

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A G E N D A

Tuesday, November 6, 2018

2:00-3:50PM

AD-145

1. Approval of EC Minutes, 10/16/18 ECM 18-02
2. Approval of EC Minutes 10/23/18 ECM 18-03
3. Approval of FS Minutes 10/30/18 FSM 18-03
4. Appointments
 - 4.1 SOTE Instrument Review Committee – 1 Lecturer

Time Certain – 2:15PM

- 4.2 IRB Appointments – Vice Provost Huizinga

Time Certain – 2:30PM

5. Faculty Professional Development Coordinating Committee – Allen Menton
6. Determining Senate College Representation

Time Certain – 3:00PM

7. English WAC Coordinator – David Carlson and Janelle Gilbert
8. EPRC Changes to the following:
 - FAM 820.9 - Syllabus Policy and Guidelines
 - FAM 820.55 - SOTE In Summer and CEL Classes
 - FAM 872.2 - Course Material

9. FAC - IDS RPT Guidelines

10. FAC - FAM for Q2S

11. Academic Affairs/Faculty Senate Retreat

12. President's Report

13. Provost's Report

14. Chair's Report

Time Certain – 3:30PM

15. Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda – FSA 18-04, November 13, 2018

16. FAC Report

17. FAC Report

18. Statewide Academic Report

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Tuesday, October 16, 2018
 2:00-3:50PM
 AD-145

Members Present: Karen Kolehmainen, Haakon Brown, Lasisi Ajayi, Donna Garcia, Rong Chen, Shari McMahan,

Visitors: Clare Weber

1. Approval of EC Minutes, 9/25/2018

The Executive Committee approved the EC minutes from 9/25/18 with the suggestion that we use last names going forward.

2. Approval of FS Minutes, 10/9/2018

The approval of the FS minutes were tabled until the next meeting.

3. Appointment of IRB Committee Members – Donna Garcia

Senator Garcia advised that the IRB voted to dissolve sub-committees and changed the language to Designated Reviewers and IRB will have some input on selection of Designated Reviewers.

Decided:

- The EC agrees with the recommendations from the IRB.
- All IRB candidates will be submitted to the EC for appointment at EC meetings in collaboration with AP Huizinga. If necessary, appointments will be made by email.
- The two current appointments will be made at a later meeting:
 Janet Chang, CSBS, Chair of Social Work Sub-Committee (2018-2021).
 Joseph Wellman, CSBS, Chair of Social Work Sub-Committee (2018-2019)
- The EC charged Senator Garcia and her committee to make a proposal for changes to the current FAM 845.72 for review by the EC.

4. WASC – Clare Weber

DP Weber came to discuss reaffirmation of accreditation and share a tentative timeline for the upcoming WASC. The mid-cycle review is online and is in the Spring 2019. Our re-affirmative of accreditation onsite visit will be in Spring 2021, but it takes a while to get ready.

- Will be rolling out timeline and shared standards in Campus Labs.
- College Assessment Coordinators and others reviewed products and agreed on Campus Labs.
- EC suggested that boots on the ground need to be involved in this technology process.
- EC suggested Dr. Sylva be invited to next EC meeting and to the full senate on October 30.

5. \$25 million for Tenure-Tract Faculty Hiring

This is money carved out of the GI2025 monies to hire more tenure-track faculty. We need to use these funds this year and there may be additional searches. Also, these monies are for new positions.

- Senator Ajayi and Senator Brown volunteered to be on the Tenure-Track Faculty Hiring Task Force.
- Senators Ajayi and Brown were appointed by the EC to this Task Force.

6. ASCSU Tenets of Shared Governance

Senator Ullman stated that this document is being considered at the next Statewide Meeting. Two campuses have made a decision on this—one for and one against these tenets. It was negotiated and will go as a first reading.

- The EC agreed that paragraph 2 could be edited and used for each representative group.
- We should consider two resolutions: one supporting this document and one calling for a similar document here at CSUSB.
- Senator Ullman will prepare a draft for presentation to the senate on October 30th.

7. President's Report – No Report.

8. Provost's Report

Provost McMahan shared the following:

- The GI-2025 Workshop is this Thursday and Friday in San Diego.
- On 10/24 the FCE is hosting the Faculty Research Awards.
- The Provost is suggesting an Academic Affairs/Faculty Senate retreat in the winter.

9. Appointments

The EC made the following appointments via email:

Graduate Council – Lasisi Ajayi

Tenure Track Faculty Hiring Task Force: Nicholas Bratcher, CAL and Yasha Karant, CMS

Meeting adjourned.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Tuesday, October 23, 2018
2:00-3:50PM
AD-145

Members Present: Karen Kolehmainen, Lasisi Ajayi, Rong Chen, Shari McMahan, Jill Vassilakos-Long, President Morales, Davida Fischman,

Zoom: Haakon Brown, Jodi Ullman, Beth Steffel

Visitors: Judy Sylva, Caroline Vickers

1. Approval of EC Minutes, 10/16/18 ECM 18-02

These minutes will be tabled for the next EC meeting.

