

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A G E N D A

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

2:00-3:50PM

AD-145

1. Approval of EC Minutes, ECM 2019.03.12 (attachment)
2. Approval of FS Minutes, FSM 2019.03.19 (attachment)
4. Appointments (attachment)
5. Retirement Resolutions (attachment)

Time Certain - 2:30PM

6. Q2S Teach In – Craig Seal
7. FAM 652.2 Evaluation of Lecturers – Senator Chen
8. President's Report
9. Provost's Report
10. Chair's Report
11. FAC Report
12. EPRC Report

Time Certain – 3:30PM

13. Approval of FS Agenda for April 9, 2019 – FSA 2019.04.09 (attached)
14. Statewide Academic Report
15. New Business

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Tuesday, March 12, 2019
2:00-3:50PM
AD-145

Members Present: Karen Kolehmainen, Lasisi Ajayi, Rong Chen, Donna Garcia, Davida Fischman, Haakon Brown, Jill Vasillakos-Long

1. Approval of EC Minutes for February 12, 2019 (ECM 2019.02.12)

- The EC Minutes for February 12, 2019 were approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

2. Approval of EC Minutes for February 26, 2019 (ECM 2019.02.26)

- The EC Minutes for February 26, 2019 were approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

3. Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes for March 5, 2019 (FSM 2019.03.05)

- The Faculty Senate Minutes for March 5, 2019 were approved as amended by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

4. Appointments

- The FS Executive Committee made the following appointments:
 - Student Grade Appeal Panel – CBPA: Monty Van Wart (2018-2020)
 - Strategic Analysis Steering Committee – CBPA: Jonathan Anderson (2018-2019)
 - Scholarship Committee – CNS: Salome Mshigeni (2018-2020)
 - Registration Appointment Task Force – At Large: John Hernandez, Library (2019-2021)

A concern was brought to the EC from Eric Chan regarding the SPAC (Space Planning Advisory Committee) committee and the lack of members attending the scheduled meetings.

- Chairperson Kolehmainen will contact the current members to ascertain reasons why not attending meetings
- Chairperson Kolehmainen will contact Eric Chan regarding scheduling meeting

5. Select Fabric for New Conference Room Chairs

- The EC voted for the Sedona Paradise (blue) fabric for the new conference room chairs.

6. FAM 818.9 Missed Class Policy – Senator Fischman (attached)

- The current policy addresses only issues of classes missed as a consequence of university-sponsored events. EPRC recommended major revisions to the policy to:
 - Include other issues such as health and religious observance
 - Simplify the policy and clarify the procedure, and
 - To provide positive rather than negative wording (“class attendance” rather than “missed class”)
- The revised FAM will be included on the FS agenda for April 9, 2019.

7. **FAM 820.55 Summer SOTE's – Senator Fischman (attached)**
 - EPRC submitted a revised policy to:
 - Align with current practice
 - Ensure confidentiality and the faculty member's control of these SOTEs
 - When we upload FAM's to the website we should save as the FAM number going forward.
 - The revised FAM will be included on the FS agenda for April 9, 2019.

8. **President's Report – No Report**

9. **Provost's Report – No Report**

10. **Chair's Report – No Report**

11. **FAC Report**

12. **EPRC Report**

13. **Approval of FS Agenda for March 19, 2019 (FSA 2019.03.19)**
 - The FS Agenda for March 19, 2019 was approved as amended by the Executive Committee.

Meeting adjourned.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 53rd SENATE

MINUTES

SESSION 07 - Tuesday- March 19, 2019, 2:00PM – 3:50PM, Pine Room

Members Present: All members were present with the exception of: H. Brown, K. Collins, Y. Hwang, A. Johnson, K. Kowalski, J. Kremling, A. Louque, A. Menton, T. Morales, J. Munoz, E. Murillo, K. Pelletier, A. Roman, L. Scow, M. Teixeira, J. Ullman

Guests Present: D. Freer, S. Pantula, B. Janiskee, C. Seal, R. Chuang, G. King, K. Nicholl, S. Yildirim, T. Jones, C. Weber, R. Nava, D. Huizinga, H. Le Grande, E. Valdez, J. Lappin, R. Mohamed,

