is currently working with the originators regarding Minor in Geospatial Studies (p) and GEOG 130-232-236-330-491-691, VSAR 301, Master of Social Work to address UCC's concerns.

###

CONSENT CALENDAR

UCC Course & Program Change Proposals

SUBJ	No.	New No.	Course/Program Title	Form Type	Originator	Rec'd AP	To UCC	UCC Action
ANTH	375		Money, Culture and Power	C	A. Yanez-Chavez	10/8/12	10/16/12	12/3/12
ANTH	379		Environmental Health and Justice	C	K. Martinez	10/8/12	10/16/12	11/19/12
BRS	P-2		Minor in Border Studies	P-2	V. Bennett	10/11/12	10/16/12	11/26/12
CHEM	021		Supplemental instruction in Intro Organic Chemistry	C-2	P. Jasien	10/15/12	10/16/12	12/3/12
HIST	331		Law, Sexuality and American History	C-2	A. Lombard	10/30/12	11/5/12	12/3/12
LING	355		Heritage Languages and Heritage Speakers	C	N. Bateman	10/30/12	11/5/12	12/3/12
NURS	493		Senior Nurse Externship	C-2	J. Daugherty	10/1/12	10/8/12	11/19/12

1

FAC: CSM RTP Standards and Procedures

Rationale: *FAC has approved a revision to the College of Math and Science's RTP document. The college made changes to the College of Arts and Sciences RTP document to create a new document that addresses the specific needs of the new CSM. FAC reviewed it for compliance with the university RTP document, and for clarity and consistency.*

Definition: A policy governing the standards and procedures for retention, tenure and promotion of faculty within the CSUSM College of Science & Mathematics.

Authority: Unit 3 collective bargaining agreement.

Scope: Unit 3 faculty within the College of ~~Arts & Sciences~~ Science & Mathematics

I. PREAMBLE

This document sets forth general standards and criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion of full-time faculty in the College of ~~Arts and Sciences~~ Science and Mathematics. The provisions of this document are intended to be implemented in conformity with university-wide retention, tenure and promotion policies, and may be complemented and refined by disciplinary documents that further specify standards, criteria, and expectations of performance.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

The College of ~~Arts and Sciences~~ Science and Mathematics (CoASM) uses the same definitions, terms, and abbreviations as defined in the university retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) document.

III. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

A. General Guiding Principles

1. All standards and criteria should reflect the University Mission, Vision and Values Statement and advance the goals embodied in that statement, including the following:
 - That students be "taught by active scholars, ~~and artists~~."
 - That student learning be enhanced through "sustained excellence in teaching, research, and community partnerships."
 - That "individual and cultural diversity, and multiple perspectives" be promoted and endorsed.
 - That the education of students includes dedication to the values of intellectual engagement, community, integrity, innovation, and inclusiveness.
2. The three performance areas that shall be evaluated, research/creative activity, teaching, and service, are integral faculty activities. While recognizing teaching as a central institutional mission, the College and disciplinary standards and criteria should recognize the diversity of each faculty member's contribution to the University. While the College affirms the university-wide requirement of sustained high quality performance in all areas, it encourages flexibility in the relative emphasis placed on each of the three performance areas. The College respects and allows diversity of contribution in individual attainment of the expected level of overall performance and further recognizes that the relative emphasis may change during an academic career.
3. ~~The evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service must be done in the context of the University's level of development. Methods Standards~~ of performance assessment for research/creative activity, teaching, and service as set forth in this document shall be ~~clearly specified and~~ uniformly applied to all faculty in the College. Activities assessed in one area of performance shall not be duplicated in any other area of performance evaluation.
4. As specified in the CBA, faculty have the right to clearly articulated performance expectations at all levels and stages of the RTP process. The RTP process should be simultaneously evaluative and developmental and be carried out in a cooperative, collaborative environment.
5. Retention, tenure, and promotion decisions are made on the basis of evaluation of individual performance, and ultimate responsibility for meeting all standards and criteria

rests with the candidate. Sound advice and counsel by tenured faculty can significantly contribute to the achievement of the highest level of individual performance and should be available. Candidates may choose whether to avail themselves of such advice and counsel.

B. Standards Applied in Different Types of Decisions

1. It is expected that candidates for retention at the rank of assistant professor will show increasing or sustained effectiveness in each area of performance and demonstrate consistent progress toward meeting the tenure requirements in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service.
2. Promotion to the rank of associate professor requires an established record of effectiveness in teaching, research/creative achievements, and involvement in service activities that enhance the institution and the profession.
3. Promotion to the rank of professor requires evidence of continued commitment to and effectiveness in teaching, service to the University and/or the profession, and evidence of substantial achievement in research/creative activities.
4. The granting of tenure at any rank recognizes accomplishments and services performed during the probationary years. Further, the granting of tenure is an expression of confidence that the faculty member has both the commitment to and the potential for continued development and accomplishment throughout his/her career. Tenure should not be granted to individuals whose record does not meet the standards required to earn promotion to the rank at which the tenure will be granted.

