I. Minutes:
Approval of minutes for the Academic Senate meeting of May 5, 2009 (pp 2-3).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:
Regular reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA Campus President:
G. ASI Representative:

Special reports:

IV. Consent Agenda:
Approval of Curriculum Committee recommendations for ART 370, Michelangelo, and GSA 551, International Taxation:
http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/curric-handbook/Continuous-Course-Summaries/Continuous-Course-Summary.doc

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Proposal to Establish CAFES Center for Sustainability: Francis/Phillips/Shelton, representatives for CAFES, second reading (pp 4-23).
B. Resolution on Revision to Fairness Board Description and Procedures: Shapiro, representative for Fairness Board, second reading (p 24).
C. Resolution on Making Excellence Inclusive at Cal Poly: Executive Committee, second reading (p 25).
D. Resolution on Archiving Senior Projects: Phillips, chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading (p 26).
E. Resolution on Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to Community: Executive Committee, second reading (pp 27-28).
F. Resolution on Campus Administrative Policies Section 523: Executive Committee, second reading (pp 29-46).
G. Resolution on Sustainability Learning Objectives: Lancaster, chair of the Sustainability Committee, first reading (pp 47-49).
H. Resolution on Mergers and/or Reorganizations of Academic Programs, Academic Senate Executive Committee, first reading (pp 50-51).

Continued on page two
I. **Resolution on Retention Promotion and Tenure Focus Group Report**: Kurfess, chair of the Research and Professional Development Committee, first reading (pp 52-60).

J. **Resolution on Research and Professional Development**: Kurfess, chair of the Research and Professional Development Committee, first reading (p 61).

K. **Resolution to Approve a Course to Facilitate Continuous Enrollment of Graduate Students**: Hannings, Chair of Curriculum Committee (pp 62-67).

L. **Resolution on Statement on Academic Freedom**: Foroohar, chair of Faculty Affairs Committee (pp 68-71).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
I. Minutes: The minutes of April 14, 2009 were approved as presented.

II. Communications and Announcements: none.

III. Reports:

   Regular reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: none.
   B. President's Office: none.
   C. Provost: none.
   D. Vice President for Student Affairs: none.
   E. Statewide Senate: none.
   F. CFA Campus President: none.
   G. ASI Representative: none.

IV. Consent Agenda: Course proposals for HIST 100 and SCM 302 were approved.

V. Business Item(s):
   A. Election of Senate Chair and Vice Chair for 2009-2010: The following appointments were made by acclamation:
      Academic Senate Chair: Rachel Fernflores, Philosophy
      Academic Senate Vice-Chair: Camille O'Bryant, Kinesiology
   
   B. Resolution in Recognition of Shared Governance as an Important Component of Faculty Service (Faculty Affairs Committee): Forooohar presented this resolution, which encourages faculty to participate in shared governance, reinstates the value of shared governance in the RPT process, and asks the administration to provide active and material support. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

   C. Resolution on Revision to Fairness Board Description and Procedures (Fairness Board): Shapiro presented this resolution, which allows the Board to dismiss a case if the grievant student fails to appear at the scheduling hearing. Resolution will return as a second reading item.
D. Resolution on Making Excellence Inclusive at Cal Poly (Executive Committee): Soares presented this resolution, which requests that Making Excellence Inclusive be a goal of the Cal Poly learning community; and its efforts recognized as a component of the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure evaluation. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

E. Resolution on Archiving Senior Projects (Instruction Committee): Phillips presented this resolution, which request that departmental policies on archiving senior projects be available in writing to all students and conform with Kennedy Library requirement, university policies regarding Intellectual Property Rights, and FERPA. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

F. Resolution on Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to Community (Executive Committee): Cornel Morton, Vice President for Student Affairs, presented this resolution, which asks the Academic Senate to endorse the Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to Community. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

G. Resolution on Campus Administrative Policies Section 523 (Executive Committee): Soares presented this resolution, which requests that the Memorandum of Understanding between the CSU and Unit 3 Faculty, be the controlling terms and conditions to resolve ambiguity and govern conflicts in the application of section 523 in faculty personnel actions. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

H. Resolution on Proposal to Establish CAFES Center for Sustainability (CAFES): Hunter Francis, Program Associate for the Sustainable Agriculture Resource Consortium (SARC), presented this resolution, which requests the establishment of CAFES Center for Sustainability as a replacement for SARC. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

VI. Discussion Item(s): none.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by

Gladys Gregory
Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
RESOLUTION ON
PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES (CAFES) CENTER
FOR SUSTAINABILITY

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the attached proposal to establish College of
Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences (CAFES) Center for
Sustainability.

Proposed by: College of Agriculture, Food and
Environmental Sciences
Date: April 13 2009
State of California
Memorandum

To: John Soares, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Robert D. Koob
      Provost and Vice President
      for Academic Affairs

Date: April 13, 2009

Copies: Susan Opava
        David Wehner

Subject: Request for Academic Senate Review of the
         Proposal for the Establishment of the CAFES
         Center for Sustainability

Attached is a copy of a preliminary proposal to establish the CAFES Center for Sustainability. In accordance with campus policy for the Establishment, Evaluation and Discontinuation of Centers and Institutes, this proposal received conceptual approval by the Academic Deans’ Council at its meeting on April 6, 2009. I would now appreciate the Academic Senate’s review of this proposal, if possible, prior to the close of Spring Quarter 2009. Simultaneously an ad hoc committee, appointed by me, will review organizational and financial aspects of the proposed center. Please feel free to contact Dean David Wehner, College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences, author of the proposal should you have any questions or would like him to make a presentation to the Academic Senate.

Thank you, and if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact my office.
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Introduction

This document has been written to satisfy the requirements for the creation of an officially-sanctioned center at the California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo. Specifically, the Sustainable Agriculture Resource Consortium (SARC) wishes to become known as the CAFES Center for Sustainability. The SARC has been in existence since 2000, and started its movement towards becoming a permanent entity in 2002 when a faculty directorship was established. Since its inception, the SARC has been active in program development, outreach, and fundraising—all of which have allowed the SARC to create a presence on campus and in the community for sustainability-related activities such as the classes, projects, and conferences discussed below.

Given the SARC’s success, the increasing relevance of sustainability concerns to the agricultural industry, and rising interest in the topic on the part of students, staff and faculty, there is now consensus within the College of Agriculture, Food, and Environmental Sciences (CAFES) to use the foundation SARC has laid to establish a new center—with a new name. The role of the current SARC in the process of the center’s development will be to steward its establishment, and meld into the new center upon its inception. The new center will become a focal point for activities around the theme of sustainability within CAFES. This focus will include:

- Existing SARC initiatives
- Relevant projects in virtually every CAFES Department
- Tasks previously assigned to CAFES’ Resource Conservation and Environmental Stewardship Committee
- Objectives generated by the ‘Sustainability’ strategic initiative, prioritized by CAFES’ 2008 Strategic Visioning process**
- Collaborations with the College’s Land Use Committee
- Fundraising, outreach, and recruitment for related programs

** One of eight strategic visions identified was: “CAFES educates leaders in sustainable agriculture, food industries, and environmental stewardship by modeling state-of-the-art sustainable practices in all of its operations.”

Since 2000, SARC activity has encompassed a wide array of issues. Our work has taken on especially critical importance since President Warren Baker signed the Talloires Declaration on April 23, 2004 that committed Cal Poly to “respond to, serve, and strengthen” its community for “local and global citizenship.” This has pushed us to maintain and strengthen our programs that serve both the local region and the state. In presenting this proposal for center status, we believe that the SARC has already attained a level of performance that is expected of centers and institutes at Cal Poly in terms of organization, fundraising, and recognition both inside and outside the University.

In the following sections, you will find text addressing the rationale, role, organization, financing and by-laws of the future center as currently planned.
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Rationale for the Center

This section of the proposal addresses the mission of the new Center, its reason for being and the gaps it fills.

The SARC has assisted the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences (CAFES) in responding to student and public interest in sustainability, which is growing rapidly. This growth reflects a need for information. The new center can help Cal Poly meet this need by working with faculty and staff to develop curricula, resources, and infrastructure, and, importantly, to cultivate connections with external stakeholders. This will greatly enhance the educational experience of those seeking to play leadership roles within a quickly changing and increasingly competitive agricultural landscape.

The current mission of the SARC is “to advance sustainable food and agricultural systems through the College of Agriculture at Cal Poly.” The SARC was formally conceived by two Cal Poly CAFES students in response to a desire to establish an umbrella organization at Cal Poly to promote sustainable agriculture. In particular, SARC was envisioned to coordinate activities at the Student Experimental Farm (SEF). The two-acre SEF was established in 1989 and was eventually certified as an organic farm in 1995. The SARC has helped the Farm maintain a high level of student interest, and has promoted faculty involvement. The current Cal Poly Organic Farm was established in 2000. It incorporates the original SEF site, plus an additional 9.5 acres within the Horticulture and Crop Science Department, both co-managed by that department.

Aside from the goal of maintaining and building programs around the Organic Farm, the SARC has been committed to creating numerous additional programs. This includes activities that go beyond the scope of certified organic agriculture. We believe a bona fide center based in CAFES is needed to advance similar activities. Our experience affirms that sustainability encompasses a broad range of practices, policies, and disciplines, to which the traditional academic department structure does not readily lend itself. The benefits of sustainability-related activities across departmental lines will deepen the understanding of students in each of the individual departments, and strengthen departments by promoting interdepartmental activities.

Furthermore, there is a need for an agriculture-based sustainability center to emphasize the agricultural aspects of sustainability in various forums at Cal Poly. Currently, other technical colleges such as engineering and architecture have well-established sustainability-oriented groups. Having an agriculture-based sustainability center will make it easier to partner with the existing groups in the other colleges to undertake multidisciplinary projects. It is important that the new center present itself as the agricultural face of sustainability when working with the University administration to implement the Talloires Declaration and other sustainability initiatives. Beyond providing a College presence in University-wide sustainability efforts, the new center will help link the College to external initiatives, and provide visibility for CAFES programs in the community and across the state (e.g., to prospective students, collaborators, and donors).

---

2 Answers the questions: What will the proposed unit do (research, public service, etc.)? Why is it needed? Why is the present organizational structure not adequate?
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The Center’s Role in the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences

This section of the proposal addresses how the center fits into the activities of the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences, both at the college and the department level, and who the center’s founding members are.

The new center will:

- Assist CAFES in providing leadership in the realm of sustainability
- Foster the development and funding of new curricula and research projects
- Compile existing information on sustainability in agriculture and resource management, and identify research needs and priorities for the future
- Increase the visibility of CAFES programs in sustainability (on and off campus)
- Assist CAFES in forging new partnerships with external leaders in sustainability
- Work with CAFES Advancement to identify funding sources for related projects
- Help CAFES to improve the sustainability of its operations
- Provide a CAFES voice in University-wide sustainability efforts

Members of the SARC have already developed a Sustainable Agriculture minor which is a broad set of courses introducing students to concepts of sustainability as they affect agriculture. The SARC has played a pivotal role in the growth of the Cal Poly Organic Farm, where students can participate via the Organic Farming Enterprise class, through student projects, and as paid staff or volunteers.

CAFES departments have made use of the Organic Farm via teaching and projects:

- Senior projects
- Numerous class field trip excursions
- Infrastructure improvement projects conducted by CAFES classes
- University-sponsored workshops (e.g., WOW and ‘Make a Difference Day’)
- Development of business and marketing plans (by AGB students)
- Studies in organic soil fertility, composting, and cropping systems

The SARC has also served CAFES goals by disseminating information on sustainable agriculture to the general public and various professional communities. It has done this through the hosting of an array of lectures, seminars and Continuing Education offerings. For example, every year since 2002, the SARC has hosted its annual Sustainable Agriculture Pest Management Conference in collaboration with CCOF (California Certified Organic Farmers). This professional development event has played a significant role in extending valuable information on sustainable practices, and in showcasing the work of CAFES faculty alongside the work of other researchers in this arena. The success of the conference has been made possible by a high level of involvement from industry partners. It provides an excellent model for the new center to expand this involvement.

---

3 Answers the questions: What is its relationship to the instructional program? Who are the unit’s founding members, and how does their expertise relate to its purpose? What effect will the unit have on the department(s) (e.g. will it generate released time for faculty or support for student research or internships)?
Outside of the University, the SARC has served as a key Cal Poly collaborator in several regional efforts to promote agricultural sustainability through:

- The Central Coast Ag Network and its ‘Central Coast Grown’ label;
- The Central Coast Agritourism Council’s ‘AgAdventures’ agri-tourism program;
- Numerous ‘farm-to-school’ workgroups seeking to establish connections between local farms and schools;
- CSU-sponsored Cesar Chavez Day, AmeriCorps, and other youth activities;
- The College Farms Sustainable Agriculture Educators Working Group, founded with other California universities (e.g., UC Berkeley, UC Davis, CSU Chico);
- An Invasive Pest Coalition project to assess the economic impact of select invasive pests and eradication measures on California agriculture.

