FAC had a challenging year that required revisiting complicated issues and items from the previous year. Two items that had been approved by the Academic Senate in 2009-10, the Policy on Emeritus Faculty and revisions to the RTP Policy and Procedures, were not approved by the President and thus returned to FAC at a time when the majority of our members in the fall quarter, including me as chair, were beginning our FAC service. We also faced challenges with our proposal to revise the Student Course Evaluations Form. Given the progress made on these issues by our members and the members of the excellent subcommittees, I have every reason to expect that 2011-12 FAC, which I will chair, will be able to complete the work.

The progress that we made on these issues resulted from the guidance of those who were continuing members and the dedication of those who were beginning their FAC service. In addition, I regularly sought advice and assistance from Senate Chair Dianne Rush-Woods, former FAC Chair Dee Andrews, and the Senate Office. We also were joined by three faculty—Toni Fogarty, Zach Hallab, and Mitch Watnik—who were willing to serve as replacement members. We always benefitted from the wise counsel of Associate Provost Linda Dobb, the Presidential Appointee to FAC. Our committee worked assiduously and collegially on all the issues we addressed.

We convened three subcommittees—Outstanding Professor, Lecturer Subcommittee, and Student Evaluations Subcommittee. We approved the number of faculty on the 2011-12 University RTP, selected Professor Steve Gutierrez as the 2011-12 CSUEB Outstanding Professor, and selected Professor Jennifer Eagan as recipient of the Sue Schaefer Award.

We reviewed and provided feedback to ExCom on the Policy on Time, Manner, and Place of Free Expression, although our suggestions have not yet been included in the document. (I have the document with our track changes available.) http://www20.csueastbay.edu/policies/tpm.html

We discussed the Senate charge to develop a “policy or best practices document” to guide “both the teaching faculty and department chairs” in the area of “ancillary responsibilities” for faculty members. The primary concern seemed to be the responsibilities of faculty members who are teaching their courses completely online. After a thorough discussion of this issue, FAC determined that this area is covered by the current documents and that these documents apply to faculty whether they teach on the Hayward campus, the Concord campus, or online. The Chair presented our conclusions to Senate Chair Woods and discussed them with ExCom (see Appendix A).

We completed four action items described below that were approved by the Academic Senate.
2010-11 COMPLETED ACTION ITEMS

FAC 1
We recommended and received ExCom approval of the memberships of the FAC Subcommittees for 09-10

FAC 3
We developed and approved the Policy on the Appointment of Distinguished Visiting Scholars.

FAC 4
We approved revisions to the Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Participation in Appointment and Review of Administrative Officers and Department Chairs that modifies the selection process for department chairs.

FAC 5
We developed and approved the new Policy on Course Syllabus information.

2010-11 ITEMS CARRIED OVER TO AY 2011-12

1. Policy on Emeritus Status
FAC developed but withdrew a new policy on emeritus status (FAC 2). After consultations we agreed to refer this item to the Lecturer subcommittee, which met four times during winter and spring quarters of 2011 to discuss the existing faculty emeritus policy as well as the proposed policies from FAC 2009-10 that had not been approved by the President and our FAC 2.

The subcommittee recommended that FAC forward no policy changes to the Senate this year in regard to the emeritus policy. Rather, they believed that it was most practical to keep the existing policy as it is. Additionally, they wanted more time for thoughtful consideration of the policy. Associate Provost Dobb, the Presidential Appointee to the subcommittee, also expressed an interest in having more time for thoughtful consideration. The subcommittee members all are willing to continue to serve and to focus on the policy as soon as possible in the fall quarter 2011.

FAC accepted the thorough report from Subcommittee Chair Gretchen Reevy and its recommendations, and commended the committee for its work. FAC will convene the subcommittee to resume the work in the fall. (See Appendix B).

2. Policy on Providing for Student Evaluations of Teaching
The Student Evaluations Subcommittee was convened by FAC with a specially elected membership in Fall 2009 comprising of Dee Andrews, Sandip Basu (Chair), Tom Bickley, John Lovell, Julia Norton (replacing John Lovell), and David Stronck to consider revisions in the Policy Providing for Student Evaluation of Teaching. It met through AY 2009-10 and consulted with Associate Provost Linda Dobb, Special Assistant to the Provost Gina Traversa, AVP of Academic Programs Sue Opp, former Director of Faculty Development Julie Glass, and Director
of Specialized Technology Services Jeff Smurthwaite. The Subcommittee concluded the year by
drawing up a preliminary draft of likely revisions.