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Senator Rizzo moved and Senator Davis seconded the motion to approve the Faculty Senate minutes for March 5, 2019 (FSM 2019.03.05) as presented. **PASSED Unanimously**

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Senator Fischman moved and Senator Rizzo seconded the motion to approve the agenda. The Faculty Senate Agenda for March 19, 2019 was approved. **PASSED Unanimously**

3. CHAIR'S REPORT

- Thanks to everyone who donated cash (\$170) and product to support the Coyote Champ Packs. (each pack costs about \$4.00)
- Two open forums regarding the GE Task Force Report coming: Tuesday, April 16th and Wednesday, April 17th.
- All Senators invited to share lunch with President and his cabinet on April 23rd in Coyote Commons.
- WASC update: Onsite WASC visit will be October 2021. Campus visit will be with Mark Grohr, VP, March 22nd from 11:00AM-2:00PM. Anyone is welcome to attend.

4. INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 Academic Calendars for Semesters – Clare Weber

- Was created/built by a Q2S Academic Calendar Sub-Committee
- The Controller's Office and Chancellor's Office tell us when we can start the academic year and require other parameters including graduation before Memorial Day, 70-80 working days and 145 instructional days.
- Will go to the Cabinet next for final approval.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS**5.1 College Representation on Senate & Bylaws Revisions – Karen Kolehmainen**

- The Constitution and Bylaws committee is working on several revisions and one is electronic voting which Senator Brown brought for discussion a few weeks ago.
- Another area we are considering for revision is determining the composition of the Faculty Senate. We are currently out of compliance according to the current bylaws. (spreadsheet is in your packet).
- Considering changing the number of college reps from 27 to another value. Would like your feedback.
- We are recommending the following 3 options to determine the total number of Senators from each college to represent in the Faculty Senate:
 - Proportional to Size
 - Baseline of 1 per college, remainder proportional to size
 - Baseline of 2 per college, remainder proportional to size
- Votes were taken to determine which option most senators agreed with.
- Baseline of 2 per college, with 1 being a lecturer, remainder proportional to size is the more popular option
- 32 appears to be the most popular option for the number of college reps on the senate

5.2 Tenets of Shared Governance in CSU

- Executive Committee and Chancellor's Office met and the process was closed which raised concerns.
- Document also states the Chancellor's office can act without consultation
- Chair Kolehmainen will send what the other campuses have already done so far
- Will be discussed in the Executive Committee to decide whether to adopt something or to endorse the current resolution.

5.3 GE Task Force Report

- We will have two forums we hope you will attend/support (April 16 & 17)
- Any formal recommendations based on this report will be a few years away
- A lot of CSU's have rejected a lot of the recommendations in this report

6. OLD BUSINESS**7. NEW BUSINESS****8. COMMITTEE REPORTS****8.1 EPRC****8.2 FAC****8.3 Q2S****9. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATOR'S REPORT****10. SENATOR'S REPORTS/INCLUDING ASI PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Meeting Adjourned at 3:55PM

At Large

****Shared Governance Steering Committee - 2 positions (tenured, tenure-track) with experience in shared governance. [Dorothy Chen-Maynard](#)**

From: Dorothy Chen

Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 1:06 PM

To: Faculty Senate

Subject: Re: [Campus] Request for Volunteers

I am interested in the shared governance steering committee. I served on the collegiality respect committee which is now disbanded. I am interested to make sure that the campus climate improves and that we have a good relationship between faculty senate and administration and will be collegial; and being on this committee would allow me to work on this process of providing shared governance on campus.

