CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 57th SENATE
[Faculty Senate Remote/Zoom Meeting Practices](#)
https://csusb.zoom.us/s/87179814033

M I N U T E S

SESSION 7 -April 25, 2023 – 2-4 PM

Members Present: Ece Algan, Melissa Bakeman, Cary Barber, Haakon Brown, Rong Chen, Nicole Dabbs, Claudia Davis, Sherri Franklin-Guy, Jordan Fullam, Donna Garcia, Janelle Gilbert, Tom Girshin, Mark Groen, Gina Hanson, Angela Horner, Tiffany Jones, Ryan Keating, Karen Kolehmainen, Janet Kottke, Angela Louque, Fadi Muheidat, Haiyan Qiao, John Reitzel, Brent Singleton, Ho Sung So, Chad (John) Sweeney, Monty Van Wart

Members Not Present: Stacey Fraser, Paola Galvez, Alain Guevara, Ann Johnson, Jason Jung, Sailesh Maharjan, Rafik Mohamed, Tomás Morales, John Mumma, Kathie Pelletier, Beth Steffel

Alternate Members Present: Taline Georgiou

Alternate Members Not Present: Erin Alderson, Nicholas Bratcher, Sharon Pierce, Terry Rizzo, Shannon Sparks

Guest Presenter: Craig Stevens

Guests Present: Gerard Au, Sandy Bennett, Gretchen Bergquist, Kelly Campbell, Lori Caruthers-Collins, Rueyling Chuang, Melissa Evans, Twillea Evans-Carthen, Karla Gonzalez, Kevin Grisham, Bryan Haddock, Christina Hassija, Miranda McIntyre, Josephine Mendoza, Robert Nava, HK Oh, Brad Owen, Sastry Pantula, Andrea Schoepfer, Samuel Sudhakar, Mandy Taylor, Jie Yu

1. CALL TO ORDER (2:00 PM)

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
    2.1. Senator Chen made a motion to approve the Faculty Senate agenda for April 25, 2023. Vice Chair Jones seconded the motion. The agenda was

approved unanimously as presented.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
   3.1. [Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes April 11, 2023](#)
      3.1.1. The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes from April 11, 2023 were approved as presented.

2:10 PM Time Certain (If preceding items have not been completed)

4. COMMUNICATIONS/INFORMATION ITEMS
   4.1. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes April 4, 2023](#)

5. OLD BUSINESS
   5.1. FAM 035.3 "University-Level Awards" [FAC] (Second Reading)
      5.1.1. [With Markup](#)
      5.1.2. [Without Markup](#)
         5.1.2.1. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned the policy was changed to allow librarians, coaches, and counselors to be eligible for certain awards.
         5.1.2.2. Senator Kolehmainen moved to accept the policy. Senator Garcia seconded the motion.
         5.1.2.3. Chair Davis noted there was no one on the speaker list.
         5.1.2.4. A vote was taken. The results were 16 Ayes, 0 Nays, 2 Abstentions. The policy was passed.
   5.2. FAM 652.2 "Evaluation of Lecturers" [FAC] (Second Reading)
      5.2.1. [With Markup](#)
      5.2.2. [Without Markup](#)
         5.2.2.1. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned she had some recent discussions with lecturers about the policy. There was a suggestion to include a rebuttal to the dean's review. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned she would like FAC to consider allowing lecturers to rebut a dean's review if it is negative and explore the possibility of the Provost reviewing the evaluation if the dean evaluation and department evaluation are conflicting. Senator Kolehmainen moved to postpone the policy until the May 9, 2023 meeting.
         5.2.2.2. Chair Davis mentioned the justification is valid.

   5.2.2.3. Senator Chen asked if FAC is considering adding the Provost as the final decision maker.

   5.2.2.4. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned she would like to discuss that with the other FAC members, but has not had time. Senator Kolehmainen welcomed any comments on this.

