

AGENDA
Executive Committee Meeting
CSUSM Academic Senate
Wednesday ~ October 15, 2014 ~ 12:00 – 2:00 pm
Kellogg 5207

- I. Approval of Agenda**
- II. Approval of Minutes – 10/1/14 and 10/8/14 (attached)**
- III. Chair’s Report, [Laurie Stowell](#) Referrals to Committee:**
 - A. NEAC: Senate Chair/Vice Chair Terms**
 - B. SAC: Student Course Grade Appeals Policy**
- IV. Vice Chair’s Report, [Debbie Kristan](#)**
- V. Provost’s Report, [Graham Oberem](#)**
- VI. Vice Provost’s Report, [Kamel Haddad](#)**
- VII. Discussion Items**
 - A. Senate Chair: Student Access Initiative**
 - B. Senate Chair: Officer and Chair Course Release Funds**
 - C. NEAC: ID Seat Eligibility**
 - D. Senate Chair and Secretary: Senate Chair/Vice Chair Terms**
 - E. FAC: Applicability of Department RTP Standards (see attached)**
 - F. FAC: Department Guidelines for Writing RTP Standards (see attached)**
- VIII. EC Members Concerns & Announcements**

Upcoming Presentations:

EC, 10/29/14 – Online Quality Teaching Initiative, Veronica Añover
AS, 12/3/14 – Extended Learning “101”, Mike Schroder

Next meeting: October 22, 2014, 12:00 noon - 2:00 pm, Kellogg 5207

Faculty Affairs Committee

Applicability of Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP Standards

FAC Rationale:

During FAC's review of new department standards for the Department of Speech Language Pathology (SLP) and the Department of Psychology in AY 13/14, it became clear that some faculty in the CEHHS and the Library have an "opt-out" option regarding new or significantly changed college RTP standards. Further, SLP proposed to extend this same option in their new department standards. The Department of Psychology, by contrast, submitted a department RTP document that was silent on the issue, meaning that the new standards would apply to all.

In AY 13/14, the Executive Committee charged FAC with developing an applicability rule that would apply to all probationary and tenured faculty, and so this element was removed from the SLP document and FAC worked to draft a new rule to be added as an article to the university RTP document. (Both of these department RTP policies were approved by the Senate and have been signed by the president.)

FAC is addressing itself only to department (or equivalent) and college (or equivalent) RTP documents because, according to practice, the university RTP document applies to all, and any changes made to it apply to all without exception once the president signs.

FAC is attempting to create a mechanism through which a probationary or tenured faculty member may formally signal their choice to exempt themselves from the new or substantially revised department/college RTP document. FAC does not envision that the faculty member must present their reasons, and FAC believes such a request should be granted automatically if the rules are followed.

Upon the first reading in the Academic Senate on 4/23/14, FAC received a number of comments. The feedback varied broadly but significantly, there was strong support for FAC's exemption concept. Some commenters suggested that FAC work with a "student catalog rights" model, but that does not pertain precisely because the university has created and revised RTP documents over the years, and up until now, the principle has been that they all automatically apply to all.

FAC would like to clarify that it has carefully read the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) 15.3:

15.3 Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators prior to the

commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty unit employee during the evaluation process.

*And FAC has considered the CFA Faculty Rights team's interpretation of 15.3, and its recommendation made in spring 2014: "CFA would like to urge FAC to support an opt-in version instead." FAC declines to do so because this would not be consistent with the established practice that RTP policies apply to all upon presidential approval. FAC is attempting to create an exemption **only** for Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP standards; not the university RTP document.*

*FAC reads 15.3 to mean that the Candidate shall have fair notice of the standards **before** an evaluation process begins. Since 15.1 defines "evaluation" as either a periodic evaluation or performance review, FAC's proposed exemption rule would be fully compliant with the spirit and letter of 15.3.*

This item was approved by FAC in May 2014 but was tabled in the Executive Committee.