Thanks

Dorothy

Retirement and FERP Report 2018/2019 AY

as of: March 13, 2019

1. RETIREMENTS:  Not FERPing

Regular:	Department
1. Tong Lai Yu Yasha???	CNS - Computer Science & Engineering
2. Mary Boland Ron Chen	CAL - English
3. Astrid Sheil Thomas Corrigan	CAL - Communication Studies
4. Kay Zemoudeh Yasha???	CNS - School of Computer Science and Engineering
5. Javier Torner Karen Kolehmainen	CNS - Physics
6. Joseph D. Chavez Davida Fischman	CNS - Mathematics
7. Donna Schnorr Lasisi Ajayi	COE - Educ Leadership&Tech ELT
8. Diana Fass	Counseling & Psychological Svs
9. Ron Chen	CAL – English
10. Kathie Pelletier Breena Coates	JHBC- Management
11. Larry K. Gaines	CSBS – Criminal Justice
12. Joseph Jesunathadas	COE – Teacher Education and Foundations
13. Pedro Santoni	CSBS – History
14. Peter Williams	CNS - Mathematics
15. Russell Barber	CSBS – Anthropology
16. Janet Chang	CSBS – Social Work

QS **CSUSB**
2
2020
**QUARTER TO SEMESTER
CONVERSION**

WHY?

- **CO wants all campuses on same calendar (except SLO)**
- **Easier to transfer between CSU/Community Colleges**
- **Simplify administrative processes**
- **Better student opportunities for summer jobs & internships**

FALL
2020

QUARTERS



4 TYPICALLY 4 HOURS PER WEEK PER CLASS

4^{YR} 16 UNITS PER QUARTER APPROXIMATELY 4 CLASSES

✓ BACHELOR'S DEGREE MINIMUM 180 UNITS

vs.

SEMESTERS



3 TYPICALLY 3 HOURS PER WEEK PER CLASS

4^{YR} 15 UNITS PER QUARTER APPROXIMATELY 5 CLASSES

✓ BACHELOR'S DEGREE MINIMUM 120 UNITS

3 unit semester class (45 contact hours) = 4 unit quarter class (40 hours)

ANNUAL TUITION AND FINANCIAL AID
IS DIVIDED INTO 3 QUARTERS



BEGINS IN SEPTEMBER
ENDS IN JUNE

ANNUAL TUITION AND FINANCIAL AID
IS DIVIDED INTO 2 SEMESTERS



BEGINS IN AUGUST
ENDS IN MAY

QUARTER TO SEMESTER CONVERSION WILL NOT AFFECT ANNUAL TUITION.

- ***Fall 2020: Aug. 24 – Dec. 11; Spring 2021: Jan. 25 – May 22***
- **Total academic year fees for two semesters will equal three quarters.**
- **Financial aid also disbursed twice a year.**

What if I'm still taking classes?

Will my degree program change?

Do I have to start over?

- If you begin your degree program ***before Fall 2020***, your requirements won't change. Semester courses have been identified to fulfill the quarter class requirements.
- If you change or add a degree program ***after Fall 2020***, your requirements for all programs (GE, second major, minor) will switch to the semester requirements. Quarter units will be applied to your semester degree programs.

DON'T PANIC:
PLAN NOW!
SEE AN ADVISOR
FOR MORE INFO!

<https://www.csusb.edu/advising/services/who-my-advisor>



**Your
advisor
can help
you
determine
which
classes to
complete in
2019-20
in order to
graduate
on time.**



FOR MORE INFORMATION VISIT
[CSUSB.EDU/SEMESTER](https://csusb.edu/SEMESTER)



Academic Affairs
Faculty Senate

EVALUATION OF LECTURERS

FAM ~~XXX~~652.2

Purpose and Scope

Lecturers have been playing an increasingly vital part in the mission of the university. The evaluation of lecturers is thus an important process that ~~helps ensure~~ the quality of instruction for students. This document sets forth ~~all~~ policies and processes ~~for involved in~~ the evaluation of lecturers.

The major aspects of the evaluation of lecturers are stipulated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). What is specified in this document is meant to implement the CBA, not to replace any element of it. If a ~~policy or process~~ provision in this document is found to ~~be inconsistent with~~ ~~contradict~~ future CBAs, it shall be revised to reflect ~~the changes in the most recent~~ CBA.

The policies on and process for the evaluation of lecturers, ~~until this policy,~~ had been stipulated in the same policy document as the one for tenure-line faculty (FAM ~~652.1642.4~~). The changes in CBA ~~policies provisions~~ on lecturers created the need to separate the evaluation ~~of process for~~ the two types of ~~instructional~~ faculty—tenure-line and lecturers. This policy therefore shall refer to FAM ~~6652.142.4~~ where necessary, as many aspects of evaluation are the same for both types of faculty.