Beyond current SARC initiatives, there are numerous classes and projects currently existing within CAFES, which could be expanded, supported and/or better promoted with the help of a new center. These include classes, research, and projects for:

- Agricultural policy
- Agri-tourism
- Alternative energy
- Animal husbandry and grazing systems (including grass-fed beef)
- Cropping systems
- Cultural diversity
- Fair Trade chocolate
- Irrigation and water systems technology
- Long-term ecological monitoring
- Organic food production, processing and certification
- Pest bio-control
- Range and watershed management
- Sustainable silviculture
- Sustainable viticulture

A variety of the above activities are currently being conducted at Cal Poly’s 3,000 acre Swanton Pacific Ranch, including an award-winning forestry program, an organic apple farm, a leased organic row crop operation, and a natural beef program. Given its distance from the San Luis Obispo campus, it has been a challenge to make CAFES students aware of the numerous sustainable agricultural opportunities at the Ranch. The new center would assist in this endeavor.

The SARC was founded by two CAFES students, Hunter Francis and Terry Hooker (both in ERSS), with the assistance of a faculty steering committee comprised of:

- John Phillips (HCS)
- Neal MacDougall (AGB)
- Tom Ruehr (ERSS)
- Doug Williams (BRAE)
- Mark Shelton (CAFES)
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Since 2000, additional faculty members have offered their assistance at critical junctures in the development of SARC and Organic Farm programs. Significant contributions have been made by:

- David Headrick (HCS)
- Rob Rutherford (ASCI)
- Tom Neuhaus (FSN)
- Lynn Moody (ERSS)
- Joe Montecalvo (FSN)
- Ramon Leon (formerly of the HCS, now at the EARTH University in Costa Rica)

As SARC initiatives have been largely soft-funded in the past, SARC participants are particularly grateful to the Horticulture and Crop Science, Agribusiness, and Earth and Soil Sciences Departments for their numerous in-kind contributions in the form of expertise, operational support, and staff time, as well as to the CAFES Dean for early seed funding.

The knowledge base of past, current, and future faculty involved with the SARC is, by necessity, diverse. However, SARC focus has been concentrated in the area of organic and sustainable crop production to date. Additionally, the SARC has worked closely with CAFES Farm Operations in the development and promotion of Cal Poly’s compost facility. The idea of forming a CAFES Center for Sustainability is to combine these with similar efforts for sustainability within CAFES. We expect that the establishment of a new center will significantly step up the involvement of CAFES faculty and staff, many of whom are already pursuing related initiatives.

In the past, involvement in the SARC at the dean’s office level has included participation by an Associate Dean in SARC oversight, and at the Assistant Dean level to help SARC find funding, and to help the college show off “learn by doing” concepts exemplified by SARC activities. There has been involvement by College accounting staff and by an accounting instructor in the Agribusiness Department to improve the organization and business operation of the SARC and the Organic Farm. Recently, the CAFES dean has engaged his department heads in providing consultation regarding the role a center for sustainability could play within the College, and he has committed to helping to underwrite the Director position for the center in the future.

It is expected that a new center would continue to draw the support and involvement of Cal Poly faculty to assist in the execution of its activities. The center would solicit ongoing university support for faculty resources as well as look externally for project-oriented support. Faculty participation would be encouraged by the development of grant funding to provide release time for participants. The center would facilitate the generation of pertinent grants, by helping to identify grant opportunities, by cultivating relationships with grantors, and by serving as an umbrella organization capable of developing resources for grant writers and of building a grant history. Furthermore, a dynamic and highly visible center for sustainability within CAFES would help to attract private sponsorship of and industry partnership in CAFES projects.
Organization of the Center\(^4\)

*This section of the proposal addresses the Center's organization, by-laws and its needs.*

At present, the SARC is a small organization with one full-time staff member (the Program Associate) serving under the direction of a Faculty Director. The intention for the new center in the near term is to keep its organizational structure simple, and overhead low. With the establishment of the center, we suggest creating a full-time directorship as a permanent position with part-time support staff directly responsible to the CAFES Dean and under the guidance of a faculty Steering Committee and an external Advisory Board. Currently, the SARC has a 28 member Advisory Board comprised of some of California's leading voices in the realm of sustainable and organic agriculture. The existing SARC Advisory Board can be refined and built upon. For the new center, the relationship of staff to the Steering Committee, the Advisory Board and CAFES administration is described in the by-laws and organizational chart below.

The new SARC Director will help facilitate faculty interested in working on projects relating to agricultural sustainability, in particular in subject areas identified by the College as strategic priorities. Specifically, a group of fifteen CAFES faculty from eight different departments has committed to working towards the College's sustainability priority by way of an *ad hoc* CAFES Sustainability Committee, and it is expected many among them will play an active role in the new center. These and other faculty already engaged in activities related to sustainability could serve as center 'Project Leaders' with little additional assignment.

Currently, the facility needs of the SARC are minimal, and it is expected this will continue to be the case with the establishment of a center. The SARC uses office space in Building 11 furnished by the Horticulture and Crop Science Department, which is shared with Cal Poly Organic Farm staff. Facilities under the control of departments like Agribusiness, Horticulture and Crop Science, and Dairy Science are often available to SARC when they involve curriculum-related activities (e.g., meetings, lectures, field trips). In the future and where possible, we anticipate that CAFES departments will work with the new center to provide facilities and resources for sustainability programs that directly benefit their respective students.

---

\(^4\) Answers the questions: What is the organizational structure of the unit? What are its by-laws? What support is required for the unit? What facilities will be needed (space, equipment, etc.)?
Financing of the Center

This section of the proposal will address the Center’s financing and sources of funding.

With funding for general support and for SARC projects, faculty have often been paid or compensated through release time. Students and staff have served the SARC through paid, work-study, volunteer or internship arrangements. The strategy for future funding of the new center will discriminate between program funding which will support the general, administrative work of the center, and project funding which will support specific projects that have specific outcomes and timelines.

Since its inception, the SARC has received substantial funding from external sources:

- The Columbia Foundation ($150,000)
- The Clarence E. Heller Foundation ($50,000)
- The Oreggia Family Foundation ($50,000, which was matched 2:1 by SARC with $100,000)

The SARC has also received numerous smaller grants from community and charitable organizations, such as:

- The San Luis County Board of Supervisors
- The San Luis Obispo Community Foundation
- The James Beard Foundation of New York

SARC has held four successful annual fundraising dinners in the past four years. These dinners have raised as much as $50,000 each. The most recent dinner, held on October 2, 2008, featured special guest speaker Dr. Timothy LaSalle, former Cal Poly professor and current CEO of the Rodale Institute in Pennsylvania. The dinners highlight the work of leading figures in the sustainability movement, and have helped raise awareness of sustainability efforts within CAFES. Best-selling author and journalist, Michael Pollan, is scheduled to be the guest speaker at the next fundraiser dinner on October 15, 2009.

Every December, the SARC co-sponsors, with the Sustainable Agriculture Pest Management Conference. This continuing education event attracts up to 200 pest control advisors (PCAs), agricultural consultants and growers. The event has been held each year for the past seven years, raising approximately $15,000 annually for the SARC.

In the future, the new center would expand activities through new projects managed by the center and funded, most likely, through project-related grants from external funding sources. For example, the center could expand the pest management conference to a second site, or develop new conferences around other themes. Funds are available through USDA and EPA to undertake new conferences dealing with the promotion of organic agriculture, community food systems, and the reduction of pesticide use, as well as other topics related to sustainability.

5 Answers the questions: How will the unit be financed in the short term and in the long term? What will happen if outside sources of funding are no longer available after the unit is formed?
Other sources of project funding include:

- The Agricultural Research Initiative (ARI) funding
- State Faculty Support Grants
- Instructionally-Related Activities funds
- Kellogg Foundation and funding from similar charitable foundations
- Organic Farming Research Institute grants
- Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (Western SARE) grants
- USDA Higher Education Challenge grants

The center should also be able to receive back from Grants Development, once it reaches the critical mass of grant awards, a portion of the overhead recovered on grant activity.

Other sources of financing may come from business opportunities generated by the center’s activities. For example, the center could work with the Organic Farm to begin supplying more produce to Cal Poly’s Campus Dining, thus shifting some of its production to Cal Poly customers as well as brokering with local organic growers to meet the complete demand of on-campus eateries. The farm currently generates approximately $300,000 of revenue from its annual, subscription Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) program, most of which is put directly back into operating the Organic Farm.

The SARC currently enjoys the use of funds generated by the Armstrong Endowment, which were granted for use by the SARC by Dean David Wehner. In the past, this endowment was used to cover the quarter-time release of SARC’s Faculty Director throughout the regular academic year. The SARC will also receive distribution of the Dr. Sonya Woods Anderson Sustainable Agriculture Resource Consortium Endowment, a $100,000 permanent endowment established as part of Dr. Woods’ estate plan. Revenue generated from this endowment in the future will be used exclusively for the purposes of meeting the greatest needs of the Sustainable Agriculture Resource Consortium (and, eventually, the new center).

The center will continue to undertake general, non-event-oriented fundraising throughout the year to supplement the other fundraising activities. As mentioned above, the center will play an active role in grant facilitation for faculty, and in collaborating with CAFES Advancement staff to cultivate private sponsorship. Through increased public awareness, the new center will build upon existing endowments to ensure an increasingly secure flow of funds to cover administrative costs. In the future, assistance in covering the center’s administrative operating expenses will be furnished by the CAFES Dean through partial underwriting of the Director position.
Participation in the Center\textsuperscript{6}

\textit{This section of the proposal will address the Center's membership and its Advisory Board.}

The Center shall be comprised of a center Program Director, a faculty Steering Committee, center Project Leaders and Program Assistants reporting to the Dean of the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences with the support of the center Advisory Board, all under the general oversight of the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs.

Faculty participating in center functions and projects will receive credit for these contributions in their reviews for retention, tenure and promotion as such participation can be classified readily as research, other scholarly activity, or service to the college or university. Professional development and service are recognized avenues for demonstrating merit in Cal Poly's faculty review process.

Oversight and governance of the SARC, as well as selection and responsibilities of its members, are described in the By-laws below.

\textsuperscript{6} Answers the questions: What constitutes membership in the unit? What is its advisory board? How is the board selected? How will the unit ensure that participating faculty receive credit for their contributions in the review for retention, tenure, and promotion?
Appendix A: By-laws of the CAFES Center for Sustainability

ARTICLE I - NAME
The name of this organization shall be the CAFES Center for Sustainability referred to in these By-laws as the center.

ARTICLE II - PURPOSE
Section 1 - Purpose: The center is a non-profit, non-partisan organization established for educational, research, and service purposes. The center will advance sustainable food and agricultural systems through the College of Agriculture at Cal Poly through a process of:

- Education of students and the general public on the principles and specific techniques for implementing sustainable practices related to food, agriculture and natural resource management;
- Demonstration of holistic approaches to sustainable agriculture and resource management on Cal Poly land;
- Investigation of sustainable farming, food systems, and natural resource management through the use of undergraduate senior projects, graduate theses and faculty research; and,
- Facilitation of collaborative efforts among students, faculty, staff, and community members interested in managing and promoting sustainable food, agricultural, and natural systems.

The center will be financed by grants, contracts, and revenue generated by center activities. The center will serve as a vehicle for securing industrial sponsorship and support to sustain projects at the center.

Section 2 - Policies: The policies of the center shall be in harmony with the policies of the California State University and the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo ("University"), and the California Polytechnic State University Corporation ("Corporation").

ARTICLE III - PARTICIPANTS
Section 1 - Class of Participants: Participants may be faculty, staff, and students of the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, and consultants, research associates, and others interested in the center.

a. Faculty: Faculty participants are persons appointed by the University to faculty rank and participating in the activities of the center.

b. Staff: Staff participants are persons employed by the University or Corporation and participating in the activities of the center.

c. Students: Student participants are persons engaged in study at the University on a full-time or part-time basis, and participating in the activities of the center.

d. Affiliated Researchers: Affiliated researchers are faculty or other persons from outside the University who carry out or collaborate on research and/or other projects under the auspices of the center.

e. Industry Representatives: Industry representatives are persons actively engaged in the agricultural industry as practitioners, vendors, or industry advocates.
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f. Association Representatives: Association representatives are persons affiliated with a professional or trade association/organization representing center interests and activities.

