

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Faculty Senate records

Arthur E. Nelson University Archives

2-12-2019

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda (2/12/2019)

CSUSB Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate>

Recommended Citation

CSUSB Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda (2/12/2019)" (2019). *Faculty Senate records*. 101.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate/101>

This Agenda is brought to you for free and open access by the Arthur E. Nelson University Archives at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate records by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Tuesday, February 12, 2019

2:00-3:50PM

AD-145

1. Approval of EC Minutes, 1/22/19, ECM 18-08
2. Approval of EC Minutes, 1/29/19, ECM 18-09
3. Approval of FS Minutes, 2/5/19, FSM 18-06
4. Faculty Evaluation FAM Survey – Rong Chen

Time Certain 2:30PM

5. Suggested Revision to FAM 841.97, Writing Requirement for Graduate Candidacy:
Caroline Vickers
6. FAM 820.9 Course Syllabus Policy & Guidelines
1. President's Report
2. Provost's Report
3. Chair's Report
4. FAC Report
5. EPRC Report

Time Certain – 3:30PM

9. Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda – FSA 18-07
10. Statewide Academic Report
11. New Business

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Tuesday, January 22, 2019
2:00-3:50PM
AD-145

Members Present: Karen Kolehmainen, Rong Chen, Davida Fischman, Haakon Brown, Jodie Ullman, Jill Vasillakos-Long

Visitors: Diane Podolske, Seval Yildirim

1. 20 Year Anniversary – CSU Center for Community Engagement – Diane Podolske

- The ASCSU passed a resolution recognizing 20 years of Community Engagement excellent for all CSU's and this is our 20th anniversary. They are asking that we hold an event that highlights and showcases 20 years of student success efforts in service learning and community engagement.
- The actual anniversary is in May—looking for a date around then.
- Include ASI, Staff Council on planning committee.

Event Suggestions:

- Nominate students to recognize.
- Bring former faculty members and honor their contributions to the community.
- Invite faculty who have received funding.
- Highlight achievements—programs that launched out of this center. Supports ongoing work.
- Have a poster session and circulate through the room and can later put the posters some place on campus.
- Have an engaging speaker and food.
- Could be an open house/reception combination.
- Community partners should be invited.
- Recognize those who supported faculty in their own professional growth.

General Comments:

- High quality faculty work has resulted from this endeavor.
- Diane will email updates to Chair Kolehmainen and Sylvia.

Action Item:

- The Faculty Senate could pass a resolution—Chair Kolehmainen will draft a resolution.

2. Approval of EC Minutes – 1/8/19, ECM-18-07

The EC approved the Executive Committee minutes of January 18, 2019 as amended.

3. Approval of FS Minutes – 1/15/19, FSM 18-05

The EC approved the Faculty Senate Minutes of January 15, 2019 as amended.

- Chair Kolehmainen will contact Craig Seal regarding using the term Designated Note Takers vs. just Note Takers going forward.

4. Appointments

The EC made the following appointments:

- Student Grade Appeal Panel (CNS) – Chris Gentry, (2018-2020)
- SOTE Instrument Review Ad-Hoc Committee – Jo Anna Grant
- Search Committee for VP and Dean of Students – Christina Hassija, CSBS
- Search Committee for Director of Financial Aid – Kim Wobick, Library

5. FAM Changes: FAM's 650.5, 650.7, 651.3 – Seval Yildirim

Associate Provost Yildirim brought a recommendation to the EC to replace the three above FAM's with the proposed document (attached) which addresses the Periodic Reviews of the Provost, Central Administrators and College Deans.

Rationale for Changes:

- Streamline review process and eliminates committee work.
- The reviews would be housed in Qualtrics.
- Everyone can go online and submit their comments.

EC Responses to proposed changes:

- Would like to see a table of: current policy, suggested change(s), reason for change.
- What problem are we attempting to solve?
- EC would like to find out where FAM 650.7 currently stands—was sent to President to be signed.
- FAM 650.5 and 651.3 have been signed.

Hot Buttons are as follows:

- Committee would be eliminated, leaving no one to summarize and/or analyze
- The process needs to include a report (from someone/somebody)
- 360 review process would need to be thoroughly explained
- Need to avoid naming specific products because they change over time
- Anonymity would be an issue.
- The system would collate the comments and submit a report.
- Analysis would be up to Provost and/or President
- Committee could/would develop survey and questions.
- Individuals need to know what they are being evaluated on.
- There are a different set of questions for each individual/group.

Action Taken:

- EC referred this and Associate Provost to work with FAC.

Associate Provost Yildirim also wanted input regarding creating a Spousal Hiring Policy.

Rationale:

- We currently have 3-4 spousal hire demands which we think will result in lost hires.
- Staff, adjunct faculty hires might be easier to do something for.