Definition

1. *Lecturer*: A non-tenure-line, unit-three employee who provides academic instruction to students. Such instruction is provided generally ~~although not always~~ under a course found in the CSUSB Catalog (e.g. MATH XXXX, ENG XXXX). A lecturer may teach on any time base and may be on any types of contract (e.g. Academic Term, Academic Year, or Three-Year, see below).
2. *Department*: an academic department or academic school (e.g. School of Social Work and School of Computer Science and Engineering).
3. *Department head*: the chair of a department or the director of a school.
4. WPAF: Working Personnel Action File.

Policy Statement

Lecturers in the university are employed on contracts signed by the dean of the college. There are three types of contract:

1. *Academic Term*: appointment ~~based on~~ based on academic terms, the totality of which is shorter than an academic year.
2. *Academic Year*: appointed for an academic year, typically from the Fall term to the end of the Spring term.
3. *Three-Year*: appointed for three academic years.

~~The primary mission of lecturers in the university is to provide instruction for students. The evaluation of them therefore should be on their teaching and, if applicable, instruction-related activities and services based on their contract. [Accomplishments and/or activities in other areas are not required but, if present, shall be seen as additional evidence for the evaluated lecturers' professional success.] Lecturers shall be evaluated based on the duties as defined in their contract. For lecturers who are assigned non-teaching duties as specified in their contract, these duties shall be evaluated as part of their regular employment.~~
All aspects of evaluation shall be confidential.

Formatted: Normal, Right: 0"

Accumulating Documentation

Effective and fair evaluation of lecturers rely on evidence and documentation collected throughout the year. For most lecturers, whose sole or primary responsibility is teaching, evidence and documentation come from two sources.

1. *SOTEs*. The SOTEs for lecturers are administered in the same way as ~~it is they are~~ for tenure-line faculty ~~as is set forth in (FAM 652.1)4. For those lecturers whose assignment is supervision, Some departments may use other instruments such as Student Evaluations of Supervision Effectiveness (SESEs) shall be used instead, as supplements or alternatives to SOTEs.~~

Lecturers on the Academic Term or Academic Year contract ~~are required to must~~ have all their classes SOTEd.

Lecturers on the Three-Year contract may exclude up to 20% of the courses ~~from being~~ SOTEd ~~from being used for evaluation~~ in a given academic year. The exclusion should not negatively affect the representativeness of the lecturer's teaching ~~portfolio assignment~~ as determined jointly by the department chair and the evaluated lecturer. In the event of disagreement about what courses are deemed "representative," each party shall select 50% of the courses as representative. If this selection process results in SOTEs not being included for evaluation, the department head and the lecturer concerned will sign a statement indicating which SOTEs shall be included for evaluation. The signed statement shall be placed in the lecturer's WPAF.
~~Exclusion of SOTEs from evaluation must be made in writing and delivered to the department office in time for evaluation [no later than April 30th]~~

2. *Class visitation*. Class visitation for lecturers is administered in the same way as it is for tenure-line faculty (FAM 652.4¹). A class visitation results in a report filed by the visitor-

~~and the evaluated lecturer~~, which becomes official documentation for evaluation.

- a. ~~All L~~lecturers shall be visited in the term in which they begin their employment~~when first hired, and in any new course they are assigned to teach.~~
 - b. Lecturers on the Three-Year contract are visited at least once in an evaluation cycle.
3. Subsequent and additional visitations of lecturers may be scheduled ~~whenever appropriate as determined~~ by the Department/College Evaluation Committee or Lecturer Evaluation Committee (see below). Additional visitation may also be scheduled ~~or~~ at the request of ~~the~~ lecturer or an appropriate administrator.
 4. Other evidence/documentation. For lecturers who are assigned non-teaching duties on their contract, such assignment shall be documented in writing by the appropriate administrator (college dean or department head) ~~in an appropriate manner (e.g. a memo) and at an appropriate time (well in advance of the evaluation period)~~. Such documentation shall be placed in the lecturer's WPAF (see below).

Procedure and Process

The evaluation of lecturers are conducted primarily at the department (and, occasionally, the college, see below) level ~~and but~~ in coordination with the college and the Office of Faculty Affairs and Development.