   5.2.2.5. A vote was taken to postpone the policy. The results were 21 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention. The policy was postponed until May 9, 2023.

  5.3. FAM 832.4 "Policy on Final Examinations" [EPRC] (Second Reading)

   5.3.1. [With Markup](#)

   5.3.2. [Without Markup](#)

    5.3.2.1. Senator Fullam motioned for second reading of FAM 832.4. Senator Chen seconded the motion.

    5.3.2.2. Senator Fullam mentioned the policy was presented and approved last semester. However, there was a request to add approval of the dean.

    5.3.2.3. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned the Table of Contents includes "Notes on Formatting".

    5.3.2.4. Senator Fullam mentioned the templates used have the formatting guidelines and it should be removed.

    5.3.2.5. Chair Davis mentioned there are two amendments: adding the dean's approval and removing the line "Notes on Formatting".

    5.3.2.6. Senator Fullam motioned to combine the amendments and moved to approve the policy. Senator Chen seconded the motion.

    5.3.2.7. A vote was taken. The results were 17 Ayes, 1 Nay, 2 Abstentions. The policy passed.

6. NEW BUSINESS

7. [CHAIR'S REPORT](#)

8. [PRESIDENT'S REPORT](#)

9. [PROVOST'S REPORT](#)

10. COMMITTEE REPORTS

10.1.   [FAC Report](#)
  10.1.1.   Senator Kolehmainen mentioned FAC is working on revisions of FAM 642.4. This policy will roll over into next year since there is only one senate meeting left this year. FAC is also working on a revision of the lecturer hiring policy and a proposed new policy on the selection of associate and assistant deans.
10.2.   [EPRC Report](#)
  10.2.1.   Senator Fullam mentioned EPRC is working on revising the grade grievance policy and the proposed distance education policy.

11.   [STATEWIDE/ASCSU (ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CSU) SENATORS' REPORT](#)

12.   SENATORS' REPORTS (INCLUDING ASI PRESIDENT'S REPORT)

13.   DIVISION REPORTS
  13.1.   [Vice President for Information Technology Services](#)
  13.2.   [Vice President for University Advancement](#)
  13.3.   [Vice President for Student Affairs](#)
  13.4.   [Vice President for Administration and Finance](#)
    13.4.1.   Vice President Sam Sudhakar invited campus members to attend the swearing-in ceremony of the new police chief and six other officers on April 28, 2023.
  13.5.   [Vice President for Human Resources](#)
    13.5.1.   Vice Chair Jones asked if the Cozen O'Connor implementation team will have faculty representatives. Will representatives need to be elected?
    13.5.2.   Chair Davis mentioned she will relay this information to Vice President Phillips.

14.   DISCUSSION ITEMS

3:15 PM Time Certain (If preceding items have not been completed)

15.   [Qualtrics Course Evaluation](#)
Craig Stevens, Qualtrics Enterprise Account Executive

  15.1.   Senator Kolehmainen provided some background on the presentation. The old SOTE policy deals with SOTEs done on paper. According to the

old policy, faculty could choose a particular day to do the evaluations. When the pandemic started, evaluations were moved online because of necessity. Since then, the evaluations have remained online, which is in violation of the SOTE policy. FAC inquired if faculty can choose the date to administer the online SOTEs and were told no because it would require extra work. Qualtrics has a module for student evaluation which allows faculty to choose the dates to administer their SOTEs. If that platform is used, it would remain consistent with the old policy that allows faculty to choose the date.

15.2. Senator Chen mentioned this issue has been on the senate floor since spring semester of 2020 when Covid first hit. The senate made requests but were told it cannot be done because of technical issues. It does not seem right to violate policy because of technical issues. Senator Chen mentioned this did not sound very reasonable to him and many other senators.

15.3. Guest Craig Stevens stated his goal is to show what Qualtrics offers for course evaluations. Qualtrics has been used heavily for numerous reasons. Administrators have the ability to customize the evaluation. It can be integrated with several Learning Management Systems (LMS) including Canvas and Blackboard and show students what evaluations they have to complete in a task list. Students do not have to go through a separate system or log-in.

