AGENDA
Executive Committee Meeting
CSUSM Academic Senate
Wednesday ~ April 9, 2014 ~ Commons 206
REMINDER: This EC meeting starts at 11:30am in COM 206

Need a notetaker!

I.   Approval of agenda

II.   Approval of minutes of 03/26/2014 meeting

III.   Chair's report, Vivienne Bennett
        Referrals: APC, Policy on Centers and Institutes

IV.   Vice chair's report, Laurie Stowell

V.   Provost's report, Graham Oberem

VI.   Consent Calendar items

        NEAC   Recommendations
        UCC   Recommendations

VII.   Discussion items
        Start with the items in green at 11:30am with the Vice Chair (the Senate Chair cannot attend EC until 12 noon)
        A.   Senate Chair: Program Discontinuation policy:
                - AD Hoc Program Viability Review Committee: when to convene the committees, Sp 14 or F 15?
                - Does the merger of two existing Options in a major into a new Option require program discontinuation policy for the two existing Options?
        B.   NEAC: Revision of Standing Rules   *attached*
        C.   LATAC: Revised charge   *attached*
        D.   FAC: Psychology Department Standards for RTP   *attached*
        E.   FAC: Post Tenure Review policy revisions   *attached (3 attachments)*
        F.   FAC: CHABSS, Evaluation of Lecturer Unit 3 Employees *attached*
        G.   Beavers/Avalos: President's Awards to include lecturers *attached*
        H.   APC   Dual Listing of LD and UD courses   *attached*
        I.   Officers: Graduate Policy Committee
        J.   Chair: Senate chair & vice chair term

VIII.   Information items

IX.   EC members' concerns & announcements

CONSENT CALENDAR

NEAC Recommendations

Committee	Seat & Term	Name(s)
Faculty Engagement Advisory Committee	CHABSS-BSS 14-16	Joely Proudfit
Faculty Engagement Advisory Committee	At-large 14-16	S. Deborah Kang (CHABSS)
Instructional Related Activities Fee Committee	Spring 2014	Ofer Melich

UCC Recommendations

SUBJ	No.	COURSE/PROGRAM TITLE	FORM	ORIGINATOR	TO UCC	UCC APPROVED
ANTH		B.A. in Anthropology	P-2	Bonnie Bade	8/26/2013	7/27/2014
HIST		History M.A. Program	P-2	Alyssa Sepinwall	9/18/2013	3/13/2014
CHEM	106	Introduction to Organic and Biochemistry	C	Sajith Jayasinghe	10/22/2013	2/27/2014
CHEM	106L	Introduction to Organic and Biochemistry Laboratory	C	Sajith Jayasinghe	10/22/2013	2/27/2014
BIOL	489	Introduction to Laboratory/Field Research	C-2	Deborah Kristan	10/22/2013	2/27/2014
MKTG	451	Customer Lifecycle Marketing	C-2	Camille Schuster	10/2/2013	3/6/2014
CHEM	250	Quantitative Chemistry	C-2	Paul Jasien	10/22/2013	3/13/2014
HIST	621	Thesis Research, Writing, and Media Presentation Continuation	D	Alyssa Sepinwall	6/20/2013	3/13/2014
EDMI	663	Middle Level Leadership	C	Erika Daniels	10/23/2014	3/27/2014
KINE	202	Introduction to Physical Education and Kinesiology	C-2	Jeff Nessler	10/29/2013	3/27/2014
KINE	307	Techniques and Analysis of Team Court Sports	C-2	Jeff Nessler	10/29/2013	3/27/2014

STANDING RULES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

California State University San Marcos

Adopted Fall 1990 by faculty vote

Amended Fall 1991 by Executive Committee

Amended Summer 1992 by Executive Committee

Amended Fall 1994 by Executive Committee

Amended Fall 1996 by Executive Committee

Amended Spring 1997 by Executive Committee

Amended Fall 2011 by Executive Committee

Amended Fall 2012 by Executive Committee

Amended Fall 2013 by Executive Committee

ACADEMIC SENATE

1. Agendas and approved minutes of the Academic Senate meetings shall be made available on the Senate website.

2. The Executive Committee will present items to the Senate for a single vote of approval without discussion via the Consent Calendar. Any item can be removed for particular consideration by request of a Senator prior to vote on the list of consent items. This item then becomes a first reading item that is discussed in the same meeting.

3. New proposed policies, procedures, and programs developed by standing committees of the Academic Senate will be subject to the first and second reading requirement. Major proposed revisions to such policies, procedures, and programs will likewise be subject to this requirement. Minor revisions, other documents intended for Senate approval, and

30   simple resolutions will not be subject to this requirement unless it is deemed necessary by
31   (1) the Executive Committee or (2) the Academic Senate during the approval of the agenda.

32

33   4.   A first reading item is a discussion item, not an action item. Its purpose is to allow the
34   proposer to explain the proposal under consideration. In addition, it provides a forum for
35   Senators to provide comments, suggestions, and questions to the proposer. Between the
36   first and second reading, the proposal remains the property of the proposer, and senators are
37   encouraged to send comments, suggestions, and questions to the proposer via email.

38

39   5.   The first and second readings of an item occur in separate Senate meetings. The Senate
40   may suspend this rule and move directly from a first to a second reading via a motion that
41   receives a favorable vote of two-thirds.

42

43   6.   A second reading item is an action item. Action items are usually scheduled before
44   discussion items in the agenda.

45

46   7.   All action items will be accompanied by a motion. Second readings will be accompanied by
47   a motion to approve the proposed policy, procedure, or program, or to endorse the
48   document in question. A proposed revision to a policy, procedure, or program will be
49   accompanied by a motion to replace the existing policy, procedure, or program. In the case
50   of documents drafted by Senate committees, the Senate may amend the document during
51   the second reading only via a subsidiary motion; the main motion then applies to the
52   document as amended.

53

54   8.   If an action item comes recommended by a standing committee, the associated motion does
55   not need to be moved and seconded in the Senate. In this case the chair will announce the
56   recommendation, and the chair of the recommending committee or designee will initiate
57   debate by speaking in favor of a motion. If an action item does not come recommended by
58   a standing committee the associated motion must be moved and seconded before debate
59   may commence. The mover will start debate by speaking in favor of the motion.

60

61   9.   Whenever a vote is taken during an Academic Senate meeting, eligible voters present will
62   choose between voting 'Yes,' 'No,' 'Abstain,' and not voting at all. Voting may be done by
63   voice, show of hands, an electronic method (such as clickers), or a secret ballot (with paper
64   ballots or electronic ballots). To determine the vote's outcome, the YES votes will be
65   compared to the NO votes; the one with most votes wins.

66

67   10.   When voting is done by voice or by an uncounted show of hands, the result shall be
68   recorded as "The motion (the vote) passed" or "The motion (the vote) did not pass."

69

70   11.   When the number of votes is tallied (counting the show of hands, ballots, or electronic
71   votes), then the results shall be recorded showing the total number of YES votes, the total
72   number of NO votes, and the total number of ABSTENTION votes. In this case, the
73   number of abstention votes is recorded for informational purposes only. Only YES votes
74   and NO votes determine the outcome of the voting.

75

76

77 <p align="center">**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**</p>

78

79   12.   The Executive Committee will meet on Wednesdays at 12:00 p.m.

80

81   13.   Agendas and approved minutes of the Executive Committee meetings shall be made
82   available on the Senate website.

83

84

85

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

14. Standing Committee meeting times, places, and agendas will be made public and affected parties will be invited to clarify on issues, particularly when there is no representative on the committee from a constituent unit.

15. Agendas and approved minutes of Standing Committee meetings shall be made available on the Senate website.

MEETING NORMS FOR SENATE-SANCTIONED GROUPS

16. Shared leadership: All are responsible for reinforcing norms and ensuring the meeting is productive.

17. Full participation: Meeting times will be established by consensus to maximize participation by all members. All agree to make themselves as available as possible during regular working days and hours, Monday through Fridays. Members will come to meetings on time and prepared to participate. If absence is anticipated, members will notify the chair in a timely fashion.

