California State University Channel Islands: Chairs' Handbook

TABLE OF CONTENTS

J. Advising
K. Student clubs and organizations

6. Identifying and Accessing Resources and Opportunities for Students
    A. Academic support services
    B. Crisis and non-academic support services
    C. Academic enrichment opportunities

Cultivating Colleagues: Hiring, mentoring, tenure & promotion

7. Search and Hiring Processes
    A. Tenure track search and hiring processes
    B. Non-tenure track faculty (Lecturers) search and hiring processes

8. Mentoring and Supporting Faculty
    A. The importance of mentoring
    B. The chair's role in mentoring
    C. Mentoring junior faculty on the tenure track
    D. Mentoring mid-career faculty
    E. Mentoring non-tenure track faculty
    F. Mentoring under-represented faculty groups
    G. Best practices in mentoring
    H. Faculty development opportunities and resources

9. Faculty Review and Assessment
    A. Tenure Track Faculty
    B. Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Lecturers)

Budgeting & Scheduling

10. Budgeting & Scheduling
    A. Budgets
    B. Budgeting and scheduling metrics
    C. NTTF Budget allocations and expenditures
    D. Principles of scheduling
    E. Creating a schedule to hit FTES and SFR targets
    F. Time scheduling
    G. Faculty assignments

Chairs' Handbook Committee (2020-21):

The CSUCI Chairs' Handbook is a living document that we expect to be periodically revised, updated, and added to in the future. The first draft of the handbook was completed in the spring of 2021 by the collective work of the following committee:

Mary Adler, English
José Alamillo, Chicana/o Studies
Dennis Downey, Sociology
Marie Francois, History
Jeanne Grier, Education
Colleen Harris, Broome Library
Kiki Patsch, Environmental Science & Resource Management

Ch. 1: Departmental Governance

Departmental governance includes all of those activities that the program undertakes collectively to make collective decisions about their program. That includes: developing/revising effective by-laws documents, creating governance structures/positions, leading meetings and democratic decision-making, effective departmental communication, and chair evaluation. Each of those areas is addressed below.

A. By-laws documents

Clear by-laws are essential to the effective governance of any academic unit. Some programs, at some time, may make collective decisions informally and by consensus – and in those contexts, it may be tempting to think that there is no need for detailed by-laws. However, no program will be free of all conflicts inevitably – and in those situations, it is essential to have structures and processes in place *beforehand* to allow the program to work through those conflicts in a way that all agree is fair and unbiased (or, at least, has not been created to push a particular resolution to that conflict). As James Madison wrote: "If men were angels, no government would be necessary." Likewise, if faculty members were saints, no program by-laws would be necessary. As most academics can attest, however, few in our profession fit that description.

By-laws solve the fundamental questions of how decisions will be made by and for the program, and how the work of the program will be distributed and completed. They also set down the specific goals and priorities of the program, communicating all of that effectively to new members, to administrators, and to those in the program who need occasional reminders. For all of those reasons, well-written and collectively embraced by-laws are essential to any program and should be put in place well before they are needed, and periodically reviewed and revised to ensure that they reflect a program's evolving priorities and personnel. It is a fundamental responsibility of chairs to ensure that by laws are always up-to-date – made official by submitting any changes to Faculty Affairs for approval by the appropriate Dean and the Provost – and that program members have access to them (and, ideally, that they are familiar with them). Current by-laws for all programs at CSUCI are posted on the Faculty Affairs website page **Program By-Laws**.

While program by-laws can take a variety of forms, and contain a variety of elements, the following is a list of common and essential elements for documents at CSUCI. The remainder of the chapter will be organized largely around the different essential areas covered in the list.

Unit Definition and Programs/Majors Offered
Mission Statement
Program Outcomes
Program Membership and Duties
Staff Membership and Duties
Program Officers and Duties & Responsibilities

Officer Terms and Limits
Election and Appointment of Program Officers
Officer Evaluations
Program Committees, Charges and Procedures as applicable
    Program Personnel Committee
    Lecturer (Temporary Faculty) Evaluation Committee
    Program Assessment Committee
    Program Curriculum Committee
    Program Ad Hoc Committees
Voting Rights of Faculty (tenure track and lecturer faculty)
Votes of Confidence/No Confidence
Program Meeting Guidelines and Scheduling
How to Amend and Approve the By-laws

Examples of these above areas can be reviewed for each unit.

There are a variety of governance structures in academic programs/departments in Academic Affairs, starting with the fundamental issue of unit definition. Some chairs oversee a collection of programs, degrees, or majors, while other chairs oversee a single program, degree, or major. In some cases, the by-laws are addressed at the school level (See Business and Economics; Library; School of Education). Positions such as vice chairs or program coordinators (discussed below) may be present due to the size of the unit or other factors. The algorithm for decision making is still evolving and highly dependent on the Deans' vision and allocation of resources. Because of the varied nature of governance structures across and within the schools, the term "chaired unit" will be used to reflect the collective academic disciplines in a chair's responsibilities that may not be considered a single department or program.

The issue of program vision and mission should be addressed in the by-laws but is less an issue of program governance than strategic priorities and leadership. For that reason, questions regarding program mission and vision are addressed in the chapter on strategic leadership.

B. Governance structures, positions, and committees

Academic units – whatever their composition – entail a lot of tasks and leading those tasks and ensuring their completion largely falls on the shoulders of the chair. The position description for Chairs at CSUCI is posted on the Faculty Affairs website: **Position Description for Chairs**. Given the significant breadth of tasks within that description, no chair can – or should! – take it upon her or himself to complete them all. Consequently, a big part of chair leadership is developing a culture and structure which fairly and effectively divides the many tasks across the faculty as a whole. Doing so requires careful collective thinking about a range of considerations: different leadership roles with varying portfolios; a distribution that reflects any reassigned time available; the varying interests and expertise of individual faculty members; and the composition of faculty (in terms of senior or junior status) as well as their responsibilities outside of the unit. The best decisions in each of those areas should be reflected in the creation

of formal positions (often elected) or committees to lead different areas of the program, as well as specification of how ad hoc tasks that come up will be assigned or embraced.

There are a range of additional positions that may (or may not) be specified in the by-laws. The role of Program Advisor is critical for ensuring that students have the guidance and services necessary for them to succeed in their major. In some Schools, resources (in the form of assigned time) is provided for the Advisor, while in other Schools, student advising in considered as service to the program. The Advisor can be appointed by the Chair or elected by the faculty – something that should be specified in the by-laws.

Another common formal position is the Vice-Chair. Having that role specified can serve several purposes: It represents a person available to make decisions in the event that the chair is temporarily unable to do so, or on leave, etc.; 2) It represents a unit leader who is able to lead initiatives to take some load off of the chair; and 3) It can serve as an opportunity to learn many aspects of the chair role so that the leadership pipeline in the unit remains strong. The Vice-Chair can be assigned a specific portfolio of tasks, or take them on an ad hoc basis, but those decisions should always be mutual. Other positions can be created to assign specific task areas (such as Curriculum Coordinator or Assessment Coordinator) and identifying them in the by-laws can give them a permanence that facilitates smooth functioning of the unit. When they are identified, it should be specified whether they are elected or appointed by the chair, the length of term, and the specific tasks that fall to them.

Additional governance structures can be identified, such as committees, that may address specific tasks or roles. Some programs have Executive Committees that are charged with making a range of decisions on behalf of the faculty (to integrate some level of collective decision-making while avoiding having to call the full faculty together for routine decisions). Such a committee can also provide advice and guidance to the Chair and confer on issues when necessary. Other committees can be created as well that address specific issues – such as handling curricular issues, assessment of specific classes, organizing evaluations, etc. Any structures should be created by the faculty as a whole to best organize the specific tasks and challenges that need to be addressed in the by-laws.

C. Leading meetings and democratic decision-making

Regular program meetings are essential for open lines of communication among faculty, to make collective decisions, and to organize collective tasks of the group. Ensuring that meetings accomplish those goals in the most efficient and democratic manner – and that the outcomes of meetings are accepted by all, regardless of the specific decisions taken – requires having processes in place to facilitate the collective work and validate outcomes.

Preparation for meetings is a critical part of those processes. Chairs should have a clear idea of what they want to accomplish in the meeting before it begins. They should also invite faculty to offer up items to add to the agenda, to ensure that everyone's concerns can be addressed. Circulate agendas along with any essential relevant materials before meetings so those

attending can anticipate what materials might be relevant to the discussion or even have some time to think about their own ideas on the subject. All faculty members, but especially program committee chairs, if any, should notify the chair in advance as to what should be placed on the agenda. The chair can consult with the meeting notetaker to review previous minutes for carryover items before the agenda is distributed. Some chairs prefer to limit discussion and list a time factor for each agenda item. In any case, times should be monitored and the discussion moved along toward action or resolution.

Some units will naturally operate more informally than others (and that may change over time). If the group collectively prefers a less formal (more conversational) way of organizing meetings, that is fine – but the Chair should monitor to ensure that doesn't systematically leave some voices out, and to act to make them heard if necessary. Even for programs that generally work informally, it is critical to have provisions in place for less consensual issues. Specifically, the Chair should be familiar with Robert's Rules of Order, and when to call on them when necessary. Rules of Order can be useful in dealing with motions and other actions during the meeting, although many departments prefer to operate in a more informal manner. Since so much time is spent in committee meetings, program meetings should be organized to produce maximum outcomes. Otherwise, faculty members feel that nothing gets accomplished and become frustrated. It is also useful to summarize at the close of the meeting what has been agreed upon, and what next steps will ensue. People can then leave the meeting feeling things are moving forward even if not everything is resolved.

In addition to thorough preparation for meetings, and orderly leadership of meetings, it is essential that good follow-up practices are enacted. Circulate minutes so that carryover items can be tracked and so those who cannot attend can keep up with the discussion and the actions taken in the meeting. It can be important to have good records of meetings in the event that different interpretations arise in the future about what was (or was not) decided.

D. Effective departmental communication

Communication is critical to the morale and vitality of the department. Communication can have a variety of content (e.g., passing on institutional information, organizing collective tasks, arranging social activities, etc.) and it can take a variety of forms (individual or collective email, announcements at meetings, hallway conversations, etc.). It is always important for a chair to consider the best way to communicate given content.

While e-mail has its problems, it can facilitate communications that need to go out to all faculty members. People like to feel informed about those issues that affect them personally or their work. The better the information they receive, the better the chance they can act on it appropriately. It has been said that 10% of any population doesn't get a message, so don't be surprised if someone claims that he or she was never informed about an issue. Therefore, important information should be sent in multiple formats and possibly multiple times. Internal department memos regarding smaller matters need also to be written if communication is to be clear, particularly between two or three people. Like a child's game of Telephone, there is

likely to be distortion if word is passed by mouth from one to another. The written message may also be misinterpreted, but it is likely to be better understood and can be reviewed if necessary.

It is also important to monitor (and to remedy, if necessary) problematic communication. From time to time, issues involving conflict arise and faculty members are likely to send angry messages back and forth. The department chair should avoid getting into the e-mail free-for-all on contentious issues. If such messages have been exchanged twice, it is time to call a halt and schedule a face-to-face meeting to work out a compromise. Keep in mind that all written messages, including those on email, are public documents and must be provided if subject to an information request or subpoena. Never put anything in writing, including an email, that you wouldn't want the world to read.

One additional possibility for communicating within the program (among faculty, or to students) is to create a CILearn/Canvas page where messages and materials and various links can be posted permanently, and updated regularly. For an example of how that can represent a best-practices form of communication, see chapter 5 regarding outreach and communication.

Communication with Colleagues

As a chair, you maintain all of your roles and responsibilities of a faculty member but must transition into the role of program leader. Your success will depend on your interactions with colleagues –faculty and staff—and students. Fostering positive and supporting relationships is key and may take time, especially when transitioning from a previous chair who may have had different approaches to the position. The chair must be in a position to see the "whole" of the program including strengths and weaknesses of each member. Creating or maintaining an environment of mutual respect that includes valuing everyone's perspectives in the program is not an easy task but can be accomplished through transparency and communication. Bringing the program together to discuss yearly program priorities and setting out plans of responsibilities for meeting those shared goals is an important step towards shared governance and success. If there is disagreement on vision or actions, it is up to the chair to negotiate with parties and find a common solution. Communication is critical and takes time, but often makes the biggest impact on process and garnering support when needed.

Communication with the Dean

Program Chairs, by position, become part of the Dean's leadership team for the School. Deans interact with university administration on all matters relating to School business. In that role they represent all programs under their umbrella. Deans need to be informed about program activities and issues concerning faculty, staff, equipment, travel, space, etc., so they may negotiate for the resources that enable a program to carry out its mission. Whether an issue concerns faculty, staff, equipment, travel or space, the Dean is a key gatekeeper as well as stakeholder in supporting and maintaining quality departments. It should go without saying that the relationship between the Dean and a chair needs to be cordial and professional in order to maximize program and college achievements. From time to time, each will need the support of the other in times of crises or conflict. Open communication between the two

parties will go a long way toward creating a strong academic environment. Information needs to pass between the Dean and the chair on a consistent and timely basis. When negative information about the program comes to the attention of the Dean, he or she must feel comfortable dealing directly with the chair, who may, in turn, investigate the matter within the program. In general, your Dean's office, including any Associate or Assistant Deans and the administrative staff, can be your most valuable ally in running the department.

E. Chair evaluation

It is important for chairs to be aware of one additional mandated aspect of unit governance: CSUCI's policy on chair evaluations. **Senate Policy 09-02https://policy.csuci.edu/sp/9/sp-09-002.htm** outlines the process and criteria for chairs to be evaluated during the final year of an appointed term. There are 15 items the Chair Evaluation Committee (CEC) will consider in the Chair Evaluation Process and detailed in a Summary Report (SR) to the Dean:

Academic Programs

1. Leads the development of quality academic programs
2. Works with faculty in program planning and review; curriculum development, maintenance, and revision.

Students

3. Mediates grievances between students and faculty and is available to receive student input about courses and instructors.
4. Supervises, advises, provides information, signs documents and petitions, and otherwise facilitates resolution of administrative difficulties students may encounter.
5. Promotes program activities (competitions, awards, professional organizations, clubs).

Faculty

6. Encourages collegial and full participation of all members of the program in recognition that governance of the program is a joint and cooperative endeavor.
7. Promotes scholarship and professional development of the faculty.
8. Promotes a culture of mentorship for untenured faculty.
9. Participates in the recruitment and evaluation of temporary faculty.1
10. Provides leadership at the program level in the university's endeavor to hire a diverse faculty.

Administrative & Other Responsibilities

11. Represents the program within the college, university, community, and profession.
12. Works well with and oversees program support staff.
13. Keeps faculty informed and works on management of resources, including the establishment of enrollment targets, allocation of faculty positions, budget matters, and class schedule.
14. Monitors program compliance with university regulations and meets deadlines.
15. Relates well with other Chairs.

Being aware of the criteria upon which colleagues will be asked to evaluate the chair will not only avoid unpleasant surprises but give chairs additional understanding of the range of roles that they are expected to play.

Chapter 2. Strategic Leadership

One of the less defined, but critically important, roles of a chair is to practice strategic leadership. Through this practice, a program maintains a more cohesive vision to guide programs planning, and uses that vision to align priorities with outward-facing promotion and representation, resources, and opportunities. The five year cycle of program review supports the strategic decision-making process and encourages the regular use of data for this purpose. In this chapter, we will look first at ways to establish a coherent program vision and then discuss ways to promote the program and access resources. Finally, we will discuss an iterative cycle of evaluation that uses data to guide strategic decision-making.

A. Program vision

A clear, if general, summary of your long-term program beliefs and values is reflected in the program mission statement. As chair, the process of creating or revising a mission statement can be equally valuable to the end product, as it provides an opportunity for the program faculty to discuss values, stakeholders, curricular offerings, and unique characteristics. The University of Connecticut has put together this helpful guide to streamline the process for creating a program vision statement.

The shared beliefs that are identified in the program mission statement are enacted in multiple ways throughout the program, school, and University. Creating a coherent focus is therefore an important way to carry out and reify the program values. The Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, for example, recommends the following:

> Each academic department and program should have a strategic plan detailing its aspirations and enduring goals and discussing how these are realized in each of the following areas: curriculum, students, faculty, and resources. In each area, current and proposed projects of the department/program should be listed. The strategic plan should also direct the annual study of and reflection on a departmental/program objective that informs the ongoing development of the department/program. The strategic plan should be in a template form following the basic format of the College's strategic plan. Although the strategic plan should be updated annually by the department/program, major changes are not expected each year. The periodic review is an opportunity for significant updates and changes to the strategic plan.

At CSU Channel Islands, each school has developed a type of strategic plan with input from faculty, such as the Arts & Sciences Collective Vision. If programs do not have resources or time to develop a program-level strategic plan, another approach is to make use of their school's plan for the areas that are priorities for the department. As a program develops collective priorities, it is also useful to look more broadly for initiatives to connect to, such as: the University mission statement, including our four mission pillars; developments across higher education, such as existing and emerging High Impact Practices (HIPs); and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) initiatives designed to address broader social issues.

With high level goals and a vision in place, the chair will need to identify several priorities for ongoing program business in a shorter, 1-3 year cycle. To arrive at these priorities, chairs should plan to:

- Schedule one or more meetings, or a program retreat, for the purpose of developing goals for the subsequent 1-2 year(s);
- Provide relevant data, such as enrollment management numbers showing trends in enrollment of majors; areas for future growth, such as articles from your discipline on state, regional or national growth areas; TT/NTT ratios; social justice elements that the program desires to strengthen; reported curricular problems, such as bottleneck courses, or potential strengths, such as a nascent internship or service learning program;
- Identify specific and tangible goals that will help your program to carry out its values and maintain or grow enrollment;
- Connect the goals to the University strategic initiatives or mission;
- Cultivate a shared sense of responsibility by encouraging individual faculty to take on specific actions to address the goals; and
- Identify needed resources or actions such as funding requests, curriculum revision, data collection or analysis, or faculty lines that will support the goals.

The document that results from this conversation will serve to focus monthly department meetings and will drive future decisions like new faculty lines, temporary faculty hiring decisions, grant funding requests, and curricular modifications. Chairs can engage with enrollment management, Institutional Research, Information Technology Services, and/or their respective Deans to discuss data sources.

Finally, chairs should be sure to document this hard work by keeping minutes from faculty meetings where progress reports and/or data are shared on the identified priorities. This work can also be discussed in annual reports alongside faculty accomplishments, as well as in the program review materials every five years.

B. Program promotion and external representation

Equally important to the program-level work listed above is the program's ability to get the word out to the public and current/future students. Reliable sources for this include:

- *The program website* is an important first stop to house program mission, goals, curricular plans, and faculty contact information. It is a good practice to check the website regularly to make sure that it is kept up to date. Recently, the websites were equipped with a direct link to the Catalog content for degrees, so prospective students should find current links every time they visit.
- *A Canvas page* **for program majors** and minors can be more dynamic and fluid than a website for daily or weekly communication. (Chairs may need to email new majors each semester with a link so that they can opt-in to the site). Potential modules include: program events and activities; forms; sneak peeks for upcoming courses; links to

contests, opportunities, conferences; faculty bios or videos; capstone information and presentations; and so on.

- A *Canvas page or Google folder for program faculty* offers a central location for program documents and in-progress work. Here, the chair and others can post program information, upcoming deadlines and events, meeting minutes and materials, and opportunities. This way, each meeting can continue from the last, with past agendas and notes readily available.
- *Social media program sites* like Instagram, Facebook, LinkedIn and Twitter can be good ways to cultivate relationships with current, former, and prospective students, and to celebrate individual and group accomplishments. Because social media works best with regular posts, this responsibility may be best suited to a particular faculty member who is willing to take it on as a formal program service.
- *Majors Fairs* take place each semester and are organized by the advising center. These are great ways to connect with students who have not yet decided on a major. Many chairs ask faculty and majors to drop by during the fair to share their experiences with prospective majors. It can also be a good time to showcase opportunities open to all students, such as minors, certificates, particular courses, and events.
- *Communication and Marketing* may have a way to share news about program faculty or students, particularly when it is of local or regional interest. CI News Center is the pathway to a posting on the University news page, to share information on an upcoming event or profile a recent accomplishment (be sure to request it 3-5 days in advance). The University's Communication and Marketing page, Forms and Resources, contains helpful information about services they offer and protocols for media outreach from programs.

C. Identifying resources and opportunities

Emails and announcements about one-time funds pop up periodically, and so having a set of priorities in hand will help chairs to know which resources will be most appropriate for faculty time. More regularly available resources include:

- *The Continuing Education Reserve Fund (CERF)* is in the process of being revised for broader program use within Academic Affairs. Those funds are collected from the program's Extended Education course fees; currently, it may only be used for spending related directly to those self-support courses.
- *Research and Sponsored Programs* **(RSP)** offers guidance and support for grants, scholarships, fellowships and awards in a range of disciplines and disciplinary clusters. Chairs may wish to contact the RSP office directly to learn about grant opportunities and timelines in particular areas.
- *Campus Minigrants* are competitive but can provide faculty with additional resources for scholarship, including the scholarship of teaching; both lecturers and tenure track faculty are eligible to apply. The Chair's support is an important step to encouraging faculty to submit applications.

- *Mission-Based Center Opportunities* are frequently available; like RSP, chairs are encouraged to be proactive in reaching out directly to center staff and faculty to discuss how their work may support program priorities.
- *The Office of Faculty Development* on campus offers resources for all faculty, any of which may align with and support program priorities. Chairs should regularly encourage faculty to take advantage of these offerings, including Faculty Inquiry Projects (FIPs), minigrants, mentoring, and the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity.
- The *Student Research Advisory Committee* supports undergraduate research in various ways and offers opportunities for faculty involvement.

D. Using data to guide decisions and the program review cycle

Every five years, programs are expected to undergo an intensive, self-study process as part of Program Review. The process, timeline, and materials are available on the Program Review website and administered through Academic Affairs. By Academic Senate Policy 06-13, This process is designed to be an iterative, substantial process that should support purposeful reflection and change. *It is not designed to be the program chair's sole responsibility; rather, the chair facilitates a process by which numerous program faculty, students, and staff participate*. Chairs should plan for the process to take a substantial amount of time across the year and scale back other initiatives accordingly. Upon request, programs can obtain samples of documents produced in similar departments; these can be useful as models both for content and for organization.

The policy "encourages the improvement of programs by thoroughly and candidly evaluating" the following:

- the mission and goals of the program and their relation to the mission of the institution
- the curriculum through which program mission and goals are pursued
- the assessment of student learning outcomes, the program revisions based upon those outcomes, and the plans for future assessment activities
- the range and quality of scholarship and creative activities, emphasizing those involving students
- the quality and diversity of faculty and staff and their contributions to program mission & goals
- the quality of entering and graduating students
- the library and other educational resources
- physical facilities
- service and contributions to the community

Additionally, WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges) poses several guiding questions to consider during program review. Two that are applicable for programs include:

- How have the results of [the prior] program review been used to inform decision making and improve instruction and student learning outcomes?

- What has the program or institution learned as it carried out assessments of students' learning? How have assessment protocols, faculty development, choices of instruments, or other aspects of assessment changed as a result?

The regular and iterative use of data is an important piece, particularly because it provides a valuable counterpoint to anecdotal reports. Data collection and analysis are complicated at CSUCI because of the lack of funding for the time it requires for program faculty to regularly collect and assess student work across courses. Additionally, until recently, it has been difficult to obtain institutional research with specific parameters useful to the program.