Section 2 - Approval to Participate:

a. Eligibility to Participate: All interested faculty, staff, and students of the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, are eligible to participate in the center, if so requested by the individual and approved by the center. Any faculty, staff, student, or outside participant may recommend individuals for participation in the center. Such recommendations shall be made to the Director.

b. Request for Participation: Any qualifying individual interested in a center program may request to participate (see Class of Participants for criteria for participation).

c. Acknowledgment of Participation: The Director of the center shall acknowledge participants.

Section 3 - Terms and Conditions: Terms and conditions of participation shall be determined by the center Director and shall conform to the duration of center project(s) in which participants are involved.

Section 4 - Role of Participants: Participants are encouraged to be actively engaged in the activities of the center. They may propose programs to be implemented by the center. If approved, these programs will receive center support as necessary and possible. Participants are expected to support the programs of the center and assist the Director in program development.

ARTICLE IV – CENTER ADMINISTRATION

Section 1 – Administration: The administration of the center shall consist of the center Director, the faculty Steering Committee, center Project Leaders, the Program Assistants, and the external Advisory Board. Their collective goal is to ensure that the center works toward fulfilling its mission.

a. The center Director: The center shall be administered by a Director appointed by the CAFES Dean in conjunction with center Steering Committee members. The Director may be an active Cal Poly faculty or staff member or may be hired from outside the University. The Director will report to the CAFES Dean. The Director is responsible for the oversight and management of all center activities. This includes working with the dean and center Steering Committee members to develop a comprehensive strategy for center programming, as well as specific annual workplans. Specific responsibilities include the coordination of fundraising, grant development and grant proposal writing, event management, bookkeeping and budgeting, outreach, web management, and maintaining and tracking all paperwork pertaining to the center. The center Director is responsible for identifying, recruiting, scheduling, and managing any part-time help. The Director shall submit an annual report following each academic year to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the CAFES Dean, and the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs. The report shall include a summary of the year’s activities and a financial report, as well as information on scholarly
publications and technical reports, students supported by the center, theses, and
senior projects completed under the auspices of the center, honors and awards to
faculty and students, and any other noteworthy achievements.
b. The Project Leaders: The Project Leaders must be part of the full-time faculty and
staff of Cal Poly (and not necessarily of the College of Agriculture, Food and
Environmental Science). They shall direct specific projects developed in
collaboration with the center Director, the Steering Committee, and the team of
Project Leaders. This includes developing and managing annual program
workplans, and coordinating, with the assistance of the center Director, projects
identified in the workplans. Project Leaders shall not be compensated directly for
their work as Project Leaders but it is expected that they will incorporate
compensation for specific projects undertaken within their program for which
funding has been provided.
c. The Program Assistants: As funding allows, the Program Assistants assist the
center Director in maintaining and tracking correspondence (mail and e-mail),
phone calls and in-person contacts; handling general questions about the center
from the university, the community and the general public; and facilitating the
staging of center events.

ARTICLE V - FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE
Section 1 - Membership: There shall be a faculty Steering Committee numbering no
more than twelve Cal Poly faculty. The Steering Committee shall be made up of a group
of faculty representing an array of disciplines relevant to sustainable agriculture, food and
environmental sciences. These faculty members may concurrently participate in center
activities as Program Leaders, though this is not a requirement. In fact, it is expected that
many Steering Committee members will be drawn from Program Leader ranks. The
center Director, in consultation with the College Dean and center Project Leaders, shall
choose the membership of the Steering Committee. Terms of the individual members of
the Steering Committee shall be three years with the possibility of renewal at the end of
the three years. There is no limit as to the number of renewals an individual member
might have. The center Director, in consultation with the Project Leaders, shall determine
whether individual Steering Committee members shall have their membership renewed.

Section 2 - Duties: The Steering Committee is responsible for working with the Director
in strategizing and implementing center programs. This includes providing leadership by
prioritizing lead initiatives, providing direction and oversight of Project Leader activity,
helping to identify and to pursue sources of funding, and assisting in the operation of the
center.

Section 3 - Meetings: The Steering Committee shall meet a minimum of once per
quarter. A report of the meetings shall be made available to the Steering Committee,
center Project Leaders, the Advisory Board, the CAFES Dean, and the Dean of Research
and Graduate Programs.

Section 4 - Number Constituting a Quorum: A majority of Committee members shall
consistute a quorum.
ARTICLE IV – EXTERNAL ADVISORY BOARD
Section 1 – Membership: There shall be an Advisory Board numbering no more than twenty members drawn from industry, community and government. The Advisory Board shall be made up of a group of people representing the diversity of activities in the agricultural industry including, but not limited to, production, services, inputs, marketing, finance, energy, and labor. This diversity should also address the scale of activity in that representatives from very small to very large organizations should be considered. The Advisory Board should also include representatives from the communities of the Central Coast of California and from local and regional government. The center Director, in consultation with the College Dean and center Steering Committee members, shall choose the membership of the Advisory Board. Terms of the individual members of the Advisory Board shall be three years with the possibility of renewal at the end of the three years. There is no limit as to the number of renewals an individual member might have. The center Director, in consultation with the Steering Committee members, shall determine whether individual Advisory Board members shall have their membership renewed.

Section 2 – Duties: The Advisory Board will endeavor to provide the center with fundraising assistance, feedback on its workplans, and guidance on its strategies via its formal meetings and via any informal consultations.

Section 3 – Meetings: The Advisory Board shall meet a minimum of once a year. A report of the meetings shall be made available to the Advisory Board, the Steering Committee, Project Leaders, the CAFES Dean, and the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs.

Section 4 - Number Constituting a Quorum: A majority of Board members shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE VII – EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ADVISORY BOARD
Section 1 – Composition: There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of four members drawn from the membership of the Advisory Board. The center Director will request those Advisory Board members interested in serving on the Committee to submit their names for consideration. In consultation with Steering Committee members, the center Director shall appoint the members of the Committee. The terms of the individual members of the Executive Committee shall be four years with a staggered membership such that every two years, two new members shall be brought onto the Committee and the two senior members rotated off. There shall be no renewal of Executive Committee membership.

Section 2 – Purpose: The Executive Committee will assist the center Director in putting together agendas for the Advisory Board meetings; will formulate potential policy discussions for Advisory Board meetings; will act as a sounding board for the center Director in matters related and relevant to the Advisory Board; and will serve to advise on tactical issues related to the operation of the center.
Section 3 – Meetings: The Executive Committee will meet at least as often as the Advisory Board and in advance of the Advisory Board meeting.

ARTICLE VIII - FISCAL POLICIES
Section 1 - Fiscal Year: The fiscal year shall be in accordance with that of the Cal Poly Corporation.

Section 2 - Accounts and Audits: The books and accounts of the center shall be kept by the Cal Poly Corporation in accordance with sound accounting practices, and shall be audited annually in accordance with Corporation policies.

Section 3 - Funding: Funding for the center shall come from private or governmental grants and contracts, gifts, and fees from center-generated short courses, conferences, and center-generated publications.

Section 4 - Dissolution: In the event the center is dissolved, any assets remaining after payment of all debts and liabilities shall be distributed to the Corporation in trust for College of Agriculture, Food, and Environmental Sciences. If debts and liabilities exceed assets, the College of Agriculture, Food, and Environmental Sciences will be responsible for said debts and liabilities.

ARTICLE VIII - OPERATING GUIDELINES
The Advisory Board may develop operating guidelines to implement these By-laws.

ARTICLE IX – AMENDMENTS
The By-laws may be amended by a 2/3 vote of the members of the Steering Committee, faculty Project Leaders, and full-time, non-student center staff voting at any meeting of the faculty Project Leaders. All relevant staff and faculty shall have two (2) weeks advance written notification of the proposed amendments. Any changes to the By-laws adopted by the faculty and staff must be approved by both the CAFES Dean and the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs before incorporation into the By-laws.
Appendix B: Organizational Chart

- CAFES Dean
- Research & Graduate Programs Dean
- Advisory Board
- Steering Committee
- Director
- Project Leaders
- Program Assistants
- Initiatives, Projects & Events
General Considerations

◊ CAFES-focused
◊ Interdisciplinary
◊ Links numerous existing initiatives within College
◊ Uses SARC as a point of departure (with CP Organic Farm example)
◊ Response to burgeoning interest in sustainability

CAFES Link to Campus Sustainability

◊ Talloires Declaration
◊ Collaboration with Centers / Initiatives in other Colleges
◊ Focal point for ideas pertaining to food/ag sustainability
◊ Campus-wide sustainability events
◊ Assistance in working with Facilities

Role

◊ Foster the development and funding of new curricula and research projects
◊ Compile existing information on sustainability in agriculture and resource management, and identify research needs and priorities for the future
◊ Increase the visibility of CAFES programs in sustainability (on and off campus)
◊ Assist CAFES in forging new partnerships with external leaders in sustainability
◊ Work with CAFES Advancement to identify funding sources for related projects
◊ Help CAFES to improve the sustainability of its operations

Organization

◊ Responsible to CAFES Dean
◊ Oversight by Dean of Research & Graduate Programs
◊ Guided by Faculty Steering Committee
◊ Advised by external Board

Viability

◊ Seed funding from SARC reserves
◊ Revenue generating activities meet current needs
◊ Additional annual support from CAFES Dean
◊ Program vs. project funding
◊ Potential sponsors currently under cultivation
◊ Growing opportunities to fund projects in this realm
DATE: May 5 2009

TO: John Soares, Chair of the Academic Senate

RE: CAFES Center for Sustainability

We, the members of the Academic Senate Sustainability Committee support the proposal to establish a CAFES Center for Sustainability. The Center is in alignment with a majority of the 10 Action Items laid out in the Talloires Declaration, a pledge signed by university administrators to foster environmental sustainability in higher education. The proposal's authors have clearly demonstrated the important role the Center will play in supporting the College's effort to emphasize the agricultural aspects of sustainability in various forums at Cal Poly. Committee members agree establishment of the Center will assist the College in achieving the strategic vision of educating "leaders in sustainable agriculture, food industries, and environmental stewardship by modeling state-of-the-art sustainable practices in all of its operations."

Careful use of the earth's natural resources is critical to our species' survival. As a steward of Cal Poly's diverse agricultural lands, CAFES is uniquely positioned to serve as a model of multidisciplinary curriculum and research addressing various issues of sustainability. As noted in the proposal, other technical colleges such as engineering and architecture have sustainability-oriented groups. This proposed Center will complement these and has the potential to serve as a catalyst for the multidisciplinary curriculum, research, and student projects necessary to address complex sustainability issues and prepare Cal Poly's students to address many of today's compelling issues.

Sincerely,
Kate Lancaster, Chair, Academic Senate Sustainability Committee
RESOLUTION ON REVISION TO
FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

WHEREAS, The service culture of the University is best served by a committee structure that is compact and robust; and

WHEREAS, To recognize the Fairness Board consists of a spectrum of University constituents who volunteer their time and resource to provide a service to the grievant (student); and

WHEREAS, The Fairness Board has well-defined procedures for handling student grievances; and

WHEREAS, The student grievant, her/himself, has a responsibility to the process; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the following addition to the *Fairness Board Description and Procedures* be approved by the Academic Senate:

"Procedures":
A.9.E: In the event the student grievant fails to appear at the scheduled hearing, the Board may dismiss the case;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That the revision to the *Fairness Board Description and Procedures* be forwarded to the President for inclusion in "Campus Administrative Policies."