18. Achieving the agenda: The agenda will be distributed in advance, and members will strive to stay focused on the agenda.

19. Safe environment: All voices are solicited, actively listened to, and respected. Diverse viewpoints and contributions from all participants are valued.

20. Civilized disagreement: Differing opinions on matters of business are expected. When these differences emerge, they will be managed in a respectful, professional manner as members work toward a better understanding of one other.

117   21.   Self-assessment: Members self-check their own behavior, and regularly assess how well
118   the group is functioning and adjust accordingly.

119

120   22.   Sense of humor: Have fun while working towards common goals

1

2 *Rationale: There committee's charge has been updated to reflect changes in academic uses of*
3 *information technology, as well as growth and change in the Library.*

4

5 Draft revised charge, Technology Policy and Advisory Committee:

6

7 The responsibilities of the Technology Policy and Advisory Committee shall include: 1) Drafting policies
8 under the jurisdiction of the Academic Senate as they relate to the academic uses of information
9 technology. 2) Coordinating with other standing and special committees in formulating, reviewing, and
10 recommending all policies and procedures related to the academic uses of information technology. 3~~2~~)
11 Advising the Academic Senate and other members of the university community involved in planning,
12 development, implementation, and application of technology campus-wide, and a.~~ssisting in the~~
13 ~~communication and collaboration between, and among various constituencies and communities of~~
14 ~~technology users.~~ Examples may include, but are not limited to issues that emerge from the use of
15 technology to support teaching and learning, research, faculty professional development, online
16 instruction, accessibility, copyright, software licensing, the generation and use of electronic databases,
17 email, systems and servers, networks and network security, the campus wireless environment, and
18 emerging technologies. 4~~3~~) Preparing an annual report on the state of technology,~~- issues, problems,~~
19 online instruction at CSUSM, and relevant emerging technologies and trends. This report should be 2-5
20 pages and may be based on, among other sources, a survey of faculty, information from Academic
21 Programs, and college and campus strategic planning documents. This report is not a substitute for a
22 year-end report to the Senate. ~~4) Assisting in the communication and collaboration between, and~~
23 ~~among, various constituencies and communities of technology users.~~In pursuit of these duties, the
24 committee may create ad hoc subcommittees.

25

26 **From the Academic Senate Bylaws:**

27 *Article 6.9: Library and Academic Technology Advisory Committee (LATAC)*

28 The Library and Academic Technology Advisory Committee shall consist of voting members
29 drawn from eligible faculty, Academic Affairs staff, and students. The eligible faculty in each
30 college-level unit shall elect a representative college-level unit to serve on the committee; and
31 one at-large faculty representative. The ~~Library staff shall select one Library staff member; the~~
32 Instructional and Information Technology Services (IITS) staff shall select one IITS
33 staff member; the Academic Affairs staff shall select one staff member; and the Associated
34 Students Incorporated shall select two student members. The committee shall include as ex-
35 officio, non-voting members the Dean of the Library and the Dean of IITS.

36

37   *Article 6.9.1: Library and Academic Technology Advisory Committee Duties:*

38   The committee shall be charged with advising, as necessary, the Dean of the Library and the
39   Dean of (IITS) on matters related to the Library and to academic technology. The committee
40   shall have the authority to draft policies falling under the jurisdiction of the Academic Senate as
41   they relate to library and academic technology issues. The committee will inform the University
42   community about library and academic technology policies, financial standing, library collections
43   and services, academic technology and services, and media issues. The committee will also
44   serve as a channel of communication for expressing faculty, staff, and student needs and
45   expectations to the Library and IITS. In pursuit of these duties, the committee may create ad
46   hoc subcommittees.

47

Department of Psychology Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

37

I. Introduction and Overview

This document elaborates on the CSUSM *Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion* and the CHABSS College *Standards and Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion*. It provides guidance to faculty members concerning the Psychology Department's expectations, and it guides review committees in recommendations related to retention, promotion, and tenure. In addition, it is intended to encourage faculty members to think carefully about how they can best contribute to the mission of the university and the Department throughout their careers. Faculty are encouraged to seek advice and assistance from more senior colleagues regarding ways to meet these expectations.

The Department expects the WPAF to demonstrate active engagement of the faculty member in his/her role as a university professor. This may be shown in a variety of ways, depending upon the interests and strengths of the faculty member, the faculty member's rank and experience, and the needs of the Department, University, and community. However, each faculty member is expected to be actively engaged in each of the three RTP evaluation areas. Of particular importance are the required self-reflection statements that must be included for all three areas of evaluation.

Some activities cut across categories. For example, supervising student research and theses and co-conducting research with students may represent teaching, service, and scholarly activity. In accordance with the University's RTP Document, each activity must be assigned to only one category. However, the faculty member is encouraged to demonstrate the activities' relevance to multiple criteria in their reflective statement.

At every review, probationary faculty in tenure-track lines should be able to clearly demonstrate their progress toward the standards for tenure and promotion, as described below. Additionally, faculty are expected to respond explicitly to advice offered in the most recent prior review when submitting the file for subsequent evaluations.

II. Teaching

A. Overview

Effective teaching is indispensable for retention, promotion, and tenure. While the number of courses offered by a faculty member in a given semester may vary, all faculty are expected to teach courses on a regular basis and to teach courses that serve the needs of the Psychology Department. Faculty are also expected to teach students outside of the classroom by serving on and chairing thesis committees and supervising students in independent study and/or independent research.

74
75   Effective teaching is multifaceted. Some of the practices and attributes that characterize
76 effective college teaching include the possession and continuing development of discipline-
77 specific and pedagogical knowledge; the use of varied instructional techniques; the planning,
78 implementing, assessing, and revising of learning interventions to achieve learning objectives;
79 and the reflection on feedback from students.
80

81 **B. Reflective statement**
82

83   The teaching section of the WPAF centers on the reflective statement. In that statement, the
84 faculty member should tell his or her "teaching story," and then directly support the points made
85 in the story with items that provide evidence of teaching effectiveness. The reflective statement
86 should begin with a brief description of teaching philosophy. The form the reflective statement
87 takes will vary by faculty member, but each of the three aspects of teaching effectiveness
88 described below must be addressed. In addition, issues raised at any level of the most recent
89 prior review must be addressed. Changes made in response to feedback given in prior reviews
90 should be documented or, if the faculty has chosen not to make suggested changes, an
91 explanation should be given.
92

93   i.   **Instructional methods:** the faculty member is expected to:
94   a. Effectively employ a variety of instructional methods such as lecture/discussion,
95   active or collaborative learning, Socratic method, etc.;
96   b. Have an appropriate level of technological competence;
97   c. Be sensitive to diverse needs of students;
98   d. Provide prompt, constructive feedback to students;
99   e. Listen carefully and communicate respectfully with students.
100

101   ii. **Course content:** the faculty member's courses are expected to:
102   a. Reflect the scientific foundation of psychology;
103   b. Have learning goals that appropriately reflect a diversity of perspectives and breadth
104   of content;
105   c. Promote the development of basic skills such as clear writing, critical thinking,
106   information literacy, collaboration with peers, and articulate oral and written
107   communication;
108   d. Incorporate ethical and diversity issues (where appropriate);
109   e. Include exams and assignments that require students to spend 2 additional hours on course-
110   related work for every hour spent in class;
111   f. Result in fair but rigorous grading of students in accordance with the definitions of letter
112   grades provided in the University Catalog.

113   iii. **Assessment:** the faculty member is expected to:
114   a. Have established specific, measurable learning outcomes;
115   b. Align evaluation of learning with learning outcomes;
116   c. Assess those learning outcomes;
117   d. Utilize the results of assessment to improve teaching and learning.