IV. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

A. Teaching

1. The central, although not exclusive, mission of the faculty is to enable students to comprehend and to utilize knowledge through scholarly activity that is both challenging and encouraging. Quality teaching requires continual crafting and dedication. Toward that end faculty are expected to learn about pedagogy, to carefully consider how to teach, as well as what to teach, and how to evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching. Faculty ~~members~~ are expected to strengthen their teaching skills continually and to demonstrate overall effectiveness in instruction at the undergraduate and/or graduate level. Toward this end, faculty are encouraged in every way to cultivate and maintain useful, innovative, and stimulating instructional techniques consistent with best practices in the discipline. ~~in-Faculty are strongly encouraged to consultation~~ with mentoring peers and ~~to be~~ mindful of the conclusions and recommendations of evaluating entities.
2. Probationary and tenured faculty are expected to set clear expectations ~~of for student~~ success and to instruct with the assumption that all students can learn. Faculty should involve students actively in the learning process and employ ~~various~~ instructional techniques appropriate for the course level, format, and audience. Faculty should adapt their instructional methods to reach and to encourage the participation of all segments of a diverse student body.
3. Teaching activities include, but are not limited to:
 - classroom teaching
 - laboratory teaching
 - ~~studio teaching~~
 - conducting seminars
 - supervision of field work and independent research at both undergraduate and graduate levels
 - thesis supervision, and library research
 - supervision of internships and community service learning
 - training and supervision of teaching and graduate assistants
 - individual consultation with students concerning course related matters.
4. While the elements of teaching may vary among disciplines and candidates, evaluations of teaching performance will consider the scholarly content and currency of courses, classroom performance, the incorporation of writing and critical thinking, efforts undertaken to iteratively evaluate and improve teaching, the quality of advising, availability during office hours, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary activities,

participation in course or curriculum development, consistency of pedagogy with best practices in the discipline, and pedagogical innovations.

5. As outlined in the university RTP policy, the candidate must include a reflective statement on their teaching. The following items may be included in the reflective statement: a self evaluation, a statement of teaching philosophy, reflections on student evaluations, discussion of the type of classes taught, discussion of collaboration in teaching, and/or a discussion of learning goals, activities, and methods for assessment.
6. Evidence of teaching performance in the WPAF shall include, but is not limited to, the following: student evaluations for a minimum of two classes annually per the CBA; a list of courses taught at CSUSM (include both state-funded and self-support courses); samples of teaching materials, such as syllabi, examinations, assignments, handouts, and other assessment tools; and descriptions of new courses developed. Additionally, WPAF the supplemental file may include:
 - Information about the direction/supervision of independent study/research projects, graduate theses, etc.
 - Grade distribution data compiled by the candidate for individual assignments or overall grades referred to in narrative, such as in comparing an assignment change from year to year or making a comparison between multiple sections of the same course taught in a given semester
 - Grade distribution for courses taught.
 - Statements from colleagues who have observed the candidate in the classroom or who have systematically reviewed the candidate's course materials.
 - Information concerning the candidate's performance as a faculty advisor (e.g., notes/letters from students, letters from faculty who are in a position to judge the candidate's performance as an advisor). The authors of such documents must be identified by name (CBA 15.16b).
 - Information concerning honors or recognition related to teaching (e.g., distinguished teaching awards).
 - An audiotape or videotape of a representative class session.
 - Statements from alumni addressing the candidate's quality of teaching/advising. The authors of these documents must be identified by name. (CBA 15.16b)
 - Examples of graded student work showing excellent, average, and poor work, along with the professor's comments as to why they were so graded. Student confidentiality must be protected: all names must be redacted unless permission has been obtained from the student (include copy of permission).
 - Any additional information not included in the narrative (e.g., documentation of professional development related to pedagogy).
7. Limitations-Factors that may be relevant for the faculty's effectiveness in teaching (e.g., limited library and laboratory resources, limited availability of audiovisual, computing, and other nonprint materials, and the need to teach courses outside one's area of expertise) shall be taken into account when evaluating performance in this area.

B. Research/Creative Activity

1. It is essential to the University's mission that each faculty member demonstrate continued commitment, dedication, and growth as a scholar and/or creative artist. In all cases, research/creative activity results in an original contribution to knowledge or understanding in the field and includes the dissemination of that knowledge beyond the classroom.
2. Research/creative activity may be theoretical, experimental, applied, and/or related to teaching ~~Research/creative activity may be basic, applied, integrative, and/or related to teaching.~~ The relative weights given to research/creative contributions in each of these areas may vary within and across disciplines. ~~Similarly, t~~ The nature of the expected research/creative contributions will vary within and across disciplinesdepartment/programs.
3. Research/creative activity includes, but is not limited to:
 - publications in refereed journals
 - publications in refereed conference proceedings
 - published book chapters, books, ~~music, scripts, poetry~~
 - scholarly editing and/or reviewing

- translating into other natural/artificial languages or media
 - ~~artistic presentations, performances, recitals, or exhibits~~
 - films, videos, or other media projects
 - ~~research published on digital media~~
 - presentations at professional meetings
 - pedagogic research and exposition, or materials development
 - ~~demonstration of creative work for peer review~~
 - applied research
 - patents
 - grant activity (funded grants, proposals)
 - computer software development
 - documented, active participation in specialized colloquia, seminars, symposia, or conferences
 - fellowships, awards, or honors
 - evidence of research or creative activity in progress
 - ~~refereeing/reviewing~~ of a book, journal article, monograph, or conference papers
 - ~~4. Measurement of scholarly/creative achievements should always include evaluation by professional persons in a position to assess the quality of the contribution to the field. Professional evaluation includes, but is not limited to, acceptance of a scholarly or creative work by an editorial board or jury. In all cases, quality of scholarly/creative achievements should be evaluated.~~
45. In the application/development of its sStandards, each discipline department/program shall take into account those inherent limitations of the developmental stage of the University department/program that may be relevant for its faculty's scholarly/creative achievements.
- C. Service
1. The College views activities that enhance the institution and the profession, both locally and nationally, as integral components of faculty service responsibility. In the review process, the value of the service contributions, as well as the effect of the level of service contributions on the scholarly and instructional areas of performance, should be considered.
 2. ~~While the magnitude of service rendered may vary,~~ In each instance, the evaluation of service ~~may~~shall include evaluation of the quality of service rendered, the extent to which the service rendered contributed to the University's mission, and the appropriateness of the service to the faculty member's rank. It is recommended that significant service contributions be accompanied by supporting documentation.
 3. Service activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - membership and offices held on committees, governing bodies, and task forces at the Department/Program^[11], College, and University level.
 - membership and offices held on committees, editorial boards, professional advisory boards, external review teams, governing bodies, and task forces at the local, national, and international level.
 - service as departmental graduate advisor
 - ~~consultantship to community organizations~~consultantship to community organizations
 - professional consultantships of a service nature
 - service ~~as faculty advisor~~ to student organizations
 - mentoring of faculty and/or students
 - training and supervision of teaching and graduate assistants (if not counted toward teaching)
 - ~~advising a student group~~
 - thesis supervision (if not counted toward teaching)
 - administrative activities such as scheduling, program coordination, or other special assignments
 - offices held and participation in professional organizations
 - ~~lectures, presentations, outreach activities, performances or displays given to community groups, or schools~~
 - organizing regional or national conferences, workshops, or seminars

