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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)
     ▪ 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


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tong Lai Yu</td>
<td>CNS - Computer Science &amp; Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mary Boland</td>
<td>CAL - English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Astrid Sheil</td>
<td>CAL - Communication Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kay Zemoudeh</td>
<td>CNS - School of Computer Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Javier Torner</td>
<td>CNS - Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Joseph D. Chavez</td>
<td>CNS - Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Donna Schnorr</td>
<td>COE - Educ Leadership&amp;Tech ELT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Diana Fass</td>
<td>Counseling &amp; Psychological Svs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ron Chen</td>
<td>CAL – English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kathie Pelletier</td>
<td>JHBC- Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Larry K. Gaines</td>
<td>CSBS – Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pedro Santoni</td>
<td>CSBS – History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Peter Williams</td>
<td>CNS - Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Russell Barber</td>
<td>CSBS – Anthropology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
3 unit semester class (45 contact hours) = 4 unit quarter class (40 hours)
• 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.

3 unit semester class (45 contact hours) = 4 unit quarter class (40 hours)
FOR MORE INFORMATION VISIT CSUSB.EDU/SEMESTER
EVALUATION OF LECTURERS

FAM XXX652.2

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 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 contradictions future CBA's, 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 652.1422.4 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.

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.

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.

**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 as is set forth in [FAM 652.1](#). For those lecturers whose assignment is supervision, some departments may use other instruments such as **Student Evaluations of Supervision Effectiveness (SESEs)** as supplements or alternatives to SOTEs.

   Lecturers on the Academic Term or Academic Year contract 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 30).

   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.
Evaluation of lecturers and the evaluated lecturer, which becomes official documentation for evaluation.

1. **All** 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.

2. 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 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 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.

   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. 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. 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).

   c. No later than the end of the term: 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 aid the dean about the lecturer’s future appointment and, if the lecturer is reappointed, 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 justification

___ 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

__________________________________________ Date
Karen Kolehmainen (Senate Chair)

__________________________________________ Date
Tomás Morales (CSUSB President)

[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.

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 appreciate 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.]
AGENDA

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