Discussing how to collect and utilize data within the very limited time and constraints is an important conversation to have prior to or during program review. Some programs save time and resources by concentrating on existing data, such as signature assignments in critical classes. Others use a mechanism such as a senior portfolio to collect relevant assignments. Some add entrance and/or exit surveys to gather student self-reported data on their experiences. In such cases, program faculty will likely have time to review only a random sampling, but even such an analysis can spark fruitful reflection and conversation – and that reflection and conversation among colleagues is an essential part of strategic planning and of realizing those plans.

Chapter 3. Departmental Management and Personnel Issues

Central to the chair's role is management of the department and personnel. This includes both managing problems and issues when they arise and building morale and handling interpersonal relationships. In this chapter, we will look at how chairs are guided in these endeavors by formal agreements, such as the CBA, and how chairs address problems in conjunction with faculty, administrators and staff in Faculty Affairs, CFA, and the Ombuds Office. Finally, we will consider how chairs can support program faculty in responding to student issues through working with appropriate campus entities such as the CARE team, Title IX, and Student Conduct.

A. Building morale and addressing departmental dynamics

A chair inherits a department composed of individuals with longstanding relationships, conflicts, and histories. Identifying and coping with departmental dynamics is an important, ongoing part of the job.

One key asset is the chair's relationship and mutual trust with each individual, built on the basis of individual and collective interactions. Trust develops over time but can be supported in several ways:

- Conducting individual, 1:1 meetings with faculty—these can take precious time, but they do not all have to occur at the same time. The chair can make a regular practice of meeting with lecturer and tenure track faculty over the year. Such meetings are great opportunities to find out about faculty experiences in the program prior to the chair's tenure, as well as their desires for the future and their progress on ongoing scholarship or teaching ideas.
- Following good meeting etiquette and practices—the chair should facilitate meetings on a regular basis, share the agenda in advance, and invite all faculty to attend. It is good practice to include some morale-building in each meeting, even if it is simply a chance for each person to introduce themselves and the courses they teach.
- Practicing consistency in decision-making for transparency. The program bylaws should include some support for consistent, equity-minded decisions (they may need to be revised in order to do this), such as providing an agenda in advance of meetings and laying out procedures for voting.

1. University Ombuds Office

In cases where departmental dynamics need additional support beyond the basic trust-building practices laid out above, the University Ombuds Office—"off-the-record, independent, impartial and confidential"—may be a good support for two or more faculty who are at the heart of the difficult dynamics. Alternatively, the Ombuds office provides Conflict Coaching to support chairs in navigating difficult conversations.

B. Managing and supporting personnel

In addition to faculty, chairs need to support and coordinate with their respective academic program analyst or coordinator. In many cases, chairs also support laboratory technicians.

1. Academic program analysts or coordinators

The relationship between program staff and the chair is a close one, although the analyst or coordinator typically does not report directly to the chair but rather to an administrator in the Dean's Office. That administrator is a good source of information about what the Chair should—and should not--ask of the staff person, or to respond to concerns about their skills, knowledge, or performance. It is important to note that the title--analyst or coordinator--signifies a different level of responsibility. Analysts, for example, work on budgets, whereas coordinators do not.

The staff member's position is difficult. They navigate a position of supporting faculty in one or more programs, assisting the chair(s), and sometimes helping guide students to appropriate offices or faculty. Meanwhile, they also do a considerable amount of often-invisible work, such as entering schedules and handling financial paperwork such as stipends and reimbursements.

Chairs can support the staff assigned to their program by clearly explaining that individual's responsibilities to the faculty. Many faculty may come from institutions where it is more typical, for example, to ask someone in the coordinator role to scan copies of their texts. They may have relied on analysts to order textbooks for them, complete all of their travel forms, and even make travel arrangements. On our campus, most of those activities are performed directly by faculty, albeit with some guidance. Similarly, program staff should not be put in the position of advising students on courses or program processes.

Chairs need to set up regular meetings with staff and cultivate a trusting relationship. They should find out how the analyst prefers to communicate and also share their own preferred communication style. During 1:1 meetings, the chair should listen and take notes, and when problems are expressed, ask for details in as objective a manner as possible, so that the staff member feels comfortable expressing concerns. For example, historically analysts have been treated poorly by some faculty members who vent simply because that person is there and in a perceived position of less power. For more on handling these kinds of complaints, see the next section.

Finally, when thinking about motivation and encouragement in the program, chairs should be careful not to overlook the staff. Remembering birthdays, thank you gifts, administrative professional days—even an occasional thank you cup of coffee or tea—all of these small gestures create awareness that the person is valued by the program.

C. Collective Bargaining Agreement and bargaining units

1. Faculty Affairs

On our campus, Chairs work directly with Faculty Affairs for most faculty-related issues, rather than Human Resources. Chairs consult with Faculty Affairs for information on the following, among others:

- Tenure track faculty retention, tenure, and promotion;
- Lecturer hiring, contracts, and evaluations;
- Faculty grievance/arbitration;
- Questions about the faculty contract (CBA);
- Faculty compensation and entitlement issues;
- Sabbatical/difference-in-pay leaves;
- Official personnel file management.

Recently, Faculty Affairs has created a section of their website called Chair Resources--it includes a range of commonly used forms and information related to program staffing and evaluations.

2. *California Faculty Association*

The California Faculty Association, or CFA, exclusively represents all CSU faculty during collective bargaining. Our local chapter membership is available on their website; current issues are discussed during a regular time slot in Academic Senate meetings.

Significant for chairs is the role that CFA plays in faculty grievances. Article 10 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) provides for faculty members to have representation by a member of CFA during the grievance process. If a faculty member believes that they have been "directly wronged" by "a claimed violation, misapplication, or misinterpretation of a specific term or provision" of the CBA, they may file a grievance; for support, they may consult their campus CFA representative. Faculty Affairs will support the chair through the process, which may entail a meeting with the faculty member, the CFA representative, Faculty Affairs, and other appropriate parties, such as a representative from the Dean's Office.

D. Addressing grievances, complaints, and misconduct (faculty and students)

Reports or filing of grievances, complaints and misconduct all tend to begin with a meeting request, some more formal than others. Each type of complaint is discussed below—but the Chair's initial actions are typically the same: listen, bringing a laptop or notepad to the meeting; take careful notes; ask questions that clarify the timeline, the participants involved, and what was said or done. If something is mentioned that has potential to be documented, such as an email, Canvas post, or text, it is appropriate to ask if such documentation exists. Chairs should get into the habit of dating notes from meetings and saving them in a file for future reference.

The next steps depend upon the type of complaint and are addressed in the following sections.

1. *Faculty Grievances: Working with Faculty Affairs and Union membership*

As mentioned above, faculty members who feel that their bargaining agreement rights have been violated may file a grievance. Typically this is related to course assignments or unit

allocations. Chairs typically hear about a grievance, or the potential for a grievance, once Faculty Affairs is contacted by the union representative.

Clearly it is preferred to avoid grievances. The best methods to do so are for chairs to consistently follow the order of assignment, adhere to entitlements when developing schedules, and apply careful consideration to who is assigned to courses. At times, difficult decisions must be made, particularly in times of fewer resources; in these cases, chairs should consult with Faculty Affairs and their Dean, and whenever possible, put the logic of the decision-making into writing and share it with both parties prior to making the decision. Grievances are not avoidable simply by following the contract and documenting decisions, but chairs are in a much more defensible position when they have done so. Additionally, notes that were made in meetings or individual discussions are also invaluable in these situations.

During the initial meeting regarding the grievance, the chair is well served by following the basic information-gathering and listening procedures mentioned at the beginning of this section. The chair will be asked to document reasons for decisions in writing, and Faculty Affairs should keep them informed about next steps.

2. *Faculty Complaints and Potential Misconduct*

Faculty may come to the chair with a range of informal complaints, both about students (see below), about staff, or about another faculty member. For the most part, practicing good listening and note-taking skills will help to defuse some of the concern. After the faculty member has completed their full explanation of the event, it is good practice to ask if there is documentation for the claims made. An effective question to ask at this point is, "What would you like to have happen?" After the meeting, it is advisable to follow up with an e-mail to the faculty member that recaps the main points discussed and identifies what happens next. This documentation can become useful if the complaint escalates. Future actions will vary depending on the answer and the chair's judgement of the situation:

- Many issues are personality conflicts or misunderstandings that do not need to be reported to other parties such as Title IX or Faculty Affairs. In these cases, the chair can proceed by meeting individually with the other party(ies) to hear their perspective on the situation. After this meeting, the chair may suggest mediation to both parties and make an appointment with the Campus Ombuds for further consultation. Or, the chair may be able to go back to the first party with more information that clarifies the misunderstanding or diffuses the conflict.
- Some situations should not be handled by the chair. These include a report about discrimination based upon a protected class or faculty misconduct related to alleged sexual harassment. In this case, the chair must make a report to the campus Title IX office. Title IX addresses "discrimination on the basis of gender or sexual orientation [that] includes sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, and [or] gender based dating and domestic violence and stalking" (Title IX website). When in doubt, a chair should contact Title IX for further advice.

- Faculty complaints related to a disability that they disclose should be addressed through consultation with Human Resources.

3. *Student complaints about faculty*

Handling complaints that students raise about faculty and/or classes is a typical part of the chairs' job. Chairs can diffuse many of these concerns by following these practices:

1. Practice good listening and note-taking practices;
2. Ask to see evidence, such as Canvas posts, emails, or texts, if mentioned;
3. Clarify other participants and their roles;
4. Ask, "What would you like to have happen?" after the information has been presented;
5. Clarify whether it is okay to divulge the student's identity when talking with the faculty member;
6. Document the meeting with a follow up email.

After meeting with the student, the Chair should reach out to the faculty member for a conversation. It is recommended to use email only to set up the meeting, with a vague meeting request, such as, "I would like to talk with you to hear your perspective on a student concern in one of your classes."

During the meeting, the chair should explain the concern and then give the faculty member time to share their perspective. If a resolution or solution presents itself, the chair and faculty member should agree on a plan and then follow up with an email to the faculty member documenting the discussion. Finally, the chair should email the student a second time to let them know that a meeting has occurred and that the instructor is addressing the issue.

Whenever possible, it is best for the faculty member to be proactive about resolving the situation rather than the chair doing so. In cases where the student requested anonymity, it is often possible to assume that more than one student had concerns, and so the faculty member can send an email, speak to their class, or post an announcement to address the situation.

E. Working with campus units

Chairs are often the first stop for faculty who need advising about how to handle difficult student situations. In most cases, it's a matter of knowing—or finding out--who the relevant campus partners are for referrals, and then urging faculty to take action as soon as possible (within 24 hours in most cases) by filing a report.

1. *Submitting Accurate and Objective Student Reports*

If the faculty member is concerned about someone's safety, including their own, or feels that the student's conduct is (as stated on the CARE report website), "clearly and imminently reckless, disorderly, dangerous, or threatening including self-harm behavior," Chairs should *advise them to reach out to Campus Police immediately* by dialing 911 rather than wait to make

a report on the website. As chair, remain with them as they make this report if at all possible to offer support and guidance.

Student consent is not required to make a report, although in Title IX cases, the faculty member should notify them that they are a mandated reporter and provide them with the Rights and Options document.

In all reports of this nature, it is important for faculty to be accurate, complete, and as objective as possible. Although these cases can be emotional, Chairs should advise faculty to strive for reporting the facts while limiting judgements or inferences as much as possible. The CARE report writing guide includes suggestions on "The ABCs of Documentation" that are applicable in most types of student reports:

- About the Person (name, relationship to reporter and the University)
- Behaviors Observed (body language, phrases stated, tone of voice, actions)
- Context (when, location of incident, if it occurred in a class what class did this take place in, any unique factors of the setting)
- Details (witnesses, times of incidents, anything else objective that is relevant)
- Effect (impact to others, impact to you)
- Follow-Up/Response (did anyone try to intervene, how did the individual receive that intervention, has the incident been reported to the police)

2. *Care Team, Title IX, Student Conduct, and Basic Needs*

Different campus partners each have reporting forms for particular kinds of student behaviors and/or needs, including those listed below. When in doubt, faculty should make a report or reach out directly to contact staff at the respective office, without delay. Again, if there is suspicion of imminent danger to the student or others, call 9-1-1 for campus police.

Student conduct

The Student Conduct Code on campus covers ethical behavior both in relation to academic dishonesty and in other respects, such as use of drugs or alcohol. Faculty should report either kind of conduct issue to the Dean of Students office using the appropriate reporting form, using the ABCs of Documentation language above.

Title IX and Inclusion

These include reports related to sexual harassment, misconduct, dating and domestic violence, stalking and discrimination based on a protected class. Reports or inquiries can be found on the Title IX website. If faculty do not know whether to make a report, encourage them to reach out to the Title IX staff with an inquiry; staff will respond with guidance. Faculty should also provide students with the Rights and Options document.

CARE Team

CARE Team referrals include concerns about student well-being in cases where the faculty feel uneasy, and/or in cases where the faculty member is aware of significant academic and/or

personal issues that are beyond the faculty member's ability to support. The CARE Team includes representatives from a range of campus entities, such as campus policy/public safety, disability accommodations, advising, housing, the Dean of Students, and others. This group is often able to "connect the dots" across services and departments on campus.

Basic Needs

The Basic Needs website includes a referral link for faculty to share the name of a student experiencing a basic necessity insecurity, including food, housing, transportation, or finance. Staff can reach out to the student to make them aware of services such as emergency housing assistance and the food pantry and guide them through applying for emergency funds or CalFresh, if they qualify.

F. Risk Management

The Risk Management office at Channel Islands will consult with faculty to determine risk from field trips, special events, internships, volunteers, international travel, and motor vehicle travel. In some cases, their Program website lists agreements and forms that are already available for faculty to use. In other cases, consultation is needed. As their website indicates, "Many University activities involve risks and thus require planning and procedures to manage those risks." Faculty should anticipate that multiple forms and/or agreements may be required for their particular program to be approved, and plan the timeline accordingly.

Ch. 4: Curriculum Development and Revision

The fundamental mission of CSUCI is to serve our students by providing a high-quality education, and to create a structure that will provide the necessary support for their success throughout the process. The curriculum that each program sets up is the path that we chart for students from the time that they enter CSUCI to the time that they leave with a diploma in hand. Ideally, it should chart a path that is easily navigable to students, and that covers the terrain in manageable steps to give them the best opportunity to reach the final goal: graduation, a thoughtful life, and a fulfilling career. It is the chair's responsibility to lead programmatic efforts to ensure that the curriculum is designed with that goal in mind, and that the program collectively conducts regular reviews and necessary revisions – both at the level of individual courses and of the curriculum as a whole – to respond to the evolving context of higher education and student needs.

This chapter will address some of the fundamental issues for chairs to consider as it pertains to leadership in the area of course and curriculum (re)design. We begin with general considerations regarding good curriculum design, describe the specific curricular structures at CSUCI, and conclude with attention to issues of curricular assessment. As with most program responsibilities, the chair can address the tasks directly, or s/he (or the program collectively) may make arrangements for another person or group to address them. But it is the chair that is responsible for ensuring that the necessary work on the part of the program is engaged thoughtfully.

A. Curricular priorities and design

Designing and maintaining a well-organized curriculum is one of the most critical responsibilities of any academic program – and it is the chair's responsibility to ensure that the faculty engage in that process. It requires significant collective thinking to answer a range of questions: What are the essential content and skills that students need to develop in order to succeed in the major? In which courses should the content and skills be delivered, and how should they be sequenced? Which courses deliver content or skills that *all* students need to cultivate (hence, core courses), and which deliver content or skills that are beneficial but optional for the major (hence, elective courses)? What is the role of the program in delivering General Education courses – both to serve majors and non-majors? How does lower division coursework – and expectations regarding preparation for upper division coursework – articulate (both formally and informally) with the courses that transfer students are likely to enter with? Do course learning objectives match with what is being taught in classes – and what content needs to be delivered in those classes? Those are just some of the many questions that programs need to address for a healthy curriculum.

Designing (or redesigning) curriculum is a collective task; faculty are collectively responsible for designing, implementing, and evaluating the curriculum. However, the chair has oversight responsibilities for these processes and activities, and her/his role is to support faculty as they carry out these responsibilities and provide the resources needed to design and implement the curriculum. The chair therefore needs to take the lead role in facilitating curriculum discussions and in implementing collective decisions – or making sure that governance structures are in

place to identify an individual (e.g., Curriculum Coordinator) or a group (e.g., Curriculum Committee) to do so. Chairs do not have to take this task on alone and should consult with the faculty for novel solutions and tapping into colleagues' knowledge and experience and meet these challenges together. When curriculum decisions may be negatively impacted by the budget, the chair and faculty should work together to find a cost-effective pathway for ensuring the students can graduate with the required courses.

Regardless of specific departmental arrangements, it is essential that the chair has some sense of the good principles and practices for curriculum design (addressed in this section) as well as how to navigate the structures to implement them at CSUCI (addressed in sections below). Here are some of the important ideas to consider in curriculum design/redesign.

Graduation Initiative 2025: As noted above, the animating mission of the CSU system as a whole is to deliver a high-quality education to our students at an affordable price that allows them to earn their degree in a timely manner. In recent years, the emphasis has been on the final component of that mission (timeliness) articulated in goals for undergraduate completion within specific time windows. The centerpiece of the initiative is for each campus to achieve specific undergraduate graduation rates by 2025. For CSUCI as a whole, the targets are as follows:

- Increase the two-year graduation rate for transfer students to 54 percent.
- Increase the four-year graduation rate for transfer students to 78 percent.
- Increase the four-year graduation rate for first-time freshmen to 40 percent.
- Increase the six-year graduation rate for first-time freshmen to 67 percent.
- Eliminate the achievement gap.

Academic undergraduate programs must also be aware of those targets, and the ways that their curriculum impacts them, positively or negatively. Most importantly, if students within a major face certain "bottleneck" courses that they have to wait to enroll in, or that they commonly have to retake, that will work against achieving GI 2025 goals – and those are areas for consideration in course and curriculum redesign. Access to courses is mostly an issue of scheduling (although the caps set on courses established in the course proposal will obviously influence that). When students frequently need to retake courses due to non-passing grades, that may mean that the skills that are expected in the class are not available to students at that point in the curriculum, and may demand that prerequisite courses be established, or undergo revised learning outcomes.

Chairs should be aware of the graduation rates and the achievement gap in their own majors and should lead efforts to move those needles in the appropriate direction. More and updated information about GI 2025 as it pertains to CSUCI can be accessed at CSUCI's **GI 2025** webpage.

Skills, content, and sequencing: The mark of a high-quality education is that graduates reliably take away content and skills that they can use in their lives and careers – some specific to the major, and some universal. That will include a deep understanding of disciplinary (and inter-disciplinary) perspectives and questions, and a competence with general and specific skills (critical thinking and clear writing, in the general category, and a broad array of discipline-specific examples that are important for programs to identify).

A passing familiarity with Bloom's Taxonomy alerts us to the idea that a general goal of education is to help students to engage in higher-level learning, and to cultivate the higher-level skills associated with that learning. While a well-ordered curriculum is not necessarily one that arranges classes to step up the ladder mechanically with each level of coursework, it is important to identify where in the curriculum students are expected to access and acquire each of the skills and areas of expertise that are expected upon graduation (or, perhaps, expected to be utilized in a capstone course that will be taken at the end of the major). That requires careful attention to sequencing in classes across the curriculum (and will eventually demand much deeper coordination across faculty teaching in the curriculum).

It is important also to recognize that model curricula will change over time as new content and perspectives emerge in one's discipline (shifting debates, new schools of thought, new emphases), and as competencies expected of graduates throughout higher education evolve (e.g., ability to work in groups, familiarity with computers, comfort working in diverse contexts, etc.). All of that will affect what should be in individual courses and across the curriculum as a whole program of study. For programs that have not recently directed significant attention to their curriculum, they may be working with a curriculum that was designed twenty years ago, based on research and best practices that came from two decades before that – and, in CSUCI's early years, it was likely to be done with a very small number of faculty members in the discipline (or one, or none).

Best practices and High Impact Practices (HIPs): We also know that best practices in teaching evolve over time. Decades of research has shown that the model of college lectures delivered by an expert to a (large) group of students mostly taking notes (sometimes derisively called the "sage on a stage" model) is not what works for contemporary students – and much of that research has given us lots of ideas about new and more active ways of teaching that can infuse a lot of different practices that will help our students to learn.

Much of the research on new practices for effective teaching in higher education is organized around the concept of High Impact Practices (HIPs). For an introduction to the concept and some of the early HIPs, see Kuh's (2008) *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter*. Finding ways to integrate HIPs throughout the curriculum is an important consideration. At CSUCI, there are many opportunities to link them with our mission pillars – but those are certainly not the only opportunities.

Examining what works for our students is particularly important for universities like ours that has a very different student profile from those that dominated higher education during its dramatic expansion in the mid-late twentieth century. Our students are more likely to be (and often overwhelmingly) first-generation college students, low-income students, and Latinx students. Each of those characteristics should be considered when designing and revising curricula and the practices within them.

B. Curriculum structures and frameworks

As a program considers its curriculum, it is imperative that those considerations are informed by a whole array of structures and frameworks (many of them external to the program or university) that will have important implications for how the curriculum can be

organized. Here, addressed are some of the most common and important of those structures, their potential implications, and provide information about how to learn more about them.

Majors, minors, options, concentrations, and emphases: Curricula are most directly organized around the recognized sequences or packages of coursework that are recognized with some collective attribution such as a major or minor or subsidiary recognition within the major like an option, concentration, or emphasis. Of course, majors are the essential recognition for a bachelor's degree, but the others offer useful opportunities for students and for programs to explore a discipline further. At CSUCI, minors are often a stepping-stone to major status – a way to build student interest and enrollment gradually. Minors are also a way to give students with other majors an opportunity to develop some critical expertise or familiarity with the discipline.

The subsidiary designations (options, concentrations, emphases) offer a way to structure a major with different paths through it. All refer to structures that offer options for gaining deeper understanding in one or another area of the discipline. (The differences among those three designations in the CSU system are technical and won't be addressed here.) For example, the Communication program offers emphases in three different areas: Health Communication, Environmental Communication, and Organizational Communication. Having emphases of that sort may be particularly attractive to students who have a focused interest in one area of the major – and it may be useful for attaining employment in that area after graduation. The chair, however, must be knowledgeable and aware of CSUCI Senate Policies and Chancellor's Office Executive Orders, such as EO 1071 that outlines guidelines or restrictions for curricular changes dealing with subsidiary designations.

Course SLOs and Program PLOs: Learning outcomes are in many senses the fundamental output of any curriculum; they are the measurable functional units of what our students should earn from our courses and majors. As the basic units of education, they must be at the center of curriculum decisions (even if only in an implied way, until those decisions are rendered formally in course and curriculum proposals). According to the California State University **Program Planning Resource Guide**, learning outcomes "guide the assessment of student learning concisely stating what a student should know or be able to do. Well-articulated learning outcomes describe how a student can demonstrate the desired outcome."

Course development should be guided by student learning outcomes (SLOs) as the course goal. SLOs are "statements clearly describing the specific and measurable knowledge, skills, and behaviors that display and verify learning has occurred." It is imperative to keep course-level SLOs up-to-date, as courses naturally evolve (both at the level of the individual instructor, and at the level of broader program understandings about the role that a specific course fulfills.) That is particularly important because SLOs are a mandated component of syllabi at CSUCI, and matching course content to SLOs is an important way to increase student buy-in to course goals and activities. Indeed, keeping course-level structures constantly up-to-date is a way of curriculum redesign at an incremental level. Interest in revising course proposals will often come from faculty teaching those courses. Faculty wishing to create new course proposals and modify existing courses should consult with the chair to discuss impacts on program planning and program modifications required as well as impacts on program assessment plans.