15.4. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned Qualtrics can interact with students to improve response rates. Notifications can be sent out to remind students to submit evaluations. Grades can also be pushed back until the evaluation is submitted. However, this method is not usually used since students feel forced and do not give a lot of feedback. Evaluations can be sent via email or through the LMS.

15.5. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned communication from Qualtrics will be sent to allow faculty to choose when to go live with the course evaluation. If a date is not chosen, the date will be seven days before the course end date.

15.6. Senator Chen mentioned it is quite clear that Qualtrics lets faculty control the date and time. Has there been a conversation between Qualtrics and admin? The two systems have to be interfaced. When faculty do their evaluations, the total number of classes is in the thousands. This will generate a massive amount of data that has to be incorporated into the system being used by Faculty Affairs and

Development (FAD). Has a conversation with admin taken place to determine if this is feasible?

15.7. Guest Craig Stevens demonstrated the workflow that allows faculty to determine the date and time of their evaluations.

15.8. Senator Chen mentioned the platform will generate a massive amount of data which has to be received or transferred to another system which is managed by FAD. That level of collaboration needs to be agreed upon. Admin buy-in will be necessary from the IT division and FAD.

15.9. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned Qualtrics works extremely well for universities that use a top-down approach where the whole evaluation process is handled and managed by a central office. However, faculty still have input to determine the dates. Qualtrics also has a user interface to handle faculty-based questions. Instructors can choose a variety of questions in addition to the core university questions.

15.10. Chair Davis asked if other universities use this system.

15.11. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned a handful of CSUs and UCs use the Qualtrics course evaluation system.

15.12. Vice Chair Jones mentioned that once students fill out evaluations, that data goes somewhere and professors don't see it right away. Currently faculty can only access that data after grades are submitted. Who would determine when results would be released? Would that come from an office here or is it automatic?

15.13. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned administrators can decide when results are visible. It can be on a certain date or after a certain number of days from when the evaluation opens. Some universities require a certain number of responses before data is given.

15.14. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned one of the best practices is creating a dashboard view that is available during the course evaluation that shows the participation rate. Qualtrics found that a simple nudge in class from the instructor can increase response rates. Major courses have a high response rate compared to courses with 300 or more students, which limits the response rates since students don't feel as connected. However, if an instructor can add a personal touch, it usually increases the response rate.

15.15. Senator Qiao mentioned in the past SOTEs were administered by FAD which involves data transfer from ITS to FAD. If there is any mistake due to system failure, is there any way to restore the data? Senator Qiao mentioned she served on department evaluation committees several

times and SOTE scores are supposed to be provided online by FAD. It is not an obligation of the faculty member under review to provide the SOTE data. Yet, faculty often create tables of data. Faculty try to include data in reports and cannot include student comments in the evaluation. In the future, is there any way to minimize issues like this? What do faculty have to do to review the online SOTEs? If anything goes wrong, where are faculty members' rights to correct this? How can faculty be included as equal members in the online evaluation workflow?

15.16. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned Qualtrics wants everything to work as intended. An implementation team is assigned to this buildout to ensure everything is running smoothly. Qualtrics does support a dashboard viewer. If there are issues where things are not shown correctly, Qualtrics supports that. If a professor is not seeing their courses, Qualtrics can take care of that. As long as the data from the Student Information System (SIS) is good and correct, there won't be any problems.

15.17. Senator Qiao mentioned it would be great if faculty have access to the dashboard. The online system involves ITS and FAD. Senator Qiao mentioned what she observed in the past is that faculty did receive SOTE scores, but not all SOTE scores were included on the evaluation. If there are mistakes or technical glitches with the data import/export how will that be detected? How could it be corrected?