EC Responses/Suggestions:

- We may need to add an extra line – Provost is willing to do so. However, adding extra lines could eventually present a problem.
- Partner with other local institutions that may have openings.

Action Taken:

- FAC would be willing to take on this project and work with AP Yildirim
- AP Yildirim will do some research with other CSU campus and work with the FAC.

6. Electronic Voting – Haakon Brown

- This will be an item on the next Faculty Senate Meeting agenda.

7. President's Report – No report.

8. Provost's Report – No report

9. Chair's Report – No report

10. FAC Report

- IDS RPT Guidelines
- Would like to renumber: 652.1 – Evaluation of Tenure-Line Faculty, etc.
- If we have a separate policy for lecturers and tenure-line faculty, will need to change in two documents.
- FAC plans to reduce the number of FAMs to under 100.

Consensus:

- The EC approved the FAC request to re-number the Faculty Evaluation FAMs.

Action Taken:

- IDS RPT Guidelines will be placed on the next Faculty Senate Agenda.

11. EPRC Report

- It was requested that an item be added to include a diversity and inclusion statement in the syllabus.
- EPRC would send out options to Senate by email prior to next FS Meeting.
- Include a link to several sample statements.
- Statement would be added to Item 2 and make it a requirement.

Meeting adjourned.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Tuesday, January 29, 2019
 2:00-3:50PM
 AD-145

Members Present: Karen Kolehmainen, Lasisi Ajayi, Rong Chen, Donna Garcia, Davida Fischman, Haakon Brown, Shari McMahan, Tomas Morales, Beth Steffel, Jill Vasillakos-Long

Visitors: Cherstin Lyon, Diane Podolske

1. Approval of EC Minutes, ECM 18-08 (January 22, 2019)

- The minutes were tabled so they could be reformatted with sections.
- Action: Chair Kolehmainen will work with Sylvia to revise the minutes.

2. Appointments

The EC made the following appointments:

- Student Grade Appeal Panel – Christine Famega (2018-2020)

3. Faculty Community Engagement Activities – Cherstin Lyon

- This is an outgrowth of the Strategic Planning process.
- We need to reduce the barriers for retention and promotion process for faculty involved with Community Engagement.
- There should be a close reading of our current document to ensure the variety of activities will be specifically supported and give people ideas and placing in particular categories.
- Goal is to raise awareness with Dean, Faculty and Chairs.
- Misconceptions that get in the way of people getting a fair evaluation:
 - Community Engagement activities should be counted under service regardless of outcome
 - Community Engagement activities are never peer reviewed and therefore not significant
 - Community Engagement activities take away from time spent producing scholarly outcomes—not a good choice of time.
 - Often steer junior faculty away from Community Engagement until they are tenured.
- Community Engagement is involved with teaching practices in both in classroom and outside the classroom, many types of research and a valuable of performing service to community.

Input to ask how Senate, EC can participate, engage in the process:

- Find out how many faculty consider themselves to be Community Engaged faculty.
- We want to get involved in the evaluation process.
- How to document and assess the impact.
- We want to do more awareness training and how to take control of the message.
- Currently working on a Community Engagement toolkit.
- Community Engagement often covers all three areas of evaluation.

EC comments/input:

- Students who do internships and service learning have a hands-up on employment opportunities and accepting their applications to graduate school.
- Community Engagement is listed under service vs. scholarly activities.
- When research involves the community, you can document significant outcomes that are not the typical outcomes.
- You can document (if funded through the grant) how you are working through the community.
- Evaluation committees need to understand how to weigh the different activities.
- “Service will not get you the promotion” has been verbalized by Evaluation chairs.
- We need guidelines in the department FAMs.
- FAC is willing to partner with Community Engagement.
- We need to establish some sort of rigor and demonstrate it in Community Engagement.
- Have discussions with departments to revise guidelines which currently may be discouraging faculty to participate in community engagement.
- Most community engagements that receive funding, want a program evaluation. Those evaluations if done by faculty members could be regarded as a type of publication if filed in government documents.
- A course could be taught with a service learning component, which includes community service. Therefore there is a teaching element that is very important because students gain a lot from these experiences.
- What sort of support would be available to faculty, i.e. CEAT awards.
- What counts as community engagement and do you need to have a level of expertise in that area.

Action:

- Cherstin will make a Community Engagement presentation to the Faculty Senate.
- RPT workshops for junior faculty could include a discussion about Community Engagement.

4. President’s Report

- Thank you for the lunch date and supporting it and we will plan more.
- Passed around the brochure for the Martin Luther King breakfast held on our campus and over 800 people attended.
- We are trying to be very aggressive where there are departments that may need more than one appointment.
- Challenge to keep up with the number of retirements we expect.