On a broader level, curriculum (re)design should be guided by program learning outcomes. PLOs are "statements describing the significant and essential learnings directly related to a major program of study or discipline that students will master and reliably demonstrate." Periodically reexamining PLOs will keep the curriculum from calcifying as a discipline marches forward, and that reexamination is helpful to echo in a program mission statement to guide the collective work of faculty.

Chairs should be familiar with both SLOs and PLOs in their program, how to craft them, and how to measure them. Again, they are the fundamental building blocks of an effective curriculum.

Modes of instruction: Course modality refers to whether courses are offered face-to-face, online, or as a hybrid. CSUCI has for years been promoting online courses, with mixed success and mixed outcomes. With the expansion of the internet, there have been consistent efforts (for good reasons and for bad reasons) to shift higher education more toward online delivery. Of course, the COVID era gave us a crash course on moving courses online. There have also been some hard lessons about the limits and disadvantages of moving courses (and whole programs) online.

The question about whether courses should be offered online or face-to-face (or in a hybrid mode of instruction) involves a number of issues – pedagogical and otherwise. It is critical to think through who will be making decisions about mode of instruction within the curriculum. (The chair, at the time of scheduling? Collective departmental decisions on a class-by-class basis? Any given instructor's prerogative?) It is also critical to make sure that 1) those processes are codified in bylaws, and, more importantly, that 2) those decisions are driven by sound pedagogy and a focus on student service (rather than, say, the convenience of a faculty member who is interested in fewer trips to campus).

University guidelines addressing modes of instruction – focusing particularly on *online* teaching – are contained largely in the **Policy for Listing of Online Course Offerings** (SP 12-08), and the **Policy for Online Teaching and Learning** (SP 14-014). It is important to be familiar with those policies as programs discuss and make collective decisions about modes of instruction across the curriculum.

General Education and Graduation Requirements: As curriculum (re)design is considered, it is important to take into consideration both how the undergraduate major is impacted by university- (and system-) level requirements, and how the program can make unique contributions to the university in those areas. To do so, it is important to be familiar with the range of requirements in practice at CSUCI, which can be accessed from the university catalog (for AY 2020-21) in the sections on **General Education Requirements** and **Graduation Requirements**. Each of those areas have implications for how a major is structured, both by limiting maximum credits (given provisions regarding the maximum number of credits required for graduation) and by provisions allowing for double-counting of courses for the major and other requirements. All of that is to say that it is critical to be familiar with those requirements when considering curriculum changes. (In AY 2021-22, new provisions for a statewide Ethnic Studies requirement will also be implemented as part of a new area of General Education, but the specifics are still being finalized.)

It is also important to remember that designating courses as university requirements must go through an approval process prior to submission to the Local Curriculum Committees. That process is guided by the **Senate Policy on General Education Course Requirements** (SP 16-012).

Mission Pillars: At CSUCI, another set of external frameworks (and opportunities) for curricula is represented in our mission pillars: community engagement, integrative approaches, multicultural perspectives, and international perspectives. Formally, each of those can be represented in our Upper Division General Education classes, which require one of the four mission attributes for each class. Beyond that, there are a range of structures that curriculum can link to that emphasizes the distinctive mission pillars of the CSUCI education.

For example, a program may designate one or more of its core courses as service-learning, which will mean that all students in the major (or some, if not a required course) will have exposure to experiential learning in the community. For example, the Environmental Science and Resource Management curriculum has institutionalized course sequencing around a sequence of progressive service-learning experiences, putting that at the center of their major. Another example is that many programs still have a significant number of cross-listed courses (some of which are team taught) that hardwire integrative approaches into their major (although many of those emphases were curtailed with the shift away from our Upper Division Interdisciplinary General Education courses several years ago). All of this is just to say that the mission pillars represent another framework that curriculum can be structured around at CSUCI.

Articulation: It is also important to be familiar with a broad swath of explicit articulation agreements that govern what can and must be accepted for credit within an undergraduate program. That is extremely important for a university like ours that is so reliant on transfer students. Many of our students (and, in some programs, the overwhelming majority) take all of their lower division coursework at other colleges and universities (primarily community colleges). Some may enter still needing to fulfill one or more such courses before they can embark on upper division courses in the major – which need to be identified immediately to avoid holding up their progress. All of that may have important implications for what is addressed in upper division (or lower division) coursework – and the extent to which the program has control over essential skills expected to be delivered in lower division coursework in the major.

Articulation agreements also mean that there are strict limits on the number of units in a major, which means that curriculum design has to pay close heed to how any classes can be offered – and, therefore, how the bundle of essential skills and content must be parceled out across the curriculum. Chairs can get ample help considering all of these issues by consulting with and getting assistance from the **Articulation and Curriculum Office**.

Considering process for curriculum redesign: In addition to considering *what* is to be included in the curriculum, it is critical to consider *how* curriculum design is to be collectively undertaken. It is essential to understand that curriculum (re)design is a process that is collective, long-term, and ongoing. It is also a process that requires considerable expertise (the more widely shared, the better), considerable time (so that resources, if available, can be

essential), and may involve considerable differences about priorities and needs (given that the curriculum will inevitably shape critical faculty interests such as teaching repertoires and future hires). That means that attention to how the process is organized and engaged will be critical to its success. For a discussion of many aspects of the process to think about, a chronicle of the Sociology Program's curriculum redesign can be read in "Navigating the Process of Curriculum Redesign in Sociology: Challenges and Lessons from One Program" (Downey, O'Connor, Abel, Armanino, Jepson, Kadakal, Nam, Sánchez, & Sowers 2019).

C. CSUCI curricular processes

In addition to understanding general considerations and local permutations that should (or, inevitably, will) shape the curriculum, it is critical to understand the mechanics and processes by which it is submitted and institutionalized on our campus. To start, it is important to understand the policies and resolutions that guide those processes, and chairs need to be familiar with them. An invaluable repository of the most critical can be found on the Senate page **Curriculum-related Senate Policies and Resolutions**. The yearly schedule and deadlines for curriculum proposals can be found on the **Curriculum Committee** webpage.

Curriculog: The curriculum review process at CSUCI is now fully online, organized around the Curriculog program. Chairs (and/or other program representatives handling curriculum submissions) must be familiar with the program. The starting point for working on Curriculog is the university page titled **Curriculog Overview**. In order to become familiar with the use of Curriculog, you can access and enroll in the online program for **Curriculum Training**, which includes thorough information on Curriculog. More detailed resources on how to submit proposals can be found at the Senate's Curriculum **Resources** page. The page contains links to range of useful information on how to propose a course in Curriculog, as well as providing information on required curricular elements of a proposal.

Local Curriculum Committees: The organizational structure within which course and curriculum changes are processed was changed in 2018 and is described in the **Policy on Curriculum: Committee Structures, Charges, and Elections** (Senate Policy 18-02), which can be accessed on the **Academic Senate Policies** webpage. The new structure established four separate Local Curriculum Committees (LCCs) to review and address curriculum issues within their area of the university. Those four LCCs are: Math/Sciences; Arts/Humanities; Behavioral/Social Sciences; and Professional Studies. Beginning in Fall 2019, and then every three years, programs will vote on which local curriculum committee their program will reside for the next three term. The chair of the LCC will be elected from and by the programs in that LCC for a two-year term.

These LCCs review all course proposals *after* chair approval, and GE Committee approval if necessary. It is important for chairs to review all program proposals to ensure that all curricular elements are acceptable, complete, and will be included with a program modification if needed. Proposals are also reviewed by the Deans and depending on their complexity, will also go through Technical Review before being entered into the Catalog. Program Chairs are

responsible for submitting Program Modification Proposals when any change in the program is proposed by adding, modifying, or deleting courses or program requirements.

D. Course and program assessment

Once a curriculum is designed, submitted, and implemented, it remains a critical task to evaluate whether the learning objectives that have been set out are being accomplished, and whether there are obstacles to student success that remain to be cleared. The chair is the program leader, and ultimately responsible for all assessment activities related to student learning and continuous improvement.

The five-year academic program review cycle provides a mechanism for faculty and administration to evaluate the effectiveness of their academic programs on a continuous basis. The intent is for the University to evaluate a program's strengths and weaknesses within the contexts of emerging directions in the discipline and the mission of CSU Channel Islands. The process of program review is structured by the **Senate Policy for Review of Academic Programs** (Academic Senate Policy 06-13), which can be accessed on the **Academic Senate Policies** webpage. The process focuses on three components: the Academic Program Self-Study and Recommendation; the External Review and Recommendation; and the University Review and Decision-Making. Information on each of those components can be found in the policy itself.

The largest component of the review cycle is the self-study, which is completed in the year prior to the external review. The self-study should be an opportunity for collective reflection on the successes of the program, as well as where it has fallen short of its goals. The review process is designed to be an opportunity for the program – but if the program is unable to carry out the preparation throughout the review cycle, the self-study is more likely to be seen as an obligatory task, and one which gains little for the program. The chair can avoid that outcome by ensuring that the program engage in substantive discussions about the curriculum and how it is working throughout the program review cycle.

Your program should have an assessment plan that outlines your Program Goals and Outcomes (generally stated in the PLOs) and aligns those goals with program coursework and SLOs across each course. The Assessment Plan should include a 4-5-year timeline of assessment activities including data collection, analysis, and time for modifications for program improvement. Forms and assessment templates are available through the **Academic Programs and Planning Office**. They can assist programs in planning for program review, and (more importantly) in planning for the full review cycle.

Sources cited:

Downey, Dennis J., Lindsey Trimble O'Connor, Leslie Abel, Daniel Armanino, Mark Jepson, Reha Kadakal, Sunghee Nam, Luis Sánchez, & Elizabeth Sowers. 2019. "Navigating the Process of Curriculum Redesign in Sociology: Challenges and Lessons from One Program." *Teaching Sociology* 47(2): 87-101.

Kuh, George D. 2008. *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Chapter 5: Engaging Students

A. Promoting student success

To be successful in our capacities both as faculty and Department Chair at California State University Channel islands, we must be guided by one preeminent consideration – the serving of our students. The education, well-being, and ultimate success of our students – quantifiable and unquantifiable – are why we work in academia, and we must never let ourselves lose sight of that.

Student Success is the priority at CSUCI. Consequently, all the areas of responsibility, the tasks and the actions delineated elsewhere in this Handbook, including your dealings with faculty and staff, the administration of the budget and other resources, the development and delivery of curriculum, and the creation and implementation of the schedule of classes, must be taken and executed with the best interests of your students at the forefront of your mind.

For the foreseeable future, the entire university will continue to pursue a variety of formal Student Success initiatives. These will be directed by your School Dean, and you inevitably will be charged with a number of relevant tasks. For many of these, the dashboards and other resources provided by Institutional Research on the CSUCI Student Data Dashboard page (via you myCI page) will prove invaluable. Instructions on how to use this dashboard can be found HERE.

B. Student engagement

While your role as Department Chair likely means that you will be teaching fewer classes, it is important to remain connected with your students, both directly and indirectly. Fostering student engagement and communication may be accomplished in a one-to-one, one-to-many, or peer-to-peer capacity. For example, you may create direct engagement opportunities through formal "Meet the Chair" and/or "Meet the Faculty" events (both in person and virtually) to create comfortable, casual ways to encourage student participation and communication in a one-to-one capacity. These events foster and sustain students' senses of belonging and community, which are vital to our efforts to increase retention and graduation rates. One-to-many events such as pot-lucks, special lectures, or department events such as capstone project presentations or other events showcasing student work may serve to bring your students together or recruit new students to the major. Peer-to-peer and near-peer interactions are invaluable to bring students into the fold of the department and university as a whole. Fostering interactions between students, alumni, faculty, and staff can pave the way for good communication and ultimately student retention and graduation, and future alumni engagement.

Best Practice Example

Student engagement at a program level may be challenging. As the chair of a department or program, you may want to communicate events, job or internship opportunities, curriculum changes, advising information, or other messaging to declared students. One way you may think about fostering student engagement in this manner is using your learning management system (CANVAS), list serves, or social media. This "low-stakes'' level of engagement allows students to easily assimilate into your program or department at their own pace and fosters relationships online. Here is an example of the Environmental Science and Resource Management (ESRM) Community Page on CANVAS, developed in an attempt to communicate with students declared with a major or minor in the program. The development of this CANVAS page in the fall of 2019 was initiated after fires caused our campus to close in previous semesters and we were unable to reach all of the ESRM students for important department messaging. We also realized that we wanted a place to share programmatic events, curriculum changes, club information, and a variety of other program specific things. Students are queried at the start of each semester to select all those with a declared major or minor in ESRM and added to this "course". From the home page, students can find modules with pages and links to important resources, students and faculty questions on the discussion board, information on advising, clubs, study abroad, recordings of past guest lectures, volunteer opportunities, safety, job opportunities, and more. These pages can easily be updated with important announcements, events, and opportunities and customized to each program to quickly increase engagement with students.

C. Orientation and major events

As Department Chair, you will be in charge of promoting your major/minor at CI's New and Transfer Student Orientations as well as the Majors Fair and any other events of that sort. This is an excellent example of one-to-many student engagement. It is often helpful to recruit additional department faculty as well as current students and/or alumni at these events. Some departments organize their own career fair for students to increase engagement between students and the working community.

D. Awards

As chair, it is your privilege to recommend outstanding students for induction in the various honor societies as well as campus honors. CSUCI bestows honors on high-achieving graduating seniors during its Honors Convocation. To receive honors at graduation, a student must have completed a minimum of 30 units at CI for a letter grade and earn a grade point average of 3.5 or above in all CI and transfer coursework. Graduates may receive honors at one of three levels: Cum Laude for GPAs of 3.50 – 3.74; Magna Cum Laude for GPAs of 3.75 – 3.89; and Summa Cum Laude for GPAs of 3.90 – 4.0. CI also recognizes outstanding students in each major with Program Honors, and acknowledges students with achievements in the areas of community engagement and integrative, multicultural, and international perspectives with Mission Center Awards. There are also many external awards for which students might be nominated – especially through disciplinary networks and associations. Nominating your students for an

award is not only a wonderful way to honor your students, but a great way to promote recognition for your program.

E. Complaints

As chair, you will field a variety of student complaints. Students may disagree with their instructor's viewpoints in class, or believe that they have not been graded fairly on a particular assignment or over the course of an entire semester. A student may complain that the professor has an inflexible policy on make-up examinations or incompletes. Some students may communicate their concerns about a dysfunctional classroom environment, which might entail students feeling "unsafe" to express their opinions, rude or dismissive comments made by other classmates or the faculty member, or a pervasive air of hostility. Whether undergraduate or graduate, students should first be encouraged to speak with the faculty member with whom they disagree. However, it is quite likely that the student has already attempted communication and felt rebuffed or misunderstood, is unwilling to approach the faculty member given that communication is already poor, or is only willing to talk with the faculty member if you are present as a mediator. Disputes of this nature are best dealt with quickly. If you receive a call or a drop-in visit from a student with a concern about a faculty member or a classroom situation, do not put off meeting with that student in the hope that the problem will disappear. By the time the student has garnered the courage to come speak with you, chances are the student is already dismayed and in need of being heard. Failure to listen and act swiftly increases the likelihood that the student will go to the dean or another university office with this complaint. Your perceived reluctance to help foster a negotiated resolution may reflect poorly on your faculty and your ability as a chair to handle these situations "in house." However, students DO have the right to go to the dean and other university administrators if they are not satisfied with the results of your attempted facilitation. When a student makes a complaint you should:

- Keep a meticulous paper trail of dates, concerns, and all specifics that the student relates.
- Suggest that the student speak one-on-one with the faculty member involved, if the student has not already done so. If the student agrees to do this, it is advisable to call the faculty member, inform the faculty member that the student has met with you, and should expect a request for an appointment.
- Speak with both the student and the faculty member after they meet to evaluate if the situation has been appropriately resolved.

If the student wants you to mediate a meeting with the faculty member, set that up within two or three days. Letting time elapse aggravates an already impaired classroom environment and/or faculty/student dynamic.

It is a courtesy to colleagues to inform them of the nature of the student's complaint before the meeting occurs so that the faculty member can collect necessary documents in order to facilitate a productive conversation. It is your goal, as chair, to work towards a negotiated

settlement during this meeting. Leaving an individual faculty member (especially someone at a junior rank) to negotiate these situations alone is a bad idea. Suggest a couple of strategies to your colleague before the meeting to facilitate this negotiated approach. You may find, after speaking to the faculty member, that they are unmovable (for example, refusing to let a student make up a missed examination because of an illness that can be corroborated by a doctor's note), but you do not have the authority to overrule an individual faculty member in the conduct of their course and grading. However, few faculty members are that stubborn. It is the gray areas that you can be of the most assistance by encouraging the student to accept responsibility for his or her deeds (or lack thereof) and the faculty member to be flexible in resolving the situation.

When persuasion fails, you should direct students to the Dean of Students, the next step in the student complaint process. Students also have the right to speak to the dean if they are not satisfied with the resolution of the situation. If complaints about a faculty member are numerous, keep a paper trail. You should always inform your dean about recurring complaints about an individual employee. Do not try to manage difficult, stressful, or potentially dangerous situations by yourself with either students or faculty members. Your dean will advise and assist you in managing these situations. As chair you have countless duties, and demanding and disruptive students or colleagues should not be allowed to impair your ability to function in your position.

If a student comes to you as chair with a complaint of sexual harassment, you **MUST** (you do not, by law, have the choice not to act) report this immediately. Do not make the mistake of "covering" for someone or hoping the student will forget about it and not mention it again. As chair, you will also be required to take a mandatory two-hour online training course on harassment.

F. Disruptive behavior

Faculty will, on rare occasions, have to deal with students they consider disruptive in class. If this happens repeatedly, the faculty member should inform the student that particular actions are considered disruptive, and that future recurrence is grounds to expel the student from the class. But know that faculty members do not have the authority to permanently remove a student from a class. They can, however, remove the student for a specific class period and then report the incident to the Dean of students, campus police, if appropriate, and to you. Campus police will follow-up with the student and initiate contact with the Dean of Students who will assess the advisability of permanent removal from the faculty member's course. It is important to remember that the standards of disruption, as defined by Title V, must be met before the university is able to enforce removal of a student. If the student's continued presence in the classroom is highly disruptive, the Dean of Students will take appropriate action that may include removing the student from the faculty member's course. If you feel there is a possibility of danger to the faculty member from a particular student, urge the faculty member to file a police report with Campus Police. Watch for danger signs such as invasive or

inappropriate email, notes, or comments from the student, sexually suggestive or threatening remarks, and a pattern of disruptive or upsetting classroom behavior. This is unnerving to faculty, and in some cases, to other students – they will need your support and guidance when situations like this occur. In the event that a student is exhibiting odd, but not disciplinary-related, behavior, the appropriate referral might be to the Student Health and Counseling Center. It is usually more effective to accompany the student there than to leave it to his or her discretion.

G. Academic/grade grievances

If a student's faculty-related concern is in regard to a grade, your first step will be to inform the student of her/his right to pursue the formal Academic Grievance and Grade Appeal process. Before the student proceeds down that path, though, ask whether they have already discussed the situation with the faculty member. If they haven't, urge the student to do so before engaging in the formal process. If the student has done so, you should document your meeting, then contact the faculty member to ascertain their position. If you are unable to lead the faculty member toward a resolution of the issue, the next step would be to arrange a meeting of the two, with yourself as mediator. If the student and faculty member remain at an impasse, then you should recommend that the student engage in the formal process. The situation will be assigned to your college's Dean, but you will remain involved.

H. Student rights and responsibilities

As Department Chair, you should be aware of the CSU student rights and responsibilities. The California State University is regulated by the California Code of Regulations. On this campus, there are two main sources for information on regulations that govern student behavior: The Student Code of Conduct and the CSUCI Catalog which has a section on University Policies that includes some of what is found in the Student Code of conduct as well as additional information on grades, course credit, student records, graduation, etc. Students are responsible for knowing the content of the catalogs, and abiding by the policies and regulations contained within.

It should be noted that the Chancellor's Office has issued an Executive Order that mandates reporting of all cases of academic dishonesty (cheating and plagiarism) to a central location. Student Affairs has prepared a form for faculty to use (linked below), and will maintain a database that can track students who have multiple infractions across departments and colleges. Remind your faculty that while individual professors are responsible for determining academic sanctions, they will also be expected to report incidents and make recommendations on further investigation and additional judicial sanctions to Student Affairs.

I. Violations of the Students Code of Conduct

The PeopleSoft database tracks students who have multiple infractions across departments and schools. Remind your faculty that while individual professors are responsible for determining academic sanctions, they are also expected to report incidents and make recommendations on

further disciplinary sanctions if so inclined. If the report/review requires a department hearing, the department chair will need to document details about the department hearing on the electronic form submitted by the faculty member.

Students are responsible for knowing the content of the General Catalog and abiding by the policies and regulations contained within. As chair, you should help your faculty, especially your newest members; understand their options when faced with student misconduct or student complaints. You may also on occasion need to address unjustified behavior on the part of a faculty or staff member toward a student. You may need to mediate between irate or unhappy students and faculty. Familiarize yourself with the university's policies and relevant campus resources and authorities when faced with these situations. Always inform and consult with your dean who will help direct you to the appropriate campus authority and/or resource.

Report violations of the student code of conduct HERE including academic dishonesty, non-academic-related dishonesty, incident of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation, or reporting a student of concern to the CARE team.

J. Advising

Student advising is a key way to increase student engagement in a one-on-one format. There are two sources of advising and students should be informed of and encouraged to take advantage of each. Students who need assistance or clarification regarding graduation requirements, general education requirements, or university policies and procedures should visit the Advising Center. Questions particular to major requirements, career prospects for the major, and graduate educational opportunities are directed to the Faculty Advisor in the respective department.

University Advising Center: The University Academic Advising Center is the centralized academic advising home for all undergraduate undeclared, exploratory students, and students in transition between majors. It assists students with major exploration, college transitions, academic recovery and success, student academic petitions and appeals, general education, and four-year graduation plans. At CI, each major is assigned to a university academic advisor to ensure continuity between major and university advising.

The mission of academic advising is "to promote student success by empowering undergraduate students to take responsibility for achieving their academic goals. The Advising Center delivers high quality advising services by providing accurate and timely academic resources, materials, and information to the campus community." The CSU has identified Advising as being critical to achieving the goals outlined in the Graduation 2025 initiative by:

- increasing the average unit load of all students
- preventing students from taking unnecessary courses
- increasing 2-year graduation rates for transfers and 4-year graduation rates for first-years
- increasing enrollment in summer courses

- increasing first year retention for first years and transfers

Department Specific Advising: Department faculty advisor(s) are department faculty who provide degree specific advising. Departments at CSUCI handle advising in a variety of ways. Some departments distribute advising duties to each of its faculty members while others entrust advising duties to a single faculty member. Occasionally, the chair may also serve as the student advisor. It is important to understand how advising is distributed in your program when you become chair. Advising can be extremely time-consuming when done well. Faculty advisors are often provisioned some amount of reassign time per academic year. Be sure you are aware of advising reassign time policies in your program to ensure the units are allocated properly in faculty workloads when creating the course schedule.

The faculty advisor is the main point of contact for students with program questions and concerns. The advisor is tasked to ensure students understand program requirements, course sequencing, pre-requisites, and minimum grade requirements. They may facilitate transfer credit from other institutions, including Study Abroad coursework, used to meet program requirements and facilitate course substitutions. Major course substitutions and other advisor requests are done through CI Records (Peoplesoft available through your myCI dashboard). The faculty advisor maintains programmatic roadmaps and ensures the information on the campus website is correct for current and new students. They may also have the opportunity to assist students with exploring career and/or graduate school options as well as internship and research opportunities.