- service award, fellowship or honor
 - editing of a journal, book, or monograph (if not counted as research/creative activity)
 - refereeing of a book, journal article, monograph, conference (if not counted as research/creative activity)
 - op-ed pieces, letters to the editor, radio and TV interviews
4. Documentation of service may include, but shall not be limited to:
- a list/description of service to the community, university, college, department/program, and/or discipline
 - evaluation by fellow committee members regarding quality of service provided
 - documents, reports or other evidence of committee service
 - letters from appropriate organizers, officers, panel chairs, editors or similar officials of regional or national organizations/publications with which the candidate was involved as an officer, speaker, panelist, external reviewer, referee, consultant, visiting lecturer, etc.
 - letters from community members who are in a position to comment on the candidate's contributions, such as those who invited the candidate to speak or worked with the candidate on a project
 - meeting agendas or programs
 - programs or fliers describing the event and/or listing the participants
 - awards made for the service (e.g., certificates, plaques)
 - newspaper clippings
 - ~~videotapes-media files~~
 - ~~audiotapes~~

FAC: University RTP

Rationale: *FAC has made some changes to the document to reinforce best practice regarding the “WPAF Checklist” for required material and the “Memorandum from the Candidate” specifying action requested and any special conditions of the initial appointment.*

Definition: The process for decisions regarding promotion, tenure and retention of faculty unit employees of CSU San Marcos shall be governed by the Faculty Personnel Procedures for Promotion, Tenure and Retention.

Authority: The collective bargaining agreement between The California State University and the California Faculty Association.

Scope: Faculty unit employees of CSU San Marcos.

[Pertinent parts]

II. PERSONNEL FILES

B. Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

6. The WPAF, when submitted by the Candidate, shall contain:

a. The “WPAF Checklist” (see Faculty Affairs website), completed and signed by the Candidate.

b. A Memorandum from the Candidate stating the action the Candidate is requesting:

- Periodic Review (typically 1st/3rd/5th year)
- Retention Review (typically 2nd, 4th year)
- Tenure and/or Promotion Review

If applicable, the memorandum shall state any special conditions of initial appointment, such as award of years of service credit or completion of terminal degree.

~~a-c.~~ A current curriculum vitae including all the accomplishments of the candidate’s career.

~~b.~~ A statement outlining any special conditions of initial appointment, such as award of years of service credit or completion of terminal degree.

~~e-d.~~ For faculty applying for periodic reviews; retention, tenure, or tenure and promotion, all personnel reviews since hire. For faculty applying for promotion after the award of tenure (or tenure and promotion), all personnel reviews beginning with the previous promotion review or original appointment materials. For faculty applying for tenure after promotion, all personnel reviews beginning with original appointment materials. Personnel reviews (including recommendations, rebuttals and responses) are defined as:

...

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THOSE INVOLVED IN THE REVIEW CYCLE

A. Responsibilities of the Candidate

1. Preparation of the WPAF

- a. Prior to the beginning of the review process, the Candidate shall be responsible for reviewing the Department/Unit/College/Library/School/SSP-AR evaluation criteria and review procedures that have been made available, including the CSUSM RTP timetable.
- b. Prior to the beginning of the review process, the Candidate shall be responsible for consulting campus resources relevant to the review process (e.g., the CBA, Academic Affairs, Faculty Center resources and workshops, and colleagues).
- c. Prior to the beginning of the review process, the Candidate shall be responsible for the identification of materials the candidate wishes to be considered and for the submission of such materials as may be accessible to the candidate. (15.12.a)
- d. The Candidate shall be responsible for the organization and comprehensiveness of the WPAF.

- 57 e. If the Candidate is requested to remove any material from the WPAF, the candidate can either
58 remove the material or add explanations to the reflective statement about the relevance of the
59 material.
- 60 2. ~~Submission of the WPAF~~
- 61 ~~a. The Candidate shall be responsible for indicating clearly in a cover letter the specific action the~~
62 ~~candidate is requesting: consideration for retention, tenure, and/or promotion.~~
- 63 ~~b.~~ The Candidate is responsible for submission of the WPAF in adherence to the RTP Timetable.
- 64 3. The Candidate is responsible for preparing, as necessary, a timely rebuttal or response at each level
65 of the review according to the RTP Timetable.
- 66 4. The Candidate is responsible for requesting a meeting, if wanted, at each level of the review
67 according to the RTP Timetable. No formal, written response is required subsequent to this
68 meeting.
- 69 5. The Candidate may request and shall approve of external review and reviewers. (15.12.d) See
70 Appendix C.
- 71 ...