2. Approval of FS Minutes, 10/9/2018

Senator Vassilakos-Long moved and Senator Chen seconded the motion to accept the FS minutes of October 9, 2018 FSM 18-02 with the recommended change.

Sylvia will do the FS minutes with bullet points on action items going forward.

3. Campus Labs – Judith Sylva

Dr. Sylva provided a handout of the Campus Labs tools available (attached). Tools that support assessment and continuous improvement from the institutional level, all divisions and has the capability to go down to the section level of a course or activity. We are beginning our project plan to begin implementation. We have early adopter projects currently going. We are at the discovery stage right now and Academic Affairs is currently in the pilot. CL can be integrated and will be with EAB, PeopleSoft, Blackboard.

We want to know how people interface with assessment and continuous improvement. We need to know what faculty beliefs are about assessments. This will influence how we develop the tools and implement the modules. Campus Labs is not currently set up, we have to build and develop it. The Insight Module gives you the ability to analyze your data and create graphs and charts.

We have at least 3 years of implementation and they will provide training and technical support. We are in the technical onboarding phase right now. We started with the CLASS community which includes assessment coordinators, and an advisory group who represent faculty, staff and administrators across divisions—both groups have been tasked with questions to gather information.

Suggested we have a representative from the FS Executive Committee should be involved with this process as a liaison. Assessment Coordinators from each of the colleges should be presenting at department meetings. We need a level of transparency to support the success of Campus Labs. The assessment process is ongoing.

EC agreed:

- The Chair will send out an email to EC members to find a volunteer to be a representative on the Campus Labs project team.

4. New Graduate Studies Minimum GPA Requirement – Caroline Vickers

Dr. Vickers is here to talk about changing the graduate studies minimum grade requirement

from 3.0 to 2.5 at the university level.

- On June 7, 2018, the Graduate Council voted to change minimum graduate admissions admissions GPA requirement to 2.5. The appeal process takes at least a week or two and we could lose students. This change will speed up the admissions process and increase our enrollment. We are currently admitting a large number of people based on an appeal.
- Current FAM 841.3 would be replaced with the short statement minus tables and published with just the program requirements.

EC agreed:

- This will be placed on the FS Agenda for October 30th as an action item – first reading.
- This FAM change will be shared with the EPRC.

5. Course Repeats Recommendations

The Q2S Conversion Steering Committee is requesting an adjustment in the current course repeat practice for students who are repeating quarter courses under the semester curriculum.

EC agreed:

- This will be placed on the FS Agenda for October 30th as an information item.

6. President's Report – No Report

7. Provost's Report

Last week we attended the GI2025 meeting which was system wide and it was nice to hear that the system was leading the country in terms of setting examples of allowing students to graduate in a timely fashion. Provost McMahan will share our data in her report at the FS meeting next week. Upcoming events:

- FCE – October 24th at 4:30PM – recognizing faculty in research and community engagement
- Homecoming – Saturday, October 27th – recruitment, festivities, volleyball game, etc.
- Saturday, October 27th - Latinas on the Diamond which is held in partnership with the Smithsonian Latino Center will be 8-5 in the Pfau Library

8. Chair's Report

There is a vacancy on the UEC Board

- John Griffin appointed Taewon Yang because Josephine Mendoza is ferping.
- Josephine can still serve and will be contacted by Sylvia.
- Taewon Yang can serve but needs to submit a statement in response to the call for volunteers
- Karen will clarify with Senator Chen-Maynard what her current status is.

EC agreed:

Going forward, any appointments/agreements made via email must be included in the meeting minutes of the FS Executive Committee.

9. EPRC Report – No Report due to time constraints.

10. FAC Report – No Report due to time constraints.

11. Statewide Academic Report – No Report due to time constraints.

12. New Business

13. Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda – October 30, 2018

EC agreed to the revised Faculty Senate Agenda for October 30, 2018.

Meeting adjourned.

At Large

SOTE Instrument Review Committee – 1 position, Lecturer

Hello Sylvia,

I would be willing to serve on the SOTE Instrument committee, if the position is still available. I am a full time lecturer in the Public Administration Department.

Sharon Pierce

Dear Executive Committee,

I would like to be included in your list of candidates for the SOTE Instrument Review Committee. I am a lecturer in the English Department on a three-year contract, and I teach one course per quarter in the Communication Studies Department. I teach linguistics, journalism, language acquisition, composition, and syntax. Though I do not have much experience presenting at conferences, I have done a small amount of work related to pedagogy and have presented the results at a few conferences. I hope to continue my professional development, and I believe that I can contribute to the work of this committee.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Joel Harris

Greetings Esteemed Colleagues,

As Liberal Studies Coordinator (one of our university's largest majors), I am in the fortunate position to work with nearly all academic departments. Additionally, many faculty who teach in Liberal Studies are Lecturers. I also have a demonstrated history of community partnership, service learning, and other collaborations. I teach and have dedicated office space at PDC and San Bernardino campuses. I am available to meet during nearly all business hours and am therefore most able to faithfully represent Lecturer Faculty as a member of the Faculty Senate and would appreciate your vote.