C. Sources of evidence for teaching effectiveness

There are many ways by which a faculty member can demonstrate that s/he is an effective teacher. In all cases, items included in the WPAF should directly relate to points made in the reflective statement, and should be discussed in terms of how they demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Three required sources of evidence *must be* included in the WPAF and will be used to assess teaching effectiveness across categories. *The required sources listed in Section 1 below are necessary but not sufficient to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, and must be supplemented with additional evidence, exemplified by the types of evidence suggested in Section 2 below.*

    i.   Required evidence

      a. **University administered student evaluations of teaching** are required for all faculty but do not count as part of the 30 item limitation**.** We recognize that student evaluations will vary across faculty and course as a function of course type, course difficulty, teaching style, and other variables that may or may not be reflected in the evaluations themselves. Therefore, student evaluations will always be viewed in the context of multiple sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness. However, the Psychology Department standard is that the mean scores on student evaluation items will be in the 4 to 5 (good to excellent) range and not be consistently and substantially lower than the mean scores for similar courses. Instances in which course evaluations are low should be discussed in the reflective statement.

      b. **Peer evaluation.** During the probationary period leading up to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, faculty will be observed in the classroom by a peer at least three times (for the 2nd, 4th, and 6th year reviews); additional classroom observations may be conducted at the request of the those being reviewed. Following a minimum of five days notice to the Candidate, the observations will be conducted by a tenured faculty member in the Psychology Department, using the department's Observable Teaching Behaviors Inventory. Each observation shall be followed by consultation between the Candidate and the reviewer and subsequently will result in a written report that will be included in the WPAF. For promotion from Associate to Full Professor, one peer observation is required. The Department expects that problems noted in the reports will be addressed by the faculty member such that improvements are seen over time. This report shall count toward the 30 item limitation.

      c. **Course syllabi.** Syllabi are expected to provide essential course material (schedules, assignments, grading policies, performance expectations, etc.) and should reflect the extent to which the faculty member has identifed and given thoughtful consideration to the student learning outcomes of each course. Assignments, activities, and methods for evaluating student learning should be consistent with those outcomes.

    ii. Examples of additional evidence: In order to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, evidence beyond the required elements described above must be discussed and included in the WPAF. Examples of such evidence include, but are not limited to:

      a. Teaching awards;

164   b. Samples of graded assignments, papers, and/or exams (with student name removed);
165   c. Samples of assignments and activities;
166   d. Examples of assessment techniques;
167   e. Lecture outlines;
168   f. PowerPoint slide sequences;
169   g. Additional classroom observations;
170   h. Effective use of guest speakers, videos, etc.
171   i. Examples of changes made in pedagogy based on feedback, assessment, additional
172   training, etc.;
173   j. Participation in teaching-related workshops with evidence of how the new
174   information was used in teaching;
175   k. Student feedback other than in course evaluations;
176   l. Examples of technological competence.

III.   Research/Creative Activity

B. Overview

179

180   In the realm of scholarship, the Department holds three primary expectations of its faculty at
181 all ranks: 1) a clear research agenda leading to 2) sustained, effective scholarly effort and 3)
182 public contributions to Psychology as a scientific discipline. The Department particularly values
183 scholarly activity in which students play a meaningful role in the conception, conduct, analysis,
184 interpretation, and final reporting of the scholarly effort. The faculty member under review is
185 encouraged to provide information regarding the role that students play in their scholarly
186 endeavors. In each case it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence of the
187 nature of his or her contribution and the quality of the completed work.

C. Criteria for demonstrating effective scholarship: major and additional achievements

190

191   **i.   Major scholarly achievements include:**
192   a) Peer reviewed journal articles on which the faculty member's contribution was
193   substantial (e.g., lead author or senior author or co-author with a student the faculy
194   member directly supervised), and which are published (or accepted for publication) in
195   well-respected academic journals.
196   b) Book chapters published (or accepted for publication) on which the candidate's
197   contribution was substantial (e.g., lead author or senior author), which is an original
198   work, and which had the possibility of being rejected.
199   c) Scholarly book authored or edited by the faculty member.
200   d) Successful externally funded major grant. Normally, this would be grants from
201   federal agencies, such as National Institute of Health (NIH), National Science
202   Foundation (NSF), Department of Energy (DOE), etc.; however. substantial grants
203   from nationally recognized private foundations may also be included.

204

205   We recognize that other items may be considered major scholarly achievements. In these

206 cases it is expected that the faculty member will provide evidence and arguments that make the
207 case that an item belongs in this category. Evidence of the quality of a journal may be
208 demonstrated, for example, by published rejection rates or impact factors. We suggest that the
209 faculty member consult with senior faculty if there are questions about the most appropriate
210 category for an item.
211

212   ii. **Additional scholarly achievements:** There are a number of other products that are
213   considered evidence of additional scholarly activity. Examples include, but are not
214   limited to:
215   a. External grant proposals (approved, but not necessarily funded)
216   b. Internal grants or small external grants;
217   c. Book chapters, books, conference presentations, invited addresses, and journal
218   articles that do not meet the criteria set forth under major scholary achievements (for
219   example, more minor contributions, articles or chapters on which the candidate is a
220   junior author).

221 D. Examples of evidence documenting Research/Creative Activity can be found in the
222   CHABSS and University RTP policies

IV.   Service

A. Overview

225   The faculty of the Psychology Department have a rich tradition of service given to the Department,
226 College, University, and broader communities. Our department has functioned very well since its
227 inception because faculty have taken service obligations very seriously. Consequently, service activities
228 are highly valued and are an essential component of retention, tenure and promotion evaluations. In
229 addition, to routine service that is required by each tenure line faculty member, we expect that all faculty
230 will participate in additional service that is impactful and meaningful. The extent to which we have this
231 expectation varies with rank, as described below.

232

B. Impact of service

234

235   Documentation of service should be accompanied by a narrative of the impact of the service on the
236 Department, College, University, community, or profession. A narrative of service impact may include a
237 description of the nature of the work, the number of hours spent on tasks, the roles played on committees,
238 and the outcomes of the work. Faculty should convey how the service activity is making a difference on
239 campus, in the community, and/or in the profession.

240

C. Levels of service

242

243	i.	**Routine service:** Routine service is expected of every tenure track faculty member
244		regardless of commitments outside of the Department or University. Psychology faculty are
245		expected to participate in routine service as part of their standard workload (15 WTUs).
246		Faculty who are not teaching due to grant work or outside service commitments are still
247		expected to routinely participate in Department activities (unless on sabbatical). On
248		occasion, routine service might be considered more major service. For example, work on the
249		Department curriculum committee may be quite extensive one year; that would not be
250		considered routine service. It is up to the individual to explain the impact and importance of
251		the service. The following tasks are considered routine service in the Psychology
252		Department and should <u>not</u> be used as evidence of exemplary service when being
253		considered for retention, tenure, or promotion:

- a) Attendance at Department meetings
- b) Scribe for Department meetings (1-2 times per year, as needed)
- c) General academic advising
- d) Monitoring a page on the Psychology Department's website
- e) Conducting transfer/freshmen orientations as needed
- f) Service on the following department-level committees: GA/TA Committee; Policies and Procedures Committee; Budget and Equipment Committee
- g) Attendance at Master's proposals/defenses when one is not a committee member
- h) Participating in regular program assessment activities
- i) Participating in the program review process
- j) Participating in tenure-track search process (not a search committee member)
- k) Attendance at the Psychology Student Research Fair
- l) Attendance at the annual commencement ceremony

268	ii.	**Major service:** These activities are expected of tenure line faculty members but are typically
269		above and beyond routine service. Over time, service activity should be at the department,
270		college and university and community levels, but may vary depending on the year and the
271		faculty members' commitments and interests. It is expected that tenure line faculty will
272		take increasing leadership within these activities as they progress in their career. Examples
273		of major service include but are not limited to:

1. Department level
- a) Department chair (typically limited to Full Professors but may in some circumstances be filled by a faculty member at the Associate Professor level)[1]

---

[1] The Department Chair is a time consuming job that is essential to the very existence of an academic department. Given the burden of this job, the Psychology Department is committed to a model whereby the Chair is rotated among Full Professors for one full term each. Faculty are added to the rotation when they are promoted to the rank of Full Professor. No one is exempt from the obligation to serve a full term as Chair, and thus newly promoted Full Professors should begin to think ahead, planning their research and other service such that they will be ready and able to assume the role of Chair when their time in the rotation arrives. Additionally, it is possible that under some circumstances, an Associate Professor may