1. *Committee for evaluation*

The committee for the evaluation of lecturers may be the Department Evaluation Committee, which is created in accordance with FAM 652.14 (three tenured faculty, two of whom must be at the rank of professor). It may also be a separate committee (Lecturer Evaluation Committee) if the department so chooses based on a vote of the tenure-line faculty. This committee will be composed of ~~at least~~ three tenured faculty, elected via the same process for the Department Evaluation Committee. The chair of the committee is elected by committee members. The department head cannot serve on the committee.

Lecturers hired by or assigned to teach in a college may be evaluated by the College Evaluation Committee or a College Lecturer Evaluation Committee. The College Lecturer Evaluation Committee shall be elected in the same way as the Department Lecturer Evaluation Committee.

If a Lecturer Evaluation Committee is composed (at either the department or college level), it will assume the responsibilities regarding all aspects of lecturer evaluation as specified in FAM 652.1 for the Department or College Evaluation Committee.

~~If a lecturer is hired by or assigned to work in a unit rather than a department (e.g. a college), the committee responsible to evaluate that lecturer shall be the evaluation committee of that unit (e.g. College Evaluation Committee)~~

2. Lecturer WPAF

- a. Evaluation of lectures shall be based solely on the lecturer's WPAF.
- ~~a-b.~~ The college shall be responsible for assembling the WPAFs and delivering them to the committee that evaluate the lecturers.
 - i. For lecturers whose responsibility is solely teaching, the WPAF shall include a Lecturer Evaluation Form (See Appendix), list of all classes taught during the evaluation cycle, SOTE results, visitation reports, and—if applicable—previous years' evaluation reports. It may also include other information as deemed appropriate jointly by the department and the lecturer as specified in Item 4 under the Accumulating Documentation section.
 - ii. For lecturers whose duties are primarily teaching but include other, non-teaching assignments, the activities and accomplishments in these assignments shall be included in addition to the items listed in "I" above.
 - iii. For lecturers whose assignments are solely or primarily non-teaching, a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) shall be submitted by the lecturer to the college office. The requirements for the FAR are the same as those for tenure-line faculty as found in FAM 652.1.

3. *Frequency of evaluation*

- a. Lecturers on the Academic Term contract ~~shall be~~ evaluated at the discretion of the department head or appropriate administrator. Lecturers themselves can also request evaluation.
- b. Lecturers on the Academic Year contract ~~shall be~~ evaluated in the ~~S~~spring term.
- c. Lecturers on the Three-Year contract ~~shall be~~ evaluated in the last year of the contract. More frequent evaluations may be conducted upon the request of the lecturer or at the discretion of ~~the president or designee~~.

4. *Process and ~~t~~Timeline for evaluation*

- ~~a.~~ The college dean's office assembles the documentation referenced above into a file and sends the file to the department in time for evaluation, which takes place in the Spring term. [Temporary full-time faculty submits FARs to the APO.]
- ~~b-a.~~ Lecturer evaluation typically takes place the spring term. However, the department or college may opt to conduct the evaluation in other terms.
- b. The third week of the term: Evaluators receive lecturers' WPAFs.
- c. Subsequent weeks: Evaluators conduct evaluation and
- ~~a.~~ The department head and the Department Evaluation Committee or Lecturer-Evaluation Committee jointly review the file, fill out the Lecturer Evaluation Form (Appendix).
- ~~e-d.~~ No later than the end of the term: ~~[Provide LINK here]~~ Evaluators submit the lecturer Evaluation Form to the college dean. ~~If the lecturer is assigned to a college, the~~

~~College Evaluation Committee and the Dean shall jointly perform the evaluation.~~

5. *Criteria of evaluation*

- a. Teaching: the criteria for teaching are the same as for tenure-line faculty's performance review (FAM 652.1).
- b. Non-teaching: the criteria for non-teaching duties are the same as for tenure-line faculty used to reflect the scope of the duties specified in the evaluated lecturer's contract (FAM 652.1).

6. *Results of evaluation*

~~The results of The~~ evaluation ~~shall~~ are intended to aid lead to the decision by the dean about the lecturer's future appointment and, if the lecturer is reappointed, ~~to~~ the decision by the department ~~head~~ about the lecturer's ~~teaching~~ assignment.