Now in AY 14/15, FAC has given to consideration to a memo from CFA (September 11, 2014), which reiterated its opposition to the FAC model. CFA emphasized CBA 12.2 when it asserted:

*When tenure-track faculty are hired, they are hired into a career path. They are notified of the "**evaluation criteria and procedures in effect at the time of his/her initial appointment**" (12.2). Tenure-track faculty are thereby provided the standards by which they will be retained, tenured, and promoted for the duration of their career with the university.*

This does not mean that evaluation criteria and procedures may not be revised. The CBA acknowledges that they are revisable and, thus, states that the faculty unit employee "must be advised of any changes to those criteria and procedures prior to the commencement of the evaluation process" (12.2, 15.3).

CFA concluded:

The CBA does not address whether, upon revision or adoption of new RTP criteria and procedures, tenure-track faculty must be given the opportunity to "opt in" to vs. to "opt out" of said standards. CFA recommends that faculty be given the opportunity to "opt in" because, unlike with "opting out," revised or new criteria and procedures are not automatically imposed upon the faculty member who was initially hired under different standards. Imposition would represent a violation of the faculty member's rights under 12.2.

Since an “opt-in” model is not required by the CBA, the question is whether this would be helpful, fair, feasible, etc. FAC has discussed the model CFA recommends. Like the FAC model, if it were passed, it would be fair in the sense that it does not appear to contravene the CBA and it would be clearly stated for all to see. However, FAC does not believe that an “opt-in” model is helpful because it would in effect say that new or substantively changed department/college/equivalent RTP standards apply to no one, unless one has opted in. FAC also believes that the opt-in model would not be very feasible because it would require paperwork be submitted for each faculty member that opted in (hopefully a large number) whereas in the FAC opt-out model, paperwork would only be required for the (hopefully few) who seek an exemption.

FAC is informed by the university RTP policy which addresses department RTP standards in three locations:

University RTP Policy (I.B.5.d.): “This procedures document does not specify standards. Each Department may develop its own standards, including guidance on criteria in that unit...”;

University RTP Policy (IV.A.1.) “Faculty shall be evaluated in accordance with the Unit 3 CBA as well as standards approved for their Departments or equivalent units (when such standards exist), standards approved by their College/Library/School/SSP-AR...”;

University RTP Policy (IV.B.5.a.) “A Department of equivalent unit may develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that Department or equivalent unit.”

FAC believes these articles basically encourage departments to create standards. Further, FAC believes that tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty collaborating to create or modify department standards is not a matter of “imposition” but rather a process that supports faculty in the evaluation process and contributes to clear and fair evaluation by PRCs and other evaluators. FAC has created the following article based on the above approved university policy. Because neither the CBA nor the University policy explicitly addresses the applicability of revised RTP documents, FAC has constructed the following article to be in compliance with university policy, to support tenure-line faculty in the evaluation process, and to institutionalize the importance of department RTP standards.

*Thus, FAC recommends allowing an exemption until the **next promotion/tenure review** and any periodic evaluations that precede it. To restate, the feedback FAC received in*

spring 2014 helped FAC see that it makes more sense to define the exemption in terms of the significant reviews rather than a number of years.

- *For probationary faculty, who are on a “tenure clock,” this allows the exemption for the remaining probationary period.*
- *For tenured faculty, who undergo periodic evaluation every five years, and who may request promotion at any time, this allows them to exempt themselves until they obtain promotion.*

In sum, these proposed rules give all continuing tenure-track and tenured faculty the option to exempt themselves from new/substantially changed department/college (equivalent) RTP standards, which FAC believes is fair and appropriate. These proposed rules would improve the situation by clearly presenting rules that apply to all tenure-track and tenured faculty.

Applicability of Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP Standards [to be added to University RTP document]

Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP standards express values, expectations, and/or requirements that are more specific than the university RTP document. These specific standards provide clear guidance to probationary and tenured faculty members and also provide important information to reviewers at all levels.¹

New/significantly revised Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP standards apply to all probationary and tenured faculty upon the date of approval by the president, except those who exempt themselves according to the rules below.