278	b)	Graduate Coordinator
279	c)	Because-I-Care (BIC) Resource Fair coordinator
280	d)	Childhood and Adolescent Development (CHAD) program chair
281	e)	Vivarium/Instructional Support Technician (IST) manager
282	f)	Research Fair advisors
283	g)	Human Participant Pool (HPP) coordinator
284	h)	Faculty advisor for course approvals
285	i)	PRC common members
286	j)	MA Thesis Committee work (routinely serve on more than 3 masters theses at a
287		time)
288	k)	Program or curriculum development beyond routine changes
289	l)	Psi Chi/Psychology Student Organization (PSO) advisor
290	m)	Lecturer coordinator
291	n)	Psychology Academic Resource Lab (PARL) Coordinator
292	o)	Developing a major new departmental initiative

293

2. College/University level:

- a) Academic senator
- b) Chair or member of College or Academic Senate committee (e.g., FDC, CAPC, HAPC, FAC, APC, UCC, etc.)
- c) Task force participation
- d) Faculty Mentoring Program participant
- e) Regular participation in university events/open houses
- f) Special event chair (e.g., organizing a conference)

302

3. Community/Professional Service level

- a) Speaker, community event
- b) Reviewer for journals and conferences
- c) Professional presentations to university or community organizations
- d) Officer or committee member professional society
- e) Journal editor
- **f)** Board member

D. Examples of evidence documenting Service can be found in the CHABSS and University RTP policies

---

serve as chair. It is our hope that we will continue to add new tenure-track faculty to our department over time such that no faculty member needs to serve as Chair for more than one term or serve while an Associate Professor. However, faculty must be prepared to serve again if the rotation does not expand or serve as an Associate if circumstances warrant it.

V. Departmental expectations at Performance and Periodic Reviews

Although the areas of evaluation are the same for all levels, expectations differ for assistant, associate, and full professors. Retention recommendations will be based on evaluation of achievements of the faculty member in the three areas as well as an assessment of the faculty member's potential to be a productive department, college, and university citizen. Tenure and promotion recommendations will be based upon evaluations of the overall record of the faculty member in the three areas. Faculty members' accomplishments that were part of the record at the time of hiring or prior promotion generally are not considered in subsequent evaluation cycles, except as evidence of performance continuity or in the case of new hires who were awarded service credit.

A. Expectations for retention of probationary faculty

   i. **Teaching:** Faculty are expected to clearly establish their effectiveness as instructors during the probationary period.

   ii. **Research/Creative Activity:** In the first year, the faculty member is expected to establish a scholarly agenda. In the second and third years the faculty member is expected to present work at a major conference so that by the end of the third year there is at least one journal article in the publication pipeline. Major and additional scholarly achievements should then accumulate across successive reviews at a rate that will enable the faculty member to meet the scholarship standard at the time of tenure and promotion.

   iii. **Service:** Service activities should reflect increasing levels of engagement starting with Department service in the first year or two and additional service at the College, University, and/or community level in the later probationary years. In the first year, service will primarily be routine department service. In the second and third years, in addition to routine Department service, the faculty member *may* include participation in some College or University committees or task forces. It may also include participating in community level events or programs. In the fourth through sixth years, service *should* include some major Department service in addition to routine service as well as some College or University level work. Service may also include participation in local or professional community.

B. Expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor

   i. **Teaching:** The faculty member should have generated considerable evidence of excellence in teaching documented by effective course materials, student evaluations of teaching, and other relevant items.

ii. **Research/Creative Activity:** In addition to evidence of continuous engagement in scholarship, faculty should be able to demonstrate the sustainable nature and independence of their research programs by providing evidence of at least six (6) contributions, at least three (3) of which must be major scholarly achievements. Of the three major scholarly achievements, at least two (2) should be peer-reviewed journal articles on projects initiated <u>after</u> coming to CSUSM.

iii. **Service:** The record of service must include some major Department service in addition to routine service as well as some College or University level work. Service may also include participation in local or professional community.

C. Expectations for promotion to Full Professor

i. **Teaching:** The faculty member should show continued excellence in teaching, as evidenced by effective course materials and student evaluations of teaching that are not substantially below the mean scores for similar courses offered in the Department.

ii. **Research/Creative Activity:** The faculty member should demonstrate a sustained contribution to the scientific knowledge base of the discipline by providing evidence of at least six (6) scholarly achievements, of which three (3) must be major scholarly achievements. These achievements must have occurred after submission of the file for tenure/promotion; therefore, only items that were not included in or added to the WPAF for tenure/promotion will be considered.

iii. **Service:** After earning tenure and promotion, service should continue at the Department level and must also include some leadership positions within the College, University or larger community (e.g., chair of a College committee; leadership in a professional group).

D. Expectations for post tenure periodic review after promotion to Full Professsor

i. Faculty are expected to remain engaged in teaching, scholarship, and service.

ii. The Department recognizes that, after promotion to Full Professor, a faculty career may take a variety of forms. Therefore, the weight given to each of the three areas may differ among faculty.

E. Expectations for faculty hired with service credit

When faculty join CSUSM with service credit based on their work elsewhere, expectations for their teaching, scholarship, and service will be applied based on their credited service time plus their CSUSM service time. For example, an Assistant Professor who arrived with one year of service credit who is being reviewed after one year at CSUSM will be evaluated by the standards appropriate for a faculty member who has completed two years.

FAC Memo to Executive Committee

RE: Post Tenure Periodic Evaluation

4/9/14

The Executive Committee had requested that FAC add a requirement to the document (relevant section below) that all Candidates for Post Tenure Periodic Evaluation (now to be renamed Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty or PETF) shall include all course evaluations.

Policy Section 3.B.1

All teaching faculty shall include consideration of student evaluations of teaching as partial evidence of teaching effectiveness. This consideration may take various forms; for example, a description of student evaluations may be included in the narrative, or a page from the summary statistics provided with the student evaluations of instruction obtained for each of the chosen classes, or a single table summarizing item statistics for all courses to be highlighted in the review may be included with the ~~PTPE~~ *PETF.*

Upon reflection and discussion, FAC declined to do so, reasoning that this was not required by the policy, the CBA, nor was it a change FAC wanted to elect to make because it would fundamentally change the nature of this evaluation.

In response, EC directed FAC to consult with CFA and the administration, based on the idea that the CBA in fact directed that all course evaluations be included. FAC requested a written response from both CFA and the Administration, which are included in full here:

From Michelle Hunt:

As CFA mentioned, below, the CBA and our campus require student evaluations of instruction to occur for all courses taught. Article 15.15 specifically mentions the word "all." CSUSM abides by that requirement, ensuring the evaluations are completed and incorporated in PAFs.

In comparison, the CBA does not clearly dictate how, or in what amount, the student evals are to be "considered" in post tenure evaluations. Article 15.34 does not use the word "all." Thus, I agree with CFA that the campus has room to determine how the evaluations should be

considered. A policy could be written to require all, which would be consistent with evaluations for lecturers or candidates for tenure and promotion; or Senate could chose to continue past practice, treating those with tenure differently by allowing flexibility in how the student evals are considered.

From Besosa for CFA:

The CBA requires that student evaluations of teaching be conducted for faculty who teach (15.15) and that the results of these evaluations be placed in faculty PAFs, which can now be done electronically by extension (15.15). Student evaluations are part of periodic evaluation (15.21) and performance review procedures (15.37).

It is up to the senate to determine in what form the student evaluations of teaching are represented or "considered" in evaluation/review files. The senate may want to consider that the post tenure review procedure be consistent in this matter with other evaluation/review procedures so as to avoid confusion.

For everyone's reference, the relevant CBA section is:

CBA 15.34
For the purpose of maintaining and improving a tenured faculty unit employee's effectiveness, tenured faculty unit employees shall be subject to periodic performance evaluations at intervals of no greater than five (5) years.

Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator. Such periodic evaluations shall be conducted by a peer review committee of the department or equivalent unit, and the appropriate administrator. For those with teaching responsibilities, consideration shall include student evaluations of teaching performance.