5. Provost’s Report

- We are putting out a call for a Diversity and Inclusion Consultant to begin work in Spring 2019 and ideally conclude work by the end of June 2019. This consultant will provide a comprehensive mapping of the university’s diversity programs. Please provide your thoughts on what we should be looking for in addition to what is already listed on the RFP.

6. Chair’s Report

- IT will be putting media equipment in Conference Room AD-145 so will have more media capabilities.
- The meeting with Trustee McGrory has been extended to one hour thanks to Pam Langford.
- CAL Dean finalist interviews tomorrow and next week in AD-145 from 1:00 to 1:45PM.
- CampusLabs will be scheduling other sessions for Faculty.

7. FAC Report

- Working on evaluation policy for lecturers.
- We want to renumber the FAMs again—more to follow.

8. EPRC Report

- Brought a separate statement for a diversity/inclusion statement to be included in the requirements in the Syllabus policy.
- Will send wording to the senators prior to next meeting on February 5th.
- The FAM regarding the SOTE (summer SOTEs) does not reflect what is currently happening on campus. Is trying to clarify what we are doing and look at modifications of FAM—may need major revisions.
- If we want to look at online SOTES vs. paper, that is something we may want to consider.
- Currently researching how the 75% is spent by CEGE.

9. Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda – FSA 18-06, February 5, 2019

- The EC rearranged several items on the proposed agenda
- Tenets of Shared Governance – could start a conversation on it
- Sylvia will add a “Discussion Items” section on the agenda going forward
- A time certain should be given to Old Business Items
- Community Engagement will be on agenda for February 19
- Suggest we give presenters a time limit
- The Chair will work with Sylvia to finalize the agenda
- IDS Guidelines will be placed on the agenda
- No GE courses should be on this agenda

Action:

Chair Kolehmainen will address the issue of going off topic in her Chair’s report.

Meeting adjourned.

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

MINUTES

SESSION 06: Tuesday, February 5, 2019, 2:00 pm, Pine Room

Members Present: All members were present with the exception of: A. Johnson, K. Kowalski, J. Kremling, A. Louque, A. Menton, T. Morales, J. Munoz, H. So, D. Sweeney, R. Trapp, J. Ullman

Guests Present: D. Freer, C. Caballero, S. Sudhakar, C. Seal, P. Bungard, L. Rose, G. King, S. Yildirim, C. Lyon, P. Maldonado, Y. Gonzalez, T. Karmanova, C. Weber, R. Mohamed, R. Chuang, A. Anderson, H. Le Grande, J. Zhu, S. Peresuh, D. Podolske, J. Lappin, A. Felix, D. Huizinga

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Senator Chen-Maynard moved and Senator Marx seconded the motion to approve the minutes as presented. **PASSED Unanimously.**

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Senator Chen moved and Senator Rizzo seconded the motion to approve the agenda as presented. **PASSED Unanimously.**

3. FACULTY COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES – CHERSTIN LYON

- Community Engagement is goal 4 of our Strategic Plan.
- The goal was by fall 2017 to have specific mechanisms in place to support faculty in gaining fair and informed evaluations of our community engagement activities in our RPT process.
- Will send out a survey for specific feedback. Please respond when we send out.
- Please put March 1st on your calendars—it will be second campus conversation about community engagement.
- Please go back to your departments and have intentional conversations about this process. Address the following: How we can support faculty efforts in a non-quantitative way, significance of work in the community, significance through impact and amount of effort involved.
- Change the language about community in the document. “Service to the university and community” is a better way to refer to this.
- In major university document, asking for feedback Scholarly creative research activities. May be more specific ways to support community which involve research what it looks like, we can show faculty and evaluator what these activities look like.
- Engaging students in community based teaching and activities provide high impact.

4. CHAIR'S REPORT

We want to move the agenda along as we have not completed an agenda yet this year. Please stick to the point being discussed. If not, possibly Senator Brown or Chair may call you out of order.

5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – (attached)**6. PROVOST'S REPORT (attached)**

- Congratulations to CNS for hosting a successful Pre-Med/Pre-Health Conference. More than 300 students attended.
- Started rounds to colleges (President & Provost)
- Pastries with the Provost tomorrow.
- Senate Retreat will be April 25 and will be sending a save the date.
- Women of Color in Academia will be hosting a Faculty Publication Celebration tomorrow.

7. INFORMATION ITEMS**7.1 Q2S Curriculum Items**

- The Faculty Senate approved the curriculum courses presented with the following exceptions: 2 GE courses (CAL 3350, CSE 1300L) and USTD 3000, USTD 5000.
- Senator Rizzo will send the Chair email regarding the USTD courses mentioned above.
- College of Criminal Justice name change: This needs to go to EPRC before approving.