In AY 2010-11, the Subcommittee was then re-appointed with the same membership plus Toni
Fogarty. It met four times, on November 19 and December 3, 2010, and January 14 and 28,
2011. In each of these meetings, the members proposed and discussed revisions, and finally
voted unanimously in favor of the draft being presented to FAC. (See Appendix C).

The Subcommittee then began its work revising the student course evaluation forms, and
submitted its recommended changes to FAC. (See Appendix D).

FAC discussed these recommendations at several meetings in winter and spring quarter. We met
with AVP Sue Opp and Donna Wiley who provided feedback. We made several changes to the
document proposed by the subcommittee and were preparing our final documents as action items
for Senate approval. Before submitting these documents the Provost recommended that we share
them with Coordinator for Learning and Assessment Sharon Green, who is overseeing our
WASC accreditation review. Sharon reviewed the document, alerted us to several problems, and
recommended “FAC report to Excom and Senate on progress to date and table final ratification
of both the policy and the document until the 2011/2012 academic year.” I have included Dr.
Green’s memo to me. (See Appendix E).

Time did not permit FAC to address some important concerns about our RTP document and
University Library RTP document. These issues include a) the review of faculty with joint
appointments, b) compliance with the CBA which allows for the opportunity for rebuttal at all
levels including the level of the University RTP committee, c) the right to review transmittal
information and letters of recommendation, and d) consistency between the RTP document for
faculty librarians and the RTP document for other faculty. In addition, there are several concerns
regarding the RTP document that have been raised by the Presidential Appointee and that should
be discussed in 2010-11. We recommend that the RTP Subcommittee be convened in fall
quarter and presented with a clear charge on each issue.

4. Policy on Review of Administrative Officers
FAC made some progress to lessen the burden on faculty committees by proposing some
reorganization of the review of administrative officers. This work should continue in 2011-12.

5. Layoff Policy and Procedures
FAC tabled our discussion of this document and the issues of compliance with the CBA. We
recommend it be reconsidered in the fall after consultation with ExCom and clarification of the
charge.
Appendix A

Memo

To: Dianne Rush Woods  
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Eileen Barrett

Re: Policy on fulfillment of faculty ancillary responsibilities

At our meetings of February 16th and February 23rd, FAC discussed the Senate charge (Feb. 14, 2011) asking us to develop a “policy or best practices document” to guide “both the teaching faculty and department chairs” in the area of “ancillary responsibilities” for faculty members. The primary concern seems to be the responsibilities of faculty members who are teaching their courses completely online.

In our preliminary discussion, FAC determined that this area is covered by the current documents and that these documents apply to faculty whether they teach on the Hayward campus, the Concord campus, or online. For example, article 20 of the CBA states that “Faculty members have additional professional responsibilities such as: advising students, participation in campus and system-wide committees, maintaining office hours, working collaboratively and productively with colleagues and participation in traditional academic functions.” Article 20 outlines additional responsibilities as do our RTP Policy and Procedures document and our Procedures for the Evaluation of Tenured Faculty document.

Thus we believe that the ancillary responsibilities of faculty are outlined in the existing documents. If there are concerns that we are failing to understand, please let us know.
Appendix B
Report of Lecturer Subcommittee to FAC

Committee Members: Gretchen Reevy (Chair), Jeanette Bicais, Scott Hopkins, Mark Karplus, Margaret Rustick, Gary Wishniewsky, and Linda Dobb

Ex-Officio: Eileen Barrett

Guest in attendance at all meetings: Wendy Sarvasy, Retired Lecturer, Department of Political Science

The subcommittee met four times during winter and spring quarters of 2011: February 28, March 29, April 18, and May 9, to discuss the faculty emeritus policy.

The subcommittee received a referral from FAC, a revised faculty emeritus policy. In the February 28 meeting we began discussing the merits of three versions of the emeritus policy. The three versions are:

1. the existent policy, passed in 1997 which does not explicitly include/mention lecturers.
2. the policy which was passed by the Academic Senate in spring 2010 but which the President did not sign. In this policy, emeritus is (nearly) automatic for faculty after ten full-time years of service or the equivalent for lecturers.
3. The third is the policy referred to us this year by FAC. In this policy, emeritus is not automatic for any faculty, but all faculty, including lecturers may apply. Faculty must be recommended by their departments and the President makes the final decision.