Proposed by: Academic Senate Fairness Board
Date: February 28, 2009
BACKGROUND: The Making Excellence Inclusive initiative is designed to help colleges and universities fully integrate their diversity and educational quality efforts and embed them into the core of academic mission and institutional functioning. Through this initiative, the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) re-envisions diversity and inclusion as a multi-layered process through which we achieve excellence in learning; research and teaching; student development; institutional functioning; local and global community engagement; workforce development; and more. (AAC&U Initiative overview)

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate has a 30-plus year history of espousing the principles of Making Excellence Inclusive as a learning-community imperative – most recently in the Senate’s Fall ’08 retreat and (AS-663-08) Resolution on Diversity Learning Objectives; and

WHEREAS, “Build an Inclusive Community” is one of seven goals of the Cal Poly Strategic Plan; and

WHEREAS, A learning environment that supports attention to diversity is a standard of accreditation as promulgated by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate has affirmed the academic value of diversity (AS-505-98); therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support Making Excellence Inclusive as a goal and organizing principle of the Cal Poly learning community; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That resources for the professional development of faculty in Making Excellence Inclusive be established, sustained, and identified by the University, colleges, and other instructionally-related entities as part of their inventory of efforts to promote Inclusive Excellence; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That faculty efforts in Making Excellence Inclusive be recognized as a substantive component of voluntary service in the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) evaluation process; and, be it further

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: March 30 2009
Revised: April 28 2009
Revised: May 20 2009
WHEREAS, Each academic department determines the standards for the successful completion of senior projects, including style guides; and

WHEREAS, Each academic department determines whether or not to archive senior projects in the Kennedy Library; and

WHEREAS, The Kennedy Library provides guidelines for formatting and archiving senior projects; and

WHEREAS, In order to ensure faculty and students are aware of departmental and library policies governing the submission and archiving of senior projects; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That all academic departments make available to their students in writing all policies and procedures relevant to archiving senior projects; and be it further

RESOLVED: That all policies and procedures shall conform to current Kennedy Library archiving requirements; and be it further

RESOLVED: All departmental policies and procedures for archiving senior projects shall conform to University policies pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and Intellectual Property Rights; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Provost’s Office should request that all academic departments provide these policies and procedures for archiving senior projects to their faculty and students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these policies be made available in writing to all students in each department by winter quarter 2011.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: April 5 2009
Revised: April 28 2009
Revised: May 19 2009
RESOLUTION ON
THE CAL POLY STATEMENT ON COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY

BACKGROUND: The Committee on University Citizenship (CUCIT) is a University-wide standing committee charged with exploring issues and making policy recommendations related to the preservation and ongoing development of a vital, effective tradition of University citizenship at Cal Poly. The committee explores and makes recommendations on strategies designed to foster and expand:

- an engaged, civil, and mutually respectful classroom and other educational environments;
- a tradition of confident, effective, and civil public campus discourse that prepares students for active civic engagement and leadership roles;
- a greater awareness of factors that lead to hostile campus work environments and strategies for further promoting campus work environments that are free from harassment and characterized by mutual respect and support; and
- the civic engagement of students, faculty, and staff beyond the University — and for strengthening Cal Poly’s role as a good institutional citizen in regional, state, national, and international contexts.

(Distilled from http://www.president.calpoly.edu/committees/CUCIT.pdf)

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate accept and endorse the Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to Community; and, be it further RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate work with its University’s administration in developing plans and strategies to operationalize the goals of the Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to Community.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: April 21 2009
Revised: April 28 2009
Cal Poly Statement on Commitment to Community

The Cal Poly community values a broad and diverse campus learning experience where its members embrace core values of mutual respect, academic excellence, open inquiry, free expression, and respect for diversity. Membership in the Cal Poly community is consistent with the highest principles of shared governance, social and environmental responsibility, engagement, and integrity.

As students, faculty and staff of Cal Poly, we choose to:

- Act with integrity and show respect for ourselves and one another
- Accept responsibility for our individual actions
- Support and promote collaboration in University life
- Practice academic honesty in the spirit of inquiry and discovery
- Contribute to the University community through service and volunteerism
- Demonstrate concern for the well-being of others
- Promote diversity and social justice by acting against intolerance, hate, and discrimination

Individual commitment to these actions is essential to Cal Poly’s dedication to an enriched learning experience for all its members.

Committee on University Citizenship
April 22, 2009
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed §523 (Faculty Personnel Actions) of the Cal Poly Campus Administrative Policies (CAP); therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly acknowledge and appreciate the work of the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee by endorsing §523 (Faculty Personnel Actions) of the Cal Poly Campus Administrative Policies (CAP); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate affirm the Memorandum of Understanding (collective bargaining agreement for faculty employees) between The California State University (CSU) and Unit 3 Faculty as the embodiment of controlling terms and conditions that resolve ambiguity and/or govern conflict in the application of §523 in faculty personnel actions.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: March 26 2009
Revised: April 21, 2009
523 FACULTY PERSONNEL ACTIONS

523.1 Performance review: retention, promotion, and tenure

A. Performance evaluation procedures

1. Evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with Article 15 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) [the collective bargaining agreement for faculty employees between The California State University and Unit 3 Faculty] and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

2. Each college or other academic unit shall develop a written statement of procedures and criteria for each type of personnel action. (In this section, the use of the word “college” includes other academic units such as the library, intercollegiate athletics, and Counseling Services covered under the MOU.) Departments (In this section, use of the word “department” includes equivalent units such as area) desiring to develop statements to serve as addenda to the college statement may do so. Full-time probationary and full-time tenured faculty may participate in the development and/or subsequent amendment of these procedures and criteria. College and department statements are subject to review and approval by the college dean and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. In the event a policy or procedure in a college or department statement is in conflict with a provision of the MOU, the provision in the MOU shall prevail.

3. Timetables for evaluations shall be published annually and shall be developed in consultation with the Academic Senate.

4. A faculty employee subject to performance or periodic review has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting evidence of their accomplishments to those charged with the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating faculty employees. Applicants should seek advice and guidance from their department chair (in this section, the use of the words “department chair” also includes department head) and dean to understand how criteria and standards are applied.

5. Evaluators will provide their written evaluation and recommendation to the faculty employee at least ten days before transmitting the evaluation to the next level of review.

6. Personnel Action File (PAF)
The PAF is the official permanent employment record of a faculty employee and resides in the office of the college dean.

The WPAF is initiated by the applicant to support consideration for a performance review for retention, promotion, tenure, or periodic review. The WPAF for tenure or tenure/promotion includes the entire employment period at Cal Poly. The WPAF for promotion shall emphasize the period since the last promotion at Cal Poly or appointment to the current rank. The Provost establishes a specific deadline by which the WPAF is declared complete for each type of personnel action. Insertion of materials after that date must have the approval of the college peer review committee (PRC) and is limited to items that became accessible after the deadline. The table of contents or index should be updated to reflect any material added to the file during the course of the evaluation cycle. All supporting materials in the WPAF should be referenced and clearly explained.

a. The applicant shall submit the WPAF to the department chair by the established deadline. Materials shall include but be not limited to:

(1) Index of materials contained in the WPAF

(2) Resume

(a) The resume should be organized according to the categories to be evaluated including: teaching activities and performance or librarian/counselor effectiveness and performance; professional growth and scholarly achievement; service to the University and/or community; and any other activities which indicate professional commitment, service, or contribution to the discipline, department, college, or library (in the case of librarians).

(b) The resume should be specific and distinguish between publications, submitted manuscripts, and manuscripts in preparation. A brief statement should describe the nature of the publication (type of journal/periodical, refereed or not) and the
applicant's specific role in the accomplishment.

(3) Professional development plan

Professional development is defined as the generation of knowledge or the acquisition of experience, skill, and information that enables one to perform at a higher level of proficiency in one's profession. Cal Poly recognizes and endorses the following four types of scholarship identified in the Carnegie Foundation report entitled *Scholarship Reconsidered: Scholarship of Teaching; Scholarship of Discovery; Scholarship of Integration; and Scholarship of Application.*

The professional development plan is a written narrative intended to serve as a guide to evaluators for understanding the faculty employee's professional goals and values as a teacher-scholar. The plan should include short- and long-term goals and objectives on how the faculty employee intends to provide substantive contributions to their discipline, how those scholarly activities can keep their teaching current and dynamic, and a periodic external validation of those activities.

(a) A probationary faculty employee should emphasize what s/he intends to accomplish by the time s/he is considered for tenure.

(b) Applicants for tenure and/or promotion should articulate a long-term professional development plan noting how they intend to continue making a valuable contribution to the University, its instructional program(s), and the academic community.

(4) Student Evaluations

(a) A summary of results from at least two student evaluations during the period under review shall be included.

(b) Evaluative statements and recommendations, along with any written
statement or rebuttal by the applicant, will be added to the WPAF by the PRCs, department chair, and dean. At the end of the review cycle, the index, faculty resume, professional development plan, evaluation summaries, and recommendations will be filed in the permanent PAF.

8. Custodian of Files
During periodic and performance reviews, the department chair is the custodian of the WPAF at the department level (and, if appropriate, the PAF); at the college level, the custodian of the files is the dean; at the University level, the custodian is the Provost. Custodians of the files and members of PRCs shall ensure the confidentiality of the files. Normally, there shall be no duplication of file materials except for copies made for the applicant or appropriate administrator, or for distribution at PRC meetings. At the conclusion of each PRC meeting, the PRC chair is responsible for the collection of all duplicated materials. The only exception to this policy is that copies of the applicant's resume may be distributed to PRC members for use at times other than PRC meetings. After the PRC has made its recommendations, the copies of the resume shall be collected by the chair. Only the applicant/designee, PRC members, department chair, dean, and the Provost/designee shall have access to the PAF and WPAF files.

9. All evaluators, as described in “8” above, must sign the logs in the PAF and the WPAF before they make their recommendations. It is the professional obligation of all evaluators to review the information in the files before they vote or prepare a written recommendation. Evaluative statements shall be based on information in the files and validated with evidence such as class visitation; course outlines and tests; and significant curricular, scholarly, and committee contributions. If, at any level, the evidence is judged unsatisfactory, or if it does not appear to support the recommendations made, the WPAF shall be returned to the appropriate level for clarification. No one shall have access to the files except the PRC, the applicant/designee, department chair, dean, and University President/designee.

10. PRCs and department chairs

a. Membership of the PRC

(1) The probationary and tenured department faculty will elect members to serve on PRCs. No one shall
serve on more than one level of peer review for each faculty employee under review. For reappointment and tenure reviews, PRC members must be full-time tenured faculty employees of any rank. For promotion reviews, PRC members and the department chair must have higher academic rank than those being considered for promotion.

(2) Faculty employees being considered for promotion shall be ineligible to serve on promotion or tenure review committees.

(3) When there are insufficient eligible members to serve on the PRC, the PRC and department chair shall select members from related academic disciplines in consultation with the faculty employee under review.

(4) At the request of the department, the college dean may agree that faculty employees participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may be eligible to serve on a PRC, by election, as long as such service can be completed during the terms of the Faculty Early Retirement Program assignment. PRCs may be not composed solely of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program.

b. Responsibilities

Because of the importance of all personnel actions, members serving on a PRC and department chairs are expected to perform due diligence; observe strict confidentiality; review, understand, and apply the relevant criteria; and provide constructive written assessment of the applicant's performance.

The PRC and department chair’s responsibilities include:

(1) Review University, college, and any departmental personnel policies and procedures;
(2) Review and sign the applicant’s PAF and WPAF;
(3) Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the applicant at least ten days prior to transmittal of the file to the next level of review;
(4) Within ten days following receipt of the recommendation, the applicants may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or
request a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation. The PRC or department chair at the second level of review, will consider the applicant’s rebuttal statement and meet with the applicant if requested. The committee or department chair will either revise the recommendation in writing or make no change to its prior recommendation. In the case of no change, no further statement is necessary from the committee or department chair. The rebuttal statement of the applicant under review shall be added to the WPAF.

c. PRC evaluations and recommendations

(1) Each PRC evaluation and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee. For purposes of determining a simple majority vote of the PRC, the membership of the committee shall be defined as those committee members casting yes or no votes. If a member of the PRC or the department chair determines that s/he cannot evaluate an applicant for some reason (e.g., conflict of interest, prejudice, bias, etc.), the committee member or department chair shall withdraw from the applicant's PRC. PRC members or the department chair who abstain from voting are expected to provide written rationale.

(2) Recommendations of a PRC at the college or department level must be accompanied by one of the following:

(a) A majority report and, if applicable, a minority report. Reports must include substantiating reasons for its recommendations and must be signed by those PRC members who support the report and its substantiating reasons.

(b) Individual recommendations from any PRC member must include substantiating reasons and signature.

(c) A combination of (a) and (b) above: a majority report, a minority report (if applicable), and/or individual
recommendations. In all cases, each report or recommendation must include substantiating reasons and must be signed by those supporting it.

11. Department chairs shall use Form AP 109 (Faculty Evaluation Form) to evaluate faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. Department chairs are expected to conduct a separate level of review. Comments regarding student evaluations must be included in Section 1 of Form AP 109.

College deans should use the final page of Form AP 109 or similar format appended to Form AP 109 to record their evaluation and recommendation.

523.1.B. Criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure

A. Standards
The quality of faculty performance is the most important element to consider in evaluating individual achievement. Although teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion, it alone is not sufficient for retention, promotion, and tenure. The degree of evidence will vary in accordance with the academic position being sought by the applicant. For example, the granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than retention, and promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor.