7.2 Q2S Programs Requiring Action in CIM – Grace King

- There were quarter programs that were not touched previously. We are highlighting steps moving forward to discontinuing, extension and conversion for minors and certificates.

7.3 Q2S Semester Programs being Discontinued

- Provided list of programs to discontinue under semester calendar.

8. WASC Presentation – Associate Provost, Clare Weber

- Reaffirmation of accreditation with our site visit from WASC in Spring of 2021.
- Have a campus-wide understanding of process and its significance
- Know our institutional strength and weaknesses
- Successfully complete the WASC accreditation for CSUSB
- Core commitments: Student learning, quality and improvement, institutional integrity, sustainability and accountability.
- We will prepare a self-study, review under standards and comprehensive overview.

- Self-Study will be due approximately 10 months before onsite visit.
- Off-site visit will be approximately 6 months before onsite visit.
- The standards were reviewed and 39 criteria for review are spread across the four standards.
- A timeline was given to everyone.
- Will send out a call for Faculty to serve on WASC steering committee.
- On March 22nd we will have a campus visit by WASC VP Mark Gore. He will conduct a campus open forum and workshop for those on steering committee.
- WASC wants to see that this is a campus-wide effort.

9. DISCUSSION ITEMS

9.1 Electronic Voting – Haakon Brown (tabled)

9.2 Tenets of Shared Governance in CSU (attachment) (tabled)

10. OLD BUSINESS

10.1 FAM 841.3 Proposed Change to Graduate Admissions Policy (second reading)

Senator Ajayi moved and Senator Fischman seconded the motion to approve FAM 841.3 for second reading. **PASSED Unanimously.**

- We did approve the office of Graduate Student Admissions office to operate under these standards in the interim.

10.2 FAM 872.2 Policy on Course Material

Senator Fischman moved and Senator Davis seconded the motion to approve FAM 872.2 for second reading.

- Could we possibly change the title of this FAM. EPRC will try to come up with a more description title for this policy. **PASSED Unanimously.**

10.3 FAM 820.9 Course Syllabus Policy and Guidelines

Senator Fischman moved and Senator Ajayi seconded the motion to approve FAM 820.9 for second reading as amended. **PASSED Unanimously.**

- Item 2h has been revised as requested. Academic Affairs website will have some examples for
- Separated examples from FAM so we would not need to revised the FAM every time the examples for changed.

ASI President Ogidikpe moved and Senator Davis seconded the motion to add item 2 J to

- read as follows: Instructions referring students to a site for information regarding emergency management and safety guidelines.”
- VP Freer offered to work with group to work on the narrative that should be included.
- There may be some legal implications to adding a safety guidelines statement.
- Suggested to provide a link with the appropriate safety information.

Senator Brown moved and Senator Rizzo seconded the motion to call the question on the amendment. **PASSED Unanimously.**

11. NEW BUSINESS**11.1 IDS Department Guidelines (first reading)**

Senator Chen moved and Senator Chen-Maynard seconded the motion to approve the IDS Department Guidelines for first reading. **PASSED Unanimously** with suggested changes.

- FAC had some concerns about the use of numbers concerning publications.
- Under “At the rank of Professor”: should read *“be at a higher level of quality and significance than expected for contributions of Assistant or Associate Professor”*.
- At the rank of Assistant Professor: could read *“At least two publications within the most recent five year period are expected,..”*
- If a publication is not listed in accepted journal list, the Chair and Evaluation Committee work together to decide/vote if it will be accepted.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS

12.1 EPRC (No report today)

12.1 FAC (No report today)

12.3 Q2S

- C. Seal reported continuing with professional development series
- Post original materials due on the 15th

13. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATOR’S REPORT

- Submitted a written report.

14. SENATOR’S REPORTS/INCLUDING ASI PRESIDENT’S REPORT

- ASI President Ogidikpe thanked everyone for allowing Cornel West event for the students.

15. DIVISION REPORTS

15.1 Vice President for Information Technology Services

15.2 Vice President for University Advancement

15.3 Academic Affairs/Deans’ Reports

15.4 Vice President for Administration and Finance

15.5 Vice President for Student Affairs

Meeting Adjourned at 3:52pm

WRITING REQUIREMENT FOR GRADUATE CANDIDACY

FAM 841.97

This Writing Requirement for Graduate Candidacy (WRGC) document outlines the procedures for assessing master's student writing proficiency preparatory to classification or advancement to candidacy, serving as a set of criteria for a CSUSB master's program to determine that a master's student has fulfilled the California State University (CSU) graduation entrance writing requirement for master's candidates.

Specifications

I. In the following, "the Program" refers to the College, Department or program from which the student will receive the master's degree.