Our committee favors the policy which was passed by the Academic Senate in spring 2010. This policy had strong faculty support in the FAC Lecturer Subcommittee, FAC, and the Academic Senate in the past academic year (2009-2010). We entertained the idea of recommending that FAC send this policy forward. However, we are aware that our new interim President may have different ideas about emeritus status, and that we have yet to resolve concerns raised by the Provost about basing emeritus status on time served.

We began to discuss a number of related issues. For instance, if emeritus is not automatic, we discussed that the consideration of merit must be fair. Criteria should be clear. In the policy that was referred to us by FAC, the department (which could mean the department chair or a department committee?) would recommend emeritus for a faculty member. In this case, recommendations for emeritus could vary by department. A more fair policy would include a college or university committee, like the sort that is utilized in the RTP process, so that criteria are more likely to be evaluated more objectively and even-handedly throughout campus. We noted that creating such a procedure would increase workload for faculty who would sit on these department and college or university committees, evaluating the merits of retiring faculty.

We also expressed some concern that, in the policy referred by FAC, the final granting of emeritus is at the discretion of the campus President.
Our recommendation is that FAC forward no policy changes to the Senate this year in regard to the emeritus policy. Rather, for this year, we believe it is most practical to keep the existing policy as it is. Additionally, we wish to have more time for thoughtful consideration of the policy. Associate Provost Dobb also expressed an interest in having more time for thoughtful consideration.

We recommend that FAC begin to consider the emeritus policy early in the fall of 2011. We also recommend that FAC convene the Lecturer Subcommittee early in fall and refer the emeritus issue to the Lecturer Subcommittee. Emeritus status, including both the title and the “benefits” associated with emeritus (e.g., campus email, access to all library privileges including electronic databases) is vitally important to some lecturers so that they can continue with their professional lives after retirement.
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To: The Faculty Affairs Committee  
From: Student Evaluations Subcommittee  
Subject: Revision of Policy Providing for Student Evaluation of Teaching  
Date: 31 January 2011

Action Requested: Approval by the Academic Senate

The Student Evaluations Subcommittee was convened by FAC with a specially elected membership in Fall 2009 comprising of Dee Andrews, Sandip Basu (Chair), Tom Bickley, John Lovell, Julia Norton (replacing John Lovell), and David Stronck to consider revisions in the Policy Providing for Student Evaluation of Teaching. It met through AY 2009-10 and consulted with Associate Provost Linda Dobb, Special Assistant to the Provost Gina Traversa, AVP of Academic Programs Sue Opp, former Director of Faculty Development Julie Glass, and Director of Specialized Technology Services Jeff Smurthwaite. It also consulted current literature on best practices in student evaluations such as the CSU “Report on Student Evaluations of Teaching”, June 2008, and the San Jose State University “Interpretation Guide for Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness Results”. The Subcommittee concluded the year by drawing up a preliminary draft of likely revisions.

In AY 2010-11, the Subcommittee was then re-appointed with the same membership plus Toni Fogarty. It met four times, on November 19 and December 3, 2010, and January 14 and 28, 2011. In each of these meetings, the members proposed and discussed revisions, and finally voted unanimously in favor of the draft being presented to FAC.

The significant recommended revisions in the Policy are as follows:

1. Elaboration of the purpose of conducting student evaluations of teaching, mandated by CBA 15.15. The subcommittee unanimously felt that student evaluations should be used only as a summative measure of teaching effectiveness and has limited utility as a formative tool to improve such effectiveness.

2. Development of separate evaluation forms based on course type and a protocol to decide the form to be used for a particular course. This recommendation was based on the evidence in the literature that evaluations are sensitive to the type of class and need to be designed and evaluated accordingly.

3. Shift to online evaluations as soon as feasible. However, in view of the findings in the literature that online evaluations are likely to have less student participation and be more unfavorable, the Subcommittee was of the unanimous opinion that online evaluation scores and comments should be evaluated accordingly and not considered as equivalent to in-class evaluations.

