FAC had a particularly complex and full year in 2009-10, involving the work of 22 different faculty members on FAC and on four subcommittees: the Outstanding Professor Subcommittee (which also included one ASI representative), the RTP Subcommittee, the Lecturers Subcommittee, and a Special Subcommittee on the Student Evaluations Policy (see Appendixes A and B). In the course of their work throughout the year, the Chair and Subcommittee Chairs and the Presidential Appointee consulted extensively with faculty, administrators, and staff, as well as the Director of the Office of Faculty Development. The outgoing Chair is grateful for these myriad campus members’ assistance.

In addition to completing 11 action items (outlined below) – all approved by either the Executive Committee or the Academic Senate -- FAC also approved the Number of Faculty on the 2010-11 University RTP Committee, selected Professor Jeffrey Seitz as the 2010-11 CSUEB Outstanding Professor, and selected Professor Emeritus Bruce Trumbo as recipient of the annual Sue Schaefer Award.

Please note that the report below contains explanation of action items that FAC voted to send on to the 2010-11 Executive Committee (the Library RTP Document) and FAC, including proposed draft wording for additional changes to the RTP document, as well as draft of a new Student Evaluation Policy.

2009-10 COMPLETED ACTION ITEMS

FAC 1
Suspension of new RTP Requirement for Departmental Professional Guidelines
[See 2009-10 RTP Revision of Section 4, introduction, for new procedures, effective AY2010-11.]

FAC 2
Approval of Membership of the 2009-10 Subcommittees

FAC 3
Faculty Office Hour Policy Revision

FAC 4
Revision of FAC Policies and Procedures

FAC 5, revised
Revision of Policy on Emeritus Faculty
FAC 6
New Interpretation of Rights of Faculty with FERP and PRTB Appointments

FAC 7, revised
Revision of Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

FAC 8
Revisions of Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Participation in Appointment and Review of Administrative Officers and Department Chairs

FAC 9
Policy on Appointment, Placement, and Evaluation of Coaches

FAC 10
Revision of Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy and Procedures
[Second round of revisions, which FAC initiated in AY2008-09; effective AY 2010-11.]

FAC 11
Updates on Professional Leave Committee Procedures

2009-10 ACTION ITEMS CARRIED OVER TO AY 2010-11

1. Revision of the Library RTP Document

The Chair of the Library Faculty Affairs Committee revised the Library RTP document to conform to FAC’s 2008-09 revisions in the University RTP document, as well as those proposed by FAC this year (and approved by the Academic Senate at its last meeting).

Both sets of revisions were approved by the Library Faculty and by FAC, and the document, 09-10 cFAC 12, has been forwarded to the Senate Office for review by the Executive Committee in the Fall.

2. Revision of the Student Evaluations Policy

FAC voted to recommend that the work of this Special Subcommittee continue in AY 2010-11. The Subcommittee made substantial revisions in the standing policy, a number of which need finalizing, including through consultation with Academic Programs. It’s also recommended that all proposed changes be reviewed by the Office of Faculty Development.
SEE DRAFT REVISIONS IN APPENDIX C.

All 2009-10 Subcommittee members (including the 2009-10 FAC Chair) have requested to continue, upon approval by the Executive Committee.

3. Drafting of a new, free-standing Policy on Visiting Professors

This recommendation is based on FAC’s revision of its Policy and Procedures, approved by the Executive Committee, which dropped the section regarding appointment of Distinguished Visiting Professors. FAC determined that this specific subject matter was lost among the other FAC procedures, and should be combined with the Policy on Foreign Visiting Professors (currently under the aegis of the Provost’s Office) into a free-standing Senate policy.

4. Recommendations for additional revisions in the University RTP Document

FAC also voted to recommend two additional changes proposed by the RTP Subcommittee to next year’s FAC, summarized below in (a) and (b). And at the final Academic Senate meeting, a member of the Senate urged the addition of (c).

(a) 9.1.3 The CBA (15.13) requires that faculty with joint appointments be reviewed by both departments. The RTP Subcommittee proposed the following for the whole section, as one possibility:

“9.1.3 Procedures

Procedures for candidates with joint appointment are the same as for all other faculty, with the following considerations:

a. The department-level Committee shall consist of eligible faculty with departmental representation in approximate proportion to the faculty member’s appointment.

b. Members of the department-level Committee shall be elected in each department in accordance with departmental election procedures.

c. Candidates with a majority appointment in one department shall be evaluated by the chair of that department for their chair-level evaluation.”

d. The department-chair level review of candidates whose appointments are divided equally between two departments shall be conducted by the chairs of both departments.”