II. This Writing Requirement for Graduate Candidacy (WRGC) applies to graduate students enrolled in master's programs. The writing requirement must be satisfied before a graduate student is classified or advanced to candidacy. (The point at which the WRGC must be satisfied shall be a Program decision.)

III. Programs shall submit to the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) notice of the candidates' satisfaction of the WRGC, and the OGS will maintain a record thereof

IV. The Program shall determine the manner by which a student satisfies or does not satisfy the WRGC by requiring one of the four options below. Students shall

- a) take an existing 306 course and attain a grade of B or better; or
- b) achieve an acceptable standardized test score, such as the Analytical Writing subtest of the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) or the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE), or the CSUSB Writing Requirement Exemption Examination (WREE), as determined by the Program; or
- c) complete a Program-specific writing intensive course with a grade no lower than a B-; or
- d) submit a paper(s) that receive(s) a passing score as described in Point VI below (the Program shall determine which faculty member(s) will evaluate such a submission).

V. If a Program-specific writing intensive course is offered to satisfy the WRGC as in Option IVc above, the Program will file the course syllabus with the OGS for approval. The course syllabus should demonstrate a focus on writing in the discipline of study.

VI. If a Program uses Option IVd above, the following rubric, or similar rubric provided by the Program, shall be used to evaluate students' writing performance. Paper(s) shall be scored

using a rubric (1-3) in each of four areas: A) Integration/Critical Analysis, B) Content/Organization, C) Style/Format, and D) Grammar/Usage, for a maximum score of 12. The minimal acceptable combined score from all of the four (A-D) sections is 8 points. Using this or a similar rubric, a Program may establish a higher minimum score for passing. If using Option IVd above, the Program shall submit a rubric as part of its plan for candidates to satisfy the WRGC, showing how students are assessed in the four areas A-D, and what minimum score is acceptable for satisfying the WRGC.

VII. The Program shall have a remediation protocol for admitted graduate students who do not satisfy the WRGC on their first attempt. The Program shall specify the maximum number of attempts that students may be allowed to satisfy the WRGC.

VIII. The Program shall file its respective WRGC and remediation protocol with the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) for approval. Upon approval, the Program shall provide the OGS with annual aggregate student WRGC performance data.

IX. For candidates seeking to transfer to a different program, the Program to which the candidate is applying has the option of accepting or not accepting a candidate's WRGC from a previous program.

X. The policy will go into immediate effect. Programs that gain approval for their WRGC plan may specify for which admission cycle candidates shall be held to the Program's WRGC.

XI. Until such time as the Program's WRGC is approved by OGS, candidates will be held to the existing Graduate Entrance Writing Requirement (GEWR) policy.

Rubric that May Be Used to Evaluate Student Submissions for Satisfaction of the Writing Requirement for Graduate Classification

A. Integration/Critical Analysis

3: The submission represents the current state of knowledge for the topic being addressed. Information about the topic is presented in an organized manner, resulting in an orderly discussion of the topic being addressed. Research source material originates from sources appropriate to the discipline such as national and international peer-reviewed journals, and sources are accurately and concisely analyzed and correctly cited in both text and bibliographic citations.

2: There are inconsistencies in the organization and logic of the information presentation, but still clear analysis of the presented materials. Synthesis of various aspects of the topic may show incomplete degrees of development, but overall, the document is well crafted. There is evidence of analysis and correct citation of appropriate source materials.

1: Discussion of the topic is incomplete and the presentation of ideas is poorly developed or lacking. Complex topics and related concepts are awkwardly presented and linkages among topics may be unclear. Analysis is limited to categorizing and summarizing topics. The resulting

manuscript is confusing, with an inadequate number of sources or lack of appropriate use and citation of reference material.

B. Content/Organization

3: Follows all requirements for the paper. Topic is carefully focused and the major points related to the topic are clearly outlined. Ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Paper is interesting and holds the reader's attention. General ideas are expanded upon in a logical manner, thereby extending the significance of the work presented beyond a restatement of known ideas.

2: Ideas presented closely follow conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Certain logical connections or inclusion of specific topics related to the student's area of study may be omitted. Ideas and concepts are generally satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic and organization are apparent. The reader is suitably introduced to the topic being presented such that the relationship to the student's area of study is obvious.

1: The paper is logically and thematically coherent, but is lacking in substantial ways. The content may be poorly focused or the scholarly argument weak or poorly conceived. Major ideas related to the content may be ignored or inadequately explored. Overall, the content and organization needs significant revision to represent a critical analysis of the topic.

C. Style/Format

3: Conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the paper. Thoroughness and competence are demonstrated in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring back to cited sources. Style and format contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper. The writing suitably models the discipline's overall scholarly style.