FAC: Department Chair Selection

Rationale: in Spring 2012, the Academic Senate approved an interim policy to incorporate lecturer faculty input in the department chair recommendation process, in compliance with lecturer faculty rights as stipulated in the CBA. Some in Senate voiced concerns that lecturer input might contradict that of tenure-line faculty -- that in units with a large number of lecturer faculty, the tenure-line faculty might be "outvoted" by lecturer faculty. During the Fall 2012 semester, the FAC consulted with affected university units to ascertain the extent to which such concerns were borne out in the Spring 2012 Chair recommendation process. The FAC inquiry found no such instances -- rather, in all of the department chair recommendation processes in CHABSS, CSM, and CoBA, there was only one nominee for each department chair opening, and in no case was there any disparity between tenure-line versus lecturer faculty recommendations regarding these uncontested nominations. The process in question is not an election -- it is, rather, a faculty recommendation to the President, who, per the CBA, exercises sole authority in the appointment of department chairs -- and thus, in the absence of "votes," neither tenure-line nor lecturer faculty can be "out-voted" in such a process;

Definition: A policy regarding the process for selecting recommendations for department chair.

Authority: President of the University.

Scope: Departments within Academic Affairs.

I. ELIGIBILITY

Any full-time probationary or tenured faculty member is eligible to serve as a department chair.

II. NOMINATION PROCESS

A. Nominations must be open for a minimum of one week.

B. Potential candidates may self-nominate or be nominated by lecturer or tenure line faculty in the department.

C. Permission must be given by a nominee before their name is placed on the ballot.

D. Nominations will be collected by the Dean's office.

III. ELIGIBLE VOTERS

A. All tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote for nominated candidates.

B. All lecturer faculty with a minimum of two semesters of employment in a department are eligible to vote for nominated candidates.

C. In the academic year in which the nominating process occurs: 1) tenure-track faculty shall have a full vote; 2) lecturer faculty with a 0.5 or greater entitlement shall have a full vote; 3) lecturer faculty with less than a 0.5 entitlement shall have a half vote.

D. Faculty with split appointments will be entitled to vote in both departments in accordance with III. A-C above.

IV. BALLOT PREPARATION AND RECOMMENDATION PROCESS

A. The voting shall take place during the last year of the incumbent's term.

B. The Dean's office shall prepare the electronic ballots.

57 C. Ballots shall contain the names of one or more nominees.

58
59 D. The Dean's office shall oversee the voting.

60
61 V. SELECTION OF CANDIDATE TO BE RECOMMENDED

62
63 A. The Dean's office will prepare separate electronic ballots for tenure track faculty, lecturer faculty
64 entitled to a full vote, and lecturer faculty entitled to a half vote, as defined in section III above.

65
66 B. Ballots will have each nominee's name and instructions to select "Recommend," "Do not
67 Recommend," or "Abstain" for each name.

68
69 C. The electronic voting will be open for one week.

70
71 D. The Dean's office will count the ballots and report the tenure track and lecturer votes separately to
72 the Dean.

73
74 E. When selecting the chair, the President's designee will take into consideration the total
75 "Recommend" votes cast by the department.

1 **BLP/UCC: CoBA Healthcare Information Technology Certificate Program**

2
3 Report from BLP: To assist members of the Academic Senate in their consideration of program
4 proposals, BLP reviews P-forms to assess enrollment prospects as well as likely resource implications of
5 launching a proposed program. We thank Dr. Jack Leu, the proposer of the proposed HIT certificate
6 program, for his collegial response to our feedback so that we could complete our evaluation in a timely
7 fashion.
8

9 **Overview:** This program was launched in AY 2012-13 as a not-for-credit certificate program. As such, it
10 did not require Academic Senate approval. This proposal would, once approved by the Academic
11 Senate, allow the program to be re-launched as a for-credit, self-support program.
12

13 **Program Demand:** As a not-for-credit, self-support program, the HIT program was launched this year
14 with 21 students, many of whom already hold advanced degrees and/or are already working in the health
15 care field. It is anticipated that moving to a for-credit model will enhance recruitment, as this will allow
16 students to apply for financial aid and/or obtain employer support for tuition fees. Extended Learning
17 estimates that 20 students per cohort will need to be recruited for the program to be viable. Community
18 support for the program is also demonstrated by the members recruited to the program's own Advisory
19 Board, the list of whom includes various leaders in the local health care industry. Additionally, the
20 current not-for-credit program is supported by partnerships with various local health care providers,
21 including Sharp Health and Planned Parenthood.
22

23 **Resource Implications:** All of the program's existing not-for-credit courses will require Senate approval
24 to be listed in the future as for-credit offerings; however, all courses will be offered as self-support, so no
25 state funding is requested or anticipated. Extended Learning currently estimates that students will be
26 charged \$450 per unit, plus any additional standard campus fees.
27

28 Most courses will be offered by COBA's tenure-track faculty; as currently envisioned, these faculty
29 members, in conjunction with the College, will have the option of teaching these courses as "overloads"
30 (for additional pay, per the CBA pay scale) or as part of their standard workload (with the College to be
31 reimbursed by Extended Learning for the faculty member's reassigned time). Advising resources
32 (including resources needed to run admissions) need to be worked out in advance with Extended
33 Learning. The Library has suggested subscribing to an additional online database (Cochrane Database of
34 Systematic Reviews, \$3500/year); this database would then be available to students in other programs as
35 well. Any such resource needs should be worked out with Extended Learning and factored into the
36 assigned student fees.
37