Thank you,
Kelly Straight Dortch

Qualifications and Rationale:

I have served or am currently serving as a part-time lecturer, full-time lecturer, and Liberal Studies Program Coordinator. As such, I have a well-rounded perspective that allows me to consider disparate points of view and synthesize a cohesive whole.

Liberal Studies intersects with a majority of academic and student services departments, and while we are invested in maintaining existing relationships, we are also actively developing meaningful relationships with those departments and other service programs with which we do not have current interactions. This puts me in the unique position of understanding the needs, concerns, and availability and expenditure of resources for students, staff, lecturers, tenured professors, department chairs, coordinators, directors, and other administrators.

Lecturers comprise the majority of faculty who teach courses in the Liberal Studies major. As such, I understand the needs of lecturers across the spectrum of disciplines.

I am still actively teaching while coordinating, so I have immediate lecturer experience.

I teach at Palm Desert and San Bernardino campuses so I understand the unique needs of both.

Liberal Studies Coordinator service is somewhat akin to ambassadorship; additionally, I have a proven performance record of conceiving, developing, and implementing community partnerships, service learning opportunities, and collaborations. Therefore, I understand the intricate delicacies of negotiation and compromise within groups. I am a consensus builder.

I have office space and support staff at both campuses and can provide a space for lecturers to present their points of views and be heard and faithfully represented.

In addition to academia, I have previous professional and managerial experience in hospitality, sales and marketing, wholesale/retail, travel, finance, military/government contracting, and healthcare. I am not a scholar in each of these fields, but I have a working knowledge of each that allows me to understand some of the needs of each discipline on campus.

October 30, 2018

To the Executive Committee,

I am interested in being considered for the At-Large Lecturer representative for the on the SOTE Instrument Review Committee. I am in my second year as a full-time lecturer for the College of Education, Educational Leadership & Technology Department. There are several reasons I would effectively represent the lecturers at CSUSB on the SOTE Instrument Review Committee.

First, my background as an administrator, master teacher, staff development trainer, curriculum developer, county program evaluator, and database warehouse designer has provided me with unique opportunities to evaluate policies, establish protocols, and support others on online instruments of evaluation. I have been on design teams to move paper evaluations to an online system. One such example, was when I was a member of the Beginning Teachers Support and Assessment (BTSA). BTSA was an individualized induction program that focused on extensive support and mentoring to new teachers in their first and second year of teaching. We developed online modules and performance-based assessments for teachers to warehouse their learning and mentors to support and assess their BTSA teachers' professional learning. We also collaboratively developed pedagogical assessment criteria to support the documentation of the new teacher's professional ability on all the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP).

Secondly, my deep understanding of engagement strategies, communication techniques, and desire to build relationships to connect with all stakeholders will contribute to ensuring an equitable and inclusive atmosphere to explore diverse community collaboration, collegiality, and research around review instruments.

Lastly, my drive and ethical integrity to ensure we provide the best environment possible for faculty to thrive so that our students can succeed will be an asset in fostering creativity, learning, and inquiry-based leadership to think outside the box for models of implementation at CSUSB.

Attached is my curriculum vita for your review. Thank you for consideration as the At-Large Lecturer Representative for the SOTE Instrument Review Committee,

Dr. Becky G. Sumbera



Dr. Becky G. Sumbera, Ed.D.
Educational Leadership and Technology
Educational Administration, Full Time Lecturer
bsumbera@csusb.edu
Office: (909) 537- 4413
Cell: (951) 236-9221



Academic Affairs
Faculty Senate

STUDENT EVALUATION OF SUMMER SESSION AND DEGREE APPLICABLE EXTENDED **LEARNING** **EDUCATION** COURSES FAM 820.55

1. All courses offered during the Summer Session shall be evaluated by students following procedures similar to those of regular termsquarters, including the use of SOTE forms. S-Print-out statistical summaries will be forwarded to the appropriate department chair/school director and college dean. All raw data, along with a copy of the print-out statistical summaries, will be forwarded to the instructor.

2. All degree-applicable College of Extended and Global Education Learning courses will be evaluated. The evaluation will be by SOTE, and the print-out statistical summaries will be forwarded to the instructor and to the appropriate department chair/school director and college dean. All raw data, along with a copy of the print-out statistical summaries, will be maintained in the College Office of Extended and Global Education Learning for one-five years following completion of the course. All raw data, along with a copy of the statistical summaries, will be forwarded to the instructor. The College Office of Extended and Global Education Learning shall make available SOTE raw data to the faculty for their inspection and upon request provide copies for one-year following completion of the course



Academic Affairs
Faculty Senate

STUDENT EVALUATION OF SUMMER SESSION AND DEGREE APPLICABLE EXTENDED LEARNING EDUCATION COURSES FAM 820.55

1. All courses offered during the Summer Session shall be evaluated by students following procedures similar to those of regular termsquarters, including the use of SOTE forms. S-Print-out statistical summaries will be forwarded to the appropriate department chair/school director and college dean. All raw data, along with a copy of the print-out statistical summaries, will be forwarded to the instructor.