2: The style and format are broadly followed, but inconsistencies are apparent. There is selection of less suitable sources (non-peer reviewed literature, web information). Weak transitions and apparent logic gaps occur between topics being addressed. The style may be difficult to follow, so as to detract from the comprehensibility of the manuscript.

1: While some discipline-specific conventions are followed, others are not. The paper lacks consistency in style and/or format. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased. Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty connecting to cited sources to the references given. Major revisions would be needed to render the paper comprehensible.

D. Grammar/Usage

3: While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Transitions and organizational structures, such as subheadings, are effectively used which help the reader move from one point to another.

2: Grammatical conventions are generally used, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use result in weak, but still apparent, connections between topics in the formulation of the argument. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. Effective discipline-specific vocabulary is used.

1: Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure, and/or other writing conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. There is some confusion in the proper use of discipline-specific terms. Writing does not flow smoothly from point to point; appropriate transitions are lacking.

GRADUATION WRITING ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENT

FAM 841.97

This Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) document outlines the procedures for assessing master's student writing proficiency to graduate with a post baccalaureate degree, serving as a set of criteria for a CSUSB master's program to determine that a master's student has fulfilled the California State University (CSU) GWAR for graduates of master's and doctoral degree programs.

Specifications

I. In the following, "the Program" refers to the College, Department or program from which the student will receive the master's or doctoral degree.

II. The GWAR applies to graduate students enrolled in doctoral and master's programs. The writing requirement must be satisfied before a graduate student graduates.

III. Programs shall submit to the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) notice of the candidates' satisfaction of the GWAR, and the OGS will maintain a record thereof

IV. The Program shall determine the manner by which a student satisfies or does not satisfy the GWAR by requiring one of the four options below. Students shall

- a) take a writing intensive course as approved by OGS with a B- or better; or
- b) achieve an acceptable standardized test score, such as the Analytical Writing subtest of the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) or the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE), as determined by the Program; or
- c) submit a rigorous academic paper(s) that receive(s) a passing score as described in Point VI below (the Program shall determine which faculty member(s) will evaluate such a submission).
- d) Successful completion of a writing intensive thesis, comprehensive exam, or culminating project.

V. If a Program-specific writing intensive course is offered to satisfy the GWAR as in Option IVa above, the Program will file the course syllabus with the OGS for approval. The course syllabus should demonstrate a focus on writing in the discipline of study.

VI. If a Program uses Option IVb above, the following rubric, or similar rubric provided by the Program, shall be used to evaluate students' writing performance. Paper(s) shall be scored

using a rubric (1-3) in each of four areas: A) Integration/Critical Analysis, B) Content/Organization, C) Style/Format, and D) Grammar/Usage, for a maximum score of 12. The minimal acceptable combined score from all of the four (A-D) sections is 8 points. Using this or a similar rubric, a Program may establish a higher minimum score for passing. If using Option IVd above, the Program shall submit a rubric as part of its plan for candidates to satisfy the GWAR, showing how students are assessed in the four areas A-D, and what minimum score is acceptable for satisfying the GWAR.

VII. The Program shall have a remediation protocol for admitted graduate students who do not satisfy the GWAR on their first attempt. The Program shall specify the maximum number of attempts that students may be allowed to satisfy the GWAR.

VIII. The Program shall file its respective GWAR and remediation protocol with the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) for approval. Upon approval, the Program shall provide the OGS with annual aggregate student GWAR performance data.

IX. For candidates seeking to transfer to a different program, the Program to which the candidate is applying has the option of accepting or not accepting a candidate's GWAR from a previous program.

X. The policy will go into immediate effect. Programs that gain approval for their GWAR plan may specify for which admission cycle candidates shall be held to the Program's GWAR.

Rubric that May Be Used to Evaluate Student Submissions for Satisfaction of the Writing Requirement for Graduate Classification

A. Integration/Critical Analysis

3: The submission represents the current state of knowledge for the topic being addressed. Information about the topic is presented in an organized manner, resulting in an orderly discussion of the topic being addressed. Research source material originates from sources appropriate to the discipline such as national and international peer-reviewed journals, and sources are accurately and concisely analyzed and correctly cited in both text and bibliographic citations.

2: There are inconsistencies in the organization and logic of the information presentation, but still clear analysis of the presented materials. Synthesis of various aspects of the topic may show incomplete degrees of development, but overall, the document is well crafted. There is evidence of analysis and correct citation of appropriate source materials.

1: Discussion of the topic is incomplete and the presentation of ideas is poorly developed or lacking. Complex topics and related concepts are awkwardly presented and linkages among topics may be unclear. Analysis is limited to categorizing and summarizing topics. The resulting

manuscript is confusing, with an inadequate number of sources or lack of appropriate use and citation of reference material.