On 3/24/14, after being briefed on the EC feedback and reviewing the responses from CFA and the Administration, FAC considered the question: Does FAC wish to change the instructions about student evaluations? Since the CBA allows the faculty to define how to implement the CBA, and since neither the CFA nor the administration believes that this change is required, FAC declined to make the change. The vote was unanimous.

FAC's revision will make the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty process more clear to all involved, and maintains it as a "periodic performance evaluation" (CBA) that is a distinctive from other evaluations. FAC emphasizes that university policy requires that all Candidates for retention, tenure and promotion include all student evaluations in the WPAF. In contrast, the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty is not concerned with retention, tenure or promotion but rather serves to provide feedback to faculty members on their "effectiveness" in order "to maintain and improve faculty performance" (PETF preamble).

Definition: A policy for the periodic post-tenure review of CSUSM faculty.

Authority: CSU Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement

Scope: Tenured Unit 3 faculty

Karen S. Haynes, President	Approval Date

Robert Sheath, Provost	Approval Date

First Revision:
Implemented: 05/01/2000

I.   Introduction

The purpose of Post Tenure Periodic Evaluation (PTPE) is to provide periodic feedback to faculty members[2] on their effectiveness in all areas considered for retention, tenure, and promotion in order to maintain and improve faculty performance. PTPE should be seen as an important part of a faculty member's professional growth, which provides faculty members with a regular opportunity to assess and revise their professional development plans and goals.

II.   Required Review Intervals

A.   Faculty unit employees not being considered for promotion are subject to review every five years following the awarding of tenure.

B.   Faculty on sabbatical or leave of absence during the scheduled year of review shall undergo PTPE upon return to campus.

C.   Faculty who are participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall maintain their five-year review cycle.

III.   Procedure and Timeline

A.   A peer review committee (PRC) of the department or equivalent unit and the Dean/Director of the College/Library/unit shall conduct the PTPE.

B.   PTPE Report -- Faculty undergoing a fifth-year PTPE shall submit a PTPE report. The PTPE report shall address the faculty member's work in all areas considered for retention, tenure, and promotion for the years under review. For faculty with teaching responsibilities, the PTPE report will cover the areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. For librarians, the PTPE report will cover

---

[2] The term "faculty member" refers to instructional faculty, librarians, and SSP-ARs.

the areas of Professional Performance, Research/Creative Activity, and Service.   For SSP-ARs, the PTPE report will cover the areas of Professional Performance, Professional Development, and Service.

1.   In recognition that PTPE may serve different functions at various points in a faculty member's career, the PTPE report may take one of three possible forms. The faculty member under review shall determine the form best suited for the particular PTPE review. The forms are as follow:

a.   A complete curriculum vitae (in the format recommended for the WPAF[3]) and up to a three-page narrative highlighting the faculty member's accomplishments since the last review. The complete CV shall contain sections on Teaching (for instructional faculty) or Professional Performance/Professional Development (for librarians and SSP-ARs), Research/ Creative Activity (if appropriate), and Service.

b.   Five annual reports and up to a three-page narrative highlighting the faculty member's accomplishments since the last review. Each annual report shall contain sections on Teaching (for instructional faculty) or Professional Performance/Professional Development (for librarians and SSP-ARs), Research/ Creative Activity (if appropriate), and Service.

c.   A five to seven page narrative highlighting the faculty member's accomplishments in Teaching (for instructional faculty) or Professional Performance/Professional Development (for librarians and SSP-ARs), Research/ Creative Activity (if appropriate), and Service.

2.   All teaching faculty shall include consideration of student evaluations of teaching as partial evidence of teaching effectiveness. This consideration

---

[3] Please refer to the RTP Handbook produced by the Faculty Center.

may take various forms; for example, a description of student evaluations may be included in the narrative, or a page from the summary statistics provided with the student evaluations of instruction obtained for each of the chosen classes, or a single table summarizing item statistics for all courses to be highlighted in the review may be included with the PTPE.

3. Any reviewer may request of the candidate additional information on their PTPE report.

4. Upon the request of the PRC and/or the Dean/Director, faculty shall be prepared to provide evidence of accomplishments listed in the annual reports.

C. The faculty member shall submit a copy of the PTPE report to the office of the Dean/Director of the College/Library/unit.

D. The Dean/Director will review the PTPE and the PRC report, and write a summary report.

E. The faculty member shall be provided a copy of the PRC and Dean/Director reports.

F. The PRC chair and the Dean shall meet with the faculty member, upon completion of his or her evaluation to discuss strengths and weaknesses. If necessary, a plan for improvement will be developed that shall include periodic status reports.

G. The faculty member may submit a written response to the PTPE assessment.

H. A copy of the PRC's report, the Dean's/Director's summary report, the improvement plan (if any), and the faculty member's response (if any) shall be placed in the faculty member's Personnel Action File.

I.   Academic units may develop guidelines for the appropriate level of performance in each of the areas covered by the PTPE report.

J.   PTPE Calendar

A.   **March 1:**   **Fifth-year PTPE reports due**

April 1   PRC report due to faculty member

May 1   Dean/Director's summary due

End of semester   Meeting with PRC chair and Dean completed

Post-Tenure Review Policy

FAC Rationale
FAC has approved changes to the "Post-Tenure Review Policy" (Approved by the Academic Senate 04/06/2005). Overall, the main change is to distinguish between the periodic evaluation for tenured faculty who have the rank of Associate Professor and tenured faculty with the rank of Full Professor.

In section III.B, we rewrote the entire section to remove the menu of three options for their report and now require all Candidates to follow one format for the report. By requiring all Candidates to present a comprehensive curriculum vitae (in the format recommended for the WPAF) and a narrative of between 1,250-1,750 words (five-to-seven pages), we have changed the report into something we believe will be more useful to all post-tenure Candidates, and will also be more useful for PRC members and deans.

As result of the detailed discussion, the following changes were also made:

The official document is entitled "Post Tenure Review Policy." The document calls the process "Post Tenure Periodic Evaluation (PTPE)." FAC has voted to change the name of the document and the process to "Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty" (PETF), *to cohere with the CBA.*
The rule stating that FERP faculty "…shall maintain their five-year review cycle" was removed because the rule has changed in the new CBA.
In appropriate instances, the "faculty" member is referred to as "Candidate," which is the format of the updated University RTP document.
A line was added to encourage but not require that the Candidate submit the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (PETF) electronically.
An established step in the process was made explicit in the document by adding the sentence: "The PRC will review the PETF and write a summary report."

I.   Introduction

The purpose of ~~Post Tenure~~ Periodic Evaluation _of Tenured Faculty_ ~~(PTPE)~~ _(PETF)_ is to provide periodic feedback to faculty members[4] on their effectiveness in all areas considered for retention, tenure, and promotion in order to maintain and improve faculty performance _in the interest of carrying out the university's mission._

.

~~PTPE~~ _(PETF)_ ~~should be seen as~~ is an important part of a faculty member's professional growth~~, which provides faculty members with a regular opportunity to assess and revise their professional development plans and goals~~ and may serve different needs at different points in the faculty member's career.

- For faculty aspiring to promotion to Full Professor, the PETF will provide feedback about maintaining and improving the faculty member's effectiveness and also feedback about strengths and weaknesses relevant to a future application for promotion to full professor.
- For faculty who have achieved the rank of Full Professor the PETF will provide feedback about maintaining and improving the faculty member's effectiveness.

II.   Required Review Intervals

A.   Faculty unit employees not being considered for promotion are subject to review every five years following the awarding of tenure.

B.   Faculty on sabbatical or leave of absence during the scheduled year of review shall undergo ~~PTPE~~ PETF ~~upon return to campus~~in the first Spring semester upon their return to campus following the regular timeline per Section III.C. of this policy.

C.   Faculty who are participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) ~~shall maintain their five-year review cycle~~ shall not be required to undergo evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator.

III.   Procedure and Timeline

---

[4] The term "faculty member" refers to instructional faculty, librarians, and SSP-ARs.