2. All degree-applicable College of Extended and Global Education Learning courses will be evaluated. The evaluation will be by SOTE, and the print-out statistical summaries will be forwarded to the instructor and to the appropriate department chair/school director and college dean. All raw data, along with a copy of the print-out statistical summaries, will be maintained in the College Office of Extended and Global Education Learning for one-five years following completion of the course. All raw data, along with a copy of the statistical summaries, will be forwarded to the instructor. The College Office of Extended and Global Education Learning shall make available SOTE raw data to the faculty for their inspection and upon request provide copies for one-year following completion of the course



Academic Affairs
Faculty Senate

POLICY ON COURSE MATERIAL FAM 872.2

Faculty may not receive any monies directly or indirectly from the sale of course materials to California State University, San Bernardino classes that they teach or coordinate (i.e. any class for which they have the authority to select or to participate in selecting instructional materials)*. Faculty who unavoidably receive any monies and who then turn over the monies to their department, their college, the university or any recognized charitable organization will not be in violation of this policy.

Any assigned instructional materials for which students are charged must be made available through the Coyote Bookstore or Printing Services Coyote Copy Center and may also be made available through any other vendor who wishes to provide the materials. Faculty members may not sell course materials directly to their students.

~~*Refer to the Faculty Information Handbook – Disciplinary Action for enforcement.~~

Comment [EoB1]: Not addressed yet to discuss potential implication of deleting this sentence.

Minor Editing 2018: EPRC

{ 1 }



Academic Affairs
Faculty Senate

COURSE SYLLABUS POLICY AND GUIDELINES FAM 820.9

Preamble: The purpose of this document is to articulate, based on university policies and California state law, what minimum information must be included on course syllabi. Such information provides students with basic course objectives and faculty expectations, and also serves to clarify course policy in the case of grade grievances or other student, faculty, or program concerns.

1. General guidelines:

- (a) Unless circumstances dictate otherwise, instructor(s) shall provide course syllabi on or before ~~the time of~~ the second class meeting;
- (b) instructor(s) shall provide students with course syllabi in paper copy and/or in ~~electronic form on a course website~~ Learning Management System and/or via e-mail at the start of each term as described in part (a). If the syllabus is only distributed electronically, instructor(s) shall provide ~~written~~ instructions for document access;
- (c) in distributed learning courses, enrolled students shall be provided with the course URL, access instructions, and the syllabus itself ~~posted to a course website~~ via ~~either e-mail or postal mail or e-mail~~.
- (d) if any information given on the syllabus is subject to change (e.g., topics of discussion, readings, due dates, examination dates), such information shall be noted on the syllabus as "tentative" or "subject to change."
- (e) instructor(s) shall submit electronic or hard copies of the syllabus for each course to the department office, which will keep a copy of each syllabus for at least five years;

Comment [CW1]: Syllabi shall be posted to Blackboard at the start of each term.

2. At a minimum, each course syllabus *must* contain:

- (a) name(s) of the instructor(s), office location, telephone number and/or e-mail address, and office hours;
- (b) class term, meeting times, location;
- (c) course goals and/or objectives, and ~~for~~ expected student learning outcomes;
- (d) required text(s) and/or materials;
- (e) types and descriptions of major assignments;
- (f) basis for assigning course grade;
- (g) a current statement of ADA compliance, as provided by the appropriate University office, in particular including contact information for the university's office for Services to Students with

Comment [CW2]: WASC requires student learning outcomes for each course, so I recommend that expected student learning outcomes are listed as not an and/or, but and.

Last Revision 2016: EPRC
Minor Editorial updates October 2018: EPRC

| Disabilities, and the_

| LastRevision2006:EPRC

[Minor Editorial updates Octobering 2018:EPRC](#)

{ 2 }

reminder that it is the *student's* responsibility to seek academic accommodations for a verified disability in a timely manner.

(h)(g) instructor(s) shall refer students to the "Academic Regulations and Procedures" in the CSUSB Bulletin of Courses for the university's policies on course withdrawal, cheating, and plagiarism.

3. Instructors are *strongly encouraged* to include the following additional information on their syllabi, as applicable:

- (a) prerequisite courses and/or prior knowledge and/or additional skills required of the student;
- (b) policies on participation and attendance, especially as those items that affect final grades;
- (c) provision(s) for makeup of missed or late assignments, if any;
- (d) other information essential to the course, e.g., information about accessing any online resources, or assignments (such as field trips or service-learning activities) that must be accomplished at off-campus locations;
- (e) consequences for cheating and/or plagiarism;
- (f) individual department/school or program guidelines, if applicable.