38 Report from UCC: In November, UCC approved Healthcare Information Technology Certificate Program
39 with six courses.

40 This program was launched in AY 2012-13 as a not-for-credit certificate program. It is currently being
41 taught through Extended Learning. This proposal would, once approved by the Academic Senate, allow
42 the program to be a for-credit program through EL.
43

44 The program includes six two-units courses:

45 HIT 500 - Healthcare Systems: Structure and Process

46 HIT 510 - Data Management for Healthcare Decision Support

47 HIT 520 - Electronic Health Records

48 HIT 530 - Data Communication and Security for Healthcare

49 HIT 540 - Managing Healthcare System Change

50 HIT 550 - Project Management and Process Improvement for Healthcare
51

52 One of the key component of the United States' healthcare system reform is to replace archaic medical
53 and health record and paper-based systems with modern information technologies. This program has

54 been designed to address these needs and challenges. It emphasizes information technology, application
55 of analytical methods, re-engineering, innovation, and change management. The program has support
56 from healthcare professionals throughout the nation as well as faculty from CoBA, Computer Science
57 and School of Nursing. All of the courses for the certificate programs have already been developed and
58 half of them have been taught in fall semester 2012. The curriculum received inputs from an advisory
59 board consisting of clinicians and healthcare professionals.

61 Proposed Catalog Language for the
62 Healthcare Information Technology Certificate:

63
64 Healthcare Information Technology (HIT) Certificate Program

65
66 The United States' healthcare system is undergoing a fundamental transformation to address
67 ballooning costs while improving access, quality, safety, and efficiency. A critical element of this
68 revolution is the replacement of archaic medical and health record and reporting paper-based
69 systems with modern information technologies. These changes will provide new and expanding
70 professional opportunities. The CSUSM Healthcare Information Technology (HIT) Certificate
71 program will focus on providing participants with a broader vision of the future of healthcare and
72 the knowledge needed to encourage its evolution and serve as agents of change, innovators,
73 leaders, and entrepreneurs.

74 The graduate-level CSUSM HIT program has been specifically designed to address these needs
75 and challenges. The program emphasizes information technology, application of analytical
76 methods, re-engineering, innovation, and change management. The program has been developed
77 and taught by faculty and industry experts. It engages students by integrating theory and real
78 world applications, drawing from a variety of organizations and industry groups. The program
79 will also showcase HIT startups. Students will acquire skills relevant to a range of healthcare
80 industry sectors including providers, insurers, government agencies, plan sponsors, HIT support
81 and training organizations, and HIT new ventures.

82 **Admission and Application Requirements**

- 83
 - A bachelor's degree or **a senior standing in college with relevant skills or experiences**
 - 84 **in information systems or healthcare**
 - 85 • Mathematical proficiency at a minimum level of college Algebra
 - 86 • Submission of the online [HIT Program Application \(http://www.csusm.edu/el/HIT\)](http://www.csusm.edu/el/HIT)
 - 87 • [Submission of a personal statement](#)
 - 88 • Submission of current resume
 - 89 • Hard copy transcripts from each college and university attended mailed to:

90 **California State University San Marcos**

91 **Extended Learning**

92 **Attn: Student Services/HIT Program**

93 333 S. Twin Oaks Valley Rd.

94 San Marcos, CA 92096

96 **Total Units: 12**

97

98 **Course Title** **Units**

99

100 HIT 500 – Healthcare Systems: Structure and Process 2

101 HIT 510 – Data Management for Healthcare Decision Support 2

102 HIT 520 – Electronic Health Records 2

103 HIT 530 – Data Communication and Security for Healthcare 2

104 HIT 540 – Managing Healthcare System Change 2

105 HIT 550 – Project Management and Process Improvement for Healthcare 2

FAC: Lecturer Evaluation policy

Rationale: *The Faculty Affairs Committee was originally charged with reviewing and revising as necessary all university procedures for evaluation in light of the new Collective Bargaining Agreement (September 18, 2012 - June 30, 2014). As it was studying the procedure for Lecturer evaluation in the College of Science and Math, FAC realized that all college/division documents on Lecturer evaluation would need revision in light of the new CBA. So FAC consulted with Executive Committee and then embarked on the project of developing a new university-wide procedure for Lecturer evaluation, parallel to the university RTP document for tenure track faculty. The draft procedure addresses all Lecturers, including librarians and counselors (SSP-ARs), but not coaches (once this document is finalized, it would be adapted for the evaluation of coaches). FAC has collaborated with the office of Faculty Affairs to develop timetables for the Lecturer evaluation process, parallel to the timetable for RTP. The timetables are not part of the proposed procedure document, but we include the draft timetables to illustrate to Senators how the process will work. Lastly, FAC has worked with Faculty Affairs to make available to Senators some materials to explain the differences between Lecturer evaluation in the old CBA and the new CBA.*

Also please note that the proposed procedure does not include any forms. Depending on the discussion in the Senate, FAC can develop them later and in light of the new procedure.

FAC believes that having a university-wide procedure for Lecturer evaluation will be beneficial to all parties. If the Academic Senate and the President approve this procedure, all College/division documents would need to be changed to conform. College/division documents would have to be updated anyway to conform to the new CBA, but hopefully with a university-wide procedure, College/division could be more streamlined and also be edited to reflect the reality of the restructuring and also any initiatives to develop standards at the department or equivalent level.

Definition:

Authority:

Scope:

I. Purpose

This document establishes a university-wide procedure for CSUSM for the periodic evaluation of Lecturer Faculty, including librarians and counselors (SSP-ARs), taking into account the need to:

- A. Comply with Board of Trustees policies, Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, the California Education Code; the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and other applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the employment of Lecturer Faculty.
- B. Be consistent with the terms outlined in the appointment letters issued to Lecturer Faculty.
- C. Provide Lecturer Faculty with feedback to improve teaching and student learning.
- D. Provide evaluators with materials for the periodic evaluation of Lecturer Faculty.
- E. Provide appropriate administrators with documentation to base reappointment and other personnel actions relating to Lecturer Faculty.