When new or substantially revised department/college (or equivalent) RTP standards are approved, the Dean will notify all affected faculty no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Faculty will be provided a copy/URL and will be informed that the new document applies to all except those who obtain an exemption.

The following rules specify who may and may not obtain an exemption:

Newly Hired Faculty (probationary or tenured) who begin work in an academic year where department or equivalent or college or equivalent RTP standards are newly created or revised **are not eligible for an exemption**. New standards will apply the subsequent academic year following appropriate notification regarding the new standards, which is required no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term (per CBA 12.2 and 15.3).

All continuing probationary and tenured faculty **may exempt** themselves from new or substantially revised Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP standards through the relevant tenure/promotion/review (including PETF²). This exemption only applies for one level of review.

To be exempted, the faculty member shall submit a form to the Office of Faculty Affairs, with a copy to their Dean's office, indicating their exemption to the application of the new/significantly revised RTP standards. The form must be completed prior to the start of the first evaluation review (periodic, performance, etc.) following the approval of the new/substantially revised standards. The form will be placed in the faculty member's PAF. The faculty member must also include the completed form in each WPAF through

¹ This article does not address the situation where minor changes are made to college or department (or equivalent) RTP standards.

² What was formerly called PTPE or post tenure review was renamed "Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty" (Academic Senate 4/23/14.)

their next tenure/promotion review (including PETF) along with any applicable standards.³ Once this decision has been made, it cannot be revoked.

³ The WPAF checklist will need to be updated.

Exemption Form⁴

This form is to be used by faculty exempting themselves from new or substantially revised department/college standards. This form must be completed prior to the start of the first evaluation review (periodic, performance, etc.) following the approval of the new/substantially revised standards. It must be provided to the Office of Faculty Affairs, with a copy to the Dean's office, to be included in the PAF. Also, the Faculty member must include the completed form in each WPAF through their next tenure/promotion review (including PETF), along with any applicable standards.

By signing this form I am indicating that I will be exempt from the specific department or college standards indicated below, and that the RTP standards attached to this document must be used by my reviewers. I understand that this exemption only applies for one level of review and will expire following my next applicable tenure/promotion/PETF review. I further understand that once this decision has been made it cannot be revoked.

Department or College RTP Standards from which I am exempt

Signature & Date

Attachment:

Prior RTP standards to be used in lieu of those I am exempt from

⁴ To be added as an appendix in the university RTP document.

FAC Rationale

FAC is updating the guidelines originally approved September 28, 2009. FAC has added two specific guidelines for format, which were devised in AY 13-14. Further, FAC has reviewed the guidelines and made improvements for clarity.

FAC has approved these guidelines and requests that the Executive Committee (1) consider them for approval and consideration by the Senate; (2) once the guidelines are approved by the president, the Senate will email the guidelines to all department (or equivalent) chairs and college (or equivalent) deans.

FAC points to the following sections of the university RTP document, which address "Department Standards."

University RTP Policy I.B.5.d.

5. Guidance on the WPAF

d. This procedures document does not specify standards. Each Department may develop its own standards, including guidance on criteria in that unit, in accordance with the "Guidelines for Department RTP Standards" (September 28, 2009). It is the responsibility of the Candidate to see out and understand these standards. See [I]V.A.1 and [I]V.B.5. below.

University RTP Policy IV.A.1.

A. General Principles

1. Faculty shall be evaluated in accordance with the Unit 3 CBA as well as standards approved for their Departments or equivalent units (when such standards exist), standards approved by their College/Library/School/SSP-AR, and in accordance with this policy. In case of conflict between the Department and College/Library/School/SSP-AR standards, the College/Library/School/SSP-AR shall prevail. The policies and procedures of this document are subject to Board of Trustees policies, Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, California Education Code, the Unit 3 CBA, and other applicable State and Federal Laws.

University RTP Policy IV.B.5.