Approved by ~~the~~ Faculty Senate (~~Chair Karen Kolehmainen~~) on _____

~~Approved by Provost (Shari McMahan) on _____~~

~~Approved by the President (Tomás Morales) _____~~

First Created by Faculty Affairs Committee, March 2019

APPENDIX: Periodic LECTURER EVALUATION FORM of Lecturers

Information: to be filled out by college department/school office

Name: _____ Department: _____

Type of Appointment: ~~__ Term by term~~ Academic Term; __ Academic Year; __ Three-Year; __ Other

Time base: ~~__ Part time; _____ Full time~~ Period under review: _____ (Term) to _____ (Term)

Courses taught during the evaluation cycle: _____

Evaluation: to be filled out by committee

Summary evaluation of performance in the areas of:

1. Teaching (Not all sections may be applicable. For example, Sections A through C may not be applicable to the evaluation of lectures with entirely supervision assignments.)
 - a. Comment on Command of the Subject Matter, Course Design/Preparation, Instructional Material and Organization, Effectiveness in Instruction, and Academic Assessment of Students
 - b. Comment on SOTEs
 - c. Comment on Classroom Visitations
 - d. Comment on other instructional related activities
 - e. Other comments
2. Research, scholarly or creative contributions (if applicable)
3. University and/or community service (if applicable)

If a ~~lecturer temporary faculty~~ is eligible for a three-year appointment or eligible for a subsequent appointment, ~~please indicate whether the lecturer's performance is provide a recommendation of satisfactory, or unsatisfactory and provide reasons for your evaluation. -or not along with a justificatio~~

Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

Reasons:

Signed by:

[NAME AND DATE] [NAME AND DATE] [NAME AND DATE]

FAM ~~652.2-XXX~~, 2019
Evaluation of lecturers

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Approved by the CSUSB Faculty Senate on _____

Signed

Karen Kolehmainen (Senate Chair)

Date

Tomás Morales (CSUSB President)

Date

[This is the last page of an FAM document and shall be kept in the senate office. The dates on this page must match dates on the corresponding lines of the previous page.]

EVALUATION OF LECTURERS

FAM 652.2

Purpose and Scope

Lecturers have been playing an increasingly vital part in the mission of the university. The evaluation of lecturers is thus an important process that helps ensure the quality of instruction for students. This document sets forth policies and processes for the evaluation of lecturers.

The major aspects of the evaluation of lecturers are stipulated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). What is specified in this document is meant to implement the CBA, not to replace any element of it. If a provision in this document is found to be inconsistent with a future CBA, it shall be revised to reflect the changes in the CBA.

The policies on and process for the evaluation of lecturers had been stipulated in the same policy document as the one for tenure-line faculty (FAM 652.1). The changes in CBA provisions on lecturers created the need to separate the evaluation of the two types of instructional faculty—tenure-line and lecturers. This policy therefore shall refer to FAM 652.1 where necessary, as many aspects of evaluation are the same for both types of faculty.

Definition

1. *Lecturer*: A non-tenure-line, unit-three employee who provides academic instruction to students. Such instruction is provided generally—although not always—under a course found in the CSUSB Catalog (e.g. MATH XXXX, ENG XXXX). A lecturer may teach on any time base and may be on any types of contract (e.g. Academic Term, Academic Year, or Three-Year, see below).
2. *Department*: an academic department or academic school (e.g. School of Social Work and School of Computer Science and Engineering).
3. *Department head*: the chair of a department or the director of a school.
4. *WPAF*: Working Personnel Action File.

Policy Statement

Lecturers in the university are employed on contracts signed by the dean of the college. There are three types of contract:

1. *Academic Term*: appointment based on academic terms, the totality of which is shorter than an academic year.
2. *Academic Year*: appointed for an academic year, typically from the Fall term to the end of the Spring term.
3. *Three-Year*: appointed for three academic years.

Lecturers shall be evaluated based on the duties as defined in their contract.

All aspects of evaluation shall be confidential.