II. Definitions

- A. A *Lecturer Faculty* member (or *Lecturer*) is a full-time or part-time Unit 3 employee appointed for one or more semesters off the tenure track. *Full-time* refers to an appointment totaling fifteen units in a semester, within one department, program or equivalent. *Part-time* refers to an appointment

55 totaling fewer than fifteen units in a semester.

56
57 B. A *semester or equivalent* means an academic semester or a four-month appointment period.

58
59 C. The *evaluation cycle* is the period of service being evaluated as specified in this procedure; e.g.
60 one semester, one academic year, three years, or six years.

61
62 D. The *appropriate administrator* for each college and the library is the Dean or Associate Dean. The
63 *appropriate administrator* for counselors is the Director of Student Health and Counseling.

64
65 E. Composition of the Peer Review Committee (PRC)

66 The Department or appropriate academic unit is responsible for determining the size and election
67 conditions of the PRC. The Department Chair shall ensure that there is an election of a PRC.
68 Where no Department Chair exists, the department or appropriate faculty governance unit will
69 ensure that there is an election of a PRC.

70
71 The PRC shall be composed of at least three full-time tenured faculty elected by tenure-track
72 faculty in the Lecturer's department (or equivalent), with the chair elected by the committee. If
73 there are not enough eligible faculty members in a department or program, the department or
74 program shall elect Peer Review Committee members from eligible university faculty in related
75 academic disciplines.

76
77 Each College or equivalent unit shall adopt procedures for electing a
78 Peer Review Committee from the eligible faculty. These procedures must follow the guidelines
79 of the CBA.

80
81 F. The *Working Personnel Action File* (WPAF) shall be defined as that file specifically generated for
82 use in a given evaluation cycle. That file shall include all required forms and documents, all
83 information specifically provided by the Lecturer being evaluated, and information provided by
84 faculty, students and academic administrators. It shall also include all faculty and administrative
85 level evaluation recommendations from the current evaluation cycle, and all rebuttal statements
86 and responses submitted (CBA 15.8). The WPAF may be submitted in electronic format. Guidelines
87 for electronic submission may be obtained from the college / division.

88
89 The materials in the WPAF shall be incorporated by reference into the PAF. At the beginning of the
90 evaluation cycle, the Lecturer being evaluated shall prepare an index of these materials and submit
91 it with the WPAF. Lecturer faculty shall appropriately update the index to reflect any material
92 added to the WPAF during the course of the evaluation. This index and the CV shall be
93 permanently placed in the PAF by the Dean's office (or appropriate administrator). At the end of
94 the evaluation cycle, the WPAF shall be returned to the Lecturer (CBA 15.9).

95
96 G. The *Personal Action File* (PAF) shall be defined as "the one (1) official personnel file for
97 employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or
98 personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee." Only the official PAF shall be used as the
99 basis of personnel actions (CBA 11.1).

100
101 H. Colleges/divisions and/or departments/programs may also provide additional evaluation
102 criteria, which may be termed *Standards*. Such *Standards* must be approved in accordance with
103 campus policy, such as the policy on *Temporary Faculty Unit 3 Employees-Department Level Standards*
104 *and Additional Material for Evaluations*.

105
106 I. Throughout this document, the word "*shall*" indicates mandatory action; the word "*may*"

indicates voluntary action.

III. General Procedure

A. No later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term, the Office of Faculty Affairs shall provide each Lecturer a copy of the *Procedure for Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty*. During that time frame, the college/division and/or department/program shall provide its specific evaluation standards and/or criteria (if any). Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committees and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in evaluation criteria and procedures (CBA 15.3).

B. Each academic year, the Office of Faculty Affairs shall publish *Timetables for the Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty*. The timetables shall include deadlines for submission of the WPAF as well as for each stage of the evaluation. All Lecturer evaluations must be completed in accordance with the established deadlines. Each spring, the Dean's Office or appropriate administrator shall give to department chairs and their equivalents a list of Lecturers appointed in their program areas, including the terms of their appointments and entitlements (if any).

C. Prior to the beginning of the evaluation process, the Lecturer shall be responsible for the identification of materials they wish to be considered and for the submission of such materials (CBA 15.12a).

D. Review for Completeness: evaluating committees and administrators shall be responsible for identifying materials relating to the evaluation *not* provided by Lecturers (CBA 15.12a). For Lecturer appointments specified in Sections IV.A and IV.C, below, department chairs shall review the file for completeness and contribute such information to the appropriate administrator.

E. Once a WPAF is declared complete, additional material may only be inserted with the approval of the evaluation committee, as applicable, and the appropriate administrator and shall be limited to items that became accessible after this declaration. Material inserted in this fashion shall be returned to the initial level evaluation committee, as applicable, for review, evaluation and comment before consideration at subsequent levels of review (if any). If, during the evaluation process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the WPAF shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner (CBA 15.12b).

F. The WPAF shall be forwarded in a timely manner to the next level of review, as applicable (CBA 15.4). At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to the next level, the Lecturer shall be given a copy of the recommendation and the written reasons thereof. The Lecturer may submit a written rebuttal or response within ten (10) days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the WPAF and also be sent to all previous levels of review, as applicable (CBA 15.5).

G. Faculty, students, academic administrators and the President may contribute information to the evaluation of Lecturer Faculty. Information submitted by the Lecturer and by academic administrators may include statements and opinions about the qualifications and work of the Lecturer provided by other persons identified by name (CBA 15.2).