A. A peer review committee (PRC) of the department or equivalent unit and the Dean/Director of the College/Library/unit shall conduct the ~~PTPE~~ PETF.

B. ~~PTPE~~ PETF Report -- Faculty undergoing a fifth-year ~~PTPE~~ PETF shall submit a ~~PTPE~~ PETF report. The ~~PTPE~~ PETF report shall address the faculty member's work in all areas considered for retention, tenure, and promotion for the years under review. For faculty with teaching responsibilities, the ~~PTPE~~ PETF report will cover the areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. For librarians, the ~~PTPE~~ PETF report will cover the areas of Professional Performance, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. For SSP-ARs, the ~~PTPE~~ PETF report will cover the areas of Professional Performance, Professional Development, and Service.

1. The PETF Report shall consist of:
   - A comprehensive curriculum vitae (in the format recommended for the WPAF). For instructional faculty, the CV shall contain sections on Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. For librarians and SSP-ARs, the CV shall contain a section of Professional Performance/Professional Development, Research/Creative Activity, and Service.
   - A narrative of 1,250-1,750 words (approximately 5-7 pages) highlighting the Candidate's accomplishments during the period covered in the PETF.
     o The Candidate should indicate their goals for the evaluation, including if they believe they may apply for promotion to full professor following the PETF.
   - All teaching faculty shall include consideration of student evaluations of teaching as partial evidence of teaching effectiveness. This consideration may take various forms; for example, a description of student evaluations may be included in the narrative, or a page from the summary statistics provided with the student evaluations of instruction obtained for each of the chosen classes, or a single table summarizing item statistics for all courses to be highlighted in the review may be included with the ~~PTPE~~ PETF.
2. The Candidate ~~faculty member~~ shall submit a copy of the ~~PTPE~~ PETF report to the office of the Dean/Director of the College/Library/unit.

~~In recognition that PTPE may serve different functions at various points in a faculty member's career, the PTPE report may take one of three possible forms. The~~

faculty member under review shall determine the form best suited for the particular PTPE review. The forms are as follow:

a.   A complete curriculum vitae (in the format recommended for the WPAF[5]) and up to a three-page narrative highlighting the faculty member's accomplishments since the last review. The complete CV shall contain sections on Teaching (for instructional faculty) or Professional Performance/Professional Development (for librarians and SSP-ARs), Research/ Creative Activity (if appropriate), and Service.

b.   Five annual reports and up to a three-page narrative highlighting the faculty member's accomplishments since the last review. Each annual report shall contain sections on Teaching (for instructional faculty) or Professional Performance/Professional Development (for librarians and SSP-ARs), Research/ Creative Activity (if appropriate), and Service.

c.   A five to seven page narrative highlighting the faculty member's accomplishments in Teaching (for instructional faculty) or Professional Performance/Professional Development (for librarians and SSP-ARs), Research/ Creative Activity (if appropriate), and Service.

2.   All teaching faculty shall include consideration of student evaluations of teaching as partial evidence of teaching effectiveness. This consideration may take various forms; for example, a description of student evaluations may be included in the narrative, or a page from the summary statistics provided with the student evaluations of instruction obtained for each of the chosen classes, or a single table summarizing item statistics for all courses to be highlighted in the review may be included with the PTPE.

3.   Any reviewer may request of the candidate additional information on their PTPE report.

---

[5] Please refer to the RTP Handbook produced by the Faculty Center.

4. ~~Upon the request of the PRC and/or the Dean/Director, faculty shall be prepared to provide evidence of accomplishments listed in the annual reports.~~

C.   Evaluation of the Candidate's Report

1.   The PRC shall review the Candidate's report and write a summary report. If the Candidate has stated that they may apply for promotion to full professor following the PETF, the PRC shall provide feedback about strengths and weaknesses.

~~D.~~   2.   The Dean/Director will review the ~~PTPE~~ Candidate's report and the PRC report, and write a summary report. If the Candidate has stated that they may apply for promotion to full professor following the PETF, the Dean/Director shall provide feedback about strengths and weaknesses.

~~E.~~   3.   The ~~faculty member~~ Candidate shall be provided a copy of the PRC and Dean/Director reports.

~~F.~~   4.   The PRC chair and the Dean shall meet with the ~~faculty member~~ Candidate, upon completion of his or her evaluation to discuss strengths and weaknesses. If necessary, a plan for improvement will be developed that shall include periodic status reports.

~~G.~~   5.   The ~~faculty member~~ Candidate may submit a written response to the PTPE assessment.

~~H.~~   6.   A copy of the PRC's report, the Dean's/Director's summary report, the improvement plan (if any), and the ~~faculty member~~ Candidate's response (if any) shall be placed in the ~~faculty member~~ Candidate's Personnel Action File.

~~I.~~   7.   Academic units may develop guidelines for the appropriate level of performance in each of the areas covered by the ~~PTPE~~ PETF report.

J.   8.   ~~PTPE~~ PETF Calendar

B.   March 1:   Fifth-year ~~PTPE~~ PETF reports due

April 1   PRC report due to ~~faculty member~~ Candidate

May 1   Dean/Director's summary due

End of semester   Meeting with PRC chair and Dean completed

1 *Rationale:*

2 *FAC deleted anything that directly reiterated the University policy to avoid the need to change this*
3 *document if the University policy is updated. This is a supplementary document that serves to document*
4 *the unique requirements for CHABBS Lecturers.*

5

College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral & Social Sciences

6

Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty Unit 3 Employees

7

8

I. Purpose

9

10 The purpose of this ~~policy~~ document is to provide additional ~~procedures~~ standards for periodic
11 evaluation ~~and performance review~~ of Lecturer Faculty in CHABSS. This ~~policy~~ document is in
12 accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and the University Policy of Lecturer
13 Evaluation FAC 389-12. ~~Procedure for Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty (UPPELF)~~. In the case of
14 any conflict or omission, the University-wide procedure shall be considered authoritative. This
15 document provides additional requirements of CHABSS lecturers, over and above those stated in the
16 University policy. ~~guidelines so that: (1) the Lecturer Faculty can (a) prepare for periodic evaluations, (b)~~
17 ~~receive feedback to improve teaching and enhance student learning; (2) evaluators are informed about~~
18 ~~the procedures for the evaluation of Lecturer Faculty; and (3) appropriate administrators can make~~
19 ~~decisions about reappointment and other personnel actions relating to Lecturer Faculty based on proper~~
20 ~~assessments and documentations.~~

II. Procedure

21

A. General Procedure

22

23 1. Within fourteen (14) days from the first day of the academic term the Dean/Associate Dean's
24 office will provide all Lecturers in the College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences
25 (hereafter CHABSS) a copy of this ~~Policy~~document.

26 2. Within ten (10) days from the start of each semester, the Dean's office shall provide
27 Department Chairs or their equivalents a list of the names of all Lecturers who will be evaluated in their
28 departments at the end of that semester. It shall be the responsibility of the Department Chair to notify
29 the Dean within ten (10) days of the receipt of the list of any changes to the list.

30 3. Within fourteen (14) days from the first day of the academic term, Department Chairs shall
31 inform all eligible Lecturers about their forthcoming evaluations.

32   4. Each academic department shall have the right to establish its own written ~~policy~~ standards
33 on the evaluation of its Lecturers. Where such ~~policy~~ standards are ~~is~~ established ~~it~~ they must be
34 consistent with the CBA, and meet or exceed the minimum requirements outlined by the University and
35 CHABSS documents ~~policies~~. Any such ~~policy~~ standards shall be reviewed by the College Faculty
36 Development Committee and the University Faculty Affairs Committee to ensure compliance with the
37 CBA and CHABSS ~~policies~~ standards before adoption. Where such ~~policy~~ standards are~~is~~ established,
38 which may include additional Department ~~standards~~ requirements for the WPAF contents, the Lecturers
39 within the department shall be provided a copy of that policy within 14 days from the first day of the
40 academic term. Criteria must be appropriate to Lecturer assignments.