B. University criteria
Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following University criteria as well as those approved for the college/department (See CAP 523.1.A.2):

1. Teaching performance or effectiveness as a librarian and/or other professional performance

Consideration is to be given to such factors as the applicant’s competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of courses, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student advising, and other factors relating to performance as an instructor.

In formulating recommendations for the promotion of teaching faculty, evaluators will place primary emphasis on success in
The results of the formal student evaluation are to be considered in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance.

For librarians, consideration is to be given to such factors as furthering objectives of the library and the University by cooperating with fellow librarians; applying bibliographic techniques effectively to the acquisition, development, classification, and organization of library resources; initiating and carrying to conclusion projects within the library; demonstrating versatility, including the ability to work effectively in a range of library functions and subject areas; and supervisory and/or administrative abilities.

In formulating recommendations on the promotion of librarians, evaluators will place primary emphasis on effectiveness as a librarian as evaluated by colleagues and library users.

2. Professional growth and scholarly achievement
Consideration is to be given to the applicant’s educational background and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies, publications, presentation of papers at professional and scholarly meetings, and external validation of scholarly activities.

3. Service to University and community
Consideration is to be given to the applicant’s participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; co-curricular activities; department, college, and University committees; Academic Senate and its committees; individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and service in community affairs directly related to the applicant’s teaching area as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

4. Other factors of consideration
Consideration is to be given to such factors as collegiality (working collaboratively and productively with colleagues and participation in traditional academic functions); initiative; cooperativeness; and dependability.

523.1.C Performance review of probationary faculty for retention

A. Performance reviews for the purpose of retention shall be in accordance with Articles 13 and 15 of the MOU.
B. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide sufficient evidence that s/he has fulfilled the criteria for retention.

C. The normal probationary period is six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

D. Evaluation of probationary faculty involves a comprehensive assessment of performance during the entire probationary period with retention seen as leading to tenure. It should be understood that if a faculty employee has not demonstrated the potential to achieve tenure, then that individual should not be reappointed. This does not mean that retention is a guarantee of tenure.

E. In the event of a non-retention decision, a probationary faculty employee who has served a minimum of three years of probation will be extended a terminal year of employment with no further appointment rights.

523.1.D Performance review for tenure

A. Tenure represents the University's long-term commitment to a faculty employee and is only granted when there is strong evidence that the individual who, by reason of their excellent performance and promise of long-range contribution as a teacher-scholar to the educational purpose of the institution, is deemed worthy of this important commitment. Tenure means the right of a faculty employee to continue at Cal Poly unless voluntarily terminated or terminated for cause, lack of funds, or lack of work.

1. To be recommended for tenure, an applicant must be rated during the final probationary year within one of the top two performance categories listed in Section V of Form AP 109 (Faculty Evaluation Form).

2. Tenure decisions are considered more critical to the University than promotion decisions. An applicant who does not have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor should not be granted tenure. This does not mean that retention is a guarantee of tenure nor is tenure a guarantee of promotion. The fact that a probationary faculty employee has received early promotion is not a guarantee of tenure.

3. Possession of the doctorate or other designated terminal degree from an accredited institution is required for tenure.

B. Tenure eligibility
Tenure eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 13 of the MOU.

1. Normal tenure
   A tenure award is considered normal if the award is made after the applicant has accrued credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

2. Early tenure
   a. A tenure award is considered "early" if the award is made prior to the applicant having achieved credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).
   
   b. In addition to meeting department, college, or library criteria for normal tenure, an applicant for early tenure must provide evidence of outstanding performance in each of the following performance areas: teaching or library effectiveness, professional growth and achievement, and service to the University and community.
   
   c. In order to receive early tenure, an applicant should, at a minimum, receive a favorable majority vote from the department PRC.

3. Tenure upon appointment
   applicants for appointment with tenure shall normally be tenured professors or tenured librarians at other universities. Exceptions to this provision must be carefully documented. The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in a management position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by tenured faculty in the appropriate department.

523.1.E Performance review for promotion

A. Eligibility
   Promotion eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 14 of the MOU. Promotion in rank is not automatic and is granted only in recognition of teaching competency or effectiveness as a librarian, professional performance, and meritorious service during the period in
rank. The application of criteria will be more rigorous for promotion to Professor or Librarian than to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian.

1. Normal promotion
   a. An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered normal if the applicant is eligible and both of the following conditions hold:
      (1) The applicant is tenured or the applicant is also applying for tenure.
      (2) The applicant has completed at least the equivalent of four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.
   b. Tenure is required for promotion to the academic rank of Professor or Librarian.

2. Early promotion
   a. An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered "early" if the applicant is eligible and one or both of the following is true:
      (1) The applicant is a probationary faculty employee who is not also applying for tenure.
      (2) The applicant has not satisfied the equivalent service requirements of at least four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.
   b. Early promotion will be granted only in exceptional cases. The circumstances and record of performance which make the case exceptional shall be fully documented by the applicant and validated by evaluators. The fact that an applicant has reached the maximum salary in their academic rank or meets the performance criteria for promotion does not in itself constitute an exceptional case for early promotion.

B. Ranking
   In addition to their carefully documented recommendations, department PRCs, department chairs, college or library PRCs, and deans shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants who were positively recommended at their respective level.
523.2 Periodic evaluation of faculty unit employees

A. Definition of periodic evaluation

A periodic evaluation of a faculty unit employee ("faculty employee") shall normally be required for the following purposes:

1. Evaluation of tenured faculty employees who are not subject to a performance review for promotion.

2. Evaluation of probationary faculty employees who are not subject to a performance review for retention. For example, a probationary faculty employee who receives an initial two-year appointment will undergo a periodic evaluation during their first year.

3. Annual evaluation of temporary faculty employees.

4. Evaluation of lecturers for range elevation.

B. Periodic evaluation procedures and criteria

1. Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees

   a. Eligibility

      (1) Tenured Professors, Librarians, and Student Services Professional-Academic Related III (SSP-AR III).

         Tenured full Professors shall be subject to a periodic evaluation at least once every five years.

      (2) Tenured Assistant or Associate Professor, Senior Assistant or Associate Librarian; and Student Services Professional-Academic Related II (SSP-AR II).

         A periodic evaluation is conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, or SSP-AR II. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, or SSP-AR II in their preparation for subsequent promotion review.
(3) Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees at any rank shall occur at least once every five years after promotion/appointment to their respective academic rank. Performance reviews for promotion can serve in lieu of periodic reviews for the purposes of this section. More frequent periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty employee may be requested by the employee, department chair, or dean. After such a request, the periodic evaluation shall be conducted as soon as possible.

b. Procedure for periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees

(1) Procedures for the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees are similar to the procedures for conducting performance reviews (see CAP 523.1.A) with the exception that the periodic review concludes at the level of college dean.

(2) A tenured faculty employee shall be provided a copy of the PRC report of her/his periodic evaluation. The PRC chair, the department chair, and dean shall meet with the tenured faculty employee to discuss her/his strengths along with suggestions, if any, for improvement.

(3) A written copy of the periodic evaluation report shall be placed in the tenured faculty employee's PAF, and a copy shall be provided to her/him.

c. Criteria for periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees

(1) The purpose of periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees is to maintain and improve their effectiveness.

(2) Criteria are similar to the criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure (CAP 523.1.B).

2. Periodic evaluation of probationary faculty employees

a. Procedures for periodic evaluation of probationary faculty employees
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(1) Periodic evaluation of probationary faculty employees shall be conducted by the elected department PRC composed of tenured faculty, the department chair, and the college dean in any year in which the probationary faculty employee is not subject to a performance review for retention.

(2) A written copy of the periodic evaluation report shall be placed in the probationary faculty employee's PAF, and a copy shall be provided to the employee.

b. Criteria for periodic evaluation of probationary faculty employees are similar to criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure (CAP 523.1.B).

3. Periodic evaluation of temporary faculty employees

a. Criteria

Evaluation of temporary faculty employees shall be appropriate to the work assignment of the temporary faculty employee and shall conform to the approved criteria established by the department/college for the performance of instructional and professional responsibilities applicable to temporary faculty.

b. Eligibility

(1) Full-time temporary faculty employees (e.g., lecturers) appointed for the entire academic year must be evaluated during that year by a PRC of the department, the department chair, and dean. Members of the PRC must be full-time tenured faculty employees. At the request of the department, the college dean may agree that a faculty employee participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may serve on a faculty PRC. However, PRCs may not be comprised solely of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program.

(2) Part-time temporary faculty employees appointed for the entire academic year must be evaluated by the department chair. A PRC evaluation is not required; however, full-time tenured faculty
employees should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements should be written and signed.

(3) Temporary faculty employees (full-time or part-time) appointed for one or two quarters are to be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair or dean. Also, the faculty employee may request that an evaluation be performed. The request must be in writing and must be accompanied by an updated resume. The request must be submitted to the department chair by the established deadline.

(4) Temporary faculty employees holding a three-year appointment pursuant to MOU Article 12 shall be evaluated at least once during the term of their appointment and may be evaluated more frequently upon the request of the faculty employee, department chair, or dean. Normally the evaluation will be scheduled during the second year of appointment.

(5) Lecturers who are no longer eligible for a service salary increase (SSI) in their current range and who have served at least five years in their current range may apply for range elevation.

c. Procedures for periodic evaluation of temporary faculty employees

(1) Academic Personnel will distribute a list of temporary faculty employees eligible for periodic review, including those eligible for range elevation, and the timetable for conducting the reviews.

(2) The temporary faculty employee shall submit a WPAF to the department chair by the established deadline. The file should include supporting materials to document the accomplishments of the work assignment of the temporary faculty employee including but not be limited to:

(a) Resume
(b) Summary of results of student evaluations of teaching
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(c) Course syllabi and examples of course materials
(d) Examples of examinations
(e) Grading schemes and grade assignments
(f) Statement of teaching philosophy
(g) Professional accomplishments which contribute to maintaining currency in the faculty employee’s field of expertise such as research, scholarship, and/or creative activity
(h) Service activities, if applicable

(3) All evaluators must sign the logs in the PAF and the WPAF before completing their written evaluative statements and recommendations.

(4) Evaluators shall provide their written evaluation and recommendation to the temporary faculty employee at least ten days before transmitting materials to the next level of review.

(5) The temporary faculty employee under review may submit a written rebuttal statement in response to the evaluation and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the evaluation within ten days following receipt of the evaluation.

(6) A written record of a periodic evaluation shall be placed in the temporary faculty employee’s PAF. The temporary faculty employee shall be provided a copy of the written record of the evaluation.

(7) College deans are delegated authority to approve range elevation.

(8) Range elevation becomes effective at the beginning of the subsequent fall quarter.
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WHEREAS, On April 23 2004, the University signed the Talloires Declaration that committed Cal Poly to a ten-point action plan to implement sustainability; and

WHEREAS, The University Mission Statement concludes, “As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility;” and

WHEREAS, One of the seven University Learning Objectives states that all Cal Poly graduates shall “Make reasoned decisions based on an understanding of ethics, a respect for diversity, and an awareness of issues related to sustainability;” and

WHEREAS, The current WASC Reaccreditation self-study process has included sustainability as one of two crosscutting issues; and

WHEREAS, The 2007 Institutional Proposal for Reaffirmation of WASC Accreditation states that the University Learning Objectives will “continue to be a guide for both accountability and, most importantly, improvement of our educational effectiveness;” and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s 2009 Strategic Plan draft includes “Lead in Sustainability: Cal Poly will lead in sustainability through the educational preparation of our graduates, the research and scholarly contributions of our faculty, and the practices used throughout the University,” as one of seven primary strategic goals and identifies the need to create sustainability learning objectives; and

WHEREAS, The CSU Commitment to Sustainability considers “CSU’s best institutional practices, as well as its hallmark strengths – teaching, applied research, and community service – advocate for a special role for the CSU in sustaining the continued economic and ecological viability of the state;” and

WHEREAS, California Assembly Bill 32, the “Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006” establishes requirements to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in California that will
require sweeping changes to California’s economy and society, and creates a
critical need for polytechnic graduates well-versed in sustainability;

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Sustainability Committee has been charged with the task to
develop sustainability learning objectives, which they have done with input from
various stakeholders; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Sustainability Learning Objectives shall be considered an addendum to the
University Learning Objectives; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend the University adopt the following
Sustainability Learning Objectives as written.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Sustainability Committee
Date: May 1 2009
Revised: May 20 2009
SUSTAINABILITY LEARNING OBJECTIVES