H. Only tenured faculty and academic administrators may engage in deliberations and make recommendations on the evaluation of Lecturers (CBA 15.2). Only tenured faculty can serve on peer review committees (PRC).

I. Probationary and Lecturer Faculty may provide peer input, if so requested by the Lecturer being evaluated, but they may not engage in deliberations or make recommendations.

J. Written or electronic Student Evaluations of Instruction shall be required for all Lecturers who teach, in accordance with the CBA. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the Lecturer's PAF or may be stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the PAF. Individuals involved in evaluations and personnel recommendations and decisions shall be provided secure access for these purposes (15.15).

K. Lecturers with appointments in more than one department, program or equivalent shall be evaluated separately by each department, program or equivalent based on their appointment in that department, program or equivalent.

L. A request for an external review of materials submitted by a Lecturer may be initiated at any level of review and by any party to the review. Such a request shall specify the special circumstances that necessitate an outside reviewer and the nature of the materials needing external review. The request must be approved by the President or President's designee with the concurrence of the Lecturer (CBA 15.12 d).

M. When classroom visits are utilized as part of the evaluation, the Lecturer shall be provided at least five (5) days notice that a peer visit is to take place. There shall be an opportunity for consultation between the Lecturer and the peer following the visit (CBA 15.14).

N. The Lecturer shall be provided an electronic copy of the evaluation, which must be signed and returned by the Lecturer (electronically or in hard copy). The signed evaluation shall be placed in the Lecturer's PAF (CBA 15.27). If the signed evaluation is not returned in 10 days, it shall be placed in the Lecturer's PAF unsigned.

O. All reappointment decisions and other personnel actions shall be based only upon evidence in the Lecturer's PAF (CBA 11.1).

IV. Evaluation Requirements by Type of Appointment

A. Lecturer Hired for One Semester or Less

A Lecturer hired for one semester or less shall be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair, the appropriate administrator, or the department or equivalent. The Lecturer may request that an evaluation be performed (CBA 15.25).

B. Full-Time Lecturer Not Eligible for a Three-Year Appointment

A full-time Lecturer appointed for an academic year but not eligible for a three-year appointment shall be evaluated on a yearly basis. This evaluation shall include Student Evaluations of Instruction, if applicable, evaluation by a PRC of the department or equivalent, evaluation by the appropriate administrator and an opportunity for peer input, if requested by the Lecturer (CBA 15.23).

C. Part-Time Lecturer Not Eligible for a Three-Year Appointment

A part-time Lecturer appointed for an academic year but not eligible for a three-year appointment shall be evaluated on a yearly basis. This evaluation shall include Student Evaluations of Instruction, if applicable, evaluation by the department chair or the appropriate administrator, and an opportunity for peer input, if requested by the Lecturer (CBA 15.24).

211 **D. Full- or Part-Time Lecturer Eligible for a Three-Year Appointment**

212 A full- or part-time Lecturer eligible for a three-year appointment shall be evaluated in the
213 academic year preceding the issuance of a three-year appointment. This evaluation shall include
214 Student Evaluations of Instruction, if applicable, evaluation by a PRC of the department or
215 equivalent, evaluation by the appropriate administrator, and an opportunity for peer input, if
216 requested by the Lecturer.

217
218 The evaluation shall consider the Lecturer's cumulative work performance during the entire
219 qualifying period for a three-year appointment and shall rate the Lecturer as "satisfactory" or
220 "unsatisfactory" (CBA 15.28).¹

221
222 **E. Full- and Part-Time Lecturer Holding a Three-Year Appointment**

223 A full- or part-time Lecturer holding a three-year appointment shall be evaluated in the third year
224 of the appointment. The Lecturer may be evaluated more frequently upon their request or at the
225 request of the President or designee (CBA 15.26). This evaluation shall include Student Evaluations
226 of Instruction, if applicable, evaluation by a PRC of the department or equivalent, evaluation by the
227 appropriate administrator, and an opportunity for peer input, if requested by the Lecturer.

228
229 The evaluation shall consider the Lecturer's cumulative work performance during the entire three-
230 year appointment and shall rate the Lecturer as "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" (CBA 15.29).²

231
232 **V. Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)**

233
234 A. A WPAF is required for all Lecturer Faculty being evaluated.

235
236 B. For the purposes of the periodic evaluation, the WPAF for Lecturers with teaching duties shall
237 include:

- 238 1. WPAF Checklist, completed and signed by the Lecturer (Exhibit I)
- 239 2. Index of Materials
- 240 3. Current curriculum vitae
- 241 4. A list of all courses taught in the department or equivalent
- 242 5. One representative syllabus for each course taught during the evaluation cycle⁶. The complete
243 university-prepared report of the Student Evaluations of Instruction for all courses evaluated in
244 accordance with the CBA during the evaluation cycle (CBA 15.15)³.
- 245 7 A self-assessment or reflection with respect to the duties of the appointment for the evaluation

¹ "A three-year appointment shall be issued if the temporary faculty unit employee is determined by the appropriate administrator to have performed in a satisfactory manner in carrying out the duties of his/her position. The determination of the appropriate administrator shall be based on the contents of the Personnel Action File and any materials generated for use in any given evaluation cycle pursuant to 15.8. Where the appropriate administrator determines that a Temporary Faculty Unit Employee has not performed his/her duties in a satisfactory manner, then the reasons for his/her determination shall be reduced to writing and placed in the Personnel Action File" (CBA 15.28).