41   5. All Lecturers are responsible to consult **the University ~~Procedure for Periodic Evaluation of~~**
42 ~~**Lecturer Faculty**~~ **Evaluation Policy.** It is also the responsibility of Lecturers to meet the deadlines
43 established by ***Timetables*** *for the Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty* published by the Office of
44 Faculty Affairs.

45   ~~6. Reviewing for the completeness of the WPAF for a Lecturer under review shall be the~~
46 ~~responsibility of (a) the Chair of the department (or equivalent) in the case of a Lecturer hired for one~~
47 ~~semester or less or in the case of a part-time Lecturer not eligible for a three-year appointment, and (b)~~
48 ~~of the Peer Review Committee (hereafter PRC) in all other cases.~~

49   ~~7. Adding material to the WPAF after it is declared complete may be allowed only with the~~
50 ~~approval of the PRC (where applicable), and the appropriate administrator, and as elaborated by~~
51 ~~paragraph III.E. of the university Procedure for Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty.~~

52   ~~8. If a classroom visit is a required part of the evaluation, a notice to the Lecturer shall be~~
53 ~~provided at least five (5) days prior to the classroom visit (CBA 15.14). There shall should be~~
54 ~~consultation between the peer observer and the Lecturer to schedule a classroom visit that is~~
55 ~~convenient for all parties. The Lecturer shall be provided an opportunity following such a visit to~~
56 ~~discuss the visiting evaluator's report.~~

57   ~~9. Once a recommendation is made at any level of the evaluation, it shall be provided to the~~
58 ~~Lecturer under review in writing. The Lecturer may respond to the recommendation within ten (10)~~
59 ~~calendar days of receiving the recommendation. The response shall be filed at the office of the Dean,~~
60 ~~who will sign and provide a copy to the Department Chair or PRC, as appropriate. The Department~~
61 ~~Chair or PRC may respond to the Lecturer's written rebuttal within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of~~
62 ~~the rebuttal. No formal, written response to a Lecturer's rebuttal is required.~~

63   ~~10. PRCs shall be composed of tenured faculty only. Probationary and Lecturer Faculty, upon~~
64 ~~request by the Lecturer being evaluated, may provide peer input, but shall not be allowed to~~
65 ~~participate in deliberations or make recommendations.~~

66   ~~11. Any Lecturer under review can request an opportunity for peer input.~~

67   6. Once provided with the evaluation, the Lecturer shall sign and return the evaluation form(s),
68   and retain a copy. The Department Chair or PRC may arrange a meeting with the lecturer to review the
69   evaluation. In the case where the Department Chair or PRC does not arrange a meeting to review the
70   evaluation, the Lecturer may request a meeting with the Department Chair, PRC or appropriate
71   administrator to discuss the evaluation within ten (10) calendar days of receiving it. 13. Per CBA 11.1 all
72   personnel actions including reappointment decisions shall be solely based on the Lecturer's Personnel
73   Action File (PAF).

74   **B. Particular Procedure**

75   **1. A Lecturer hired for one semester or less** shall be evaluated at the discretion of the
76   Department Chair or the equivalent authority. Also, the lecturer may request an evaluation to be
77   performed. It is the college's policy to encourage department chairs or their equivalents to review
78   Lecturers hired for one semester or less.

79   **2. A Part-Time Lecturer Not Eligible for a Three-Year Appointment** shall be evaluated on an
80   annual basis. The evaluation shall be performed by the Department Chair or equivalent. The evaluation
81   shall include Student Evaluations of the Lecturer (if applicable).

82   **3. A Full-Time Lecturer Not Eligible for a Three-Year Appointment** shall be evaluated on an
83   annual basis. The evaluation shall include (a) Student Evaluations of the Lecturer (if applicable); (b) an
84   evaluation by a PRC (if applicable) and; (c) evaluation by the appropriate administrator.

85   **4. A Full or Part-Time Lecturer Eligible for an initial Three-Year Appointment** "shall be
86   evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of a three-year appointment" (UPPELF). This
87   evaluation shall include (a) Student Evaluations of Instruction (if applicable); (b) an evaluation by a PRC
88   (if applicable) and; (c) evaluation by the appropriate administrator. Per CBA 15.28, the Lecturer's
89   "cumulative work performance during the entire qualifying period for a three-year appointment" shall
90   be subject to evaluation. The evaluators shall rate the Lecturer's performance as "satisfactory" or
91   "unsatisfactory." Further elaboration on this procedure is provided by CBA 15.28.

92   **5. A Full- and Part-Time Lecturer Holding a Three-Year Appointment** shall be evaluated in the
93   third year of his/her appointment. The Lecturer may be evaluated more frequently upon their
94   request or at the request of the President or designee (CBA 15.26). This evaluation shall include (a)
95   Student Evaluations of Instruction (if applicable); (b) an evaluation by a Peer Review Committee (if
96   applicable) and; (c) evaluation by the appropriate administrator. Per CBA 15.28, the Lecturer's
97   "cumulative work performance during the entire qualifying period for a three-year appointment" shall
98   be subject to evaluation. The evaluators shall rate the Lecturer's performance as "satisfactory" or
99   "unsatisfactory." Further elaboration on this procedure is provided by CBA 15.29.

100

101   1.   All lecturers shall be evaluated on a regular basis in accordance with the type and term of their
102   appointment per Section IV of the UPPELFUniversity Lecturer Evaluation Policy.

103   2.   CHABSS ~~policy is to~~ encourages Department Chairs or their equivalents to review Lecturers hired
104   for one semester or less.

105

106   **III. Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)**

107   1. All Lecturers shall submit a working personnel action file (WPAF) to their respective Department Chair
108   or equivalent according to the ***Timetables for the Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty*** published by
109   the Office of Faculty Affairs ~~timelines~~ for the~~ir~~ type and term of appointment. Failure to submit a WPAF,
110   or submitting an incomplete WPAF, will be reflected in the evaluation. If the WPAF is submitted
111   according to established timelines and no evaluation takes place, performance of the temporary faculty
112   is deemed satisfactory. In such cases, temporary faculty may request to be evaluated by the
113   appropriate administrator.

114   ~~2. The WPAF shall include the following as appropriate to the terms of the appointment:~~

115   ~~a) WPAF Checklist, completed and signed by the Lecturer~~

116   ~~b) Index of Materials~~

117   ~~c) A current curriculum vita~~

118   ~~d) A reflective statement of no more than three pages on specific successes and/or challenges of each~~
119   ~~course taught during the evaluation period~~

120   ~~e) Copies of all prior periodic evaluations and performance reviews~~

121   ~~f) A list of all courses taught each semester in the evaluation period~~

122   ~~g) A syllabus for each course taught in the evaluation period~~

123   ~~h) A representative sample of examinations and assignment materials for each course~~

124   ~~i) Student evaluations for each section of each course in which student evaluations were conducted,~~
125   ~~including all University-prepared numerical analyses and all student comments. When student~~
126   ~~evaluations for the current semester are not available at the time the Working Personnel Action File~~
127   ~~(WPAF) is submitted, the Dean or the Department Chair shall add them to the WPAF as soon as they are~~
128   ~~received~~

129   ~~j) Evidence of scholarly/creative activity and/or service if appropriate to the terms of appointment;~~

130   ~~k) Other materials deemed pertinent to evaluating the area of teaching, e.g. peer input, evidence of~~
131   ~~innovative pedagogy, curriculum development, teaching awards, students supervised (independent~~
132   ~~study, etc.), student advising or mentoring;~~

133   ~~L) Mailing address to which a copy of the Lecturer's evaluation may be sent.~~

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

136

137 2. In addition to the required WPAF elements in UPPELFreferenced in Section V.B. of the University
138 Lecturer Evaluation Policy, CHABSS Lecturers are also required to include:

139 a)   A reflective statement of no more than three pages on specific successes and/or challenges of
140 each course taught during the evaluation period
141 a)b)   Evidence of scholarly/creative activity and/or service if appropriate to the terms of appointment

142

143 ## IV. Forms for Evaluation of the Lecturers [hyperlink to PDF to be incorporated]

144 1) Form A: Department Chair Evaluation

145 2) Form B: Peer Input to the Evaluation

146 3) Form C: PRC Evaluation

147

148

149

December 10, 2013

To: President Karen S. Haynes

From: David Avalos, Professor, Visual & Performing Arts
Staci Beavers, Professor, Political Science

Subject: Lecturer Inclusion in Eligibility for President's Faculty Awards

Each year, CSUSM celebrates faculty achievements showcased by the President's Awards for Outstanding Faculty. These awards serve as a powerful reminder of all aspects of active faculty members' roles, recognizing excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. While a separate Outstanding Lecturer Award recognizes the instructional contributions of the campus's contingent faculty, lecturers remain ineligible even to be nominated for the other President's Awards. This divide remains even while some CSUSM lecturers maintain rigorous scholarly and creative agendas and while many provide critical service contributions essential to our institution's functioning. And certainly CSUSM's lecturers rightfully take great pride in their "teaching innovation & excellence." Thus, we urge you to revise the eligibility criteria so that our lecturer colleagues can be nominated and considered as candidates for all President's Awards for Outstanding Faculty.