Accumulating Documentation

Effective and fair evaluation of lecturers rely on evidence and documentation collected throughout the year. For most lecturers, whose sole or primary responsibility is teaching, evidence and documentation come from two sources.

1. *SOTEs*. The SOTEs for lecturers are administered in the same way as they are for tenure-line faculty (FAM 652.1). For those lecturers whose assignment is supervision, Student Evaluations of Supervision Effectiveness (SESEs) shall be used instead.

Lecturers on the Academic Term or Academic Year contract are required to have all their classes SOTEd.

Lecturers on the Three-Year contract may exclude up to 20% of the courses SOTEd from being used for evaluation in a given academic year. The exclusion should not negatively affect the representativeness of the lecturer's teaching portfolio as determined jointly by the department chair and the evaluated lecturer. In the event of disagreement about what courses are deemed "representative," each party shall select 50% of the courses as representative. If this selection process results in SOTEs not being included for evaluation, the department head and the lecturer concerned will sign a statement indicating which SOTEs shall be included for evaluation. The signed statement shall be placed in the lecturer's WPAF.

2. *Class visitation*. Class visitation for lecturers is administered in the same way as it is for tenure-line faculty (FAM 652.1). A class visitation results in a report filed by the visitor, which becomes official documentation for evaluation.
 - a. All lecturers shall be visited in the term in which they begin their employment and in any new course they are assigned to teach.
 - b. Lecturers on the Three-Year contract are visited at least once in an evaluation cycle.
3. Subsequent and additional visitations of lecturers may be scheduled by the Department/College Evaluation Committee or Lecturer Evaluation Committee (see below). Additional visitation may also be scheduled at the request of the lecturer or an appropriate administrator.

4. Other evidence/documentation. For lecturers who are assigned non-teaching duties on their contract, such assignment shall be documented in writing by the appropriate administrator (college dean or department head) Such documentation shall be placed in the lecturer's WPAF (see below).

Procedure and Process

The evaluation of lecturers are conducted primarily at the department (and, occasionally, the college, see below) level and in coordination with the college and the Office of Faculty Affairs and Development.

1. *Committee for evaluation*

The committee for the evaluation of lecturers may be the Department Evaluation Committee, which is created in accordance with FAM 652.1 (three tenured faculty, two of whom must be at the rank of professor). It may also be a separate committee (Lecturer Evaluation Committee) if the department so chooses based on a vote of the tenure-line faculty. This committee will be composed of three tenured faculty elected via the same process for the Department Evaluation Committee. The chair of the committee is elected by committee members. The department head cannot serve on the committee.

Lecturers hired by or assigned to teach in a college may be evaluated by the College Evaluation Committee or a College Lecturer Evaluation Committee. The College Lecturer Evaluation Committee shall be elected in the same way as the Department Lecturer Evaluation Committee.

If a Lecturer Evaluation Committee is composed (at either the department or college level), it will assume the responsibilities regarding all aspects of lecturer evaluation as specified in FAM 652.1 for the Department or College Evaluation Committee.

2. *Lecturer WPAF*

- a. Evaluation of lectures shall be based solely on the lecturer's WPAF.
- b. The college shall be responsible for assembling the WPAFs and delivering them to the committee that evaluate the lecturers.
 - i. For lecturers whose responsibility is solely teaching, the WPAF shall include a Lecturer Evaluation Form (See Appendix), list of all classes taught during the evaluation cycle, SOTE results, visitation reports, and—if applicable—previous years' evaluation reports. It may also include other information as deemed appropriate jointly by the department and the lecturer as specified in Item 4 under the Accumulating Documentation section.
 - ii. For lecturers whose duties are primarily teaching but include other, non-teaching assignments, the activities and accomplishments in these assignments shall be included in addition to the items listed in "I" above.
 - iii. For lecturers whose assignments are solely or primarily non-teaching, a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) shall be submitted by the lecturer to the college office. The

requirements for the FAR are the same as those for tenure-line faculty as found in FAM 652.1.

3. *Frequency of evaluation*

- a. Lecturers on the Academic Term contract shall be evaluated at the discretion of the department head or appropriate administrator. Lecturers themselves can also request evaluation.
- b. Lecturers on the Academic Year contract shall be evaluated in the spring term.
- c. Lecturers on the Three-Year contract shall be evaluated in the last year of the contract. More frequent evaluations may be conducted upon the request of the lecturer or at the discretion of the president or designee.