B. Content/Organization

3: Follows all requirements for the paper. Topic is carefully focused and the major points related to the topic are clearly outlined. Ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Paper is interesting and holds the reader's attention. General ideas are expanded upon in a logical manner, thereby extending the significance of the work presented beyond a restatement of known ideas.

2: Ideas presented closely follow conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Certain logical connections or inclusion of specific topics related to the student's area of study may be omitted. Ideas and concepts are generally satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic and organization are apparent. The reader is suitably introduced to the topic being presented such that the relationship to the student's area of study is obvious.

1: The paper is logically and thematically coherent, but is lacking in substantial ways. The content may be poorly focused or the scholarly argument weak or poorly conceived. Major ideas related to the content may be ignored or inadequately explored. Overall, the content and organization needs significant revision to represent a critical analysis of the topic.

C. Style/Format

3: Conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the paper. Thoroughness and competence are demonstrated in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring back to cited sources. Style and format contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper. The writing suitably models the discipline's overall scholarly style.

2: The style and format are broadly followed, but inconsistencies are apparent. There is selection of less suitable sources (non-peer reviewed literature, web information). Weak transitions and apparent logic gaps occur between topics being addressed. The style may be difficult to follow, so as to detract from the comprehensibility of the manuscript.

1: While some discipline-specific conventions are followed, others are not. The paper lacks consistency in style and/or format. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased. Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty connecting to cited sources to the references given. Major revisions would be needed to render the paper comprehensible.

D. Grammar/Usage

3: While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Transitions and organizational structures, such as subheadings, are effectively used which help the reader move from one point to another.

2: Grammatical conventions are generally used, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use result in weak, but still apparent, connections between topics in the formulation of the argument. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. Effective discipline-specific vocabulary is used.

1: Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure, and/or other writing conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. There is some confusion in the proper use of discipline-specific terms. Writing does not flow smoothly from point to point; appropriate transitions are lacking.

Faculty Evaluation FAM Survey

Faculty Affairs Committee

The senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) has received many comments on and concerns over the lack of clarity in the early promotion and tenure process. The FAC is planning a possible revision of FAM 652.4 to address these concerns and is seeking your input. Your identity and input will be kept confidential and the results will be of great value for the FAC.

1. Currently, FAM 652.4 is silent about the number of years of service a faculty member must have performed before s/he can apply for early tenure/promotion. You prefer that application for early tenure/promotion should take place (check one):
 - A. Whenever the faculty member feels ready (leave the current policy unchanged).
 - B. After one year of service at CSUSB (file FAR for early promotion/tenure in the second year.)
 - C. After two years of service at CSUSB (file FAR third year.)
 - D. After three years of service (file FAR the fourth year.)
 - E. After four years of service (file FAR in the fifth year.)
 - F. After five years of service (file FAR in the sixth year.)

Comment:

2. Whichever your option for Question 1 above, do you think a faculty member going up early should have accumulated a fixed number of SOTEs and class visitation reports (the exact numbers of SOTEs and visitation reports can be decided later)?
 - A. Yes.
 - B. No.

Comment:

3. Some faculty members are hired with up to two years' service credit. So, the regular probationary period for them is "7 - years of service credit." Do you think whether the years of service credit should be counted in the number of years of service for early tenure/promotion (so that the terms of early promotion/tenure would be "X years of service at CSUSB minus years of service credit"?)
 - A. Yes.
 - B. No.

Comment:

4. In FAM 652.4, the activities and accomplishments before CSUSB employment are merely “considered” whether or not the faculty member gets service credit for them. If a faculty member gets service credit for those activities and accomplishments, would you prefer to...
- A. Leave the current vague FAM language the way it is.
 - B. Give those pre-employment activities and accomplishments equal weight as post-employment activities and accomplishments.
 - C. Do not evaluate those activities and accomplishments.

Comment:

5. FAM 652.4 does not specify the number of years of service a faculty member must have completed since the previous promotion before applying for promotion to professor. You think that promotion to professor should take place:
- A. Whenever the faculty member feels ready (leaving the current policy unchanged).
 - B. At least one year after the previous promotion (file FAR in the second year).
 - C. At least two years after the previous promotion (file FAR in the third year).
 - D. At least three years after the previous promotion (file FAR in the fourth year).
 - E. At least four years after the previous promotion (file FAR in the fifth year).
 - F. At least five years after the previous promotion (file FAR in the Six year).

Comment:

6. If the number of years of service is fixed before a faculty member applies for promotion to professor, you think that early promotion to professor should take place:
- A. At least one year after the previous promotion (file FAR in the second year).
 - B. At least two years after the previous promotion (file FAR in the third year).
 - C. At least three years after the previous promotion (file FAR in the fourth year).
 - D. At least four years after the previous promotion (file FAR in the fifth year).
 - E. At least five years after the previous promotion (file FAR in the Six year).