5. Departmental Standards

a. A Department or equivalent unit may develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that Department or equivalent unit.

b. Department or equivalent unit standards shall not conflict with law or University policy. In no case shall Department standards require lower levels of performance than those required by law or University policy.

c. Written Department or equivalent standards shall address:

1. Those activities that fall under the categories of Teaching Performance, Scholarly and Creative Activity and Service;
2. A description of standards used to judge the quality of performance;
3. The criteria employed in making recommendations for retention, tenure, and promotion.

In addition, FAC wishes to restate the importance of the fact that tenure-line faculty participate in the process of developing or editing the department RTP standards, by which they and their tenure-line department colleagues are to be evaluated. FAC intends that these guidelines will assist tenure-line faculty in the process of developing or editing the department RTP standards. FAC reaffirms that its fundamental focus is to review department RTP standards for compliance and not for content.

Guidelines for Department RTP Standards
Approved by the Academic Senate 5/6/2009
Approved by the President 9/28/09
FAC 338-08

I. "Department RTP Standards"

- A. A “standard” is a reference point or formalized expectation against which progress can be measured for retention, tenure, and promotion.
 - B. Faculty have a right to clearly articulated performance expectations. Departmental RTP standards provide consistency in guiding tenure-track faculty in the preparation of their WPAFs.
 - C. “Department” refers to units that are departments or an equivalent unit.
 - D. Department RTP Standards educate others outside of the discipline, including deans, university committees, and the provost, ~~with respect to~~ about the practice and standards of a particular department/discipline/field.
 - E. Departments must respect the intellectual freedom of their faculty by avoiding standards that are too prescriptive. Department standards should be as brief as possible with emphasis on the unique nature of the department.
 - F. ~~All Department RTP Standards shall conform to the CBA and University and College RTP Documents.~~ Department or equivalent unit standards shall not conflict with law, CBA or University policy.
 - G. The “Department RTP Standards” document shall contain the elements of the department RTP standards described below and shall not repeat the CBA, university and/or College, ~~or include department-specific advice.~~
 - H. Approval Process for All Department RTP Standards

Standards shall ~~must~~ be approved by a simple majority of all tenure-track faculty within a department and then approved by the college/school/library and the Academic Senate before any use in the RTP decisions.
- II. Elements of the “Department RTP Standards” Document
- A. Formatting
 - 1. Include a Table of Contents at the beginning of the document that lists each section
 - 2. In section headers, refer to three areas of evaluation in the terms used in the university RTP document:
 - Teaching (or Professional Performance)
 - Research/Creative Activity

- Service

B. Introduction Section

The following principles should be addressed in an opening section that includes a brief discussion of the department's philosophy with respect to the RTP process. Department RTP Standards shall:

1. Briefly explain the Department's philosophy with respect to RTP.
2. ~~Reflect on the department, college, and/or university mission, vision, and values statements and~~ Explain how they apply to the Department's RTP expectations: relate to the college and university mission.
3. ~~Explain How does the department views the expected~~ distribution or value of the three required areas: teaching, research/creative activity and service?.
4. ~~There should be both evaluative and developmental aspects of this process. How are faculty expected to use the RTP process?~~ Explain How does the department supports faculty development through the processes for retention and promotion, including both evaluative and development aspects.?
5. ~~Is there~~ Identify any applicable accrediting body. that needs to be taken into account?
6. ~~How~~ Explain how does the department recognizes distinctive disciplinary practices, innovation, and unusual exceptional contributions, e.g. teaching first-year students, mentoring majors, supervising undergraduate research, teaching in graduate programs, using particularly innovative or challenging types of pedagogy? A general statement may be made here with some specifics in each area below.