4. *Process and timeline for evaluation*

- a. Lecturer evaluation typically takes place the spring term. However, the department or college may opt to conduct the evaluation in other terms.
- b. The third week of the term: Evaluators receive lecturers' WPAFs.
- c. Subsequent weeks: Evaluators conduct evaluation and
 - a. fill out the Lecturer Evaluation Form (Appendix) .
 - d. No later than the end of the term: Evaluators submit the lecturer Evaluation Form to the college dean.

5. *Criteria of evaluation*

- a. Teaching: the criteria for teaching are the same as for tenure-line faculty's performance review (FAM 652.1).
- b. Non-teaching: the criteria for non-teaching duties are the same as for tenure-line faculty used to reflect the scope of the duties specified in the evaluated lecturer's contract (FAM 652.1).

6. *Results of evaluation*

The results of evaluation are intended to aid the decision by the dean about the lecturer's future appointment and, if the lecturer is reappointed, the decision by the department about the lecturer's assignment.

Approved by the Faculty Senate on _____

Approved by the President _____

First Created by Faculty Affairs Committee, March 2019

APPENDIX: LECTURER EVALUATION FORM

Information: to be filled out by college office

Name: _____ Department: _____

Type of Appointment: __ Academic Term; __ Academic Year; __ Three-Year; __ Other

Time base: _____ Period under review: _____(Term) to _____ (Term)

Courses taught during the evaluation cycle: _____

Evaluation: to be filled out by committee

Summary evaluation of performance in the areas of:

1. Teaching (Not all sections may be applicable. For example, Sections A through C may not be applicable to the evaluation of lectures with entirely supervision assignments.)
 - a. Comment on Command of the Subject Matter, Course Design/Preparation, Instructional Material and Organization, Effectiveness in Instruction, and Academic Assessment of Students
 - b. Comment on SOTEs
 - c. Comment on Classroom Visitations
 - d. Comment on other instructional related activities
 - e. Other comments
2. Research, scholarly or creative contributions (if applicable)
3. University and/or community service (if applicable)

If a lecturer is eligible for a three-year appointment or eligible for a subsequent appointment, indicate whether the lecturer's performance is satisfactory or unsatisfactory and provide reasons for your evaluation.

___ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory

Reasons:

Signed by:

[NAME AND DATE]

[NAME AND DATE]

[NAME AND DATE]

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Approved by the CSUSB Faculty Senate on _____

Signed

Karen Kolehmainen (Senate Chair)

Date

Tomás Morales (CSUSB President)

Date

[This is the last page of an FAM document and shall be kept in the senate office. The dates on this page must match dates on the corresponding lines of the previous page.]

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 53RD SENATE

A G E N D A

SESSION 09– Tuesday – April 9, 2019, 2:00PM – 3:50PM, Pine Room

- 1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**
 - 1.1 Minutes for March 19, 2019 (FSM 2019.03.19)**
- 2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
- 3. CHAIR’S REPORT**
- 4. PRESIDENT’S REPORT**
- 5. PROVOST’S REPORT**
- 6. INFORMATION ITEMS**
 - 6.1 Minutes of EC Meeting – 3/12/19 ECM 2019.03.12 (attachment)**
- 7. NEW BUSINESS**
 - 7.1 FAM 818.9 Missed Class Policy – Senator Fischman (first reading) attachment**
 - 7.2 FAM 820.55 Summer SOTE’s – Senator Fischman (first reading) attachment**
 - 7.3 Q2S Teach In – Craig Seal**
 - 7.4 FAM 652.2 Evaluation of Lecturers (first reading) attachment**
- 8. OLD BUSINESS**
- 9. NEW BUSINESS**
- 10. COMMITTEE REPORTS**
 - 10.1 EPRC**
 - 10.2 FAC**
 - 10.3 Q2S**
- 11. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATOR’S 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 Academic Affairs/Deans’ Reports**
 - 13.4 Vice President for Administration and Finance**
 - 13.5 Vice President for Student Affairs**