In addition to Academic Advising, the Faculty Advisor, will be the main point of contact to discuss students of concern with other faculty in the program in regards to their performance in major/minor courses. They may need to reach out to students to schedule advising appointments and collaborate with Academic Advising when needed to discuss students with academic difficulties (e.g. students on probation).

As the faculty advisor, it is important to become familiar with students' CI Advising Requirement Report (CARR)- accessible through CI Records at myCI. The CARR is an electronic report that outlines General Education, Graduation, Major and Minor requirements for students. Use the CARR to prepare for advising appointments to ensure students are on track to meet their graduation requirements. When reviewing the CARR, it is important to keep in mind the catalog year and degree requirements needed at the time the student declared their major. Students should be aware of the catalog year they started at CI and/or declared their major. This is particularly important for programs that have undergone changes in the last several years. To view the requirements for different catalog years, use the dropdown menu in the upper right corner of the online **University Catalog** and select the year applicable to the student. Four-year roadmaps for each major are available HERE. Two-year (Transfer Student) roadmaps are available HERE.

Course substitutions and articulations are done by the faculty advisor upon approval of the chair through CI Records. It is helpful to use the website Assist.org to check for classes already approved for articulation. If the substitution is not already approved, the chair may ask for the syllabus from the external class to ensure the learning objectives are consistent with the original requirement. It is often helpful to discuss the proposed substitution with a faculty member that teaches the class to ensure there is a satisfactory articulation between courses. This applies for courses taken domestically as well as those taken as part of a Study Abroad program.

It is recommended that the faculty advisor, as well as the department chair, hold weekly office hours for advising students. These can be arranged by appointment using CANVAS's Calendar or by external applications like Calendly.com

For more information on advising you may ask to be added to the Advising Canvas Course. Here are a few important links found in this course:

1. Campus Strategic Initiatives: CSUCI has campus-wide strategic initiatives. Academic advising plays an important role in helping to meet those initiatives.
2. Each department is assigned to a specific university advisor. An academic advisor resource list may be HERE.
3. The Academic Policies and Procedures Module includes information on Academic Probation, Disqualification, and Reinstatement, Adding Classes, Repeating Classes, Unit Load Limits, Withdrawals from Courses, and FERPA information.
4. The Petitions and Forms Module has links for the following forms: Additional Unit Authorization, Change of Major/Minor/Emphasis/Certificate, Drop Form, GE/Graduation Substitution, Major/Minor Course Substitutions, Petitions for Exception, Applying to Graduate, and Term Withdrawal.

K. Student clubs and organizations

When you assume the responsibilities of chair your department may already have (an) intact student organization(s). A student-run organization can help you contact your students should you need attendance at an upcoming event, feedback on a departmental issue, volunteers to meet with donors or community members, or contributors to a special department initiative. Leaders of a student organization can also serve as excellent recruiters for majors. If your department awards scholarships, having a working knowledge of your majors and minors can help you identify the students so that they are more than "just a name" on an application. Students who take an active role in the life of their department are more likely to stay in touch once they graduate and become supporters and donors themselves.

Students benefit greatly from student organizations. They foster a community of peers and networks among your majors and minors. This is crucial to helping students negotiate department and university bureaucracies. A departmental group helps students develop leadership skills, hone organizational abilities, and define their career goals more clearly. They provide formal and informal peer mentoring for incoming students, and a learning opportunity for specific skills needed for success in the classroom and beyond. Students may use these groups to organize panels of their own research for presentation at local and national conferences. This is particularly the case among graduate students, but many departments encourage undergraduates as well. In many cases, department-related student organizations can receive funding through the Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) to support scholarly and creative activities for students.

Department-related student organizations can elect officers and apply for on campus status as a recognized student organization. Registering as a recognized student organization entitles them to submit funding proposals to ASI for a budget with the ability to plan events and invite speakers. Your recognized student organization can co-sponsor activities offered by your department by contributing time, talent, and in some cases funding. Conversely, you are encouraged to co-sponsor their events as well.

Please note: Clubs and organizations should not be used as sponsors of events that are in fact being organized and presented by your department. It is important to understand that funding awarded to a student organization is entirely supported through student fees.

To start and/or nurture an ongoing student organization, take the “pulse” of your students. Do they have an established group? If yes, ask if they have applied for and received official recognition as an approved student organization. Student organizations must apply for on campus recognition status.

Faculty serve as student organization advisors. It is important that a faculty member who agrees to serve as a student organization advisor be genuinely interested in working with students, and is not someone who merely serves as a figurehead. Faculty advisors for a departmental student organization should be recognized for their department service. It may be helpful to ask the faculty advisor to briefly report on the student organization’s activities at a department meeting so all your faculty understand the value of this service as another means of fostering student community and engagement in your discipline. Encourage the faculty advisor to schedule an informal social event during the academic year for faculty to interact with club members outside of the classroom. Events like these make lasting impressions on students when faculty show a genuine interest in their efforts and concerns.

Currently CI has more than 80 Student Organizations and Clubs.

Ch. 6: Identifying and Accessing Resources and Opportunities for Students

The University offers a number of crucial student and faculty services through various support programs and offices. Such programs and services can make a tremendous difference in the experience and trajectory of students. They can make the difference between a struggling student who gets demoralized and gives up, or who gets the additional support that will give them the skills that they need to meet challenges and become stronger and more confident academically. They can make the difference for a student facing challenges in their personal lives (their economic security or mental health, for example) – whether they are able to persevere through the challenges or feel compelled to give up their dream of a college degree to focus on those challenges. They can make the difference for a student who is eager to dive further into their education – say, by conducting their own research – which may set them on a completely different trajectory for their education, their career, and their lives. And the programs can make all of the difference for faculty who are doing their best to support their students (or even in some cases themselves) when they face issues that go far beyond the classroom and far beyond their own expertise. All of the programs are critical ways that CSU Channel Islands promotes and supports student success in the fullest sense of the term.

As a chair, it is important to be familiar with these programs in order to most effectively connect students and faculty to the support that they need, and opportunities that may benefit from. Faculty are in a unique position of high contact with students, able to identify student needs and recommend appropriate University services, and the chair can play an instrumental role in making faculty aware of the services that are available (either for their students or for themselves) and how to access them. That is particularly important for new faculty who are unfamiliar with University programs and services, but faculty can spend many years on campus and still be unaware of critical programs and how to access them. Consequently, a chair who is familiar with the can make a big difference in a department.

All of the services and offices addressed here welcome the opportunity to talk to faculty individually, and it is recommended that department leaders invite representatives to attend department meetings where they can distribute accurate information and take questions. Chairs should encourage faculty to include information about critical services in their syllabi, to include the information about offices and services in their Canvas/CILearn course modules, to periodically remind students about these services, to include links in their email signatures, and to physically lead students in critical need to necessary services. Staff and faculty from each of these offices encourage faculty to contact them directly for more information on how they can be of service.

In this chapter, we present programs across three different areas: Academic support services, Crisis and non-academic support services, and Opportunities for academic enrichment. While some will be ore helpful to some students than others, nearly all are resources for all of our students at one time or another. As a chair, it is critical to be familiar with these services. As noted above, they are critical to student academic success, to retention, and in some cases to their health and welfare. Familiarity with the range of programs gives chairs the best

opportunity to access them for students as appropriate, or to direct them in the proper direction, or to assist faculty by letting them know when they can most use the programs. . . .

Here, we try to give chairs (and others) a sense of the major services offered on campus for students, what they provide, and how to access them. As you'll see, there are many links to follow up for additional information in each case – but just getting a general familiarity with what is available is the most important initial step for a chair to serve their department in this area.

A. Academic Support Services

Academics are the primary reason students are at CSUCI, and academic support services are central to student retention and completion success. It is important to remember that success requires a range of skills and understandings that must be acquired by students at some point. To the extent that we want to truly serve our students – many of whom are first-gen students who are unfamiliar with high education, or transfer students navigating upper division coursework without having cultivated the skills that may be common for our native students, or Latinx students who may feel uncomfortable approaching some faculty and asking for help – academic support services play a critical role. Faculty have the most contact with students and the most opportunity to encourage them to use the resources available that are focused on helping them reach their academic potential. Chairs should arrange for their faculty to hear from each of these critical services, and encourage their faculty to advertise these services to students early and often in syllabi, in their Canvas/CILearn course modules, and via announcement. Staff and faculty from each of these services are ready and available to work directly with faculty for course-specific needs.

1. John Spoor Broome Library

The Library is the heart of campus and a hub of student activity, serving as a space for individual study, for group work, for socializing, as well as for a variety of academic events. The Library also delivers some of the most easily available and commonly utilized academic support services on campus which are available daily directly from faculty librarians – as well as hosting two of our campus centers that offer critical and specialized academic support services (the Library, Writing & Multiliteracy Center (WMC), and the Learning Resource Center (LRC) – both collocated in the building – and described in more detail below). Chairs should encourage faculty to become familiar with the range of services offered in the Library, particularly in the beginning of the semester, a time that proves critical in terms of student success for the rest of the semester.

The John Spoor Broome Library enhances the CSUCI mission of interdisciplinary, international, multicultural, and service learning through active collaboration with students, faculty, and staff to plan, implement, promote, and access the use of collections and services and support student learning via its robust information literacy program. Faculty librarians collaborate with faculty in all disciplines to provide information literacy sessions, resource- and subject-specific

research instruction, reference and research service, and instruction on digital equipment. Library staff offer a course reserves service for physical materials in the building, as well as scanning or linking Library materials into a faculty member's Canvas course.

For students, the Library offers a vast array of services, including borrowing traditional library materials as well as laptops, cameras, and other technology necessary for their assignments; reservable study rooms; research appointments with librarians; access to computers with specialized software; and an interlibrary loan service to acquire needed resources not held by the Broome Library.

2. Writing & Multiliteracy Center (WMC)

Writing and other forms of communication form the basis of student assignments, and student success is largely dependent on these skills. For that reason, student support in the area of writing is a critical component to student success. Chairs can recommend that faculty include Writing and Multiliteracy Center (WMC) information in their syllabi, require certified visits to the WMC to review their papers and receive constructive critique on oral and video presentations, and ask that WMC tutors work with students, and work directly with the WMC to arrange for critical communication workshops for students. Faculty can contact the WMC directly, and encourage students to take advantage of appointments as well as drop-in opportunities.

The Writing and Multiliteracy Center (WMC) supports all members of the CSUCI community with free academic or personal writing support at any stage of the composing process. WMC peer writing consultants and multiliteracy specialists assist students with a range of topics related to thinking, writing, and oral communication including: reviewing and understanding prompts; brainstorming and applying creative strategies; developing a strong thesis or research question (for research writing, oral presentations); improving the delivery of oral presentations; strategically organizing essays or oral presentations; documenting and integrating relevant evidence, revising papers or rehearsing practices; getting over writer's block, writing and oral anxiety; and helping with citation styles.

The WMC helps students working on any writing in any discipline: from freshman composition essays to senior capstone projects. Students are also welcome to bring in other types of non-academic written work, such as résumés, letters of application, and personal statements for fellowships or graduate school applications. Our team includes the Faculty Director, Assistant Director, and Multiliteracy Specialists (all CSUCI faculty). The WMC supports faculty across disciplines through writing and multiliteracy consultations, workshops, and feedback on course material such as syllabi, assignments, and rubrics. Learn more about how they can help faculty.

3. Learning Resource Center (LRC) & Tutoring Services

Tutoring is a service provided by the University to assist students with academic success. For faculty, it is imperative to drive students to resources that will help them to access and cultivate

the skills that lead to high performance in their assignments. Faculty can coordinate assignments with the tutoring center, require tutoring and a confirmation document that tutoring was attended, recommend tutoring in their syllabi, and recommend students successful in their classes to the LRC to become paid tutors.

The Learning Resource Center, located on the second floor of the John Spoor Broome Library, offers free one-on-one peer tutoring in many academic subjects, including but not limited to Math, Chemistry, Biology, Physics, Computer Science, Business, Psychology, Statistics, Sociology, and Nursing. Tutors help students with study skills, concept mastery, comprehension, homework, test preparation, and much more. Tutors at the LRC work to foster independent learning skills and to promote a community of supportive scholarship. If faculty would like to encourage students to visit the LRC for class credit, there is a verification form and a stamp the student can request from their tutor that verifies the student's visit to the LRC. The LRC tutors will sign a verification form only after working directly with a student. The LRC also offers exam proctoring.

Separate from the other peer mentoring programs on campus, the LRC offers an extensive Embedded Peer Tutoring (EPT) program. Faculty may request an EPT to support their virtual and/or in-person course sections by contacting the LRC Coordinator at 805-437-8921. EPTs attend all synchronous lectures with enrolled students and support student engagement and learning in a variety of ways. Asynchronous instruction is also enhanced with an EPT, who may be utilized to engage with Canvas course activities and other asynchronous elements. EPTs host weekly drop-in support hours for enrolled students, in addition to tutoring broadly in their content area. Consult Faculty Resources for additional information on any LRC services.

4. Disability Accommodations and Support Services (DASS)

Related to faculty, the DASS office reaches out to faculty to communicate required and requested accommodations for students. Students requesting accommodations should be directed to DASS who will communicate approved accommodations. Such accommodations may include a student having extra time to complete assignments, note-takers in class, recording of class lectures, and more. As chair, you may be asked to work with DASS and your faculty should any issues arise. Chairs should familiarize themselves with rights and responsibilities concomitant with DASS accommodations.

DASS supports students in a number of ways, including student appointments, academic and housing accommodations, support programs, and various additional student resources. Encourage your faculty to include the following statements in their syllabi:

> "If you are a student with a disability requesting reasonable accommodations in this course, please visit Disability Accommodations and Support Services (DASS) located on the second floor of Arroyo Hall, or call 805-437-3331. All requests for reasonable accommodations require registration with DASS in advance of need. You can apply for DASS services online. Faculty, students and DASS will work together regarding classroom

accommodations. You are encouraged to discuss approved accommodations with your faculty."

For faculty who have course attendance policies, encourage them to use the following statement in their syllabi:

> "For extenuating circumstances related to a medical condition or disability for which you may require reasonable accommodation, please refer to the Disability Statement."

B. Crisis and Non-Academic Support Services

Many of our students find themselves impacted by situations and influences that go far beyond any narrowly academic challenges – but which have critical implications for their ability to continue with their classes and make progress toward graduation. Indeed, in many instances, issues come up with our students that make the academic side of their lives the least of their concerns – issues associated their own health (mental and physical) and that of family members, issues associated with economic precarity that can lead to food insecurity or homelessness, or events that come up that impact them negatively (such as the Borderline shooting, or periodic evacuations or threats from wildfires, etc.). There are a lot of reasons students might find themselves in distress, and faculty can play a vital role in helping students to get the help that they need to bridge those episodes and continue to pursue their academic dreams. Faculty expressions of interest, concern, and compassion – and direction to the programs which can help them – is an important factor to provide support and intervention toward students obtaining the assistance they need. Likewise, a chair has an important role to play in ensuring that their faculty (and themselves) are aware of those services and how to access them. Here, we provide basic information on several providers of crisis services on campus: the Campus, Access, Retention, & Equity (CARE) Team; Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS); and our Basic Needs Program.

1. Campus Access, Retention, & Equity (CARE) Team and Reporting

It can be difficult to decide what to do about and for students in crisis, or students who give you cause to worry via their behaviors, their appearance, or their absence. Rather than navigate these difficulties by yourself as chair, report concerns about individual students to the CARE team to get students immediate assistance. The CARE team is formulated both for fast response and provision of multiple services and interventions, and depends on faculty to report concerns early and as often as necessary.

The **Campus Access, Retention & Equity (CARE) Team** is a multidisciplinary partnership which consists of CSU Channel Islands (CSUCI) faculty, staff and administrators that evaluate and assess distressing or concerning behaviors exhibited by students. The CARE Team coordinates and develops a centralized response to provide assistance and intervention for students of concern and evaluates and monitors the ongoing related issue(s). You can report, and

encourage your faculty to report, concerns via the online form. For immediate help, faculty and staff should call the CSI Channel Islands Police Department at 911.

2. Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)

Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) provides short-term mental health services in a confidential setting to assist students in achieving their academic and personal pursuits. Chairs should encourage faculty to know what services are available through this office, and to recommend them to students accordingly. CAPS provides a wide range of services to assist the campus community including:

- Individual counseling
- Group counseling
- Couples counseling
- Psychiatric consultation
- Crisis intervention
- 24/7 phone counseling
- Consultation with faculty, staff, and loved ones
- Outreach
- Relaxation Room - currently closed due to COVID-19
- Psychoeducational resources

Student mental health is a priority, and a necessary foundation for healthy functioning and learning. Connecting students with CAPS services can be critical, and there are a number of ways to lead students to the CAPS services: a call to the CAPS office, directing students to the 24-hour help line, walking students in crisis to the CAPS office are all options, and encouraging faculty to include CAPS services and contact information in their syllabi are all options.

3. Basic Needs Program

Many of our students come from low-income and otherwise economically precarious backgrounds. (That is simply the reality of a University that prides itself particularly on our ability to contribute to students' economic mobility.) As a result, many of our students have periodic or chronic experiences with food insecurity, housing insecurity, and difficulty meeting other basic needs. The **Basic Needs Program** exists to provide support to students experiencing a basic necessity insecurity. The strategy focuses on short-term mediation while they work with students to find long-term solutions. The program assists students with finding food, housing, and financial assistance; the Dolphin Pantry is one of the major services the program provides for food insecure students. The chair can help to make faculty aware of those services, and encourage faculty to refer students to apply for assistance.

C. Academic Enrichment Opportunities

The fundamental goal of academic and non-academic support is to help our students to successfully meet the challenges that they confront and ultimately persist to achieve their degree. But we also want students to do more than survive – we want them to thrive. And part of thriving is making opportunities available that go beyond what they might get in the basic coursework (as critical as that is). We want to offer opportunities that go beyond basic academic expectations and offer students a chance to invest more into their education to harvest more from it. A number of University offices and programs offer those opportunities to students, and chairs can really support that goal by making those opportunities known to students and faculty throughout their program. Staff from these areas are happy to meet and/or partner with your department to reach students. Chairs should contact these offices to give presentations at faculty meetings, and encourage faculty to be aware of the opportunities.

1. The Island Website

The Division of Student Affairs created the Island website as a place for the CI community to stay connected and engaged virtually. This site is a "one-stop shop" where you can find all of the virtual programming and support services in one place. Content and messaging are updated regularly. The purpose of the Island website is to support students and increase engagement in CSUCI's virtual spaces. Chairs should encourage faculty sponsoring events to advertise them on *The Island* to encourage greater student attendance.

The Island Website includes links to:

- Current events related to the school
- Opportunities for student engagement
- Academic support
- Health and wellness opportunities
- Links to virtual ceremonies
- Links to social media outlets
- Racial healing and educational resources
- Student union events
- Basic needs resources
- Virtual ceremonies

2. Student Research and the Student Research Advisory Committee (SRAC)

CSU Channel Islands is committed to student-centered, High-Impact teaching Practices (HIPs). Faculty-mentored student research and creative activities ("student research" for short) at CSUCI provides students an opportunity to employ skills and concepts gained in the classroom in activities that promote creativity, synthetic thinking, and discovery. The Student Research Advisory Committee (SRAC) guides the development of Student Research on campus. The SRAC

supports the student-centered and interdisciplinary mission of the University by facilitating opportunities for students to engage in faculty-mentored research and creative activities within and across academic disciplines.

Student Research at CSUCI does not *only* benefit students. Student research is promoted as part of a fundamental commitment to the teacher-scholar model of faculty development. Engaging students in faculty-driven research projects promotes faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity. Students and faculty both benefit from working with faculty-mentors to gain skills, apply classroom knowledge, and engage in professional development. Chairs can make faculty aware of the benefits to themselves of engaging in student research.

Student Research provides opportunities such as a **Faculty-Student Research Grant Program**, support to attend and present at the **CSU Student Research Competition**, **Southern California Conference on Undergraduate Research (SCCUR)**, and/or a regional disciplinary conference, or to participate in the **Summer Undergraduate Research Fellows (SURF) program**, and more. See the website for additional information for faculty.

3. Learning Communities

First Year students have a variety of options to live the CSUCI Mission through academic success and integration into the life of the University, both inside and outside of the classroom. Participating in these communities is shown to improve student learning, persistence to the second year, time to graduation and stronger relationships with peers and faculty[1]. Open to all majors and interests, there are ethnic-studies communities, communities for undeclared students, and communities for those headed for teaching and health care careers or interested in community-based research. The goal is student success.

There is no additional cost to participate in these communities. Participation in some requires an application, and placement in Learning Communities is on a first-come, first-served basis in a co-requisite block of classes. In Learning Communities (LCs), students share a common intellectual experience through taking a common set of courses. In Living-Learning Communities (LLCs), students share a common intellectual and residential experience with an academic focus. Living-Learning Communities (LLCs) offer an opportunity to be pre-registered in a block of high-demand courses before the Orientation registration process begins, as well as a guaranteed seat in at least one course for the Spring. Students placed in Communities ahead of Orientation will be informed of their placement, and pre-registered in the block of classes by the Registrar. If there is still space at Orientation, students can add linked Community courses when registering for the rest of their classes. Students who register in LC and LLC courses should make note of the whole year's course lineup, and be sure to not register in the Fall for a course that they will take (or GE area for which they will credit) in the Spring. In the Fall, designated sections of two General Education courses are paired to promote student success

[1] Andrade, M. S. (2007). Learning communities: Examining positive outcomes. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, & Practice, 9*(1), 1-20.

and align with a CI Mission Pillar. Students take one or two classes together in the Spring. Most students are housed with other students in their Living-Learning Community.

4. Career Development & Alumni Engagement

Career Development and Alumni Engagement offers resources related to job searches, resume writing and improvement, exploring majors and careers, career counseling, promoting and hosting career and internship fairs, offering workshops, and providing graduate and professional school resources. Faculty can request a presentation or workshop for their classes. Students interested in internships and career positions can search available positions via Dolphin CareerLink, CSUCI's online recruitment portal, through their myCI student portal.

Ch. 7: Search and Hiring Processes

Faculty hiring is among the most important and impactful decisions for our institution. Faculty are at the center of everything that we do, and choosing colleagues who embrace our institutional mission – and who have the desire and skills to make significant contributions to it – is critical to our ability to best serve our students. On a local level, each faculty member hired into the department/program helps to shape its intellectual life and culture for years to come.

Chairs have a critical role to play in search and hiring decisions – whether that role is formal (on the search committee) or informal (as department leader not on the search committee), and whether the hires are tenure track (TT) faculty or non-tenure track (NTT, or lecturer) faculty. Indeed, the Chair's role and responsibilities as it concerns adding colleagues into a department or program is one of the most impactful duties that a chair has.

The focus of this chapter is the important contribution that the Chair makes to search and hiring. For TT faculty, CSUCI is currently completing an exhaustive policy and handbook to guide the search and hiring processes, with a particular focus on increasing faculty diversity and ensuring equity in hiring. Those materials go much into much greater depth about the processes generally – and the responsibilities of the Chair in particular – than we can here. It is strongly recommended that Chairs familiarize themselves with that policy and handbook.