15.18. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned this is a different system than what CSUSB currently uses and would be a different setup. Hypothetically, if a professor accesses the dashboard and one class is not viewed, they can raise the issue to Qualtrics or the CSUSB central office. Qualtrics would want to make sure the right instructor is assigned to the right courses. As long as the data is correct in the SIS, it should be correct in Qualtrics.

15.19. Senator Kolehmainen asked if questions can be customized rather than choosing pre-existing questions. Also, there is a set of questions that every instructor has to fill out. However, instructors have flexibility to add questions that do not go in their personnel file and are just for their personal use. Is that something that can be done? Can there be certain questions available to evaluators, deans, etc. and other questions only for the instructor? Faculty have the ability to exclude a certain fraction of evaluations according to the current policy. Is that something that can be done?

15.20. Guest Craig Stevens answered yes, everything is customizable including the questions and how they are arranged. Questions can be hidden or

only made available to certain subsets. Qualtrics can also be set up so course evaluations are only available to instructors, not their supervisors or vice versa.

15.21. Senator Dabbs asked if once the data is received, does it talk to Interpolio, which is what is used to evaluate files. Currently staff upload SOTEs to that interface.

15.22. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned the data can be interfaced into another system.

15.23. Senator Dabbs mentioned this dashboard would be good for instructors, but evaluators may want to see it in another system.

15.24. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned Qualtrics can push data to other systems. It is going to come down to whether it is easier to take this dashboard and house it with the file system or to push the data and to what is easier for IT to handle and for faculty to have.

15.25. Senator Kottke mentioned she is very impressed with the customizability. A pilot study is currently underway. There is an option to have two surveys during the term. The first survey would be at the faculty member's discretion and would be formative feedback for their review. The second survey would be mandatory for the file. It sounds like it is quite feasible. Senator Kottke asked where the data is stored. The information from the formative assessment would be for the faculty member and not released to anyone else. Additionally, Senator Kottke asked who owns the data.

15.26. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned the data is stored in Qualtrics servers. Qualtrics is a top-tier data facility and is compliant with a variety of standards. The ownership of the data would be with the university. How the data is stored and visualized to instructors is a bit different. The dashboard can be set up to where it is live throughout the semester. Qualtrics works with a lot of programs that want to better the experience for students. There is also an AI that can make sense of some of the qualitative data.

15.27. Senator Algan mentioned it looks like Qualtrics gives faculty more flexibility. Senator Algan asked how time consuming it is for faculty and how user friendly it is. If faculty don't want to do mid-evaluations and just want to do the mandated questions, how long would it take to select a date to administer?

15.28. Guest Craig Stevens mentioned the process is very straightforward and easy. It takes a few minutes for the faculty member to read the email and

fill out the survey. If they take no action, the course evaluation will be released on the pre-established date.

15.29. Senator Garcia yielded her time to allow Guest Brad Owen to speak.

15.30. Guest Brad Owen mentioned the platform looks promising. Guest Brad Owen asked about integration with Canvas, whereby students could access the evaluations.

15.31. Guest Craig Stevens presented an example with a task list for students with the course evaluations. Qualtrics can send a notification as an assignment and students can complete the evaluation without being sent to another platform.

15.32. Senator Kolehmainen asked if the evaluation allows open ended questions.

15.33. Guest Craig Stevens answered yes, comment boxes can be included. AI looks at recurring comments and can show changes over time.

15.34. Senator Algan asked if faculty will be able to see written responses.

15.35. Guest Craig Stevens answered yes, it is up to the individual.

15.36. Senator Algan asked if the AI feature can be enabled and disabled. Is it up to faculty or the university to enable or disable AI evaluations?

15.37. Guest Craig Stevens answered correct.

15.38. Chair Davis thanked Guest Craig Stevens and mentioned the current pilot study uses the Qualtrics platform. In an effort of good faith and shared governance, the next step is having a roundtable discussion with stakeholders.

16. OTHER BUSINESS

17. ADJOURNMENT

17.1. The meeting adjourned at 3:54 PM.