We define sustainability as the ability of the natural and social systems to survive and thrive together to meet current and future needs. In order to consider sustainability when making reasoned decisions, all graduating students should be able to:

1. Define and apply sustainability principles within their academic programs.

2. Explain how natural, economic, and social systems interact to foster or prevent sustainability.

3. Analyze and explain local, national, and global sustainability using a multidisciplinary approach.

4. Consider sustainability principles while developing personal and professional values.
WHEREAS: The Academic Senate of the California State University, "urge individual campus senates to develop guidelines, policies and/or procedures regarding the creation, reorganization, consolidation and elimination of academic units, programs, departments and schools to ensure that the processes of consultation and shared governance are followed (AS-2891-09/AA/FA, March 19-20, 2009); and

WHEREAS: There is no promulgated University policy on changes in the re-organization of academic programs (units, departments, and schools hereinafter referred to as "teaching areas"; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate should be consulted and should make recommendations on changes in the academic structure of teaching areas whenever the matter involves creation, combination, or general reorganization; and be it further

RESOLVED: That whenever teaching areas are created, combined, and/or reorganized, or whenever a change occurs in the administrative location of a teaching area, it shall be considered a change in academic organization; and be it further

RESOLVED: That no change in the structure of a teaching area shall be effected without consultation with the faculty who are directly affected by the potential change; and be it further

RESOLVED: Upon consultation with Dean(s), Directors(s), and other members of the affected teaching areas, formal proposals for restructuring shall be presented by the Vice President Academic Affairs to the Senate Executive Committee and will include an explicit description of the proposed administrative arrangements and shall include a curricular and/or administrative justification, which supports in detail the proposed change. The justification shall also include an analysis of costs and benefits. Such proposals shall be presented in time to allow for reasonable review; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Vice President Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee and with the dean(s)/director(s) and other members
involved, shall appoint an *ad hoc* committee composed of at least five faculty members (including representation from the units involved and from a school not involved in the proposed restructuring) and at least one student; and be it further

RESOLVED: That as part of its deliberative process, the *ad hoc* committee shall with adequate notice conduct at least one open meeting where individuals may express their opinions about the proposed change: and be it further

RESOLVED: That the charge of the *ad hoc* committee shall be to evaluate the proposed change and provide a report to the Vice President Academic Affairs, the Senate, and the Dean(s)/Director(s) and the faculty/staff of the units involved.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: May 1 2009
Revised: May 20 2009
WHEREAS, The criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure decisions should be determined by the respective academic unit such as departments, colleges, and the library; and

WHEREAS, The Research and Professional Development Committee of the Academic Senate during 2006/07 did a review of the retention, promotion, and tenure process for each college, and that report was a starting point for the focus group report; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate is currently examining the definition of the Teacher-Scholar model and its implementation at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, The process of evaluating candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure should be evaluated and updated as appropriate; and

WHEREAS, The Research and Professional Development Committee of the Academic Senate has examined the report within its purview and with specific emphasis on research, professional development, creative activities, and related issues; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse recommendations 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 presented in the attached Retention Promotion and Tenure Focus Group Report (see pp. 5-8 of the report).

Proposed by: Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee
Date: May 1 2009
Revised: May 19 2009
Retention Promotion and Tenure Focus Group Report

February 5, 2009

Chair: Al Liddicoat, Assistant Vice President for Academic Personnel
Phil Bailey, Dean College of Science and Mathematics
Bruno Giberti, Professor of Architecture
Linda Halisky, Dean College of Liberal Arts
Mike Miller, Dean of the Library Services
Mike Suess, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel
Brian Tietje, Associate Dean Orfalea College of Business

Overview

The Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Focus Group instituted by Provost Durgin was given the task to review the RPT procedures and policies throughout the University, to identify best practices and issues, and to make recommendations for areas of improvement. Faculty members and administrators with a broad range of experiences and diverse backgrounds were selected to participate in this focus group. The group began by reviewing campus policies, committee reports, and faculty survey results including the Collaborative On Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey conducted during the 2006-2007 academic year, the "Academic Senate Subcommittee on Research and Professional Development report to the Academic Senate" dated May 8, 2007, and the "Recommendations on Providing Workload Relief for the College of Engineering Faculty Engaged in Scholarly Activities", January 4, 2007. The committee then identified a set of issues that affect probationary faculty members engaged in the RPT process and their ability to be successful as teacher-scholars at Cal Poly. Next, the committee reviewed RPT policies, criteria, and practices, identified best practices, and considered an electronic RPT evaluation process. Finally, the focus group compiled a set of recommendations included in this report to improve faculty success and the RPT policies, procedures, and processes at Cal Poly.

Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education

In winter 2007, Cal Poly participated in the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) project endorsed by the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the project was to determine factors that are important to the success and job satisfaction of probationary faculty, as well as to enhance the programs that best serve the needs of new faculty members at Cal Poly. The COACHE survey was designed to solicit the perspectives of full-time, tenure-track faculty members and to study aspects of tenure and promotion, the nature of work, policies and practices, as well as culture, climate, and collegiality. Fifty-six universities across the country participate in the survey, including seven California State University Campuses- San Luis Obispo, Pomona, Fullerton, Long Beach, San Bernardino, San Marcos, and Sonoma State University.

The COACHE survey results indicate that the probationary faculty members at Cal Poly feel that the criteria for tenure in the area of professional development and service are less clear and reasonable as compared to the faculty members at the other institutions that participated in the survey. Specifically, faculty members from Cal Poly expressed lower satisfaction in the following areas:
1. Cal Poly faculty members rate the tenure standards (acceptable threshold) in their departments to be less clear than faculty members in the CSU and at other institutions (what is expected is clear and reasonable as a scholar, as a campus citizen, and as an advisor to students.)

2. Cal Poly faculty members report less satisfaction with resources and support for scholarly activities than faculty members in the CSU and at other institutions (time, number of courses, facilities, computing services, and research services.)

3. Cal Poly and CSU faculty members expressed concern over the effectiveness of a policy on the upper limit on teaching and service obligations and the balance between family and personal time.

4. Cal Poly faculty reports less satisfaction with opportunities for collaboration and professional interaction with senior faculty than faculty in the CSU and at other institutions.

The 2008 report of the Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee indicates that the understanding of the Teacher-Scholar Model needs strengthening on this campus and that at times there is a lack of consistency among various levels of review in applying the standards for tenure and promotion. Furthermore, this report indicates that the University should provide clearer guidance on the expectations for Professional Development Plans (PDP) and a process to approve and hold faculty members accountable to their plans. Peer advising and/or mentorship may provide an avenue for feedback as faculty members develop as teacher-scholars.

The Focus group reflected on the time demands of the probationary faculty. In order for faculty members to be successful as teacher-scholars, the group felt that probationary faculty should have sufficient time and resources to engage in scholarly activities, particularly during their first two years at Cal Poly. This sentiment was reinforced in the Research and Professional Development Committee’s report. Furthermore, the committee affirmed that reduced service obligations, a more efficient RPT process, and better guidance on preparing working personnel action files and professional development plans will increase faculty members’ time for professional development.

Best Practices

The focus group identified several best practices that could be used to guide college and university recommendations. These practices include personnel policies and criteria processes, a practical definition of the Teacher-Scholar Model, faculty professional development support, digital archival of faculty work and accomplishments, faculty development, online student evaluations, and faculty mentoring. This section presents a brief overview of these best practices.

Personnel Policies, Procedures, and Evaluation Criteria. The College of Science and Mathematics “Personnel Policies Procedures and Evaluation Criteria” is an example of an efficient and consistent RPT process that has been established for all departments in the college. The focus group identified the following positive aspects of this document:

- Reduced the number of performance evaluations during the tenure process (Part III-B).
- Guidance on developing Working Personnel Action Files (WPAFs) for periodic reviews (Part IV-A) and for performance reviews (Part V-B).
- Example outline for preparing WPAFs (Appendix A).
- Criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (Part V-D).
- Periodic review of newly promoted tenured associate professors in 3rd Year (Part VII-A).
- Procedures for student evaluations (Part X).
- Candidates for promotion are expected to submit a professional development plan with a plan to sustain their role as teacher-scholars.

The "Library Faculty Handbook of Personnel Policies and Procedures" Section III-4 provides an example of the evaluation criteria for other factors of consideration. This document provides an excellent discussion of collegiality, professionalism, and successful interaction with coworkers. The document states that, "Collegiality represents a reciprocal relationship among colleagues and a value system that views diverse members of a university community as critical for the progress and success of its academic mission.... Moreover, collegiality among associates involves appreciation of and respect for differences in expertise, ideas, background, and viewpoints."

**Teacher-Scholar Model.** The Orfalea College of Business' "Faculty Annual Report" (FAR) provides an approach to college-wide resource allocation based on a quantitative review of the accomplishments and the professional development plans of the faculty. The FAR document has also defined the Teacher-Scholar Model in a flexible way that allows faculty members to vary their emphasis on teaching, research and service throughout their careers. In the FAR evaluation process a weighting based on the faculty members' work emphasis is used in conjunction with an established numeric criteria to compute a composite score. The locus of service obligations changes from department to University as faculty members progress through the ranks. For example, tenured faculty members are often expected to serve on Peer Review Committees and in leadership positions within the department, college, and the University. The Orfalea College of Business uses an electronic tool, Digital Measures, to track faculty achievement and activities for resource allocation and accreditation purposes.

**Faculty Professional Development Support.** Recently, the College of Liberal Arts has established a system to support faculty members in their professional development and scholarly activities. Faculty members submit proposals to the College of Liberal Arts requesting one or more course release(s), student assistant support, or funds for travel that will enable them to bring their scholarly work to completion and present it to the community of scholars. The College provides some funds and support for course releases, and in some cases the College partners with departments to provide student assistant time and additional financial support for faculty professional development. At times, CLA has been able to support special unexpected faculty professional development opportunities in addition to their regularly supported activities. Examples of this supplemental support include a course release to finish a textbook, travel support to allow faculty members to present their work at prestigious invited engagements such as concerts or performances, and support for student assistance in the collection and analysis of research data. In several cases, resources are used to supplement partial support provided through the State Faculty Support Grant Program or other similar funding sources. The College of Liberal Arts reports that their support has been highly effective and not only has it enabled faculty members to be successful in their scholarly activities, but also the support has enhanced faculty morale and their sense of scholarly community within the college.

**Digital Repository of Faculty Work and Accomplishments.** Many universities use electronic tools to capture faculty accomplishments which can be used for dissemination of knowledge, accreditation, alumni communications, advancement, and RPT purposes. Cal Poly is in the process of implementing the Digital Commons to provide a repository for faculty work and accomplishments. Faculty members voluntarily enter their work into the Digital Commons to allow students, faculty members, staff, administrators, and the community to access their scholarly work through an electronic portfolio. The Digital Commons provides an example of an institutional repository capable of capturing information and making it available in an electronic
portfolio. There may be opportunities to apply information technology such as the Digital Commons to the RPT process and in some cases for program accreditation. Academic software tools such as Digital Measures may interface directly with the library's Digital Commons and if adopted this would create a seamless workflow from the college to the library, thus avoiding duplicate effort.

**Faculty Development.** The COACHE survey included custom questions used to solicit feedback on faculty support that is provided through the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). 84%, 60%, and 29% of faculty reported that participating in CTL activities have strongly enhanced or somewhat enhanced their teaching, professional development, and service respectively. More strikingly 92%, 86%, and 58% of female faculty report that participating in CTL activities have strongly enhanced or somewhat enhanced their teaching, professional development, and service respectively. These results indicate that the majority of probationary faculty members find that their involvement in CTL has benefited their teaching and professional development. Furthermore, an overwhelming majority of female faculty report that their involvement with CTL has enhanced their teaching, professional development, and service to the University.

**Online Student Evaluations.** Information provided through student evaluations is of particular interest to the University since the data provides both formative feedback that can be used to improve teaching effectiveness and summative feedback used for personnel actions. Some departments in the College of Liberal Arts have been using online student evaluations for their online courses and are interested in exploring the use of online student evaluations in face-to-face courses. The CSU, CFA, and Academic Senate CSU formed a joint committee to investigate student evaluations in response to Article 15.19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement dated May 15, 2007. This committee was charged to study the “best and most effective practices for the student evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness.” The study evaluated instruments used for student evaluation and the use of online student evaluations. The committee documented their findings in the “Report on Student Evaluations of Teaching,” dated March 12, 2008. This report provides suggestions for implementing online student evaluations and interpreting the results of these evaluations. Furthermore, the report encourages campuses to carry out research to assess the validity and reliability of online student evaluations.