(b) 12.2.10: The CBA (15.5) requires a rebuttal period for all levels of RTP review. If FAC determines that the University RTP Committee and Presidential reviews constitute separate levels of review, a possible revision would be as follows:

“12.2.10 The Committee shall notify the faculty member of its recommendation and provide the faculty member with a copy of the Committee's letter of recommendation no later than the
deadline date for transmittal of WPAFs to College Deans. Official date of receipt of the letter shall be defined as the deadline date.

a. If the initial recommendation is negative, the candidate may request reconsideration, may submit a rebuttal letter, and is entitled to meet with the Committee to discuss the recommendation. The request for reconsideration and submission of the rebuttal letter and/or request for a meeting with the Committee to discuss the recommendation must be made within ten (10) days after the date of receipt of the letter of recommendation.

b. The meeting will be held as soon as possible, but normally not later than ten (10) days after the Committee has received the request from the candidate. A rebuttal letter shall be read by members of the Committee. Copies of the rebuttal letter shall be sent by the Chair of the Committee to the previous levels of review. If a meeting has been held and/or a rebuttal letter submitted, the Committee shall send, as soon as possible, a memorandum containing its subsequent recommendation to the University President with copies to the College Dean, candidate, the Department Committee, and the Department Chair.”

c) Copies of transmittal information and letters of recommendation

At the final 2009-10 Senate meeting, a Senate Representative requested that FAC next year consider amending the RTP Policies and Procedures to include giving Department RTP Committee members the right to review RTP transmittal documents and letters of recommendation after completion of action at the Department level.

In addition, see 3 Nov 2008 memo from Senate Chair to FAC regarding College/Library Outstanding Faculty Award Policy: no action taken.

In addition: The Provost’s Office has requested that FAC or the Office of Faculty Development devise Guidelines for Policies relating to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities at CSUEB. This will likely be a 10-11 referral from the Senate Chair.
APPENDIX A
2009-10 FAC Membership

Dee Andrews (CLASS), Chair
Dennis Chester (CLASS)
Mitchell Craig (CSCI)
Linda Dobb (Presidential Appointee)
Doug Highsmith (LIB), W & S 2010 Secretary
David Larson (CLASS)
Xinjian Lu (CBE)
Julia Norton (CSCI, F and W 2009-10)
John Lovell (CSCI, S 2010)
Lynn Paringer (CBE)
Craig Wilson (CEAS), F 2009 Secretary
APPENDIX B
2009-10 FAC Subcommittees

Outstanding Professor
FAC member = David Larson (CLASS), Chair
Faculty member = Craig Wilson (CEAS)
Faculty member = Yi Jiang (CBE)
Student = Melissa Grottkau, ASI Director of CLASS
Director of Faculty Development = Julie Glass (ex-officio)
Chair of FAC = Dee Andrews (ex-officio)
(Previous Winner = Sue Opp: MPP; not eligible to serve)

Lecturers
FAC Member = Dennis Chester (CLASS)
Faculty member = Zach Hallab (CEAS)
Faculty member = Carl Stempel (CLASS)
Lecturer member = Gretchen Reevy (CSCI)
Lecturer member = Mark Karplus (CSCI), Chair
Lecturer member = Jeff Newcomb (CBE)
Director of Faculty Development = Julie Glass (ex-officio)
Chair of FAC = Dee Andrews (ex-officio)

RTP Procedures
FAC Member = Doug Highsmith (LIB), Secretary
Faculty member = Xinjian Lu (CBE)
Faculty member = Craig Wilson (CEAS), Chair
Faculty member = Grace Munakata (CLASS)
Faculty member = Chung-Hsing Ouyang (CSCI)
Director of Faculty Development = Julie Glass (ex-officio)
Chair of FAC = Dee Andrews (ex-officio)

Sue Schaefer Award = Committee of the whole

Student Evaluations Policy Special Subcommittee
FAC Chair = Dee Andrews (ex officio, CLASS)
Sandip Basu (CBE), Chair
Tom Bickley (LIB), Secretary
Julia Norton/ John Lovell (CSCI)
David Stronck (CEAS)
APPENDIX C

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
A POLICY PROVIDING FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

1. Purpose and Origins

DETERMINE LANGUAGE: Student evaluations are one measure of teaching effectiveness at CSEUB.... OFD, etc. Refer to CSU-wide study.]

This policy is intended to meet the requirements specified in a resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees on September 27, 1978, directing all CSU campuses to develop programs for student evaluation of teaching for all faculty in at least two courses each academic year, such programs to be in effect by the 1979-80 academic year.

The policy is in compliance with the CBA Section 15.15, and conforms to current best practices regarding student evaluation of teaching.

2. Frequency, Forms, and Content

2.1 All faculty at CSUEB shall have students evaluate their teaching in at least two courses per year.* This requirement includes tenure track faculty at all ranks and lecturers.

CLARIFY: 2.2 Departments wishing to require more than two course evaluations per year per faculty member must give notice to all department faculty of a “consultation” meeting to be held no later than the end of the Fall Quarter. The proposal requires a simple majority vote of those present at the meeting. Regular faculty are entitled to one vote each. Lecturers with a time base of .49 or less are entitled to one half a vote each and those .50 or greater time base are entitled to 1 vote each.