A. Tenure track search and hiring processes

TT faculty hires are led at CSUCI by Disciplinary Search Committees (DSCs), which carry out the roles of cultivating a wide and diverse pool of applicants, selecting applicants for initial online interviews, selecting the (generally) three candidates to bring for a more extensive campus interview (in which they should seek to include the greatest participation of interested parties – primarily students and faculty), and make recommendations to the administration about hires (through the Dean). Most often, Chairs will be on departmental search committees (and often chairing the search committee), in which case Chairs play a very direct role in the search and hiring. But even when they are not on the search committee, they have an important role to play in presenting a welcoming prospective home to visiting faculty and in communicating about specific departmental needs related to the position.

The tenure-track search process follows the Policy on the Recruitment and Appointment of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty, and the Faculty Hiring Handbook maintained by Faculty Affairs. Generally, the goal in hiring is to identify and recruit the best faculty for the university's academic programs. This superlative reflects qualities of teaching excellence; potential in research, scholarship, or creative activity, area of specialization; and the candidate's ability to serve the university's diversity, equity, and inclusion needs relative to the institution's goals.

One of the emphases in the current (emerging) policy and handbook on faculty search and hiring is the importance of understanding successful hiring as an extended process – one that begins long before the search is initiated, and one that continues long after the search

concludes. On the front end, academic departments/programs must maintain a regularly-updated list of needed tenure-track faculty needs, regarding specialization for example, which are given to Deans to include in hiring planning. The policy outlines the long-term contexts, a two-year hiring timeline; the need for departments/programs to submit hiring and retention plans ahead of approved searches focused on inclusive and equitable processes; and the screening, selection, appointment, and onboarding processes. Because the long-term hiring plan is developed prior to or outside of any specific DSC, the Chair has to play the lead role in organizing discussions about departmental needs and linking those needs to a long-term vision for the program. Those conversations are critical to equitable and successful hiring (here, success being measured by the hiring of a faculty member who is willing and able to make contributions to the departmental in all three areas of responsibility – teaching, service, and research) – so the Chair's role is essential in helping to build a foundation for a search and hire long before it ever officially begins.

Our new policies and practices on campus also link searches to a retention plan that map out actions far beyond the conclusion of the search, and which is also essential for a successful hire (in the extended sense). Essentially, a retention plan requires that departments work collectively in an intentional manner to identify what faculty will need in terms of support and assistance to realize their potential in the program – both in terms of making significant contributions and in terms of experiencing a satisfying and fulfilling career. Again, the Chair plays in important role in leading the department to think through what a retention plan should include, and then in making sure that it is enacted – most particularly during the probationary years when it is most needed.

To summarize, the Chair is likely to play a central role in the search itself, and should be aware of best practices throughout the search. But successful hiring begins long before the search, and continues long after it, and the Chair has a particularly important role to play in leading departmental faculty in carrying out those tasks (embodied in the hiring plan and the retention plan).

B. Non-tenure track faculty (Lecturer) search and hiring processes

At CSUCI (and increasingly across higher education generally) Non-Tenure Track faculty play a critical role in teaching students, and simply have a lot more contact with our students than Tenure Track Faculty. Most, if not all, departments or schools rely on full-time and/or part-time lecturers (temporary faculty members), to cover some of their classes, particularly lower-division introductory courses. On a very basic level, that means that on a collective level, NTT faculty hiring is every bit as important to the core mission of serving our students as is TT faculty hiring. In addition, the CSU system grants significant protections and entitlements to NTT faculty (as fundamental fairness demands), which means that selecting faculty who can really serve our students is absolutely critical to a well-functioning department. Departmental dynamics depend on faculty who have commitments to our institutional mission as well as the same general goals for disciplinary teaching. NTT faculty search and hiring tends to be significantly less structured and regulated than for TT hiring (and often, to our collective

detriment, overlooked) – and in part because of decreased regulation, it is generally (though not always) a task that the Chair completes individually. These are all reasons for chairs to strive to take care in the hiring of lecturer colleagues, and that represents another critical role for Chairs in building a strong department. Because our university policies and procedures focus primarily on detailing best practices for hiring tenure track faculty, we will spend more time here on parallel practices for NTT search and hiring.

The fundamental guiding principles for the hiring of NTT faculty is that all applicants, candidates, and finalists should be treated equitably and with respect. That is particularly important since the culture of higher education generally addresses NTT faculty with a deficit of the forms of respect and support common to TT faculty and which are essential to their own careers and their ability to best serve our students.

When one considers the hiring of NTT faculty, it is important to keep in mind that hiring lecturers for specific classes often (and in some departments, mostly) does *not* require bringing a new colleague into the department. Given the order of assignments enumerated in our Collective Bargaining Agreements, lecturers already teaching in the department should generally be offered the class (assuming they are not already teaching full-time, that they are performing satisfactorily in the classroom, and that they have sufficient expertise in the content covered in the class). Appointment of new lecturer faculty is governed by the CBA, so lecturer recommendations requires also submitting a Certification of Compliance with CBA 12. Before hiring new lecturers, each existing lecturer should receive "careful consideration" for work they are qualified to perform and available work should be offered to them up to their time base. If there is one section of the CBA that chairs should study, it is Article 12, especially 12.3, 12.5, 12.6, 12.7, 12.12, 12.13, and 12.2. Provision 12.7 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement requires you to maintain a list of all lecturers who have been evaluated by the department, including the courses they have taught. That situation benefits faculty (allowing them additional employment, if they desire), students (since having faculty teaching multiple classes allows students to develop deeper rapport with them), and the Chair (since it allows them to hire someone they know to be a good teacher and not spend the significant time necessary to bring in a new colleague who may or may not work well with our students). To learn more about orders of assignment, you can refer to chapter 9 on Budgeting and Scheduling.

Assuming that there are no lecturers available and/or qualified to teach a class which needs to be filled, Chairs must engage in the search process to identify and hire a *new* TTF faculty member. The reality of NTT faculty hiring is that it is often conducted under conditions that are far less than ideal for generating a strong pool and identifying the best candidate to hire. Sometimes, a class opens up right before the semester starts (or, worse yet, once the semester has already begun). When those situations arise, it is extremely useful to have a lecturer pool open and available. Maintaining a refreshed pool of competent lecturers will help you respond to shifting scheduling dynamics that arise for a variety of reasons (unexpected retirements or resignations, course buyouts, curriculum changes, etc.).

The lecturer pool exists online and can be set up in a general way (that, for example, allows it to be kept open for emergency hires) or in a way that elicits applicants for a specific position. The University uses an electronic system to post lecturer faculty job advertisements and to manage the pool. The Office of Faculty Affairs manages the system, http://www.csucifacultyjobs.com/hr. They set up guest passwords for the Chair and/or a hiring committee to review application materials. It is important to remember that opening a lecturer pool requires a formal application process and the approval of the Dean, with which Faculty Affairs can assist. It is also important to remember that in most cases (generally, outside of emergency hires), a pool must be open for two weeks before the Chair (or others) can begin to review candidates. So it is important to keep timing in mind in order to ensure classes are filled in a timely fashion.

The search process for NTT faculty generally happens in a very different way than in the case of TT faculty, for a variety of reasons. First, the pools will inevitably be much smaller, largely because they tend to be extremely local. That is the case for the obvious reason that few people are willing to relocate from outside of the area to teach one or two classes. While that is a constraint that will limit the pool, it is important to recognize that there are still ways to increase the pool and ensure that there are good candidates to choose from. For example, graduate students finishing up their dissertation are often quite interested in picking up a class or two – both to earn needed income and to get valuable experience for the job market. Reaching out to local graduate programs (like UC Santa Barbara, in our case) and asking them to distribute a job advertisement among their students can produce good outcomes. Likewise, colleagues at local community colleges may be interested in teaching another class or two – especially if those courses are lower division (and which they may already be teaching). All of that is true regardless of whether we are talking about keeping a general lecturer pool open, or creating a new one for a specific position.

When it is necessary to create a pool or to solicit new applicants for an existing pool, it is important for the Chair to make materials available for distribution that will inform (and, hopefully, excite) potential candidates about working in the department. For example, having a clear departmental mission statement that emphasizes the specific pedagogical priorities of the program, and which informs candidates about our students – and our commitment to serving them, among other information – can help not only to expand the pool of candidates, but helps to ensure that those candidates are clear about expectations should they ultimately be hired.

The tasks associated with searching for and hiring NTT faculty is generally done by the Chair. But in some instances, a program may create a hiring committee for that purpose. That does not change the fundamental process, but it does spread out the workload and allows more time for cultivating the pool and then identifying the best candidate(s) from among that pool.

Once a candidate is selected, the hiring process is much simpler (understandably) than is the case for TT faculty. An initial appointment can be for one term or more but should comply with the Order of Assignment in CBA Article 12.29. To make a lecturer appointment, the chair submits their recommendation to the Dean and Faculty Affairs on the Lecturer

Recommendation Form. The Faculty Affairs office can give guidance on what range and salary to recommend for new faculty appointments, depending on level of degree and relevant experience. Once a part-time lecturer has taught two (2) consecutive semesters within one academic year and the Chair decides to re-appoint the part-time lecturer, the starting time base assumption is to be re-appointed to a similar assignment. This means that if the Chair rehires a lecturer who taught 12 units in the prior year, the lecturer should be appointed to teach 12 units. However, this assumption is subject to the lecturer's qualifications, the campus budget, and class enrollment. Thus, if due to budget and enrollment, 12 units are no longer available and the Chair still wants to reappoint the lecturer, the Chair may appoint the lecturer to any number of units for which the lecturer is qualified to teach. These units can be distributed in any manner across the academic year. Keep in mind, that AY lecturers lose their benefits if they fall below .40 in any semester, so, whenever possible, distribute their work equitably and compassionately. Lecturers holding three-year appointments have the expectation of receiving subsequent appointments except in cases of documented needs improvement or unsatisfactory performance or serious conduct problems. The time base of the subsequent appointment follows the same process as outlined above. If you do not have sufficient work to meet the similar assignment, you may offer whatever work is available; however, if this assignment changes in the third year of the appointment, it may establish a new amount of entitlement.

Another possible option to consider for hiring of TT faculty is to make a one-year full-time appointment. In situations where one or more full-time faculty (TT or NTT) will be gone for a year (e.g., for sabbatical, or some type of leave, etc.) it is possible to effectively fill their position with a full-time one-year replacement. That type of position can be attractive because it is possible to fill multiple classes with a single hire. Moreover, the possibility of finding faculty who are willing to move into the area for a yearlong full-time position is generally much greater than the changes of finding someone willing to move in to teach one or two courses – so the pool of potential candidates is significantly greater. Such positions are often very attractive to those who have recently received their PhD, but perhaps were not able to attain a tenure track position that year. So a one year position is a perfect option. That is all the more so because it can give them significant teaching experience that is likely to make them more marketable in the coming application cycle. There are multiple factors that must line up to make this type of one-year hire possible, but it is important to keep in mind in such instances.

The Faculty Affairs website has a "Chair Resources" section with the following information items related to lecturer hiring and appointment:

- Lecturer Entitlement - General Practices(PDF, 215KB)
- Determining Part-Time Faculty Entitlements (PDF, 238KB)
- Lecturer Entitlement - Assignment of Work (PDF, 225KB)
- Assignment of Work under Article 12.29 (PDF, 147KB)
- New or Additional Work, Temporary (PDF, 282KB)
- Lecturer Entitlements – FAQs (PDF, 231KB)
- Eligibility Criteria for 1-year and 3-year Appointments (PDF, 346KB)
- Article 12 (Appointment) - CBA (PDF, 260KB)

Ch. 8: Faculty Mentoring

A. The importance of mentoring

Mentoring is the sharing of professional experience and wisdom with the goal of helping to navigate the profession and to set a foundation and a trajectory for a productive and fulfilling career. In academia, faculty mentoring typically involves an accomplished senior faculty who mentors a new tenure-track faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and community service (Sands, Parson, & Duane, 1991). Mentoring is vital to the success of any academic career. Mentoring is also essential for academic departments to help all members to make the most valuable contributions to the collective endeavors, as well as to develop a pipeline of leadership that will ensure long-term stability and success.

The benefits of good mentoring are numerous. Faculty who receive quality mentoring will have a satisfying career that will benefit the department, the school, and the university (Bland et al., 2009). Qualitative data have indicated that more established faculty can help new faculty in multiple ways, such as facilitating their understanding of the social and political climate of the university, providing social support, and contributing to their personal well-being (Teranishi Martinez & Alamillo 2016). New faculty with mentors reported more successful career development and emotional support than those without a mentor (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007). Furthermore, when viewing mentoring through an equity and inclusion lens it will ensure that faculty from minoritized groups will receive the needed guidance and support to be successful (McNair, T.B et al, 2020).

Over the past 10 years, research on formal faculty mentoring programs has provided considerable evidence of their contribution to increased faculty retention and performance. According to Lumpkin (2011), successful faculty mentoring programs have clear goals and purpose, involve regular meetings and interactions, and evaluate effectiveness on a regular basis.

It is also important to note that while mentoring is largely seen as an investment on the part of the mentor to benefit the mentee, the relationship can and should provide mutual benefits for both parties. For mentors, engagement can have many of the same satisfactions as teaching in that it is helping another person to achieve their potential. It can also provide an opportunity to reflect on possibilities that can help guide one's own career. And it can simply be a way to cultivate a positive professional relationship with all of the benefits that entails.

B. The chair's role in mentoring

The Chair plays a critical role in the success of a mentoring program, whether informal or formal. Given the individual and collective benefits of good mentoring, the chair has a vital role to play in ensuring that faculty members within the department have ample opportunities to access mentoring. That doesn't necessarily mean that the chair should provide that mentoring in all instances, but that a chair will help to facilitate mentoring when necessary as part of

broader efforts to build and maintain a healthy program. Chairs can lead the department in the process of creating its own mentoring program, which can also draw on the variety of university and extra-mural programs that exist to support mentoring. A formalized mentoring program with buy-in from all faculty is highly recommended.

A comprehensive faculty mentoring program should cover topics focusing on the professional triad of teaching, research and creative activities, and service, as well as broader topics such as networking, time management, work-life balance, and navigating department and campus culture.

In terms of direct support, at minimum the chair should ensure that new faculty members have a copy of the department bylaws, Program Personnel Standards, and other relevant documents. The Chair can also appoint a tenured member of the department as a faculty mentor to a new junior faculty member or ensure that they have access to more than one mentor. It is also critical to recognize that some faculty may feel more marginalized than others and thus may need special consideration. This is especially important for women, racially minoritized faculty, LGBTQ faculty and other underrepresented groups. In some cases, it may be appropriate to seek assistance from other departments, faculty development office and faculty and staff associations or seek mentors external to the university.

There are multiple pathways to faculty mentoring so its important to identity what will best benefit each faculty member. At the department level, mentoring needs can be determined through conversation with new faculty members. Before deciding on a one-on-one mentoring or multiple mentors, it is important that the Chair serve as the "point of contact" to guide the faculty member in the right direction, provide contacts, support and services, as needed. Perhaps a good place to start is creating a mentoring map with assistance from the National Center for Faculty Development & Diversity (NCFD). NCFD recommends that each faculty member develop a map with many points of support and contact tin each area of their professional life. CSUCI offers Faculty Mentoring Resources such as Mentoring Mondays and Faculty Inquiry Projects.

Mentoring does not apply only to junior faculty. It is recommended that chairs regularly review student evaluation, post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty and provide some feedback on mid-career challenges and opportunities. The chair may recommend some strategies for reviving the career of a tired and disaffected faculty member.

C. Mentoring junior faculty on the tenure track

The traditional subject of mentoring is junior faculty on the tenure track, with the goal of successfully achieving tenure. As we will discuss below, that is not the only category of faculty who can – and should – benefit from mentoring. But it is useful to being with that category because the focus on the RTP process helps to clarify some of the essential elements of good mentoring.

Faculty mentoring provides the necessary support for a new probationary faculty member in order to achieve the goals of retention, tenure and promotion. The three overarching areas that structure the RTP process identify the areas on which mentoring should focus: Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service. Each of those areas can and should be areas of professional contribution, as well as areas of professional satisfaction. Reaching that goal requires thoughtful navigation through a range of challenges, and the insights of faculty with significant experience in the profession are essential to doing so. The following lists represent some of the specific issues that may arise within each broad area, and some practices within them.

Teaching: Effective teaching demands an exceptionally broad array of content knowledge, of specific skills, and of familiarity with the needs of our students. The development necessary to do runs a steep learning curve which can benefit immensely from the guidance of those who have significant experience.

- Discuss expectations about teaching content, organization of courses (and materials), appropriate levels of rigor, forms of assessments/assignment, and other aspects of creating effective courses
- Discuss student assessment practices that will most help students without demanding unsustainable time commitments for grading;
- Discuss how to read and draw from teaching evaluations (and what to ignore, especially for faculty who may face student biases);
- Offer to conduct a peer teaching evaluation, and suggest other colleagues who are known to offer thoughtful feedback;
- Assist with the preparation of the Teaching narrative for RTP portfolio;
- Discuss the importance of continuous improvement in teaching;
- Recommend teaching workshops offered by Teaching & Learning Innovations;
- Recommend other professional development opportunities in Faculty Development.

Scholarly and Creative Activities: Scholarly and Creative Activities are central to the sense of fulfillment that drew (most of) us to academic careers, but it is also a fraught area for many junior faculty members. Moving research forward on a timeline to meet RTP requirements while setting a trajectory for long-term contributions can be immensely assisted by professional guidance.

- Review and provide thorough feedback on the Professional Development Plan;
- Provide advice for selecting appropriate journals or other venues for the mentee's research manuscripts, as well as venues for research presentations;
- Organize opportunities for presentations that will give useful practice prior to professional presentations;
- Provide information about internal and external sources of support for research, and provide feedback on any applications for such support;

- Provide specific feedback on the preparation of the Scholarly & Creative Activities narrative for RTP portfolio;
- Use professional networks to connect mentee to disciplinary colleagues outside of the university that may enhance their visibility or opportunities;
- Apply to National Center for Faculty Diversity and Development's signature Faculty Success Program to increase research productivity, get control of time, and find a work-life balance.

Service: The third leg of our professional tripod of responsibilities is too often seen as merely an obligation. When approached thoughtfully – with a focus on developing skills to facilitate eventual leadership in an area of particular passion – service should be an area of professional fulfillment equal to the others. Identifying those areas of passion (at the program, university, community, and/or professional levels), and navigating the steps to develop the necessary skills and experiences for leadership, require particularly thoughtful guidance.

- Protect faculty member from high levels of service during their probationary years, and help them to identify the service roles that are most appropriate for them to take on;
- Provide guidance on the level of service for various university committees, and the type of work that each might entail;
- Help to evaluate requests for service to the department, university, and profession, and decide which are appropriate to accept at different points in time;
- Suggest various service opportunities that exist at the college, university, and community levels;
- Identify areas of service about which faculty are passionate, and identify the skills and experiences that they should pursue to take on leadership roles in those areas in the future.

It should also be noted that good mentoring can help colleagues to establish a better balance across investments in each of the three areas, and how to make adjustments in that balance at different points in their career. Finally, for all areas, a good mentor will always be on the lookout for opportunities and recognitions that may be appropriate for the mentee. Even when those opportunities are not pursued, it is invaluable for early career faculty to know what is out there and to think about possibilities. And it is one of the highest forms of mentorship to sponsor a mentee by submitting their name (and necessary materials) for some type of professional award or recognition.

D. Mentoring mid-career faculty

While junior faculty require the most intensive mentoring, it is counterproductive to assume that once faculty achieve tenure they have access to all of the information and resources that they need to continue to thrive within the institution and the profession. The challenges evolve over time; mid-career faculty often face an understandable let-down after tenure, and will often need support to get back up to speed and to adjust goals and trajectories. Once they have achieved their final promotion in particular, they may find that they have fewer incentives to

expend the energy necessary to make the contributions that they are in the best position to make in all three areas of the profession. That is particularly the case if their own mentoring was geared solely to tenure and promotion, and not to the long-term trajectory that makes mid- and late-career contributions most valuable.

The satisfaction and engagement of mid-career faculty are equally essential to a healthy department – and they have needs that are frequently invisible (or individualized) at the institution. For the health of the department, chairs need to pay close attention to the needs to Associate and Full Professors, and to help them to find the satisfactions and resources in their position that will allow them to serve the department while maintaining their own fulfilling careers. Mentoring at that level is often significantly different in style to the mentorship of junior faculty (for example, often dealing with much more specific issues to navigate, rather than general plans), but it is equally essential to the department as a whole.

E. Mentoring non-tenure track faculty

While mentoring has traditional been focused on junior faculty on the tenure track prior to tenure, it is essential to recognize that *all faculty can benefit from mentoring of some* sort depending on their role in the program, their stage of career, and their career goals. Among the most important of those groups – and one which has too often been left out of the mentoring conversation – is non-tenure track faculty. At CSUCI (and, increasingly, across higher education) non-tenure track faculty have significantly more contact with our students as teachers – that is, in the central role which faculty play on campus. Mentoring of non-tenure track faculty is vital for the overall success of the department, school and university (Wasburn-Moses & Mara H. Wasburn, 2016). As with all faculty, the greatest teaching effectiveness is built up over a long trajectory of intentional and incremental development that is facilitated by help with navigation. Moreover, the most productive faculty are those who feel that they are making important contributions in their role, and who feel like they are on a career trajectory that they see as progressive and fulfilling – all of which can be particular difficult for non-tenure track faculty. Mentoring by the chair (in tandem with fair and equitable department management) can help to realize those needs.

The most basic steps a chair can take is to ensure thorough onboarding to the department. As part of their orientation to the department, the Chair should review the School's Lecturer's Handbook with the new lecturer and answer any questions. To help ease their transition into the department, the Chair should introduce the lecturer to the tenure-track faculty and staff members. Although lecturers are not required to attend department meetings, it is important that they know they are invited to all faculty meetings, events, colloquia series, brown-bag discussions, etc. Creating a welcoming working environment is a first crucial step.

On a longer time horizon, there is much that the chair can provide or facilitate for lecturers that will help them to best serve the program and to build the foundation for a fulfilling career. The chair should begin by asking the lecturer about career goals as that will have important implications in the kind of mentoring that might be appropriate. Some lecturers may want to

teach a small number of classes for a semester or two to get teaching experience (often graduate students who are completing their terminal degree). Some may want to teach a class on an ongoing basis to supplement (financially or in terms of interests) a career outside of academia. Some may be seeking to work their way to full-time as a lecturer. And some may be in the position with the interest of ultimately securing a tenure track position at CSUCI or elsewhere. All can benefit from a mentor's contributions to help them best navigate their preferred path to serve the program and to realize their own career aspirations.

For lecturers who primarily want experience, it may be most useful to be steered toward appropriate professional development opportunities, and perhaps to offer to observe a class that will allow a more thorough letter of recommendation if and when that is requested. For those who want to establish an ongoing relationship as a lecturer in the department, it is critical to share expectations that will help them to meet departmental needs as well as to familiarize them with processes that may lead to a more permanent contract (entitlements, three-year contracts, periodic reviews, etc.).

Lecturers who are interested in ultimately securing a tenure track position require particular attention to ensure that they are aware of realistic possibilities in the department, and that they are doing what they need to do to make themselves competitive (here or elsewhere). It is critical to remember that mentoring in graduate school is very uneven, so many lecturers early in their career are unaware of significant aspects of our profession to which they need to be attentive – such as the need for developing a research agenda, including publications and the timelines that they entail. It is important that they are able to access appropriate developmental opportunities, and that they have any support necessary for maintaining their research as a lecturer – particular since that is such a challenge in the best of situations. Just finding a colleague with similar interests with whom to discuss research and perhaps to read and offer feedback on drafts can make a significant difference between maintaining marketability for a tenure track position and having that dream evaporate before it has a chance to get off the ground. Again, chairs may provide some of that mentoring, or they may act as facilitators (or connectors) between lecturers and those who have the necessary expertise and willingness to mentor. Mentoring models for non-tenure faculty may include one-on-one mentoring, mentoring teams, and group sessions held by one or more faculty members with similar career interests. Mentoring structures may vary according to the needs of the non-tenure track faculty. For example, the English composition program may create a mentoring structure in which tenure track faculty worked with other non-tenure track colleagues all year, visiting each other's class, discussing pedagogical strategies and writing assessment rubrics.