4. Faculty offering web-based or other distributed learning courses *must also include*:

- (a) the statement, per the CSU San Bernardino Distributed Learning Policy (FSD 01-01.R2, available at [http://senate.csusb.edu/docs/Policies/\(FSD%2001-01.R2\)%20DL%20Policy.pdf](http://senate.csusb.edu/docs/Policies/(FSD%2001-01.R2)%20DL%20Policy.pdf)), if faculty have chosen to use non-university supported course resources, that "the university will not provide technical support for those resources that the university does not endorse any products which may be advertised through those resources."
- (b) information regarding minimum computer hardware and software requirements for the class as well as what campus facilities are available to support these requirements for students who cannot afford to buy the technology; and
- (c) alternate procedures for submitting work in the event of technical breakdowns

Tenure-track faculty RPT Evaluation Guidelines

Department of Information and Decision Sciences

PREAMBLE

In order to achieve greater clarity and consistency in the expectations for tenure-track faculty to go through the retention, promotion, and tenure process, the Department of Information and Decision Sciences of the College of Business and Public Administration agrees on the following evaluation guidelines. These guidelines are set forth in accordance with the relevant CSUSB Faculty Administrative Manual (FAM) sections and clauses and specify the kinds of expectations that the department faculty deems most appropriate for the disciplines of Information and Decision Sciences.

The department chair will distribute this document to:

- a. newly hired tenure-track faculty members and the department evaluation committee.
- b. the College of Business and Public Administration and its evaluation committee and relevant units in the university.

Together with the department evaluation committee, the department chair will implement these guidelines by applying the standards and expectations in the RPT process. The chair and the department evaluation committee are encouraged to make explicit reference to the expectations in this document to achieve clarity and consistency both longitudinally (in the evaluation of a faculty member over time) and attitudinally (in the evaluations of different faculty members in the same cycle).

I. TEACHING

A. Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching

The Department of Information and Decision Sciences recognizes that rigorous and high quality teaching is the key mission at CSUSB. The department encourages its faculty to explore the effectiveness of various teaching modes and methods and adopt those that best suit the courses they teach.

Instruments of evaluation of teaching will include SOTEs and classroom visitation reports which shall be administered according to the guidelines established in FAM 300. In addition, the faculty member must provide clear evidence in the syllabi of appropriate course rigor/challenge of materials. Further, he/she is invited to provide other relevant evidence of

innovation in teaching and quality of instruction.

Quality of instruction shall be evaluated in the following areas:

1. Command of Current Subject Matter

Credentials presented by a faculty member upon appointment attest to the faculty member's initial command of the subject matter. However, because refinement and change are inherent in any area of knowledge, faculty members must possess current knowledge within their area(s) of expertise. Faculty members are expected to continually update course materials, class activities and assignments.

2. Course Design/Preparation, Instructional Material, and Organization

Faculty members must design or prepare and develop a course that (a) is aligned with course goals, description, and mode of instruction (i.e.: lab, lecture, seminar); (b) is organized to include learning activities and strategies that will achieve course goals and enhance student learning; (c) reflects a reasonable allocation of time and resources; and d) has the appropriate use of instructional materials, including technology. A course syllabus will be designed and developed for each course. At the beginning of each course, faculty members should make clear to students the objectives, requirements, student assessment standards and methods, and plan for that course.

Faculty members are expected to align course objectives with major learning outcomes articulated in the college's Assurance of Learning process, and to clearly articulate course expectations to the students. Faculty members should convey course information to students clearly with teaching methods and classroom activities suitable for students with various learning styles.

3. Effectiveness in Instruction

It is vital that faculty regularly review and modify course content to meet changing curricular needs. Instructional effectiveness requires that faculty members modify and incorporate course content to reflect relevance, timeliness, and comprehensive understanding of central issues and prevailing perspectives in the discipline. The course content is to be communicated and delivered using suitable instructional modes and teaching techniques/strategies for the type and size of class being taught.

In addition, effective teaching requires that content, organization, and delivery are suitable for both the overall course and the individual class sessions.

Successful experimentation with, and/or teaching research on, innovative teaching strategies and methods shall also be viewed as effective teaching.

4. Academic Assessment of Students

Fair and thorough assessment of student achievement is an important aspect of effective instruction. Assessment methods need to be consistent with program goals and course objectives. Methods of assessment vary markedly, but may include examinations, homework, term papers, laboratory reports, completed special assignments, seminar presentations, and other means appropriate to the type of class or instructional mode involved.

Faculty members should make clear to students what methods will be used to assess student work, and should apply standards appropriate to the level of the course and sufficient to make meaningful distinctions among different levels of student achievement. A faculty member's methods of assessing student achievement shall be documented by exemplary copies of items used, as appended to the classroom visitation report or the FAR. As part of a teaching portfolio, faculty members may also include examples of assessed student work.

B. Meets Expectations in the Area of Teaching

1. At the rank of Assistant Professor

As an incoming faculty member in years one and two of the probationary period, the MEETS EXPECTATIONS teacher at the rank of Assistant Professor must demonstrate command of the subject matter. Further, SOTE mean and median scores on overall effectiveness should range between '4' and '5' ("good" to "very good") at minimum.