2.3 The classes to be evaluated are to be determined jointly by the faculty member and department chair at the beginning of the academic year or the first quarter of employment. In event of disagreement, the faculty member and chair will each select 50% of the total courses to be evaluated. The courses may be selected by type, e.g., lecture, seminar, graduate course, etc., rather than by course number. The department shall maintain the schedule of courses to be evaluated.

2.4 Evaluations shall be conducted by means of impartially administered evaluation forms:

2.4.1 All forms used for official teaching evaluations shall be designed by the Faculty Affairs Committee and submitted for approval to the Academic Senate and the President.
2.4.2. The same form shall be used for all classes, with the exception of activity courses under 2.4.5.

2.4.3 The form shall include no more than (8) questions in order to encourage student response.

2.4.4 The questions shall be equally suitable for in-classroom and online courses.

2.4.5 Separate official forms following the provisions set out in 2.4.1-2.4.4, shall be designed for activity-based classes, such as laboratories and studio courses.

*If a faculty member teaches only one course, then that course shall be evaluated.

2.5 Departments may add questions to the official forms with approval of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and with the understanding that long evaluation forms discourage student response.

2.6 All evaluations shall also provide for the following accompanying information: the course number, the date of the evaluation, the number of students in the class, and the number of respondents.

2.7 Faculty are encouraged to design their own informal evaluations for receiving student feedback during the course of the quarter. These are not governed by this policy.

3. Implementation

3.1 As soon as is feasible, all teaching evaluations shall be conducted electronically for all courses, both in-classroom and online.

3.2 In implementing electronic evaluations, the Office charged with administering the evaluations shall make every effort to ensure as full student participation as possible.

3.3 Evaluations shall be conducted during the last week of classes prior to final examinations. For abbreviated classes, evaluations shall be conducted within the last two days of class meetings before the final examination.

4. Reporting and Use

**CLARIFY**: 4.1. When the student evaluations are received by the department chair, after the conclusion of each quarter, the department chair shall forward student evaluations for the selected courses to the Provost’s Office for inclusion in department faculty members’ personnel action files (PAF’s). Faculty members may also offer their own summaries or interpretations of results, and/or may place additional official student evaluations in their PAFs.
4.2 As soon as possible at the conclusion of each quarter, the Office charged with administering the evaluations shall prepare a summary of student comments and a statistical summary of students’ answers to all questions, and a summary of all department evaluations, to be forwarded to department chairs for distribution to faculty members. As far as possible, the Office shall employ a median measurement to summarize overall responses on student evaluations.

4.3 Student evaluations shall be used only by:

- bullet one: faculty members for purposes of improvement in instruction;
- bullet two: department chairs and lecturer evaluation committees as one element in assessing the quality of instruction provided by temporary or part-time faculty;
- bullet three: appropriate committees and academic administrators as one element in assessing quality of instruction during consideration of candidates for retention, tenure, promotion;
- bullet four: by department chairs and peer review committees in reviewing faculty members’ teaching performance for post-tenure evaluations.

4.4 Aggregated statistical data from official student evaluations may be used for purposes of department, college, or campus-wide assessment of teaching. Aggregated statistical data shall not include faculty members’ names or other identifying characteristics of a particular class or instructor.

5. Storage and Copying for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

5.1 In addition to the copies of statistical summaries in faculty members’ PAFs, student evaluations shall be stored in the following manner:

- 5.1.1: Paper comment forms and statistical summaries shall be formally stored at individual department offices, and at the College Offices if desired. Faculty members will use copies of these forms and summaries in retention, tenure, and/or promotion dossiers.

- 5.1.2: Electronic commentary and statistical summaries shall be stored in hard-copy at individual department offices and at the College Offices if desired. Faculty members will use copies of these forms and summaries in retention, tenure, and/or promotion dossiers.

- 5.1.3: Electronic commentary and statistical summaries shall also be stored on ad database to be determined by the Office of the Provost. Only statistical summaries shall be stored at the Office charged with administering evaluations.

5.2. Evaluation commentary and statistical summaries shall be stored at department and/or College offices as determined by the Office of the Provost until the granting of tenure for probationary faculty and for five years for all other faculty. At the end of this time period, the Provost’s Office shall remove outdated evaluations from faculty members’ PAFs, and the Office
charged with administering evaluations shall purge outdated evaluations in their database. Faculty members’ shall be given advanced notice of one quarter before such removals are to occur, and shall be granted the teaching evaluations upon request.

5.3 The University shall maintain statistical summaries at the Office charged with administering evaluations as long as necessary for university-wide use.

5.4. Student evaluations shall not be sent to department computers, laptop computers, or non-password controlled shared computers.