San Diego State University conducted a two-year formal study of online student evaluations during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 academic years. Their study investigated the response rate and mean ratings for traditional and online student evaluations conducted for courses in the College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts. Paper and pencil and online student evaluation results from forty-four courses that used five instruments with 5,972 respondents were analyzed. The results of this study are documented in the “EDTEC 798: Independent Study – Effort Report.” The results of this study show that online student evaluations generated higher response rates for four of the five instruments analyzed. The researcher notes that the form that did not demonstrate a higher online response rate had the smallest sample size: two courses with 176 responses. The aggregate response rate for online evaluations was 82% as compared to 73% for paper and pencil evaluations. No significant difference was found in the mean ratings for online versus paper and pencil evaluations: 4.238 and 4.294 respectively.

San Jose State University’s “Interpretation Guide for Student Opinions of Teaching Effectiveness” documents a method to normalize the student evaluation results by departments and colleges so that valid comparisons can be made. The affects of grade level, course size, and major versus non-major courses were also analyzed. This report provides insight and methods that can be used to gather and interpret student evaluation data. These methods could be used to compare traditional and online student evaluations and to help the University transition to online student evaluations.
**Faculty Mentoring.** The College of Agriculture, Food, and Environmental Sciences has developed a formal faculty mentoring program for their faculty. This is a volunteer mentoring program that has evolved over a period of seven years. The college mentoring program coordinator meets with interested faculty members in the fall quarter to explain the mentoring program and the roles and responsibilities of the faculty involved. Faculty members wishing to be mentored fill out a survey to identify specific area of mentoring interest. These areas of interest include teaching, professional development, establishing a research program, faculty advising, Cal Poly culture, or other faculty defined topics. Similarly, faculty mentors fill out a form that includes their strengths and identifies the areas that they feel qualified and comfortable mentoring faculty members. The mentoring program coordinator then pairs mentees with mentors and asks them to work together to define their expectations, goals, and plan to accomplish these goals. The program coordinator tracks the mentoring relationships and coordinates a recognition event in the spring quarter for the faculty participants.

Several faculty members have reported benefits from the program and several faculty members who have been mentored later become mentors themselves. The program coordinator commented on non-traditional pairings such as an instance when a senior faculty member requested mentoring for the use of technology in his classroom and was paired with a junior faculty member who was a technology expert. The mentoring program coordinator plans to formally evaluate the impact of the program using survey instruments in the near future.

**Committee Recommendations**

This section presents a list of recommendations identified by the committee and an implementation table that includes champions and a rough timeline to guide the implementation. The first five recommendations focus on enhancing University and college procedures, and the remaining six recommendations include suggestions to clarify, support, and evaluate faculty professional development, teaching, and service accomplishments.

1. **The University should provide clear guidelines and a common format for the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF).** A common format will facilitate the preparation and review of Working Personnel Action Files. The committee recommends that the University standardize a template of required materials which should be submitted in a small binder and allow faculty members to submit additional supporting materials in a separate binder as needed. The small binder would include a summary of teaching and work assignments, student evaluations, a list of scholarly activities and research projects, and service activities.

2. **Each college should establish common faculty evaluation procedures to be used for all departments within the college.** Many departments within a college have similar but different RPT procedures. This adds to confusion of probationary faculty members within a college and unnecessarily complicates the work of the college peer review committee which is required to review and understand the documents for all of the departments they review. Departments should use the college procedures and amplify the college criteria used to evaluate teaching, professional development, and service within the discipline.

3. **The University should recommend that colleges consider the multiyear appointment procedure for probationary faculty that has been developed by the College of Science and Mathematics.** The multiyear appointment procedure developed by CSM allows three 2-year appointments for probationary faculty. In the first year of each two year appointment a periodic review is conducted to provide faculty formative feedback as they make progress
towards promotion and tenure. During probationary years two and four, summative performance reviews are conducted for retention to a subsequent two-year appointment. In year six, faculty members undergo a performance review for promotion and tenure. This procedure reduces the time faculty members spend preparing voluminous WP AF files for performance reviews, as well as the time faculty members and administrators spend reviewing materials, while providing formative feedback each year to help develop and prepare the faculty to be successful as teacher-scholars.

4. The implementation of an online student evaluation pilot program in the College of Liberal Arts and the Orfalea College of Business to study and evaluate the effectiveness, benefits, and disadvantages of online student evaluation. Online student evaluations have been successfully implemented University-wide at San Diego State University with no significant decrease in response rate or change in mean ratings. Online student evaluations provide a convenient mechanism for students to provide feedback of teaching effectiveness, do not take time from course instruction, and give all students an opportunity to submit feedback. The data collected via online student evaluations can be stored directly into an electronic database or faculty e-portfolio. On-line student evaluations significantly reduce the time required to prepare and process evaluation packages by the department staff, faculty, and ITS. Online student evaluations allow easily customizable instruments that may include common questions defined by the University, college, department and/or instructor. Electronic reports can automatically normalize or scale the results by factors such as course level, modes of instruction, enrollment, or major versus non-major course. Thus electronic data analysis and interpretation of student evaluations may better inform instructors and reviewers of faculty teaching effectiveness. The Provost should designate a committee to develop an RFP, evaluate potential vendors, and report recommendations to the Deans’ Council. Members of the vendor selection committee should include a college dean or associate dean, and representatives from the Academic Senate, Academic Personnel, ITS, and the Library.

5. The University should explore the use of electronic faculty evaluation processes and set up a pilot process in one college. Several software tools are available that facilitate electronic review of faculty members via e-portfolios; the committee briefly reviewed the Activity Insight software package from DigitalMeasures.10 There appear to be several advantages to using an e-portfolio for faculty evaluations. These advantages include extracting and archiving information directly from University databases such as teaching assignments, grading patterns, student evaluation results, and scholarly work included in the Digital Commons; consistent organization, categorization, and presentation of materials; the ability to run reports and summarize data electronically; and electronic control over the evaluation process (online access to personnel files, deadline notification, verification of process requirements, automatic WP AF access logs, and security to protect personnel information). The Provost should designate a committee to develop an RFP, evaluate potential vendors, and report recommendations to the Deans’ Council. Members of the vendor selection committee should include a college dean or associate dean, and representatives from the Academic Senate, Academic Personnel, ITS, and the Library.

6. The University should produce a comprehensive statement on scholarship and professional development to reflect the University’s vision of the Teacher-Scholar Model. This statement should define the Teacher-Scholar Model within the context of Cal Poly and it should be in concert with the Teacher-Scholar section of the WASC self-study and the various other University documents on this subject. The statement will provide guidance to faculty members as they develop as teacher-scholars at Cal Poly and should include the benefits of the Teacher-Scholar Model to the students, faculty and the University.
7. The University should establish guidelines to assist faculty in the development of Professional Development Plans to encompass teaching, scholarship/professional development, and service, and to clarify the method by which they will report the progress they have made toward their goals. Probationary faculty members are expected to write and maintain Professional Development Plans (PDP) that communicate their scholarly goals and state what they intend to accomplish by the time they are considered for tenure and promotion. The PDP should include a timeline for activities that support their tenure and promotion requests, short- and long-term goals, scholarly activities of substantial quality, and intended external validation of their work. In addition, the University should define a common process for faculty to submit Professional Development Plans, gain the endorsement of their peers and approval by their dean/provost, update and archive the plans as they progress, and define how faculty members report their accomplishments against their plans in the RPT process. Candidates for promotion should be expected to submit a five-year plan indicating how they will sustain their development as teacher-scholars.

8. The University should establish an environment and develop the resources to support faculty members in their endeavor to become successful teacher-scholars. Policies should include reduced teaching and service assignments for new faculty members to allow them to focus on developing their teaching and scholarly activities as they begin their careers at Cal Poly. Deans should dedicate funds to provide assigned time for scholarly activities. Departments should be encouraged to schedule courses such that faculty members have blocks of time to focus on scholarly activities.

9. Specific criteria and expectations regarding service should be included in college RPT guidelines. The COACHE survey indicates that the University should better define the service expectations for tenure. A lack of clarity of criteria leads to misaligned priorities and unnecessary anxiety for the faculty. The college RPT documents should include a discussion about the expectation of service contributions and the roles and responsibilities of faculty members as they progress from assistant to full professor.

10. The University or colleges should articulate a policy indicating how learning assessment can be linked to teaching, service, professional development, or some combination of them all. Faculty members have a significant role in learning assessment for the courses they teach, program curricula, program accreditation, and the scholarship of teaching. Currently college and department RPT documents are silent and ambiguous on faculty expectations in the area of learning assessment. Clarity of faculty expectations with respect to learning assessment will lead to a better understanding and implementation of learning assessment.

11. The University or colleges should provide direction for faculty members to better evaluate teaching effectiveness. Peer Review Committee evaluators need guidance in how to best determine if instructors are effective teachers. Examples might include evaluating the instructor's process of defining learning outcomes for their courses, developing appropriate measures to assess learning, and developing course content and activities that achieve student learning. All faculty members should include the course learning outcomes in their syllabi so that teaching effectiveness can be evaluated against course learning outcomes. Quantitative data related to teaching effectiveness such as student evaluations, grade distributions, and other relevant evaluative parameters should be standardized. Student evaluation surveys could be rewritten to place greater importance on learning and the instructor's role in facilitating student learning in order to better assist faculty members in evaluating effective teaching and learning. In accordance with the MOU requirement to consult with the faculty of a department or equivalent unit, college deans should address the expectation of
probationary faculty to evaluate all courses and amend college guidelines accordingly. Colleges should expect probationary faculty to include a constructive narrative statement reflecting and interpreting the results of their student evaluations.

Recommendation Implementation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Champion</th>
<th>Develop</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. WPAAF common format</td>
<td>Academic Personnel</td>
<td>Winter 2009 –</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>AY 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Common college-wide RPT procedures</td>
<td>College Deans</td>
<td>Winter 2009 –</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>AY 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Multiyear appointments</td>
<td>College Dean and Academic Personnel</td>
<td>Winter 2009 –</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>AY 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pilot online student evaluations</td>
<td>Provost Committee</td>
<td>Winter and</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pilot Electronic RPT evaluations</td>
<td>Provost Committee</td>
<td>Winter and</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PDP guidelines</td>
<td>Academic Personnel and College Deans</td>
<td>Winter 2009 –</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>AY 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Support for scholarship</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Winter and</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Clear RPT criteria</td>
<td>College Deans and Departments</td>
<td>Winter 2009 –</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>AY 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Learning assessment policy</td>
<td>Provost and/or College Deans</td>
<td>Winter 2009 –</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>AY 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>Provost and/or College Deans</td>
<td>Winter 2009 –</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>AY 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WHEREAS, The Research and Professional Development Committee of the Academic Senate is charged with the responsibility of making recommendations relative to policies and procedures for research and professional development activities on campus; and

WHEREAS, The Teacher-Scholar model is espoused as a goal and/or objective by the strategic planning initiative and the University’s accreditation self-study; and

WHEREAS, Results of the WASC student survey strongly suggests faculty engagement in their disciplines by way of research, scholarship and creative activities (RSCA) is a benefit for students; and

WHEREAS, For the past several years Cal Poly has hired a significant number of faculty, and they have expressed a strong interest in, and expectations for, RSCA; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Provost shall charge College Deans, Department Chairs, and the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs, to explore, identify and in a timely manner report best practices in their support of RSCA, including but not limited to, specific examples of exemplary Teacher-Scholars; and be it further

RESOLVED: That such reports clearly explicate the use of resources (e.g., assigned time, direct funding, graduate assistants, etc.) in support of RSCA, along with the criteria for applying and awarding those resources; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Research and Professional Development Committee be responsible for collecting those reports and presenting them to the Academic Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Provost, College Deans, Department Chairs, and the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs promote teaching across the colleges as a platform to enhance interdisciplinary and collaborative RSCA.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee

Date: May 1 2009
Revised: May 15 2009
Revised: May 19 2009
WHEREAS, Most universities require their graduate students to be continuously enrolled during at least the three quarters of the regular academic year until they receive their degree; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly does not require this, or requires that graduate students be enrolled during the quarter in which they graduate; and

WHEREAS, During the period between completion of classes and graduation many Cal Poly graduate students use campus facilities, resources, and faculty time over many quarters; and

WHEREAS, Requiring graduate students to be enrolled during these quarters will allow Cal Poly to keep better track of the students, and the students may be more motivated to finish in a timely manner; and

WHEREAS, The University wishes to implement a requirement for continuous enrollment of graduate students, including enrollment during the quarter they graduate; and

WHEREAS, This enrollment could be through a one-unit class administered by the Open University to reduce expense to students; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the attached proposed GS 597, Continued Graduate Study course, be approved as a vehicle for this enrollment.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Date: May 8 2009
Revised: May 19 2009
# Course Proposal

Use this for Proposing New Courses, GE Courses, U.S. Cultural Pluralism Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Course Proposal Guidelines</th>
<th>To Curriculum Roles and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Click on links in this form for definitions</td>
<td>Today's Date: April 13, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Research and Graduate Programs</td>
<td>For 2009-11 Catalog, courses effective Su 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposer(s): Susan Opava email:<a href="mailto:sopava@calpoly.edu">sopava@calpoly.edu</a> telephone: 6-1508</td>
<td>For other courses, requested start term:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Course Catalog Information

1. **Course Prefix, Number, Title:** GS597 Continued Graduate Study

2. **Catalog Description** *(substantive, but no more than 40 words of content description)*

   Activities other than regular coursework that are needed to complete the requirements for the degree. Analysis of data, thesis and project report writing, oral defense of the thesis/project, preparation for the comprehensive exam, and other activities related to the culminating experience for the student's program. Can be used to fulfill the continuous enrollment requirement for graduate students. Units earned in this course may not be used toward degree completion.