4. Secure electronic storage of student evaluations by the Office of Academic Programs for at least five years.
5. Adoption of a policy of purges of evaluations older than five years to be implemented only after due notice to concerned faculty and access to these evaluations.

6. Use of a median measure for statistical summaries of evaluations.

In sum, the only parts of the current policy that have been deleted are sections 2.2 and 2.3. These two deleted sections have been replaced by references to electronic evaluations in Section 3 and to the possibility of additional questions from departments under Section 2.5.
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FAC SUBCOMMITTEE ON STUDENT EVALUATIONS

PROPOSED REVISIONS FOR UNIVERSAL STUDENT EVALUATIONS FORM

The instructor

1. communicated clearly the requirements for the course;
2. communicated clearly the grading policy for the course;
3. selected a text and/or course materials appropriate to the goals of the course;
4. taught effectively the course content;
5. adhered to the course schedule;
6. incorporated the text and/or course materials into the course;
7. provided timely feedback on coursework;
8. made provisions for consultation;
9. encouraged students to take responsibility for learning;
10. maintained high standards of achievement.

The course

11. advanced my knowledge of the subject;
12. advanced my skills relating to the subject.
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Thank you for forwarding the student course evaluation documents for my review. In my new role as Coordinator for Learning and Assessment, I am in the process of developing expertise about effective assessment practices that support learning and ongoing improvements in teaching and student. I have only been on the job for a few months, and I'm doing my best to address all of the issues that have direct relevance to assessment. The Provost and Sue Opp have recently requested that I review the proposed student evaluation document and policy and recommend action that aligns with other efforts currently in progress. Based on my review of the situation, I recommend that FAC report to Excom and Senate on progress to date and table final ratification of both the policy and the document until the 2011/2012 academic year.

As you are aware, a critical foundation for effective assessment of learning is the establishment of learning objectives at the institution, program, and student level. In March, I became the chair of the CAPR ILO Subcommittee. During the past two months the committee has made significant progress toward developing institutional learning outcomes, a process that has included input and participation from stakeholders across the campus. The committee is currently on track to present proposed ILOs to the CSUEB community during fall 2011. Following adoption of a set of ILOs by the Senate, the campus community will work during the 2011/2012 academic year to map the ILOs to program and student learning outcomes.

This is pertinent for FAC and the subcommittee revising the student evaluation policy and document because a number of campus-wide learning and assessment efforts are now converging, including ILO development, faculty and program assessment planning, filling the Planning and Institutional Research AVP position, and coordination of WASC re-accreditation efforts. With an eye toward supporting long-term success, the Provost has requested that we coordinate these efforts so that all assessment information collected--from student learning outcomes, program evaluations, surveys and student evaluations--contribute in significant ways to teaching and program development.

Based on my reading of WASC recommendations and the current learning and assessment literature, student evaluations should include direct reference to the institutional learning outcomes to which courses and programs are linked in. Both WASC and learning and assessment scholars also strongly urge the full participation of all stakeholders in the development and refinement of major assessment instruments that inform student and faculty outcomes. I would like to acknowledge the effort and time that the subcommittee has committed to rethinking the student evaluation process, and good use will be made of that effort. However, at this time I recommend that final Senate ratification be postponed, and the next phase of development for both documents be carried out during the 2011/2012 academic year. In the interim, I will work with the ILO Subcommittee, the WASC Preparatory Group, and Dr. Amber Machamer (the new AVP of Planning and Institutional Research) to draft recommendations for aligning student evaluations with other assessment processes. I would like to note that none of these resources were available to support the FAC subcommittee during the past year. I also strongly urge FAC to involve students and faculty in the next phase of development. For example, the wording of each question should be reviewed by a representative sample of students to ensure comprehension (this is particularly important with our diverse student body...
that includes a significant proportion of non-native speakers). While the FAC subcommittee has laid the important groundwork for policy and document revision, I recommend that a sample of faculty and administrators from across campus be invited to comment on the subcommittee's recommendations. This will contribute to improvements in the documents and will support faculty buy-in. It will also meet WASC recommendations for broad participation.

I will attend today's FAC meeting to review my recommendations to the committee. I am happy to talk with any members of FAC or the subcommittee about the issues that I have raised.

Best Regards,

Sharon Green