C. Main Section

Department RTP Standards shall:

1. Address activities that fall under the categories of Teaching or Professional Performance, Scholarly/ Creative Activity and Service;

2. Describe the standards used to judge the quality of performance.
3. Describe the criteria employed in making recommendations for retention, tenure, and promotion.
 - a. ~~For the three areas where faculty are evaluated, explain the standards for~~
4. Address the different developmental periods (either in a separate section or as a part of the three sections):
 - Periodic Evaluation
 - Performance/Retention Review
 - Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor
 - Promotion to Professor
 - Post-Tenure Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

~~Address the standards for the different developmental periods either in a separate section or throughout the three sections below.~~

D. These guidelines include multiple examples of topics, ~~found in the sections below~~, to which a department may want to write a discipline specific standard. Only the most relevant or important topics should be addressed in the department standards. Departments may consider topics not listed.

1. Teaching

- Describe Department priorities and values in teaching and learning.
- List the most important department priorities in terms of teaching. In addition to discussion what is valued in teaching, include a statement about expectations emphasized in or unique to the department with respect to teaching. Such expectations may include, but are not limited to, descriptions of:

~~a. Workload in terms of WTUs, contact hours, and/or FTES~~

- Types of courses included in a typical semester faculty assignment
 - Classroom teaching
 - Laboratory teaching
 - Studio teaching
 - Clinical teaching
 - Seminar courses
 - Undergraduate versus graduate courses

--Supervision of field work, independent research, graduate research and theses, and library research
--Teaching modality, e.g. on-campus, off-site, on-line, distance learning
--Training and supervision of teaching and graduate assistants

- Pedagogical tools typically used or expected in the department
 - Independent study students/courses
 - Department approaches to support excellent teaching
- Describe the types of evidence used to examine teaching performance. Include specific expectations, citing the College document if necessary, rather than repeating the list. At a minimum, include expectations with respect to the following:
 - Student evaluations. How many are required and how are they evaluated?
 - Syllabi: Are there unique department expectations for syllabi?

Describe the value the department places on participation in curriculum development (e.g. course, program, etc.).

- Describe the difference in teaching expectations for undergraduate versus graduate courses, if applicable.

2. Professional Performance (For Non-Teaching Assignments)

- Describe department priorities and values in professional performance
- List the most important department priorities in terms of professional performance. In addition to discussing what is valued in professional performance, include a statement about expectations emphasized in or that are unique to the department with respect to professional performance. Such expectations may include, but are not limited to, descriptions of:
 - Workload in terms of assignment of responsibility
 - Types of professional duties included in a typical faculty assignment
 - Supervision of staff and/or student assistants
 - Pedagogical tools typically used in the department
 - Departmental approaches to support excellent professional performance

- Describe the types of evidence used to examine professional performance. Include specific expectations, citing the Library/SSPAR document if necessary, rather than repeating the list.
 - Describe the value the department places on participation in program development
 - Describe the value the department places on contributions to student learning across the curriculum

3. Research/Creative Activity

Describe department priorities and values in research/creative activity

Describe the department's research/creative activity standards with the context of the discipline (i.e. regionally, nationally, globally). List the most important department priorities in terms of research/creative activity. Describe the specific types of research which are most valued in the department and/or the field. Cite the lists in the College RTP document, if necessary, rather than repeating the entire lists.

- How should the faculty member describe the contributions of research when multiple authors are present? Are there expectations with regard to lead authorship?
- How does the department expect research to be integrated into teaching?
- What are the major challenges the face faculty in terms of their research/creative activity in your department? Are there limitations that may be relevant for the faculty's progress in research in this discipline?

4. Service

Describe the department priorities and values in service contributions.

List the most important department priorities in terms of service. In addition to discussing what is valued in service, include a statement about expectations emphasized in or unique to the department with respect to service. Such expectations may include, but are not limited to:

- a. Internal service activities—Department, College, university.
 - Membership or offices held on committees or task forces
 - Leadership or administrative activities
 - Special assignments, initiatives
- b. External service activities
 - Service to profession/professional organizations

- Membership, offices held, organizing events or programs, special assignments
 - Professional consulting (gratis only)
- c. Service awards and special recognition

Does the Department have specific expectations in terms of documentation of service other than accurate listing in the comprehensive CV? (Please note that submitting letters from committee chairs is not considered best practice.)