F. Mentoring under-represented faculty groups

Faculty from under-represented groups represent another critical population for mentoring. CSUCI has frequently stated its commitment to diversifying faculty, and a critical aspect of that is fully supporting the diverse faculty we hire to not only succeed in a minimal sense (earning tenure, or a long-term contract), but to create a place at the university where they can achieve

a fulfilling professional career and personal satisfaction. That can be more challenging for faculty do not have colleagues with similar experiences, or who are expected to do more than their share of student service, or who are unable to find a comfortable and supportive community outside the university. For all of those reasons (and more), chairs need to pay particularly careful attention to under-represented faculty.

Department Chairs need to be intentional about ensuring that all underrepresented faculty have strong mentoring, especially since they tend to experience higher rates of marginalization and isolation (Xu, 2008; Misra et al, 2011) These issues are exacerbated for female faculty of color, who in addition to negating the gendered academic climate, may also manage racialized situations such as invisibility, stereotyping, imposter syndrome, tokenism, micro-aggressions. (Ong et al, 2011). Through mentoring it is possible to minimize these forms of marginalization and isolation.

Research shows that mentoring relationships are important for members of under-represented groups, especially women and faculty of color (Zambrana et al, 2015). It is important that faculty mentors make themselves aware of equity and diversity issues often encountered by faculty members of color, LGBTQ+ faculty and women faculty, particularly in disciplines where these groups are underrepresented. One issue is "cultural taxation," a term is used to describe the unique burden placed on racially minoritized faculty in carrying out the extra work and responsibility to service the university (Padilla, 1994). For example, the demand for serving on committees that need diverse memberships and mentoring or advising diverse students and student groups who seek them out. Women faculty experience various forms of identity taxation due to their intersectional identities and this taxation may negatively affect their promotion and tenure advancement. (Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012) Another issue is how student evaluations are skewed against women, women of color and faculty of color (Huston 2005). Issues related to gender equity in the academy are significant not only for women faculty but for their departments, their institutions, and for the academic community.

For faculty members from under-represented groups, Faculty and Staff Associations can play a critical role in supporting them and helping them deepen their connections to the university. Faculty and Staff Associations are designed to connect under-represented faculty and staff populations to each other and foster a sense of community within CSUCI. Research shows that these groups support recruitment, retention and mentoring of new staff and faculty by their addressing social, cultural and professional needs that will enhance their professional career and quality of life (Elfman, 2019). These groups help to unify, increase productivity, provide social gatherings and enhance morale of underrepresented faculty and staff at CSUCI. They also organize their own events, offer leadership opportunities, promote an equitable and inclusive environment for faculty and staff at CSUCI. As of 2020, CSUCI supports the Chicana/o Latina/o Faculty and Staff Association, Black Faculty & Staff Association and the LBGTQ Faculty and Staff Association.

G. Best Practices in Mentoring:

Below are some best practices that can strengthen the mentor/mentee relationship:

For Mentors	For Mentees
Engage mentees in ongoing conversations	Engage in interactions with your mentor
Establish clear, shared expectations for the relationship including time commitment, meeting schedule and ground rules	See the mentor/mentee relationship as an important resource for career development
Demystify the academic profession	Never be afraid to ask questions, regardless of how minor they may seem
Provide encouragement and support	Accept critiques in a professional manner
Provide constructive and supportive feedback	Be open to mentor suggestions and actively practice what you learn
Help foster networks	Take initiative to create and engage different opportunities
Treat mentee with respect	Ask mentor on how to build a network of multiple mentors with needed strengths
Look out for your mentee's interests	Recognize that one mentor can't meet all your needs. Mentees should identify gaps
Set and respect boundaries	Set and respect boundaries

H. Faculty development opportunities and resources

CSUCI provides faculty development opportunities to ensure that faculty members have the tools and information necessary to realize their full potential. We encourage you to share these Faculty Development resources below with existing and new faculty members, both tenure-track and lecturers.

Faculty Mentoring Network: This CSUCI mentoring program is built on a network model of mentoring. A network model of mentoring asks faculty to reflect on what they want and need and then seek out connections to help them achieve their professional goals. This approach is fluid and dynamic and will and should change as your goals and needs change from year to year and across academic career.

Mentoring Mondays: All tenure track faculty in their first or second year are invited to join Mentoring Mondays. These gatherings for new(er) tenure track faculty seek to enhance their knowledge of CSUCI faculty roles and to prove a space for collaboration and supportive conversations about responsibilities and expectations.

TLI Faculty Mentors: Teaching and Learning Innovations (TLI) offers faculty mentors to support faculty in virtual course design and virtual teaching practices. Each TLI faculty mentor is assigned to specific Academic Programs that most closely relate to their discipline and virtual teaching experience.

Center for Community Engagement (CCE): The CCE offers a range of faculty development programs for those interested in engaging more directly with the community. The Service-Learning Faculty Mentoring Program pairs experienced service-learning faculty with new service-learning faculty to share best practices in service learning. The purpose is to help new faculty design and implement high-quality service-learning courses, offering guidance and financial support for the mentoring relationship. All faculty are invited to apply to participate in the program. The CCE has other faculty development programs in which mentoring relationships are embedded, such as the Community Engagement & Social Justice Faculty Fellows Program, and the Community-Based Research Faculty Fellows Program.

Works Cited:

Bland, C.J, A. L Taylor, S.L. Shollen, A.M Weber Main & P.A. Mucahy (2009) *Faculty Success Through Mentoring: A Guide for Mentors, Mentees, and Leaders.*, Rowan & Littlefield Publishing.

Elfman, L. (2019) "Hispanic Faculty Associations as Recruitment, Retention Resource" *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, Oct. 16, , 3-6.

Hirschfield, L.E. & Joseph, T. D. (2012). We need a woman, we need a black woman: Gender, race, and identity taxation in the academy. *Gender and Education.* 24(2): 213-227.

Huston, T. A. (2005). Race and Gender Bias in Higher Education: Could Faculty Course Evaluations Impeded Further Progress Toward Parity? *Seattle Journal for Social Justice*, 4(2), 591-611.

Lumpkin, A (2011) "A Model for mentoring university faculty," *The Educational Forum*, 75, 357-368.

McNair, T. B., Bensimon, E. M., and Malcom-Piqueux, L. (2020). *From equity talk to equity walk: Expanding practitioner knowledge for racial justice in higher educatio*n. Wiley.

Misra J, Lundquist J.H, Holmes, E. Agiomavritis, S. (2011) The Ivory Ceiling of Service Work. American Association of University Professors. https://www.aaup.org/article/ivory-ceiling-service-work#.YGSpma9Ki70

Ong M, Wright C, Espinosa L, Orfield G (2011) Inside the double bind: A synthesis of empirical research on undergraduate and graduate women of color in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. *Harvard Educational Review.* 81(2):172–209.

Padilla, Amado. (1994) "Ethnic Minority Scholars, Research and Mentoring: Current and Future Issues," *Educational Researcher*, 23(4) 24-27.

Sands, Parson, & Duane (1991) “Faculty mentoring faculty at public university,” *The Journal of Higher Education*, 62(2): 174-193.

Sorcinelli M.D & Yun J.H. (2007) “From Mentor to Mentoring Networks: Mentoring in the New Academy,” *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 39(6), 58-61.

Teranishi Martinez, C & Alamillo, J. (2016) “Power of Faculty Mentoring: Stepping out of the comfort zone to enhance faculty success”. *Proceedings from Developmental Networks: The Power of Mentoring and Coaching*. Albuquerque , NM.: The Mentoring Institute at University of New Mexico.

Wasburn-Moses, L., & M.H. Wasburn, (2016) M. *Mentoring Non-Tenure Track Faculty*. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing.

Zambrana, R.E, Rashawn Ray, Michelle Espino, Corinne Castro, Beth Douthirt Cohen, Jennifer Eliason (2015) “’Don’t Leave Us Behind’: The Importance of Mentoring for Underrepresented Minority Faculty,” *American Educational Research Journal,* 52(1), 40-72.

Xu, Y.(2008) Mentoring and Career Development of Minority Nurses and Faculty. *Home Health Care Management & Practice*, 20(6), 503-505.

Ch 9: Faculty Review and Assessment

Regular review and assessment is a central part of academic life. It is the process by which we are able to provide and receive the feedback and guidance that is essential to our development and improvement as educators. The chair has a critical role to play in that process, either directly by conducting review and assessment, or indirectly by organizing it across a program and upholding a model of helpful and developmental feedback. Review and assessment are also processes that are required for all faculty by the university through the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The chair is generally responsible for ensuring that university obligations to conduct fair assessment are met – both for tenure track faculty in the RTP process, and for lecturers in the regular observation and evaluation cycles.

The materials presented in this chapter lay out, first and foremost, the contractual obligations of faculty review and assessment and the role of the chair in fulfilling them. They also highlight best practices to ensure that reviews are, in fact, developmental. That is, that reviews are conducted in a way that offers the greatest opportunity to communicate to the faculty under review both areas of strength to build on as well as specific areas where improvement might lead to deeper contributions (and ideas about how they might be achieved). The focus here is primarily on the review of teaching, since it is the central professional responsibility for tenure track faculty and the sole formal responsibility for lecturer faculty. While we focus on teaching, developmental recommendations for tenure track faculty in the areas of scholarly and creative activities and in service are also critical to supporting long-term contributions. In all areas, review activities should naturally overlap with mentoring, so it is worth reading over chapter 8 (Faculty Mentoring) as one considers how to most effectively produce and deliver reviews. Indeed, faculty review should always be considered an extension of faculty mentoring. That is in no way to suggest that review should be anything other than honest evaluation, or veer into advocacy – but to suggest that honest evaluation delivered in a developmental manner is how review can best serve the purpose of continuous improvement at both the individual and institutional levels.

The sections below are organized around the distinct processes of review for tenure track (TT) faculty and for non-tenure track (NTT) faculty (or lecturers). In addition to differences in the scope of review (teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for TT faculty, while NTT faculty are evaluated on only the first of those), the specific requirements and procedures also differ and are governed by distinct policies. All of that will be made clear below. Each section will proceed through governing documents, component materials to be reviewed, and specific procedures – followed by any additional explanatory information.

Chairs as contributors to files: Before elaborating on the chair's role in reviewing a file, it is important to note one separate role that they can play – as *contributors* to a faculty member's file. That is, the chair may always submit a letter commenting on contributions the candidate has made to the department to any faculty file, with the understanding that faculty must consent to have it added to their file. Such letters can be added for formal evaluation when the chair is not directly involved (although that is rare), or in a more routine way to

acknowledge a particular accomplishment or contribution to the program. A chair's commendation becomes a part of the formal PAF, which is then included in all future reviewers – including in situations beyond formal review (such as that for pay adjustments for lecturers).

A. Tenure-track Faculty

Preliminary to the actual review, it is the responsibility of the chair (shared with the Office of Faculty Affairs) to ensure that all faculty members in the department undergoing review are apprised of the criteria set out by the department, the college, and the university. The Office of Faculty Affairs offers regular presentations for faculty undergoing review to help them to understand and prepare for the process – and the chair can help by steering faculty to those presentations. The chair also needs to be familiar with all governing policies to make sure that they can (and do) give accurate advice to faculty under review.

Beyond ensuring that junior faculty understand the formal processes, it is also critical for the chair to help them to make their best efforts to assemble a clear and convincing case for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. That means not only that the file has to be well-organized, but that it has to include essential materials and explanations that will provide reviewers a narrative to understand and contextualize accomplishments and contributions. Much of the essential mentorship happens long before or outside of the review process itself by helping junior colleagues to do what is necessary over the full probationary period in order to meet and exceed expectations in each area of responsibilities by the time of review. (It is again recommended that chairs pay close attention to chapter 8 which addresses mentoring in depth.)

The support and assistance of chairs is particularly important in the earliest rounds of review for faculty, which can often be confusing and overwhelming. That assistance should continue throughout the probationary period, although as faculty get more familiar with review processes the chair's input is likely to be in response to more specific questions. But it is always important to check in at some point during the process to make sure that faculty are clear about expectations and comfortable presenting their files. The first and foundational step in helping faculty to navigate the RTP process comes with the creation of the Professional Development Plan (PDP).

Professional Development Plan: The PDP is the opportunity for faculty members in their first year to map out their goals and aspirations – both in the form of a sequence of sequential steps toward tenure, and toward a fulfilling career beyond. That depends first and foremost on an understanding of the expectations that they face for achieving retention and tenure. Chairs can help to underscore that TT faculty are reviewed on each of their three areas of their professional responsibility – Teaching, Scholarly & Creative Activities, and Service – and that the emphasis at CSUCI is on Teaching. Specific expectations for each of those areas should be laid out clearly in the departmental Program Personnel Standards (PPS), discussed below. Chairs can help by meeting with faculty in their first semester to discuss the PPS document and making sure they understand both the letter and the spirit of the document.

Chairs can help new faculty to think across the long arc of professional development – to tenure and beyond – which is likely to be unfamiliar to them. Chairs can help them to think about goals for their teaching – developing a repertoire of classes; identifying areas of their teaching practices that need to be developed, and professional development opportunities to do so; and long-term goals associated with mastery (such as presenting or publishing about their own pedagogical practices). The chair can also alert new faculty to priorities and emphases within a program so that their teaching better builds on and supports collective efforts across the curriculum as a whole. All of that can inform a PDP that is written intentionally and which will best serve new faculty.

New faculty also benefit from guidance on Scholarly and Creative Activities that will help them to craft a PDP that will serve them well. Chairs can help them to think about realistic timelines for publications, as well as the types of publications that will best help them to meet (and exceed) expectations codified in the PPS. That counsel is particularly important since while scholarship and creative activities are required for tenure, it is the sole area of professional responsibility that is not reflected formally in the contract with any sort of support (that is, dedicated WTUs). Invariably, new faculty will have different interests than chairs, but deeper experience in the profession and discipline can be invaluable compliments to the specific expertise that new faculty bring to their work.

Service is often seen as the tertiary leg of professional responsibility – in terms both of their own investments and what they expect to receive back in return. It is important to remind new TT faculty that their contract designates three weighted teaching units (WTUs) per semester for service, and that it is an important part of the review and assessment of their record. Having said that, chairs play a role in counseling probationary faculty on appropriate levels of service, so as to not overload probationary faculty who generally need to prioritize the construction of a foundation for their scholarship and/or creative activities. Chairs also play an important role in not only choosing appropriate *levels* of service, but identifying specific *areas* for service that reflect the faculty members' expertise and interests (either existing or, equally important, aspirational).

The PDP is the first important document in the RTP process, and the one which offers the greatest opportunity to provide developmental feedback with little of the accompanying evaluative element. Working closely with new faculty on a clear and productive PDP can serve them well, and alleviate the need for redirective feedback in a later review.

Governing documents

In the CSU system, Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) processes are governed primarily by two documents: Senate Policy (which identifies required elements and mandates procedures), and the Program Personnel Standards (which detail specific departmental priorities and thresholds for meeting expectations). It is important for chairs (and all reviewers in the RTP process) to be familiar with both documents.

Senate Policy: Senate policy specifies the procedures through which RTP review occurs and specifies information such as the components of review; general requirements for retention, tenure, and promotion; and the responsibilities of all parties involved. Faculty are either under SP 17-08 RTP Policy or SP 15-15 RTP Policy. Faculty hired prior to AY 2018-19 may choose to be governed by SP17-08. There are some important differences between the two policies, especially pertaining to early Tenure and Promotion. SP 17-08 also includes time "at the rank of lecturer for former CSUCI temporary faculty appointed as tenure-track assistant professors" as part of the "length and breadth of the applicant's entire record." SP 17-08 also includes a statement regarding the expectation that a faculty member has achieved "widespread recognition" for early tenure of which faculty should be aware. For those faculty members who can select which policy to apply under, the chair should make sure that they understand their option and the implications of their choice.

Program Personnel Standards (PPS): PPS documents represent the specific expectations for retention, tenure, and promotion held by a department based on collective priorities and disciplinary understandings. PPS documents always exist within the parameters set by Senate RTP policy, and in the event that there are discrepancies (which should never be the case), Senate policy always holds. PPS documents specify procedures of review (such as PPC composition, the role of the chair, etc.) and lay out the specific criteria by which faculty will be reviewed. All PPCs must be approved by the University RTP Committee, as well as the Provost's designee, so they must also reflect overall campus values. But each department will have subtle (or significant) differences – such as disciplinary standards for publication, specific service needs, and pedagogical priorities. That is to say that PPSs indicate specific priorities of the program, and should be taken into consideration in the review process. For those reasons, it is critical that the chair and other reviewers have a deep familiarity with the document. PPS documents for each program at CSUCI are posted on this Faculty Affairs page. Given the importance of the PPS, it is important that the document does, in fact, reflect the collective priorities and expectations of the department and discipline. For that reason, the chair should lead the program in periodic review of the document to ensure that it is not unclear or out of date.

Component materials for review

The RTP process is generally designed to be inclusive, which is to say that it places no real restrictions on faculty under review in terms of what they submit to document their accomplishments in any of the areas under review. Having said that, there are some general and universal components at the center of review in all files which will be described below. We first address the Personnel Action File. Then we address two central and mandated components in the area of Teaching: Student Ratings of Teaching and Peer Observations of Teaching.

Personnel Action File (PAF): Every faculty member has a PAF, maintained in the Office of Faculty Affairs. The PAF may be accessed by members of peer review committees constituted for the purpose of conducting a performance review or periodic evaluation, for determining a market/equity or merit-based salary increase, for recommending on range elevation, or for

appointment or reappointment decisions. The PAF may be accessed by an appropriate administrator, such as the dean or AVP for Faculty Affairs, who may need to respond to an information request or grievance. No other faculty members should have access to the PAF; no one outside the university should be given access without the approval of the AVP for Faculty Advancement & Student Success. Anyone accessing the file on official business must sign the PAF access log, including writing down the reason for access, which becomes part of the PAF. Based on Article 11of the CBA, a faculty member has the right of access to all materials in his or her PAF, exclusive of pre-employment material (e.g., letters of recommendation). A faculty member wishing to inspect his or her file must make an appointment, and has the right to be accompanied by another person. If a faculty member believes that any portion is inaccurate, they may submit a written request to the custodian of the file to correct or delete that material. Faculty members also have the right to submit material to their own PAF, including rebuttals to materials that others place in their PAF. Chairs should be sure to log in and out of the PAF when reviewing it for evaluations and appointments. This documentation can serve as evidence of "careful consideration" by the chair, a contractual right of the faculty.

Note: The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) is also known as the "Portfolio," and refers to that portion of the Personnel Action File prepared by the faculty member and used during periodic evaluation or performance review of a faculty unit employee.

Student Ratings of Teaching: Students are, in many ways, in the best position to assess faculty teaching. They are the ones who spend each semester observing and interacting with faculty, inside and outside of the classroom. Student Ratings of Teaching give students the opportunity to provide that evaluation. (For information on SRTs and their administration, see Senate Policy 14-01 SRT Policy.)

While SRTs offer a rich source of direct evaluation of teaching by those in the best position to do so, they are also problematic on multiple levels so they need to be approached with substantial care. Reviewers should always consider the SRTs in context. For example, how many students completed the SRT compared to the number enrolled in the class? Is this a new prep for the faculty member? Is the faculty member from a historically-underrepresented group in the academy (i.e., POC in all disciplines; women in some disciplines), and might that inform student review of teaching? How do SRTs for a given semester or course compare to earlier SRTs? Ideally, a chair can surmise improvement (or not) in teaching practice through this comparison. Chairs should review teaching evaluations for "bias" in student comments and scoring for faculty from minoritized communities.[1] All of those issues should be taken into consideration when reading a faculty members' SRTs.

---

[1]Anderson, K.J. and Smith, G. (2005). Students' Preconceptions of Professors: Benefits and Barriers According to Ethnicity and Gender. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 27(2), 185-201; Bavishi, A., Madera, J. M., & Hebl, M. R. (2010). The effect of professor ethnicity and gender on student evaluations: Judged before met. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3*(4), 245–256; Hendrix, K.G. (1998).. Student Perceptions of the Influence of Race on Professor Credibility. *Journal of Black Studies*, 28(6), 738-763; Hornstein, H.A. (2017). Student evaluations of teaching are an inadequate assessment tool for evaluating teaching performance. Cogent Education, 4(1), 1-8; Smith B.P. and Hawkins, B. (2011). *Examining Student Evaluations of Black College Faculty: Does Race Matter?* The Journal of Negro Education 80(2), 149-162; Smith, B.P. (2009). *Student ratings of teaching effectiveness for faculty groups based on race and gender*. Education 129(4), 615-624.

Peer/Teaching Observations: RTP policies call for at least one peer observation of classroom teaching from each probationary year for probationary tenure-track faculty. The Chair should be in communication with probationary faculty on the tenure-track to help them identify tenured associate or full professors who are most likely to be able to offer useful and relevant feedback, and then (if necessary) to help them to contact those colleagues and request that they conduct their observations. Chairs should also generally plan to conduct a peer observation themselves for junior faculty at some point during their probationary period. Chairs should be most aware of the specific learning outcomes to be met in each class, and should also be more familiar with the needs of program students (as well as general pedagogical research in higher education). All of that can make peer observations from the chair particularly helpful to junior faculty. Observations by the chair can also be fraught, so it is important to engage in the process in a way that makes reviewees feel comfortable and supported – and the observation should be written honestly with an eye toward identifying existing strengths as well as identifying helpful steps that the faculty can make to improve their teaching. It is likely to be one of the most weighty pieces of feedback on teaching in the reviewee's career, and should be approached with that sense of responsibility. Meeting with the faculty to be observed before the observation to identify areas that the faculty is particularly interested in getting feedback serves the developmental role of the observation, as well as a follow-up meeting before writing the observation for the record.

Review processes

The specific role of chair in the tenure track faculty review process depends on procedures specified in the PPS. In some programs, chairs are required to conduct a review separately from the Program Personnel Committee (PPC), while in others there is no such requirement (although, in those cases, the chair is frequently a member of the PPC). If the chair is serving on the University RTP Committee, they are required to recuse themselves at some level of review so as to only weigh in once in the review process. The chair should be aware of those specifications before the process begins – especially so, since it may impact preliminary processes such as selecting members for a departmental PPC.

RTP decisions are based entirely on the written record including the WPAF and the Personnel Action File (PAF). Hearsay, observation, personal interactions or conversations, or other extraneous information not documented in the WPAF or PAF may not be considered. The Chair's letter can be very persuasive. In addition, a Chair may provide a perspective on teaching, publication, and service which includes consideration of the mission of the entire department that a PPC may not have. The chair's letter sometimes includes nuances that are very helpful to successive levels of review. The chair's letter should never rubber-stamp that of the PPC. It should be a completely independent evaluation and recommendation. Although it is likely that the committee and the Chair will agree on a recommendation, they may disagree. This is part of our open process.