Comment:

7. Whatever your choices for Questions 5 and 6 above, 1, do you think a faculty member going up for promotion to professor should have accumulated a fixed number of SOTEs and class visitation reports (the exact numbers of SOTEs and visitation reports are not relevant at this stage)?
- A. Yes.
 - B. No.

Comment:

**COURSE SYLLABUS POLICY AND GUIDELINES FAM
820.9¹**

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 and what information is recommended for inclusion. 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.

Deleted: ¶
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.55", Right: 0.67", Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

Deleted: ¶

1. General guidelines:

- (a) Unless circumstances dictate otherwise, instructor(s) shall provide course syllabi on or before the second class meeting;
- (b) Instructor(s) shall provide students with course syllabi in paper copy and/or in a 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 instructions for document access;
- (c) In distributed learning courses, enrolled students shall be provided with the course URL, access instructions, and the syllabus itself via 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;
- (f) Instructors shall ensure that their syllabi are created with accessibility best practices. Information and templates can be found on the Accessible Technology website.

Deleted: the time of

Deleted: i

Deleted: electronic form on a course website

Deleted: written

Deleted: i

Deleted: posted to a

Deleted: course website

Deleted: either

Deleted: or postal mail

Deleted: l or e-mail

Deleted: i

Deleted: i

Deleted: XXX

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt

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 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 and entitlement to accommodation, as provided by the appropriate University office, in particular including contact information for the university's office for Services to Students with Disabilities, and

Deleted: /or

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: 8

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: <object><object>

¹ Revised January 29, 2019, EPRC

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

Deleted: FSD: 06-02
FAM 820.9
Previous FAM N/A

(h) A statement of commitment to the values of inclusion, diversity, and equity. Examples of such statements are available at [insert name of site and url here].

Deleted: , and inclusion

(i) Instructions referring students to the "Academic Regulations and Procedures" in the CSUSB Bulletin of Courses for the university's policies on course withdrawal, cheating, and plagiarism.

Deleted: instructor(s) shall refer

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 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.

Deleted: t lat

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

FSD: 06-02
FAM 820.9
Previous FAM N/A

Commented [MOU1]: Update

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Deleted: <object><object>

HI EC members,

The Academic Affairs Council always meets the day after the senate, and the senate chair discusses the policies passed on the previous day. At yesterday's AA Council meeting, there were several suggestions on the syllabus policy:

(1) The course name, number, and description should be included. The course description should be the same as the catalog description (although the catalog description can be expanded upon for special topics courses).

(2) Should there be a statement that there are to be no additional course fees beyond those that are officially approved for the course?

(3) Should there be a statement that grading policies and confidentiality are compliant with FERPA?

I agree that (1) should be required on the syllabus. I'm not so sure about (2) and (3) - we should follow these rules, of course, but I don't think they need to be on the syllabus. (Most students probably don't even know what FERPA is.) Maybe they should be specified in some other policy, but I'm not sure the syllabus policy is the appropriate one.

Please weigh in on this. If we feel that a minor non-controversial change is warranted (including (1), for example), we can discuss it at the EC meeting on Tuesday, and if we agree, perhaps we can put a revised version as an information item on the February 19 senate agenda.

If anyone thinks we need a revision to the policy on course materials (or whatever new name we come up with) based on Mike Chao's comments and the ensuing discussion on forum, perhaps we can treat that the same way.

Karen

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

A G E N D A

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

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1.1 Minutes for February 5, 2019 (FSM 18-06)

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

3. CHAIR’S REPORT

4. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

5. PROVOST’S REPORT

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

Time Certain – 2:30PM

6.1 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) – VP Samuel Sudhakar & Tanner Carollo

Time Certain – 2:45PM

6.2 Ally Feature on Blackboard – Leon McNaught/Christine Fundell

Time Certain – 3:05PM

6.3 Coyote Champ Packs – Carlos Huesca, Staff Council Rep

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Time Certain – 3:10PM

7.1 Online Education at CSUSB – Mihaela Popescu & Jo Anna Grant

7.2 Electronic Voting – Haakon Brown

7.3 Tenets of Shared Governance in CSU (attachment)

7.4 Faculty Evaluation of FAMs Renumbering/Retitling

7.5 Faculty Evaluation FAM Survey – Rong Chen

8. OLD BUSINESS

8.1 IDS Department Guidelines (second reading)

9. NEW BUSINESS

9.1 FAM 841.97 – Writing Requirement for Graduate Candidacy – Caroline Vickers (attachment)

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