In years three through six, strong indications of developing abilities must be demonstrated in all four teaching criteria. If applicable, concerns raised by students in SOTEs and/or colleagues in visitation reports must be addressed and the issues of concern resolved or improved upon over time. An appropriate level of rigor should be maintained in all aspects of the course, as documented in visitation reports and SOTE comments.

2. At the rank of Associate Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS teacher at the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate proficiency in each of the four teaching criteria. The target for mean and median SOTE scores on overall teaching effectiveness is between '5' and '6' ("very good" to "excellent"). If applicable, concerns raised by students in SOTEs and/or colleagues in visitation reports must be addressed and the issues of concern resolved or improved upon over time. An appropriate level of rigor should be maintained in all aspects of the course, as documented in visitation reports and SOTE comments.

3. At the rank of Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS teacher at the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate proficiency in each of the four teaching criteria, and also demonstrate a record of involvement and achievement indicative of a commitment to continued professional performance in teaching. The target for mean and median SOTE scores on overall teaching effectiveness is between ‘5’ and ‘6’ (“very good” to “excellent”). If applicable, concerns raised by students in SOTEs and/or colleagues in visitation reports must be addressed and the issues of concern resolved or improved upon over time. An appropriate level of rigor should be maintained in all aspects of the course, as documented in visitation reports and SOTE comments.

C. Above Expectations in the Area of Teaching

To be considered ABOVE EXPECTATIONS in the area of teaching, the faculty member must meet the requirements set forth above for MEETS EXPECTATIONS appropriate to rank. In addition to this, the faculty member must meet at least one of the following additional criteria:

1. A preponderance of evidence demonstrating excellence in teaching as indicated in classroom visitation reports, SOTEs (or alternative student evaluation instruments), the FAR, or additional appropriate documentation related to teaching.
2. Demonstrate a record of involvement and achievement indicative of a commitment to continued professional performance in teaching.
3. A record of distinction for some aspect of teaching at or beyond the university.

II. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, OR CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS

A. Criteria for Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions

The Information and Decision Sciences Department recognizes that its faculty is entrusted with the mission of actively contributing to the collective body of knowledge in their respective disciplines. The Department also recognizes that research, scholarly, and creative contributions may come in various forms including publication in professional journals, presentations, work in progress, etc. In addition, such contributions may consist of professional activities such as consulting projects, participation in professional organizations, or grants and contracts.

The following list of research, scholarly or creative contributions should be regarded as exemplary in nature and is not meant to be limiting, definitive, or prescriptive in its order. Work

professionally evaluated by peers in the field is generally more significant. The individual contribution to collaborative activities must be clearly stated on a Joint Activity Report form.

1. Publications, such as books or texts (whole or part thereof), journal articles, or any other type of academically specialized form such as music, script, or software. Professionally recognized or refereed publications are generally more significant.
2. Receipt of a fellowship, grant, contract, award, prize, or other indication of professional recognition.
3. Active participation in seminars, conferences, meetings, or other activity leading to research, scholarly or creative contributions.
4. Continuing education, retraining, and the development of new skills relevant to one's current or potential assignment. Evidence of these activities may be taking of courses, earning advanced degrees, or participating in professional conferences, seminars, workshops, institutes, or special programs which lead to systematic updating of knowledge.
5. Presentations at regional, national, or international conferences or professional meetings dealing with research, investigative activity, or creative activity.
6. Keynote speeches at scholarly meetings.
7. Invited speeches on research at scholarly venues such as universities, research institutions, and professional conferences.
8. Active leadership and/or service in recognized professional societies. (This activity may also be relevant to University Service.)
9. Consultantships, whether paid or unpaid, of a professional nature.
10. Editing or reviewing of monographs, papers, textbook chapters, or scholarly books.
11. Service on editorial boards of Cabell-listed, Australian Business Dean Council's list, Financial Times (FI), Science Index (SI), Social Science Index (SCI), Engineering Index (EI) and others journals as agreed to be added by the IDS department faculty journals. (This activity may also be relevant to University Service.)
12. Development of patents, proprietary products, or software.
13. Development or presentation at training courses or workshops that consistently update knowledge of professionals.
14. Any other pertinent contributions to knowledge creation recognized in the relevant academic disciplines and discussed with the Department Chair.
15. Any other items of specific professional activity, such as work in progress, research related to instruction, research on how students learn and apply knowledge over an extended period of time, etc.

All activity will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- 1) *Quality*: The quality of a publication may be evidenced by the journal's circulation, acceptance rate, or its ranking by recognized agencies; the citation frequency, reviews

of, or comments on the publication, or any other pertinent information such as its use or citation in the public arena. The quality of a consultancy, fellowship, or other professional activity may be documented by the outside agency for whom the work is done.