As noted at the start of this chapter, review should always be approached as an opportunity to provide developmental feedback. But it is also a serious evaluative procedure that has to

embrace a sense of responsibility in acting on behalf of our students and the state of California that supports our university. The core of the evaluative element is the 1-5 rating system for each area of professional responsibility (Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service). A rating of 3 represents that the faculty member is meeting expectations, with higher scores exceeding expectations and lower scores failing to meet expectations. Faculty must be rated at 4 or above in two of the three areas of professional responsibility to achieve tenure and/or promotion, and one of those scores of 4 must be in the area of teaching. (It is important – if fundamentally challenging – to explain to new faculty that they must essentially *exceed* expectations in the rating system in order to meet expectations for tenure and promotion.)

It is important to note that a departmental PPS may explicitly enumerate the collective accomplishments required to meet each rating. (For example, the particular number and type of Scholarly and Creative Activities to merit, say, a 4 in that area of review.) In that case, it is critical to base the review explicitly against that enumeration system in order to assign ratings. Reviewers have less need in explicit accounting where the PPS does not contain that sort of detailed enumeration.

B. Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty (or, as they are more commonly called, lecturers) play a critical role in serving students at our university. Significantly more classes are taught by NTT faculty than by TT faculty, and they are collectively and individually critical to our ability to serve our students. NTT faculty are also professionals who need and deserve the feedback that will allow them to develop as teachers – especially those faculty members in the early stages of their career. As with TT faculty, the university and the chair have formal obligations associated with review spelled out in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (presented below), and also a professional duty (and opportunity) to provide feedback to help teachers to develop and better serve our students.

Non-tenure track faculty have many rights in the CSU system. Assuming they have received satisfactory performance evaluations, they have considerable workplace security. For this reason, it is essential that you write honest evaluations of lecturers. There are a number of tools to use in your assessments of lecturer's teaching, but the central sources of assessments are the SRTs and Peer Observations which we will revisit below.

Governing documents

The document that governs the periodic review of Lecturers on our campus is our Senate Policy 12-10: Policy on Temporary Faculty Evaluations, as well as the provisions and protections codified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (which are largely reflected in the Senate Policy). Under the Collective Bargaining Agreement, all faculty who are to undergo periodic evaluation must be notified within fourteen days of the beginning of the semester of the procedures and criteria to be used. The Faculty Affairs Office also sends each chair the lecturer evaluation schedule and a list of lecturers with the type of review required for each of

them. It is important to assess that list annually to be able to anticipate the workload associated with evaluations each year.

Lecturers require two actions during the evaluation process: One Peer Observation of Teaching and the actual periodic review or "evaluation." It is important to note that a frequent (and understandable) confusion for new chairs is that between "observations" and "evaluations." The former refers to the teaching observation, (above) while the latter refers to the summative evaluation that chairs (or peer review committees) complete for their lecturer colleagues (addressed below). The deadline for the evaluation is in mid-spring, and the observation must (of course) be completed and submitted to the file before the evaluation can be done. Given how busy spring can be, it is useful for the chair to organize lecturer observations in the fall, to the extent possible.

Components of review

The main difference between the review of TT faculty compared with Lecturer faculty is that while the former are reviewed across the three areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service, Lecturers are only reviewed in the first of those categories. The main components of review of teaching are the same: SRTs and Peer Observations. All of the same best practices – and the same cautions – presented above regarding the use of those components in reviewing TT faculty apply equally to the review of lecturers. It is perhaps even more critical in the review of lecturers since those components represent a much greater share of the total review. And there are also some specific issues to be aware of that may be distinct when using those components to review Lecturers.

Student Ratings of Teaching: Many of the practices of critical reading of SRTs have been presented above, and apply to TT faculty and NTT faculty alike. For example, it is critical to be aware of biases that can impact student ratings, especially those associated with race and gender. There are also some issues that are more likely to affect SRTs for lecturers. For example, lecturers more frequently teach lower division and General Education course (or other graduation requirements) which bring together a much wider set of students, and which students generally take because they have to rather than because they are interested in the topic – which may influence their ratings. In addition, those courses are often much larger, which again can have an impact on ratings. Lecturers may also feel pressured to keep students satisfied, which can have a negative impact on rigor, which can deteriorate what students get out of the class – so a good evaluator has to be careful not to enhance that pressure to bump ratings. Of course, lecturers play a critical role in teaching our students – so none of this should be interpreted as encouragement not to evaluate them honestly with our students concern in focus.

Peer Observation of Teaching is done by a tenured/tenure-track faculty member requested by the chair, or by the chair. While it may be suitable for the chair to do the initial observation of a newly-hired lecturer, it serves the program/department and the lecturer well to have colleagues other than the chair do subsequent observations, so that the lecturer colleague has the benefit of more perspectives on their performance. The peer observation process is an

integrated faculty development opportunity for both parties. Chairs should encourage tenure track faculty to participate in observations of lecturers as part of their service, so that non-tenure track colleagues get to hear more than the chair's voice.

Peer observations can be particularly fraught for lecturers, for a variety of reasons. First, the observation must be completed by a TT faculty member, emphasizing the divide across positions and the relative power associated with each. That means that lecturers are likely to feel less empowered to select specific dates for observations, or to make a case for what they are doing in their classes, etc. Second, lecturers generally have fewer personal connections with tenure track faculty, and the absence of a personal relationship can make the process more intimidating. That can also make lecturers feel less free to share honestly about what challenges they are having in classes. Third, lecturers are often the last to be assigned classes, and full-time lecturers have more classes to teach and often more varied courses – and the demands that places for course preparation may be poorly understood by tenure track faculty, providing less essential context for any particular observation. Fourth, tenure track faculty often approach the observation as a service obligation, with little sense of the developmental role it should play and how to make sure that it does so. This does not exhaust the issues that should be considered when conducting or reviewing a peer observation, but it is important for evaluators to keep in mind – in the same way that they keep the limitations of SRTs in mind when they assess that component of review.

Portfolios: The portfolio (or Working Personnel Action File, WPAF) is also a component of evaluation for *some* lecturers. A portfolio is *required* for all full-time lecturers, but is *optional* for part-time lecturers. The portfolio is largely a collection of the components above, along with other materials in the Personnel Action File (PAF). If part-time faculty choose not to submit a portfolio, the review will be based on the PAF directly. The portfolio includes a curriculum vitae, SRTs, peer observations (at least one during the period of review), and all syllabi for courses taught during the review period.

Evaluations

The evaluation itself is conducted in the spring, based on all of the materials described above. The core assessment determines whether Lecturers are performing at a satisfactory level or not. Satisfactory performance is essential to rehire, so the evaluation has important implications. However, evaluation of Lecturers offers one of the few formal opportunities for the chair (or the Peer Review Committee) to offer developmental feedback to colleagues – which, as noted above, is essential to assisting our colleagues to develop and improve, and essential to the chair's role in developing a program that best serves our students.

In order to conduct the evaluation, the Faculty Affairs Office offers forms which can be accessed at the following link: Faculty Affairs Office Documents and Forms page. If you scroll down the page to the section on "Lecturer Information," you'll find links that will bring up Word documents for Full-Time Lecturer Evaluation and Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation, as well as forms for Librarian Faculty (both Full-Time and Part-Time). Those documents are minimalist, largely identifying required information (such as a comprehensive listing of courses taught) and

evaluative sections. For teaching faculty, there are four headings within which the evaluator may enter narratives: Student evaluation of teaching; Peer observation of teaching; Additional elements; and Overall Evaluation. At the end, the evaluator must indicate whether the faculty member is evaluated as "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." For Librarian Faculty, the sections are slightly different, beginning with an overall assessment of Professional Effectiveness (five categories ranging from "commendable" to "unsatisfactory"), followed by a section indicating what the evaluation is based on, with an area for supervisor's comments. The Faculty Affairs forms identify essential components

The forms themselves may help to organize evaluations, although use of those forms and their format is not required. Regardless of format, it is essential to remember that the evaluation is a critical means for providing developmental feedback to faculty colleagues – often, the only form that they will get from the department chair. Consequently, a chair must use the evaluation process not simply to ensure that the faculty colleague has surpassed the minimal threshold allowing them to renew a contract and continue teaching, but should provide the type of feedback (and, ideally, a dialogue) that will help lecturers to be recognized for their strengths and their contributions to the department as well as to identify where they might be able to deepen those conversations. Given the relative isolation that lecturer faculty can feel in the institution, it may be an opportunity to communicate departmental needs in specific classes (learning objectives, etc.) that may not be completely clear. Again, the evaluation process offers an important opportunity to provide critical feedback to faculty that will help them to develop and to better serve our students and the department – similar to the RTP process for TT faculty (when conducted properly). However, to fulfill that role, the feedback must itself be developed and thoughtful. That cannot be accomplished with a brief evaluation that merely confirms whether a colleague is meeting minimal expectations.

Frequency and Procedure of Evaluation: The frequency with which lecturers are evaluated, the extensiveness of the evaluation, and regulations about who is involved, vary according to the status and timing of the lecturer's contract. They are governed by policies. . . .

Frequency: The main distinction regarding the frequency of evaluation concerns whether the faculty member is on a 3-year contract. As noted above, lecturers who have been teaching for six years can be granted a 3-year contract. Prior to that point, lecturers must be evaluated every second semester (regardless of any break in service). Assuming a fall hire, that generally represents a spring evaluation. Once a faculty member has been granted a 3-year appointment, they need only be evaluated at the end of that period

Lecturer faculty on semester or one-year contracts are evaluated by the chair only annually (usually by February/early March). If a lecturer has taught at least one semester in each of six (6) consecutive years, the lecturer is entitled to a cumulative evaluation. If the cumulative evaluation is satisfactory, the lecturer will receive a three-year appointment in the seventh year. The entitlement of the appointment is based on the units accepted in the sixth year. This means that if the Chair rehires a lecturer who taught 12 units in the prior (sixth) year, the lecturer should be appointed to teach 12 units for the 3-year contract.

For lecturer faculty on three-year contracts, the periodic evaluation is usually done in the third year, and must be done by a Peer Review Committee, which includes the chair and at least one tenured faculty member. Faculty on three-year contracts are also evaluated by the Dean. Lecturers holding three-year appointments have the expectation of receiving subsequent appointments except in cases of evaluations that have documented needs improvement or unsatisfactory performance or serious conduct problems. The time base of the subsequent appointment follows the same process as outlined above. If you do not have sufficient work to meet the similar assignment, you may offer whatever work is available; however, if this assignment changes in the third year of the appointment, it may establish a new amount of entitlement.

Procedure: An important distinction is also made vis-à-vis full-time and part-time lecturers in terms of the evaluation procedure – mostly, in terms of who conducts the evaluation. For part-time lecturers, the evaluation is a simple one-stage process carried out by the chair. For full-time lecturers, the evaluation is a two-stage process: first at the departmental level, and subsequently at the Dean level. Moreover, at the department level, the evaluation must be conducted by a Peer Review Committee consisting of 2-5 tenured faculty. (That means that chairs must also carry out a process to select those faculty members – a process that should be specified in the departmental bylaws.)

Adjusting Lecturer Pay Scales

One of the other important tasks of the chair is to seek to ensure that all faculty are paid equitably within their category, and that they get periodic pay increases as merited. Unlike with tenure track faculty, chairs make the critical determinations regarding lecturer pay – initially, and through periodic revisions. (For information on setting initial pay, see chapter 7 on Faculty Search and Hiring.) Chairs can recommend lecturers for an increase in pay at the time of reappointment through either a standard salary adjustment, or a range elevation. A salary adjustment is a standard percentage raise that is recommended by the Chair (with accompanying justification), and submitted to the Dean for approval. A standard salary adjustment must be made within the existing salary range – that is, at most up to the top of the range where the lecturer's salary is found. (The Faculty Affairs Office can provide information on current pay ranges, and where all faculty in a program are within each range.)

Once a faculty member reaches the top of a pay range, they are eligible for a range elevation which will move them to the next higher pay range. For information on how that is accomplished, see SP 10-07 Policy on Lecturer Range Elevations. Chairs should use the two types of pay increases to make sure that lecturers are paid equitably – both across the program specifically, and in a universal sense. Doing so requires familiarity with the salaries of faculty across the program, where each faculty member is in terms of their pay range, and the schedule on which their next reappointment will be made. The Faculty Affairs Office can also provide invaluable assistance in tracking pay scales.

A final situation to be aware of is when a lecturer completes an advanced degree which will require reclassification and associated pay increase. Again, Faculty Affairs can assist with navigating the reclassification.

C. Schedule of Annual Review and Assessment Tasks:

Here is a sequenced list of the various evaluations that you may be called upon to do as chair – for both TT faculty and NTT faculty – with the expected month for the task indicated. Faculty Affairs will inform chairs of the specific due dates for each task:

Sept:	RTP Schedule B: Portfolios Due
	RTP Schedule C1, C2, & C3: Portfolios Due
	RTP Schedule B: Program Personnel Committee (PPC) Review Begins
	RTP Schedule C1, C2, & C3: Program Personnel Committee (PPC) Review Begins
	Range Elevation: Review Begins
Oct.:	Sabbatical/Difference-in-Pay Leaves: Impact Statement from Chair
	RTP Schedule B: Program Personnel Committee (PPC) Written Evaluations Due
	RTP Schedule C1, C2, & C3: PPC Written Recommendations Due
	RTP Schedule B: If not on the PPC, then Chair Review Begins
	Range Elevation: Notification Letters Due
	RTP Schedule C1, C2, & C3: If not on the PPC, then Chair Review Begins
	RTP Schedule B: If not on the PPC, then Chair Written Recommendations Due
	Sabbatical/Difference-in-Pay Leaves: Impact Statement Due
Nov:	RTP Schedule C1, C2, & C3: If not on the PPC, then Chair Written Recommendations Due
Jan.:	RTP Schedule A: Professional Development Plan (PDP) Due to Chairs
	Post-Tenure Review: Deadline for Faculty to Submit Names for Program Review Committee (PRC) to Chair
	RTP Schedule A: Review Begins if on the Program Personnel Committee (PPC)
Feb.:	Lecturer Evaluations: Portfolios due to Chairs or Faculty Affairs
	Post-Tenure Review: Deadline for Submission of Portfolios to PRC
	Lecturer Evaluations: Chair or Program Committee Review Begins
	Post-Tenure Review: PRC Review Begins
	RTP Schedule A: Written Recommendations Due if on the PPC
March:	RTP Schedule A: Review Begins if not on the Program Personnel Committee (PPC)
	Lecturer Evaluations: Written Recommendations Due
	Post-Tenure Review: PRC Written Recommendations Due
	RTP Schedule A: Written Recommendations Due if not on the PPC
April:	Post-Tenure Review: Deadline for Dean & Peer Review Committee Meetings Concluded

Ch. 10: Budgeting and scheduling

Budgeting and scheduling are closely interconnected processes for department chairs. The reason for that is because the dominant component of budget to allocate is the Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) budget – which is completely allocated for teaching. In this chapter, we will explore the several budgets, focusing our attention on the NTTF allocation. To do so, we will need to focus attention on the several components at the heart of budgeting and scheduling – such as Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs), Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF); Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES); and Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR). All of those will be explained and made familiar.

A. Budgets

A department chair generally has three budgets to keep track of: the Operations budget, (what used to be known as) the "CERF" budget, and the NTTF budget – which, as noted, is *by far* the most important budgetary component. We will address each of those below – and will link NTTF budgeting to the associated process of scheduling. (Department expenses also include salaries for tenure track faculty, as well as administrative support. However, the department chair has no control over those so they are effectively a budgeting issue for the school – not the department. Therefore, we will not address those budget issues here.)

Operations budget: The operations budget is allocated for routine expenses incurred in the normal functioning of a department. That budget will include items such as copying costs, materials (paper, highlighters, etc.), telephones, etc. Generally, those budgets have been low at CSUCI, and have not risen for many years. Generally, Administrative Analysts track expenditures against the operations budgets, and have the best sense of whether the department will exceed the allocation.

While it is important to be aware of the status of the Operations budget, there are several reasons that it is not a central concern. First, because the budgets have traditionally been low, many departments exceed the allocations. Second, there is very little that the chair can do to control that budget. (We are required to have telephones in each office, which is a significant expense. Copying can run up costs, and it is important to encourage faculty to use the least cost options – such as Coast Copy – for large batches, but one can assume that much of the copying is a fixed cost issue. That is, faculty need to make copies whether we're over budget or not.) Finally (and the good news) is that the Operations budget is a small part of the overall cost structure of a department (generally, for a mid-large department, the total departmental operations budget is about the cost to staff a single class). Consequently, it is definitely *not* a critical budget to address. Again, it is important to be aware of, in case there are surprise costs (a faculty member copying thousands of pages for exams or materials for students?), or to request additional funds from the dean in the following year. Again, those are things that the Administrative Analyst can communicate about. But it is mostly a budget to monitor and spend little concern on.

CERF/PACE Budget - The Continuing Education Revenue Fund (CERF), currently known as Professional and Continuing Education (PaCE), budget is funded by revenue share allocations

from Extended University and International Programs. CERF/PaCE funds are to be administered and spent for the support of continuing education and/or its programs, as required by state, CSU systemwide, and campus specific policy.

NTTF budget: The Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) budget is far and away the largest and most important budget for the chair to manage. For most departments, it is in the six figures – exceeding a half million dollars for large programs on campus. The chair has the central role in managing this budget – so it is the primary concern for budgeting issues. It also requires some additional training and understanding to manage effectively. The essential understandings are how the budget is allocated and how the budget is expended through scheduling. Both of those require an understanding of the basic components and determinants of NTTF budgeting: Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs), Students Credit Units (SCUs), Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF); Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES); and Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR). We will start by addressing each of those before moving on to an explanation of how departmental NTTF budgets are generated/allocated, addressing how scheduling can be done in a way that meets targets and falls within budgets, and finally how a schedule can be made within those parameters that best meets student and faculty needs.

B. Budgeting and scheduling metrics

The fundamental challenge of scheduling (and the related issue of NTTF budgeting) is creating a schedule that best serves students (largely by providing most access to the courses needed to proceed toward graduation in a timely manner) while simultaneously hitting FTES and SFR targets and falling within budget. At the nexus of scheduling and budgeting are a handful of metrics that are the essential components to successful scheduling. In the sections below, we will review each of those components: SCUs, WTUs, FTES, FTEF, and SFR.

Student Credit Units (SCUs) and Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES): Chairs are familiar with the basic concept of Student Credit Units (SCUs) – the credits that each student earns toward graduation from each class they complete. Most of our classes are 3-unit classes, but there is plenty of variation around that baseline. In the California State University system, it is assumed that one SCU represents three hours of work on the part of the student – most often, representing one hour of classroom instruction (direct faculty contact) and two additional hours of out-of-class student work. (The balance between in-class and out-of-class work varies for some classes, as will be discussed later. But it is useful to start with the basic metric of one in-class hour to two out-of-class hours as the basis for one SCU.)

While SCUs are the basic building block of student schedules and work toward graduation, the basic building block of schedules are FTES, or Full-Time Equivalent Students. Every program (and school, and the university as a whole) has an FTES target – that is, the number of full-time equivalent students it should try to enroll in its schedule. The targets are important for funding, for planning, for allocation tenure track faculty, and lots of other things. Really, they are the most rudimentary "output" from a university. As such, they are the metric that the Chancellor's Office uses for our funding – so, as a university, it is important that we *meet* those targets (to avoid losing funding), but also *not to exceed* those targets (since that

means teaching students for which we are not funded – which invites the CO and the legislature to conclude that we're getting funded at a higher rate than necessary).

FTES are simply bundles of 15 SCUs, which represents a full-time student. It is important to point out that one FTES can be accounted for by a student enrolled in 15 SCUs, or five students enrolled in one 3 unit course – and lots of other permutations. For a department (or the school as a whole), because each bundle of 15 SCUs represents one FTES, total FTES is simply the total SCUs divided by 15.

At this point, it is important to distinguish between FTES *targets* (for programs, schools, and the university as a whole) and *actual* FTES. Each program is allocated a target by their dean that it should seek to meet through intentional scheduling (to be addressed below). But while we can plan for targets, we do not know what the *actual* FTES will be until we get our final enrollment count – known as the "census" which occurs following the third week of every semester. (The university is funded based on our census.) So, there is always some gap between a schedule designed to hit a certain FTES target and the actual FTES count for the semester. We can't account for the individual decisions made by thousands of students about which classes to take or how many classes to take in a given semester, and whether to drop a class (or drop out altogether due to work or family obligations). When we make a schedule, we know what the caps are for any given class, but we also know that classes do not always (or even most often) hit their caps. It sounds like a complete crapshoot. The good news is that we have a lot of data to help us make surprisingly accurate estimates of enrollments – and we'll address those below in the sections on scheduling. All of this is to say that when we talk about FTES, we have to make sure that we understand whether we're talking about *targets* or *actual* (and that a central goal of good scheduling is to close the gap between them).

Note: One will often hear our campus enrollment presented in two ways: FTES and Headcount. Headcount refers to the actual bodies of our enrolled students. Because FTES represents the "bundles" of 15 SCUs, and because students on average take slightly less than 15 SCUs per semester, our headcount is always somewhat higher. (FTES have been somewhat over 6,000 in recent years, while headcount has been closer to 7,000.)

Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) and Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF): If FTES are the most rudimentary *output* for the university, FTEF are the most rudimentary *input*. WTUs and FTEF can be thought of as the faculty workload analog of student workload as represented in SCUs and FTES. WTUs are the fundamental units that comprise faculty workload – whether they are directed toward teaching, or toward service, or toward some other type of "reassigned time" (reassignment, that is, from teaching load – which is generally for some special form of service).

The CSU contract for full-time faculty is for 15 WTUs. For tenure track faculty, 12 of those WTUs are dedicated to teaching. (Exceptions are made for new faculty, who get 6 WTUs of reassigned time for their first who years to allow for new preps, research progress, etc. And other faculty get reassigned time for various other types of service.) For non-tenure track faculty (NTTF, or lecturers), the full-time load is also 15 WTUs, with all of that applied to teaching.

The relationship between WTUs and FTEF is very similar to the relationship between SCUs and FTES (with one critical complicating factor, as I'll explain below). So, one FTEF is

represented by 15 WTUs of teaching assigned to one or more lecturer – say, one lecturer assigned to 15 WTUs of teaching, or five lecturers each teaching 3 WTUs, or some combination. Again, the important point is the 15 WTUs – it doesn't matter how many lecturers are teaching them (in the same way that it doesn't matter how many students are carrying the 15 SCUs to count for one FTES).

The critical complicating factor mentioned above is that the calculation for TTF is that it is 12 WTUs of teaching that accounts for one FTEF. At first glance, this makes sense, since the teaching load for TTF is 12 WTUs. It doesn't make sense because that is not the extent of TT workload – and it complicates and confuses calculations for SFR (discussed below). But it is the way that the CSU calculates FTEF, so we're stuck with it. The point, again, is that one FTEF for lecturers is 15 WTUs of teaching, while one FTEF for TTF is 12 WTUs of teaching.

Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR): Student-Faculty Ratio, or SFR, is simply the ratio of full-time faculty to full-time students. On one side is the number of FTES (or SCUs divided by 15), and on the other side is FTEF (which, somewhat more complicatedly, is the number of WTUs taught by NTTF divided by 15, added to the number of WTUs taught by TTF divided by 12). Our university as a whole has a SFR of about 21:1 – that is, 21 full-time equivalent students for each full-time equivalent faculty.

Student-Faculty Ratio (as any such ratio) is simply the first sum divided by the second sum. That is: Students divided by Faculty (or how many students are enrolled for each faculty member. Of course, we have to make adjustments for credits associated with classes, and how many classes faculty are teaching, and whether those faculty are tenure track or lecturers – but the basic idea holds. The way that we make all of those adjustments at the level of the schedule as a whole (which is the only level at which it makes sense) is simply by using the FTES and FTEF metrics. If one follows the logic of the metrics introduced above, then, we can see that the basic formula for SFR is simply FTES/FTEF.