3. **Prerequisite and/or Concurrent Enrollment:** *(note: 300-400 level courses must have prerequisite)*

   **A.** List course(s) or other prerequisite/concurrent requirement:

   Students must be in good standing in a graduate program at Cal Poly.

   **B.** Briefly explain the reason for any prerequisites or concurrent enrollment for the course.

4. **Total Units:** Number of units per mode of instruction: N.A. (independent study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Laboratory</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Seminar</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Grading Type:**

   - Regular
   - Credit/NC [X]

6. **General Education (GE):**

   - No [X]
   - Yes [ ]

   If yes, GE Area: If yes, refer to GE criteria and specify criteria in “Section III. Course Objectives, Assessment, Content” of this form.

7. **United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP):**

   - No [X]
   - Yes [ ]

   If yes, refer to USCP criteria and specify criteria in “Section III. Course Objectives, Assessment, Content” of this form.

8. **Service Learning:**

   - No [X]
   - Yes [ ]

   If yes, refer to Service Learning criteria.

9. **Study Abroad:** Will students be taking this course while studying abroad?

   - No [X]
   - Yes [ ]

   If yes, refer to International Education Program criteria.
10. **Crosslisted Course:** If yes, indicate other course prefix and number:
   - No ☐ Yes ☑
   If the course already exists, and you want to add a Crosslisting, use the "Course Modification" form. If this is a new course, include a Course Proposal form for each prefix.

11. **Repeatable?** Is the course repeatable for multiple credit? No ☐ Yes ☑ If yes, maximum # units: 15
   Is the course repeatable in the same term? No ☐ Yes ☑ 15

12. Is this a Course to be taught with specific Subtitles? (e.g., ENGL 439 British Writers) No ☐ Yes ☑
   *To schedule a specific subtitle, send an email to Mary Whiteford (mwhitefo@calpoly.edu). Copies may be required by your department chair/head and/or college dean's office.*

13. Is this a Selected Topics Course? (e.g., 470, 471, 570, 571, IS 301) No ☐ Yes ☑
   *To schedule a specific topic, use the "Selected Topic Course Proposal" form. These require approval by department chair/head and college dean.*

14. Is this a Replacement Course? (replaces the content of a course to be deleted from the catalog) No ☐ Yes ☑
   Is the deleted course Articulated with a California community college or university? No ☐ Yes ☑
   If yes, indicate prior course prefix, number:
   If yes, do you want the articulation agreement to continue? No ☐ Yes ☑

15. **Course Classification Number(s) C/S#:** (Academic Programs will provide)

### I. Purpose of Course

#### A. Where does the proposed course fit within the curriculum (major, support, concentration, etc.)?

- **Graduate Program?** No ☐ Yes ☑ If yes, specify name of program/specialization: all graduate programs, unless exempted
- **Undergraduate Major?** No ☐ Yes ☑ If yes, is the course:
  - *required?* No ☐ Yes ☑ If yes, specify name of major and/or concentration:
  - *elective?* No ☐ Yes ☑ If yes, specify name of major and/or concentration:
- **Support for a Major outside of department?** No ☐ Yes ☑ If yes, specify name of major and include a memo from that department:
- **Minor?** No ☐ Yes ☑ If yes, specify name of minor:
- **Other program (is this course for GE, USCP, a Certificate, Credential)?** No ☐ Yes ☑ If yes, specify name of program:
  If the course is intended for another department, please include a memo from that department.

#### B. Need

Briefly explain the need for this new course (e.g., changes in the discipline/profession, based on review of assessment data, etc.). Describe how the course aligns with program learning objectives. *(Note: "program" refers to the item(s) check in 1.A. above—graduate program, undergraduate major, support, minor, GE, etc.)*

It is the vehicle for implementing a continuous enrollment requirement for graduate students. Ensures that students have access to university resources and are officially enrolled.
II. Course Learning Objectives, Assessment, Content

Note: Excerpts from already prepared materials may be "copied & pasted" into this section. Please do not attach a separate document.

A. Course Learning Objectives and Assessment Methods
List the learning objectives for the course (e.g., What should students know or be able to do after taking this course?) and the assessment method that will be used to collect credible evidence of student achievement of the learning objectives. Consult the Associate Dean in your college about assessment resources. Here's a link to institutional assessment resources.

If course is proposed for General Education, refer to GE criteria and identify GE objectives and criteria here. If course is proposed for U. S. Cultural Pluralism, refer to USCP criteria and identify USCP criteria here.

You may use the chart below to directly relate course learning objectives to assessment methods OR you may list course learning objectives and assessment methods separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Expanded Course Content
Provide a detailed week-by-week outline (you may include readings, discussion topics, lab experiments, activities, assignments, etc.) For courses with multiple sections, faculty and/or courses with different subtitles, describe the consistent principles or key elements that will be common to all sections. For a course with different subtitles, please provide a representative sample of a syllabus.

If course is proposed for General Education, refer to GE criteria and identify GE objectives and criteria here. If course is proposed for U. S. Cultural Pluralism, refer to USCP criteria and identify USCP content here.

III. Consultation

A. If other departments or programs will be affected by this new course, please talk with the other department chairs/heads and attach signed consultation memos to this form.

Memo not required ☒ Memo attached ☐

B. List all courses that already cover any significant part of the planned content/learning objectives of this course either within the department or from other departments. Explain why duplication of subject matter is necessary. Please talk with any other departments with which there will be significant duplication and attach signed consultation memos to this form.

To the best of my understanding, a memo is not required ☒ Memo attached ☐
C. Course proposal forms will be forwarded to the Library's representative on the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee by the Academic Programs office. The appropriate college librarian will comment on support of this course. This will be done one term prior to review by the full Senate Curriculum Committee.

IV. Resources (in consultation with the Department Head/Chair and College Dean/Associate Dean)

A. For Department and College Planning Purposes: NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated number of students in one section of this course?</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>Lec/Sem</th>
<th>Lab/Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of sections offered</td>
<td>Fall: 1</td>
<td>Winter: 1</td>
<td>Spring: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Explain the impact of this new course on current and/or new resources and accessibility.

1. Equipment.  
   * Does this course require new equipment? No ☐ Yes ☐ If yes, specify:

2. Supplies.  
   * Does this course require new supplies? No ☐ Yes ☐ If yes, specify:

3. Facilities.  
   * Indicate type of teaching environment needed.
     - Lec
     - Lab
     - Smart Room
     - Other
     
     None needed; most students will not be on campus.

4. Faculty.  
   * Indicate the names of the faculty members who will initially teach the course. NA

   Additional information regarding staffing of other courses and/or faculty workload may be requested by department head/chair and/or college dean.

5. Information Technology.  
   * Does this course require new computer facilities and/or software? No ☐ Yes ☐ If yes, please specify:

6. Instructional Materials and Information Technology Accessibility. (Revised 12/3/07) NA
   - As of Fall Quarter 2008, new courses, including associated instructional materials and websites, must meet CSU accessibility requirements unless an exception is granted. Information is available at the following website, Accessibility.calpoly.edu
   - Please review the Universal Design and Faculty Support sections of the Learning Management System support website at BlackBoardSupport.calpoly.edu
   - I have read and understand Cal Poly's Universal Design webpage: No ☐ Yes ☐
   - Take advantage of the technology support tutorials, workshops and other services offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning.
   - If you still have questions or need any assistance, email the Electronic and Information
**Technology Campus Compliance Officer or telephone 805-756-5538.**

### V. Approval Signatures (to Curriculum Roles and Responsibilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Curriculum Chair: NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head/Chair: NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Curriculum Chair: NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Dean: NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(This signature is the Dean's guarantee that s/he will provide any additional resources needed to support this course.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Provost for Academic Programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For questions and concerns contact Mary Whiteford at mwhitefo@calpoly.edu or 756-5475*
WHEREAS, Consistent with constitutional protections and long-standing American Association of University Professors (AAUP) principles, Cal Poly is obligated to support the academic freedom of its faculty and the integrity of its educational programs; and

WHEREAS, Faculty must have “freedom to conduct research, teach, and publish, subject to the norms and standards of scholarly inquiry, without interference or penalty, wherever the search for truth and understanding may lead”; and

WHEREAS, A “Report of the Board of Trustees Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, Collegiality, and Responsibility in the California State University (adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees in September 1985) states in paragraph three:

Collegial governance assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the institution in accordance with basic policy as determined by the Board of Trustees. This includes admission and degree requirements, the curriculum and methods of teaching, academic and professional standards, and the conduct of creative and scholarly activities,

WHEREAS, The statewide Academic Senate (ASCSU) “encourages the local campus senates to develop or review campus policies for the protection of freedom of inquiry, research, expression, and teaching both inside the classroom and beyond” (Academic Freedom and Free Speech Rights, AS-2649-04/FA, March 11 & 12 2004),

WHEREAS, President Baker, in his response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-621-04/MF “Resolution on Academic Freedom,” reaffirmed the University’s commitment to the “principles of academic freedom,”
WHEREAS, In recent years, there have been attempts to quell discussion of contentious issues under the guise of a need for a “balanced” approach to controversial issues; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has witnessed attempts by political organizations and citizen groups to bring pressure to bear on our University to circumvent the domain of faculty in determining academic offerings and/or content; and

WHEREAS, The ASCSU recommends that campus senates incorporate into their policies on academic freedom the 1940 AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure with the 1970 Interpretive Comments (per AS-2661-04/FA, March 6-7, 2004, “Endorsing the AAUP Statement on Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure”),

http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2003-2004/2661.shtml; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s Statement on Academic Freedom has not been updated since 1991, http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/academicpolicies/Academic-freedom.htm; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate reaffirm its commitment to the principles of Academic Freedom as contained in the 1940 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure with the 1970 Interpretive Comments,

http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate object to and reject any attempts to circumvent the domain of faculty in determining academic offerings and/or content; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly’s Statement on Academic Freedom be expanded to include the nationally recognized definition of academic freedom as attached.

1 The term “Faculty” to include instructional faculty, researchers, librarians, and counselors.


Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: May 11 2009
STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Cal Poly recognizes and supports the principle of academic freedom, by which each instructional faculty member, researcher, librarian and counselor has the right to teach, to conduct research, and to publish material relevant to that faculty member's discipline, even when such material is controversial.

The University also guarantees to its faculty the same rights shared by all citizens which include:

- the right to free expression,
- the right to assemble, and
- the right to criticize and seek revision of the institution’s regulations.

At the same time, the faculty should recognize an equally binding obligation to perform their academic duties responsibly and to comply with the internal regulations of the university.

Each faculty member is expected to recognize the right of free expression of other members of the University community; intolerance and personal abuse are unacceptable.

Faculty shall not claim to be representing the University unless authorized to do so.

Cal Poly endorses the nationally recognized definition of academic freedom from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP): The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretative Notes, as follows:

**Academic Freedom**

(a) Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research, for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

(b) Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial subject matter which has no relation to the subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of appointment.

(c) College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and institution by their utterances. Hence, they should at all times be accurate, should
exercise appropriate restraints, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate they are not speaking for the institution.


2 The footnote from the 1970 Interpretative Notes on the AAUP Statement reads: “The intent of this statement is not to discourage what is ‘controversial.’ Controversy is at the heart of free academic inquiry which the entire statement is designed to focus. The passage serves to underscore the need for teachers to avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to the subject.”