- 2) *Significance*: The significance of a publication may be evidenced by the originality of the topic, the soundness and innovation of its methodology, and the validity and significance of its findings. The significance of a consultancy, fellowship, or other professional activity may be documented by the outside agency for whom the work is done.
- 3) *Joint Authorship*: The department encourages joint research and recognizes that joint-authorship is common in the disciplines it houses.

A faculty member may request that the material prepared for evaluation be sent to an external reviewer (a professional outside of the university) for the purpose of providing additional input to the evaluation. The external evaluator shall be agreed upon by the faculty member and the department chair. The faculty member is to provide at least three names of external evaluators, and the department chair will select one of the three names provided for the evaluation process. The department chair will contact the external evaluator to see if he/she is willing to participate during the time frame needed.

B. Meets Expectations in the Area of Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions

1. At the rank of Assistant Professor

During years two and three of the probationary period, the MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor must demonstrate involvement in research, scholarly or creative activities. In subsequent years, continued active involvement in and successful completion of some professionally evaluated activities should be evident. At least two publications within a five year period are expected, and can come from Cabell-listed journals, Australian Business Dean Council's list, Financial Times (FI), Science Index (SI), Social Science Index (SCI), Engineering Index (EI) and other journals as agreed to be added by the IDS department faculty in a ballot format. The quality of the article and journal are considered in the evaluation process as well as the number of articles. This activity can be supplemented by other contributions listed above (2.A.1 – 15).

2. At the rank of Associate Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate a record of active involvement in and successful accomplishment of research, scholarly or creative activities. At least two publications within a five year

period are expected, and can come from Cabell-listed journals, Australian Business Dean Council's list, Financial Times (FI), Science Index (SI), Social Science Index (SCI), Engineering Index (EI) and other journals as agreed to be added by the IDS department faculty in a ballot format. The quality of the article and journal are considered in the evaluation process as well as the number of articles. This activity can be supplemented by other contributions listed above (2.A.1 – 15).

3. At the rank of Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at the rank of Professor must demonstrate a record of successful accomplishment and recognition in research, scholarly or creative activities since the last promotion to Associate Professor. Typically, at least three publications within a five year period are expected in journals listed in or indexed by in Cabell , Australian Business Dean Council's list, Financial Times (FI), Science Index (SI), Social Science Index (SCI), Engineering Index (EI). The IDS department may also decide to include outlets not thus listed through ballot. Publications are expected to be at a higher level of quality and significance than contributions of Assistant or Associate Professors. This activity can be supplemented by other contributions listed above (2.A.1 – 15).

C. Above Expectations in the Area of Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions

To be considered ABOVE EXPECTATIONS in the area of research, scholarly or creative contributions, the faculty member must meet the requirements set forth above for MEETS EXPECTATIONS appropriate to rank. In addition to this, the faculty member must have attained recognition beyond the University in research, scholarly activity, and/or creative activity; OR the quantity and/or quality of the faculty member's work must be significantly higher than the requirements set forth above for MEETS EXPECTATIONS.

III. UNIVERSITY AND/OR COMMUNITY SERVICE

“Service” is broadly defined as professionally related service to the University and/or Community. It can be undertaken as department, college, and university governance; peer support; student advising; and/or community and professional service. Underlying all these broad areas is the notion of citizenship: The expectation that the faculty member is an effective contributor in the various areas of service and a collegial professional in the day-to-day functioning of the department, college, and the university.

A. Criteria for Evaluation of University and/or Community Service

The following list provides examples of service activities. This list provides examples only and

Information and Decision Sciences Department
must not be construed as limiting, definitive, or prescriptive in its order.

1. University Service

- a) Active participation in service to and/or governance of programs, departments, colleges, the campus, and/or the University System. If a faculty member is given reassigned time to perform such service or governance, this shall not be considered in evaluating the quality of such work. However, having received reassigned time may be considered when evaluating the quantity of such work.
- b) Attendance and active participation at program, department, and college meetings.
- c) Active participation on committees at the department, college, campus, and/or the University System level.
- d) Participation in educational equity programs and activities.
- e) Authorship of documents, reports, or other materials pertinent to the University's mission or operation.
- f) Advisor or sponsor to student groups on campus.
- g) Participation in student advising and other services to help students succeed.
- h) Assisting with grants, documents, contracts, proposals, reports, or other materials pertinent to the University's mission or operation.
- i) Active participation in program, Department, College, Campus and/or University-wide Advisory Groups.
- j) Completion of classroom visitation reports.
- k) Academic and/or career advisement of students.

2. Community Service

- a) Service at local, state, federal, or international government levels.
- b) Consultantships to community service groups.
- c) Media presentations such as interviews, articles, speeches, or other presentations in newspapers, magazines, radio, television, or film.
- d) Lectures, speeches, talks, presentations, and/or displays given to schools, community groups, or the University community.
- e) Judge at science fairs, art shows, music contests, etc.
- f) Active participation and/or office holding in civic, educational, service, or humanitarian groups.
- g) Participation in community partnership activities which enhance social, economic, and cultural conditions.