Just like FTES, it is important with SFR to distinguish between SFR *targets* and *actual* SFR – the former which is the plan, and the latter which is the outcome. (Again, I'll reiterate that good scheduling based on a clear understanding of FTES and SFR will produce actuals that are very close to the targets.) Let's start with targets: Each program is given an SFR target along with the FTES target – which serve as the twin metrics for scheduling. It is also important to recognize that different programs have different SFR targets. Each program is given an SFR target by their dean – and those targets can be substantially different based on the type of program and program needs. So, for example, programs in studio arts and lab sciences typically have lower SFR targets due to the need for a number of smaller classes to allow for more intensive faculty-student interaction (in studio and lab classes). Once one understands how SFR targets work – requiring a higher or lower number of students in courses across the schedule – one understands that SFR is a budgeting mechanism. Essentially, a lower SFR means that the program's students are funded at a relatively higher rate. And vice versa – a higher SFR means that the program is funded at a relatively lower rate per student.

While the concept of SFR is simple enough, it can get to be a little more complicated to project than FTES – in part because while FTES is a first order calculation (essentially just enrollments), SFR is a second order calculation (estimated FTES divided by FTEF, which depends not only on enrollments, but on the balance of TTF and NTTF in the schedule).

K Factor and S Factor Courses: We need to address one final complication for all of the metrics relying on student credit hours (SCUs) – which, derivatively, means FTES and SFR (since it relies on FTES). So far, we have implicitly assumed that teaching WTUs and learning SCUs are essentially a one-to-one equivalence. That is, for a 3 unit course, students get three SCUs and faculty workload is 3 WTUs – and the faculty meets with the student for three class hours per week. Thankfully, that is the case for the *overwhelming majority* of our courses. But there are a small number of courses for which the WTUs and SCUs are slightly different – which affects the calculation of all of the components above, directly or indirectly, as well as the number of class hours that are expected to earn the WTUs. Those courses are K factor courses (a little bit of a misnomer, corrected below) and S factor courses, described below.

The K factor is a "multiplier" that indicates how many WTUs are allocated based on SCUs. (I mentioned that speaking of "K factor courses" is a bit of a misnomer. What I meant is that *all* courses have a K factor – but for the overwhelming majority of courses that K factor is 1. That means that the "multiplier" for SCUs to WTUs is 1 – so, WTUs equal SCUs. As a result, it is common to speak of K factor courses as any course with a K factor *other than* 1.) The issue here, then, is which courses have a k factor other than 1 – which, on our campus, are essentially limited to courses designated as activities and labs. For activities courses, the K factor is 1.3 – which means that a 3-unit course is allocated 3.9 WTUs. For lab and clinical courses, the K factor ranges from 1.5 to 2.0 – which means that a 3-unit course is allocated 4.5 or 6 WTUs, respectively. It is also important to point out that activities courses are expected to have two hours of class time for each SCU (so, typically, two hours of class for a 1-unit course), and labs and clinicals have three hours of class time for each SCU (so, three hours of class time for a 1-unit course – with the expectation that essentially all student work should be completed within the class time itself).

S factor courses are those in which WTUs for faculty workload are assigned on the basis of student enrollments. The primary course in which this occurs is the 492 course (independent study) – but also the similar 494 (independent research), and 497 (directed study). For each of those courses, WTUs are allocated at .33 per student – so that a 9 student course enrollment represents the typical 3 WTU assignment. While there are a fair number of independent study (and similar) courses across the schedule, most often they are just one or several students here and there. As a result, they are commonly taught as an overload – that is, taught above workload. (The reasons for that are that: 1) most often, there are not sufficient students to make a class enroll; 2) they are very difficult to work into a schedule because WTUs are unknown until final census; and 3) because they enroll a small number of students, which reduces FTES and SFR which requires raising caps elsewhere in the schedule to meet targets.) If they are taught on overload, they add (extremely marginally) to FTES, but they also reduce SFR – which is important to keep in mind when trying to meet targets.

While K factors and S factors complicate projections (targets) and calculations (actuals) for FTES and SFR, they are pretty marginal (both because they are a relatively small part of the schedule, and because the adjustments aren't generally huge). Still, for ninja-level targeting, they should be considered. Having said that, they are extremely important to consider for faculty workloads, since TTF have to account for all of their assigned WTUs, and because

variation in WTUs will affect lecturers take-home pay, entitlements, and may bump them over 15 (which cannot be done).

Recommended resource: Humboldt State University has a very useful description of SCUs that clearly explains the basics of the SCU concept, as well as addresses the complexity of K factors and S factors. The document is **How to Calculate: Credit Units / Class Time / Course Classifications / Faculty Workload**.

C. NTTF budget allocation and expenditures

With an understanding of the budgeting and scheduling metrics, we can now turn to the question of how NTTF budget is allocated (by the school, or dean), and how to calculate expenditures to ensure that the schedule is made within the NTTF budget. Essentially, all of these calculations determine the *size* of the schedule; subsequently, we will address some heuristics for ensuring that the schedule best serves students. We will start with allocation.

NTTF budget allocation: NTTF budget allocation is made on the basis of need. Programs are provided the resources that they will need to provide the classes that their students need to progress and to graduate. In a general sense, the allocation is made based on the need of the program to pay faculty to staff the courses necessary to deliver the courses needed by its students (both within the major and outside of the major). More specifically, the allocation is made based on the FTES target (which determines how many student-classes the program should be offering) – and adjusted based on two other metrics: the number of TT faculty that the program has to teach some of those courses, and the SFR target (which dictates, roughly on average, how many FTES should be enrolled for each course). And there are adjustments to be made for reassigned time and so forth, but that is the foundation of the NTTF allocation. Let's look at that more closely.

Once a program has been assigned both an FTES target and an SFR target, that essentially determines the number of courses (or, technically, course units) that the program will offer (assuming a rough average of enrollments) across the schedule, and at the given salaries of lecturers. (Technically, it determines that number across the academic year, which planning has to allocate for each semester.) Once we know the total WTUs needed to staff the schedule, we can determine a rough estimate of NTTF need – which is simply the number of WTUs beyond what will be taught by the existing TT faculty. So, we subtract the total TT faculty teaching WTUs from the total WTU need, and we have determined the remaining NTTF need. Technically, we have the NTTF WTU need – which we could convert into FTE NTTF by simply dividing that WTU need by 15 WTUs. Remember: for NTTF, one FTEF is simply equal to 15 WTUs.) That is the standard for our baseline funding.

To convert those WTUs into funding, we simply multiply by the funding level that each program is given per WTU. That, too, varies from program to program based on a variety of factors such as past averages, market rates, etc. (Generally, those rates mirror pay hierarchies across higher education as a whole.) So, put in another way, each program is funded (at a rate set by the school) for each WTU that they need to staff to meet their targets beyond the WTUs available from TT faculty. That is the NTTF budget that chairs have to work with – that is, the baseline NTTF budget.

Now, there are always adjustments to be made to that baseline. For example, program chairs have reassignments to teaching on the order of 6 to 12 WTUs annually (depending on things such as the size of the program, past deals, etc.). So, that adds a corresponding number of WTU need for NTTF, and will add to the NTTF budget. Likewise, the variety of reassignments that TT faculty receive will make them unavailable to devote those WTUs to teaching – so the program should be reimbursed by the unit that they will be serving with that reassigned time. Likewise with WTUs devoted to the Program Advisor role, to sabbaticals, UNIV 498 courses, etc. – essentially, anything that takes their WTUs out of the teaching pool. (Oddly, leaves on our campus are not reimbursed – so programs just go over budget to a corresponding amount.)

It is important to note that the final funding for NTTF is a bit of a rolling total. Last-minute changes occur when faculty are pulled into some reassigned service or leave at the last minute (for which additional NTTF funding is provided to hire a replacement at the last minute). Ultimately, that should level out, though, as TT WTUs taken out of the mix are replaced with funding for NTT WTUs. Likewise, in some cases it will be necessary to add classes as enrollment patterns become clear, long after the initial NTTF budget has been allocated. An approval of those classes is essentially an agreement to increase funding in the NTTF budget, so it should not increase (or diminish) any gap between budget allocated and budget expended (only to the extent that the faculty assigned to those classes are paid at a rate higher or lower than the average/funded rate, although that is a marginal shift).

NTTF budget expended: NTTF budget expended is simply the mirror image of NTTF budget allocated. NTTF budget is expended to pay for each WTU (or course, as "bundles" of WTUs) taught by NTT faculty. The primary difference is that while NTTF budget per WTU is *allocated* at a constant rate (generally determined by past averages), NTTF budget is *expended* based on the actual salaries of NTT faculty being hired to teach those classes. Of course, most of the NTT faculty in any program at any given time are continuing, so the funding rate should be generally based on that mix of salaries. Hiring new faculty changes that – however, in most cases (though certainly not all) continuing faculty generally have higher salaries than new hires. That means that such late adjustments generally contribute more to NTTF allocation than to NTTF expenditures, in a relative sense.

D. Principles of scheduling

With an understanding of the various components above, one can approach scheduling in a way that works intentionally to hit the assigned targets within the assigned budget. That is the core task of scheduling, from a budgetary perspective. To reiterate, however, that the way the NTTF budget is calculated and allocated means that if a schedule meets the FTES targets at the assigned SFR, then budget is essentially assured to be fine. So the budget itself does not need to be considered during the scheduling process – only checked after the schedule is put together to make sure the numbers line up (which, again, will virtually always be the case if the FTES and SFR are on target).

Now, we noted above the core task of scheduling *from a budgetary perspective*. But the more fundamental task is not budgetary. Rather, the fundamental task is to provide students access to the classes that they need, when they need them, to move promptly through the major toward graduation. The challenges associated with that task will vary according to several factors in the major, such as the extent of sequencing within the major, the balance between

core requirements and electives, the balance between major-oriented courses and GE courses, variations in course caps across program classes, and even the program SFR which may allow more or fewer empty seats across the schedule as a whole.

Making the necessary courses available to students is more complicated in a sequenced program because in order to proceed they need to have specific courses available in a specific semester – which requires estimating the number of seats (and sections) that may be necessary in any given semester. (For programs that do not have a specific sequence – or which have a wider variety of electives and fewer core requirements – there is less need for getting the right number of seats each semester.) To estimate the number of seats, there are a variety of heuristics that can be helpful – always starting with the number of seats/sections available in the most recent semester. (In checking past schedules, it is important to use the previous fall for a fall semester schedule, and the previous spring for a spring semester schedule – since there are important variations across semesters.) While the previous (matching) semester is a good starting place, *it is generally not useful to simply replicate the previous semester to make a schedule*. First, that previous semester may not have met student needs -- it is critical to assess whether student needs were met in that semester, and adjustments made. Second, student needs may have changed. For example, growth of the major (or decline), or altered curriculum (inside or outside the major), or shifting popularity of courses (due to topic, timing, staffing) may change course demand.

E. Creating a schedule to hit FTES and SFR targets

Once one has a firm understanding of the needs of students, and a basic understanding of the metrics of scheduling (and budgeting), it is possible to compile the fundamental building blocks of a schedule: the courses to be offered.

Building to meet FTES targets: The first target to address in scheduling is the FTES target. FTES, to recall, is generated by the SCUs for each course multiplied by the student enrollment – summed across all courses in the schedule. Some schools have useful templates that allow this to be calculated automatically, but it can also be done rather simply on one's own in an Excel spreadsheet. All that is required is a list of courses, with the credits noted, and estimated enrollments. The rest is basic multiplication (enrollments x SCUs) and addition (summing up estimated FTES for each class). Again, this can be done very simply in an Excel spreadsheet.

Of course, while SCUs for each class is a fixed multiplier, enrollments have to be estimated – which means that estimated FTES will only be as accurate (i.e., as close to the *actual* FTES that eventually are counted) as the estimates of enrollments for each class. One common mistake to avoid in estimating enrollments is to just default to the course cap. A course may hit a cap (and if one is doing a lot of very intentional scheduling, perhaps many courses will hover right around those caps), but simply assuming that all courses will achieve maximum FTES is a recipe for underestimating (perhaps badly) the total FTES.

Projecting class enrollments may seem daunting – like trying to get inside the minds of hundreds of potential students – but, as noted above, there are some very useful tools that one can use to predict enrollments within a pretty narrow range. By starting with a previous semester, one can see approximately how many students enrolled in a particular course

(whether one or multiple sections). One can consider whether there was unmet need (meaning that if more sections are offered, or if caps are raised, there is potential for greater enrollments). And then considering issues such as growth, decline, possible external drivers of enrollments, time changes that may bring in more (or fewer) students, etc. Mental heuristics can make adjustments for projected enrollments. The good news is that the more times that one creates a schedule, and estimates enrollments, the better one gets at it – and the better the base schedule that one adjusts from.

I have noted that one does not want to simply use course capacity to estimate course enrollments. However, it is important to note that where one sets course caps will certainly have an impact on course enrollments – and, hence, on FTES. So it is worth stopping for a moment to discuss course capacity (or course caps). A program can (and should) thoughtfully and intentionally adjust course caps upward or downward (accounting for such things as how many students can effectively be taught in that course, which is closely related to the anticipated faculty workload per student) to achieve the most effective deployment of resources across the schedule. That is, for classes (like the capstone, for example) which may require a lot of investment in each student, it is important to keep the caps relatively low – both for student learning and for faculty sanity! On the other hand, if electives are mostly "exposure" courses where less is expected in terms of student skill development (and therefore less intensive for grading and other interactions), it may be possible to raise the caps significantly. The purpose of those adjustments is to use the personnel resources of colleagues in the way that best serves students as a whole. (One way of thinking about this is the idea of faculty "workload neutrality" across courses – such that those with higher per student workload have lower enrollments, and vice versa.) That balancing of course caps (and enrollments) is central to the balancing across the schedule that determines SFR.

Balancing to meet SFR targets: Estimating SFR is slightly more complicated than estimating FTES in an arithmetic sense. However, once course enrollments have been projected, all of the necessary components are in place to compute the estimated SFR for those enrollments. Remember that SFR across the schedule as a whole is simply FTES/FTEF (or FTES divided by FTEF). One can certainly make that calculation for individual classes – but SFR targets are only important for the schedule as a whole. We have already addressed the logic of setting course caps differentially across the schedule to optimize student learning and faculty workload. Of course, if we want to truly optimize student learning (and optimize/minimize faculty workload) we can just lower caps on all courses. What prevents us from doing that is our need to meet our SFR targets (which is premised on the fair and rational assignment of SFRs across all programs that will allow us to meet our FTES targets within the budget that we have been allocated). Meeting SFR targets is about the balance across the schedule such that the mix of courses (some with higher caps, and some with lower caps) together meets the appropriate SFR.

(*Note:* It is tempting to think about SFR as simply the average class size – and in some ways that is correct, if we take into consideration a lot of issues of weighting for class credits, TT or NTT faculty, K and S factors, number of course sections, etc. Once all of that is taken into consideration, the idea of average class size has to be significantly adjusted.)

Let's look at how to best calculate SFR – whether *actual* SFR after census, or *projected* SFR based on a given schedule. The easiest way to do that is to sum up all estimated FTES (described in the previous section) and divide that by FTEF. So, the question is how to calculate FTEF for a given schedule. Let's turn to that.

Calculating FTEF across a full schedule is done by summing up the (portion of) FTEF that each course represents. Now, this is where the adjustment for TTF or NTTF is important – because a 3-unit course is .2 FTEF for a NTTF or .25 FTEF for a TTF. Let's unpack that. First, we're assuming here that a 3-unit course is assigned 3 WTUs for the faculty member. (Again, that isn't the case for courses where the K factor or S factor come into play – such as labs, activities, independent studies, etc. For those, you will have to either calculate the WTUs [based on the K factor] or estimate the WTUs [based on enrollment for S factor courses]). Regardless of the specific WTUs, the FTEF for the course is simply WTUs/FTEF (where FTEF is 12 units for TTF or 15 units for NTTF). So, for our 3-unit and 3 WTU example: If the course is taught by a NTTF, it is 3/15 or .2 FTEF; If it is taught by a TTF, it is 3/12 or .25 FTEF. It can be a bit confusing at first, but it will come to make sense once you work with it for a while (and give up on the faulty logic which suggests that TTF workload is all in teaching). Of course, sometimes it will be necessary to make a best guess as to whether a TTF or NTTF will be teaching a given course – since courses have to be added late, or dropped late, or reassigned time comes up that requires reassigning classes, etc. Once one gets familiar with the basic logic, one can get a pretty good sense of the range within which SFR is likely to change based on foreseeable adjustments – and most of the time, changes will run in different directions so that the net effect is not large.

So, each course is allocated a percentage or fraction of an FTEF based on the WTUs assigned (which *may* be influenced by K and S factors) and which varies based on the faculty member assigned (whether NTTF or TTF). Once the WTU for each course is determined, then, it is possible to calculate the (portion of) FTEF associated with each course. Once that has been done, it simply requires summing up the FTEF for each course in the same way that FTES is summed up across all courses. That sum will be the FTEF for the schedule. At that point, we have both estimated FTES and estimated FTEF, so estimated SFR is just one step away: simple division. FTES / FTEF – and that is SFR.

One final note: It is useful to keep in mind that SFR is very "sticky" – that is, it takes a lot to change it dramatically. That is good news if it is where it should be, but bad news if it needs to move much. For that reason, it is useful to keep a close eye on it when the schedule is made, because it is (again) very difficult to shift mid-stream, or to remedy in spring semester if fall semester is off.

F. Time scheduling

When creating the time schedule, it is critical to remember one additional piece of wisdom: *Schedules are made for students, not for faculty*. Faculty may have particular interests that run contrary to the needs of students – such as teaching multiple sections of the same course on adjacent times and days. We will address below how to best accommodate faculty – which is another critical piece of the puzzle. But the primary goal has to be to provide students the courses they need when they need them – and then to accommodate faculty as well as possible within that structure.

To arrange time scheduling to best accommodate student access, several principles hold:

- Broaden scheduling options as widely as possible, so that students with different schedules can access the classes that they need. Different sections of the same course (or courses that fulfill the same general role) should be spread across the schedule in terms of day and time options.
- Many of our programs have students with day jobs, so making some classes available in the evening can be particularly helpful for those students.
- Courses that should be taken in the same semester should be offered in close time proximity. That will assist students hoping to create a schedule that demands as few trips to campus as possible – and minimize "down time" on campus (although some non-class time on campus is actually a good thing for students).

G. Faculty assignments

While the priority in scheduling must be the consideration of students, there are still a number of principles to keep in mind for faculty assignments to ensure fairness and optimal satisfaction among colleagues.

It is critical to start by identifying how many teaching WTUs each faculty should be assigned. For TT faculty, that means simply getting as much information as possible on reassignments for the coming year or semester, and taking those away from their 12 WTUs per semester.

Entitlements: For NTT faculty, identifying the appropriate number of courses to assign means understanding entitlements, and getting accurate information about the specific entitlements of each person. In the CSU system, lecturers gain entitlements after teaching for two semesters for a program. Those entitlements are equal to the WTUs that they have taught; as their teaching WTUs increase, so do their entitlements. CSUCI Faculty Affairs has produced a useful **handout that explains the basics of entitlements**. Entitlements are tracked by Faculty Affairs, and they will send accurate information about the entitlements of each lecturer around scheduling time. It is critical to understand entitlements because they determine who among lecturers should be assigned courses first. It is also important to understand the imitations of entitlements. First, they apply to WTUs generally, and not to any course(s) in particular. That is, lecturers have entitlements to employment, but they do not have entitlement to any particular course. Second, entitlements only apply to courses that are actually scheduled; that is, entitlements do not require adding courses solely for the purpose of meeting entitlements.

Preferences: Ask at the beginning of each scheduling cycle: What classes would you like to teach ideally (and which are you able to teach in a pinch)? Do you have preferences (or dealbreakers) for time and day scheduling? Some faculty will want back-to-back classes to make their schedule most "efficient," while others will want to avoid that so they have time to get into focus for each class. Scheduling issues may include work at other campuses (for lecturers), or a variety of family obligations requiring particular schedules. Again, it is important to get that information before the schedule is created. It is much easier to accommodate preferences at the time when a schedule is being created, than to try to accommodate them by revising a

schedule (which can entail a lot of time and frustration). Some (most?) will want to teach multiple sections of the same class, if available; some will find it boring to teach repeat sections. Some will want day classes, some will want evening class. Again, for these reasons, it is useful to send out an inquiry (which can be easily automated) about teaching preferences. It is important to make clear that not all preferences can be met, but that the best effort will be made to meet them – with the proviso (again) that schedules are made for students first.

It is also important to be fair in making assignments – and fair may differ from program to program. One of the greatest scheduling tensions is between TTF and NTTF – and there are a wide range of logics in determining how to assign classes across those groups. In some programs, TTF may be assigned first – with the idea that their preferences should be given priority – and NTTF assigned to what remains. Other programs may try to be more equitable to ensure that lecturers also have opportunities to teach sought-after courses. Among lecturers, it is important to distinguish between long-term and/or full-time lecturers, and those who may be brought in temporarily, or only teach a particular course regularly.

Among TTF, an equally important distinction should be made between junior and senior faculty. Junior faculty should be protected as much as possible – both in terms of limiting new preps, and providing schedules that will allow the most focused time for research. Senior faculty may feel entitled to first dibs (and perhaps that is the culture in some programs), but that should be resisted (or at least determined collectively).

However those decisions are made, equitability should be among the concerns for assignments. Equitability should also pertain to teaching high workload courses (like the capstone), or at times that are often less desirable (evenings). Rotation across semesters is often the fairest solution.

Tracking and documenting faculty workloads: A final set of tasks is associated with tracking and documenting faculty workloads, which should be a simple outcome of the processes above. All TT faculty are responsible for 15 WTUs per semester, and the chair should ensure that through proper scheduling. Generally, that means assigning 12 WTUs for teaching each semester, with the remining 3 WTUs being assigned for general service obligations. (*Note:* TT faculty workload can be imbalanced such that more WTUs are assigned in the fall or spring, as long as the annual WTUs allocation are met within the Academic/Fiscal year.)

Faculty, of course, will often have some additional reassigned time – for example, a special service task that takes significant time (beyond expectations associated with the general 3 WTU service allocation) will be granted reassignment (generally in increments of 3 WTUs, mirroring a course assignment). Similar reassignments can occur when a faculty member is awarded a grant (intramural or extramural) in which funds have been allocated for reassignments. Regardless of the source, it is the chair's responsibility to ensure that teaching assignments are made to balance out the workload to 30 WTUs annually (including the 6 service WTUs). Before a faculty member is reassigned out of a course, the funding source should be verified – whether that is a confirmation of grant funding or confirmation of funding from an intramural source. As long as chairs are routinely accounting for TT faculty workloads, providing that documentation should not take any additional time or effort – and is rather just a by-product of regular academic scheduling processes. At CSUCI, the documentation is

generally submitted by program staff at the request of Academic Affairs (generally to the Dean, or directly to other offices that track reassignments for Academic Affairs as a whole).

Chairs are also responsible for processing Additional Employment forms for faculty in their department. Generally, requests for completing those forms go directly to faculty, but chairs are generally routed in the submission process for their signatures through AdobeSign. They are included in that route so that they are aware of such additional employment of their faculty. Again, this should not generate additional workload for the chair, aside from routine signatures for faculty who claim additional employment.