We recognize that lecturers are typically contracted solely to teach students and that most lecturers are not actively involved in campus life beyond their classes and their students and may not have significant opportunities to engage actively in scholarly/creative activities. Thus, most lecturers will not be nominated for these awards or are unlikely to produce files for the Service Leadership or the Scholarly & Creative Activity Awards that would make them truly competitive. (Indeed, most tenure-track faculty members are never nominated for these awards either, as few award nominations are received each year.) However, CSUSM continues to rely heavily on lecturers to fill some critical service leadership positions, and those lecturers who are actively engaged in service or scholarly/creative activities deserve the opportunity to be considered for campus-wide recognition. Further, "Teaching Innovation & Excellence" is certainly not limited to tenure-track faculty members; indeed, CSUSM's lecturers teach the vast bulk of students in the critical lower-division coursework that lays the foundations for student retention and later graduation success. In short, these faculty members have earned the opportunity for recognition by the campus as a whole.

This year, Professors Avalos and Beavers chaired the review committees for the Service Leadership and Teaching Innovation and Excellence Awards, respectively. We appreciated the opportunity to assist with celebrating our faculty colleagues'

achievements, but we were both struck by the explicit limitation on faculty eligibility and agreed to bring our concerns to your attention. However, we are encouraged that your most recent award (Inclusive Excellence and Diversity) is not limited to tenure-track faculty and is inclusive of lecturers.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the matter with you in person or to answer any questions via email or phone.

Dual listing
Definition   This policy governs the mechanism for offering undergraduate and
                      graduate courses as dual-listed courses.

Authority   *The president of the university*

Scope   *This policy applies to all CSUSM undergraduate courses..*

0
1
2
3   Karen S. Haynes, President   Approval Date
4
5
6   *For P&P's proposed by Academic Senate, also include the following signature line:*
7
8
9   Graham E. Oberem   Approval Date
10   Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
11
12

13 **Dual-listing Lower-division and Upper-division Courses**

14 **Preamble**
15 California State University San Marcos allows departments to offer lower-division (100- or
16 200-level) undergraduate courses with upper-division (300- or 400-level) courses having
17 similar course content in a dual-listed arrangement with a single instructor and a common
18 meeting schedule. The dual-listing of lower-division courses with appropriate upper-division
19 courses is a means of facilitating course offerings in circumstances where limited resources
20 would prohibit the offering of courses in the same subject area at both levels
21 concurrently. Such dual-listing could be quite appropriate in studio or activity-based
22 courses. Dual-listing of courses may be necessary in order to provide sufficient offerings
23 within some subject areas. This policy addresses the need to ensure the quality and rigor of
24 dual-listed courses.

25

26 **I. CRITERIA**

27 In order to ensure the integrity of the degree programs and the individual courses that may
28 be used to meet graduation requirements, approval to offer courses in a dual-listed
29 arrangement is subject to the following conditions.

30 A. The lower-division and upper-division courses must cover similar course content. The
31 titles and descriptions of the two courses must reflect the similarity of the subject
32 matter. The courses must meet in the same classroom at the same time and have the
33 same instructor.

34 B. Dual-listed course pairings normally consist of one 200-level and one 300-level
35 course. Exceptions to 200- and 300-level pairing should be rare and occur only under
36 extreme circumstances. A strong rationale must accompany proposals, and only the
37 following pairing exceptions will be considered:

38   1. 100- and 300-level

39   2. 200- and 400-level

40 C. 100-level courses may not be paired with 400-level courses.

41 D. A lower-division course may not be dual-listed with an upper-division course that is dual-
42 listed with a graduate course.

43 E. Dual-listed offerings must be arranged through the use of regular courses which are
44 published in the General Catalog or Catalog Addendum, and the course descriptions must
45 indicate that the courses can be dual-listed. The course descriptions must also include a
46 statement regarding whether students who have received credit for the lower-division
47 course can subsequently receive credit for the upper-division course.

48   F. Students who have completed the upper-division course for credit may not take the
49   lower-division for credit.

50   G. Any course that is cross-listed with a dual-listed course is considered to be dual-listed
51   and is governed by this policy.

52   H. Independent study, research and internship courses for which independent student work
53   is the primary mode of instruction may not be used as part of a dual-listed arrangement.

54   I. If the total enrollment of the dual-listed courses meets minimal enrollment expectations
55   for at least one of the courses of the pair, the dual-listed courses shall be considered to
56   have met minimal enrollment.

57   J. The *Class Schedule* should make clear, by means of class notes, that dual-listed courses
58   meet with the same instructor at the same time and location, but that the two courses have
59   different requirements reflecting the different course levels.

60   K. Course proposals must be submitted and approved separately for each of the courses in
61   the proposed pairs through the campus curricular review process. The course proposals
62   must address the following:

63   1. Both course proposal forms must specify that the courses are dual-listed;

64   2. Justification for the dual-listing must be attached to each of the proposals;

65   3. Specification of the requirements for the upper-division course must clearly
66   delineate greater expectations and additional requirements for the upper-division
67   students, appropriate to the field of study. At the time of the review of the dual-
68   listing, syllabi for both courses complete with course descriptions, course readings
69   and activities, and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) will be submitted to all
70   curriculum committees as support for the dual-listing.

71   a. Examples of greater expectations may include that upper-division students
72   conduct more of their work independently and/or demonstrate a higher level
73   of skill.

74   b. Examples of additional assignments might include significant research
75   papers, oral presentations of research on course assignments, and/or the
76   demonstration of more sophisticated laboratory or studio skills than those
77   required of students in the lower-division course.

78   4. The proposal must specify whether students who have completed the lower-
79   division course for credit are allowed to take the upper-division course for credit. If
80   so, the proposal must explain how it is appropriate for students to be able to receive
81   credit for both courses.

82   5. Proposals for dual-listing of courses can be submitted at the same time as the
83   proposals for review of the courses as new courses. Approval of the courses is not

84   contingent upon approval of the dual-listing; however, dual-listing is contingent upon
85   the approval of the courses. Proposals for dual-listing of courses can be submitted
86   for already-existing courses if accompanied by a complete syllabus for both courses.

87   6. The Associate Vice President for Academic Programs can approve a temporary
88   dual-listing of two courses while a dual-listing proposal is under review in the
89   curriculum approval process. In this situation, the description of the courses is not
90   changed in the General Catalog but the dual-listing is to be noted in the class notes.
91   So item E of this policy (on the General Catalog) does not apply in such a temporary
92   situation, but item J (on the Class Schedule) does.

93

94 **II. PROGRAM REVIEW**

95   All proposals for the dual-listing of courses, as well as any exceptions to the provisions of
96   this policy, shall be reviewed through the campus curricular review process. As with all
97   courses, the curricular review process will ensure that the above-stated conditions are
98   satisfied and that the use of dual-listed courses preserves or enhances the quality of
99   undergraduate programs of the University.

100   In light of the special status of dual-listed courses, it is expected that the review of these
101   courses will be especially thorough.

102

103
104