² "A subsequent three-year appointment shall be issued if the temporary faculty unit employee is determined by the appropriate administrator to have performed in a satisfactory manner in carrying out the duties of his/her position. The determination of the appropriate administrator shall be based on the contents of the Personnel Action File and any materials generated for use in any given evaluation cycle pursuant to 15.8. Where the appropriate administrator determines that a Temporary Faculty Unit Employee has not performed his/her duties in a satisfactory manner, then the reasons for his/her determination shall be reduced to writing and placed in the Personnel Action File" (CBA 15.29).

³ "All classes taught by each faculty unit employee shall have such student evaluations unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after consideration of the recommendation of appropriate faculty committee(s)."

cycle

8. Course materials such as sample lesson plans, assessments of student learning outcomes, assignments, and examples of student work, pertaining to the evaluation cycle

9. Materials required in accordance with approved college/division and/or department/program or equivalent criteria

10. Copies of all prior periodic evaluations with responses/rebuttals (if any);

11. A copy of the relevant university procedure, and all college /division, and department /program Lecturer evaluation criteria

11. Mailing address to which a copy of the Lecturer's evaluation may be sent.

C. For the purposes of the periodic evaluation, the WPAF for Lecturers, Librarians and Counselors whose primary duties are not teaching shall include:

1. WPAF Checklist, completed and signed by the Lecturer (Exhibit II)

2. Index of Materials

3. Job Description or Assignment of Responsibility

4. Current curriculum vitae

5. A self-assessment or reflection with respect to the duties of the appointment for the evaluation cycle

6. Materials required in accordance with approved college/division and/or department/program or equivalent criteria

7. Copies of all prior periodic evaluations with responses/rebuttals (if any);

8. A copy of the relevant university procedure, and all college /division, and department /program Lecturer evaluation criteria

9. Mailing address to which a copy of the Lecturer's evaluation may be sent.

D. For the purposes of the periodic evaluation, the WPAF may also include:

1. Any other evidence relevant to the duties of the appointment

2. Evidence of scholarship, professional development, creative activities, and/or service to the campus, the community and/or the profession, whether or not these are required by the appointment. (If these activities are not required by the appointment but are performed voluntarily, they may be recognized as an additional positive factor in the evaluation. However, a lack thereof shall not be considered a negative factor in the evaluation.)

3. Optional peer input from the period being evaluated.

VI. Considerations

A. Lecturers shall be evaluated in compliance with the Unit 3 CBA, in accordance with this procedure, and following the criteria approved by their colleges/divisions and by departments /programs(if any).. In case of conflict between college/division criteria or department/ program criteria and this University-wide procedure, the University-wide procedure shall prevail. This procedure is subject to Board of Trustees policies, Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, the California Education Code, the Unit 3 CBA, and other applicable State and Federal laws.

B. Lecturer Faculty shall present the relevant evidence in each category (or area) of performance of their appointment. Each level of review is responsible for evaluating the quality and significance of all evidence presented.

C. Every evaluator, at all levels of review, shall read the Lecturer's WPAF.

D. In the evaluation of teaching performance, Student Evaluations of Instruction shall not constitute the sole evidence of teaching quality.

298 E. The Lecturer shall have access to their WPAF at all reasonable times except when the WPAF is
299 undergoing review.

300
301 F. Maintaining confidentiality is an extremely serious obligation on the part of reviewers.
302 Lecturers who believe that confidentiality has been broken may pursue relief under the CBA
303 (CBA10).

304
305 G. The issuance of a three-year appointment shall be determined by the appropriate
306 administrator based on the contents of the Lecturer's PAF and any materials generated for use in
307 any given evaluation cycle. Where the appropriate administrator determines that a Lecturer has
308 not performed their duties in a satisfactory manner, then the reasons for their determination shall
309 be reduced to writing and placed in the PAF (CBA 15).

312

Timetable for Periodic Evaluation of Lecturers:⁴ 1. On one-semester appointments 2. Part-time on one-year appointments		
Action	Calendar Days	Due Date
Fall Semester Evaluations		
WPAF turned in to Dean's Office by Lecturer	1	
Chair to review for completeness	10	
Chair to notify Dean's Office of lacking materials		
Dean's Office to notify Lecturer of lacking materials	10	
Lecturer adds requested material		
Chair review period	30	
Chair adds summaries of Fall Student Evaluations of Instruction		
College/division sends Chair evaluation to Lecturer		
Lecturer's optional response/rebuttal period	10	
Spring Semester Evaluations		
WPAF turned in to Dean's Office by Lecturer	1	
Chair to review for completeness	10	
Chair to notify Dean's Office of lacking materials		
Dean's Office to notify Lecturer of lacking materials	10	
Lecturer adds requested materials		
Chair review period	30	
Chair adds summaries of Spring Student Evaluations of Teaching		
College/division sends Chair evaluation to Lecturer		
Lecturer's optional response/rebuttal period	10	

313

314

Timetable for Periodic Evaluation of Lecturers:⁵ 1. Full-time on one-year appointments 2. Eligible for three-year appointments 3. On three-year appointments		
Action	Calendar Days	Due Date
WPAF turned in to Dean's Office by Lecturer	1	
PRC to review for completeness	5	
PRC to notify Dean's Office of lacking materials		
Dean's Office to notify Lecturer of lacking materials	7	
Lecturer adds requested material		
PRC review period	20	
College/division sends PRC evaluation to Lecturer		
Lecturer's optional response/rebuttal period	10	
Dean/Associate Dean review period	20	
College/division sends Dean's/Associate Dean's evaluation to Lecturer		
Lecturer's optional response/rebuttal period	10	

315

316

⁴ If an extension of time is necessary, a request shall be made to the appropriate administrator. It may only be granted for a reasonable period of time.

⁵ If an extension of time is necessary, a request shall be made to the appropriate administrator. It may only be granted for a reasonable period of time.