3. Other items related to University and/or community service.

- a) Faculty members are encouraged to participate in community service in his/her profession. Examples include volunteering or serving as committee members, or officials in community and professional organizations.
- b) Faculty members are encouraged to participate in supporting and mentoring

colleagues in advancing teaching effectiveness, research, scholarly, and creative contributions.

B. Meets Expectations in the Area of University and/or Community Service

1. At the rank of Assistant Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor should demonstrate a developing level of participation, particularly at the departmental and college levels.

2. At the rank of Associate Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor should demonstrate significant participation in the area of service. It is expected that the faculty member is beginning to participate at the University level and to take leadership roles at least at the department level.

3. At the rank of Professor

The MEETS EXPECTATIONS faculty member at the rank of Professor should demonstrate significant participation in service and to provide effective leadership in some of these activities. It is expected that the faculty member have some level of participation at the university level.

C. Above Expectations in the Area of University and/or Community Service

A rating of ABOVE EXPECTATIONS in this area is awarded for exceptional service that has been clearly documented as to quantity and quality.

To be considered ABOVE EXPECTATIONS in the area of service, the faculty member must meet the qualifications set forth above for MEETS EXPECTATIONS appropriate to academic rank. In addition, the faculty member must demonstrate unusual effectiveness or performance as a contributor or leader in the University, the off-campus community, or a combination of both.

EVALUATION RATING SYSTEM

A. Evaluation Scale

Evaluation of a faculty member applies only to the rank at the time of the evaluation. Therefore, a rating of Above Expectation for Retention at the Rank of Assistant Professor at the Second Year does not imply that this Candidate is ready for Promotion or Tenure. It means that for a Second Year Assistant Professor the candidate is Above Expectations only.

Above Expectations: This rating reflects performance above the established criteria for the rank at the time of the current evaluation.

Meets Expectations: This rating reflects performance within the range of the established criteria for the rank at the time of the current evaluation.

Below Expectations: This rating reflects performance below the established range of criteria for the rank at the time of the current evaluation.

Well Below Expectations: This rating reflects performance well below the range of established criteria for the rank at the time of the current evaluation.

B. Outcomes of Evaluation

1. Second Year Retention Review

- a. If faculty member is evaluated in two categories at least Meets Expectations and the third category is evaluated at no lower than Below Expectations then the faculty member will be recommended for Retention at the Rank of Assistant Professor at the Second Year.
- b. If a faculty member is evaluated at Below Expectations for Retention at the Rank of Assistant Professor in the Second Year review in two categories and is evaluated at least Meets Expectations in the third category for Retention at the Rank of Assistant Professor at the Second Year review, the faculty member will be recommended for Retention. In this case the Retention will include recommendations from the President or his designee for successful future reviews.
- c. In the case where a faculty member is evaluated to be Well Below Expectations for Retention at the Rank of Assistant Professor at the Second Year review in any of the three categories or is evaluated to be Below Expectations or Well Below Expectation in all three categories at the Rank of Assistant Professor at the Second Year review, the faculty member will not be recommended for Retention.

2. Fourth Year Retention Review

- a. If a faculty member is evaluated at Meets Expectations or Above Expectations for an Assistant Professor at the Fourth Year review in all of the three categories evaluated the faculty member will be recommended for retention at the fourth year.
- b. If a faculty member is evaluated as Below Expectations for Retention at the Rank of Assistant Professor at the Fourth Year Review in any of the three categories and evaluated at a minimum rating of Meets Expectations at the Rank of Assistant Professor at the Fourth Year Review for the other two categories, the faculty member will be recommended for Retention. In this case the Retention will include recommendations from the President or his designee for successful future reviews.
- c. In the case where a faculty member is evaluated as Well Below Expectations for Retention for at the Rank of Assistant Professor in the Fourth Year Review in any one category, or is evaluated as Below Expectations in two or more categories, the faculty

member will not be recommended for Retention.

3. Tenure

- a. To be recommended for Tenure the faculty member must be evaluated as Above Expectations or Meets Expectations in each of the three categories for Tenure at the current rank at the time of this evaluation.
- b. If a faculty member is evaluated to be Below Expectations or Well Below Expectations for Tenure at the current rank at the time of this evaluation in any of the three categories, the faculty member will not be recommended for Tenure.

4. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

- a. To be recommended for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor, the faculty member must be evaluated as Above Expectations for one of the categories and as Meets Expectations or Above Expectations for the other two categories at the current rank.
- b. If a faculty member is evaluated to be Below Expectations or Well Below Expectations for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor in any of the three categories, the faculty member will not be recommended for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor.

5. Promotion to Full Professor

- a. To be recommended for Promotion to Full Professor a faculty member must be evaluated as Above Expectations for one of the categories and as Meets Expectation or Above Expectations for the other two categories at the current rank.
- b. If a faculty member is evaluated to be Below Expectations or Well Below Expectations for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor in any of the three categories, the faculty member will not be recommended for Promotion to Full Professor.