I. Minutes:
Approval of minutes for the Academic Senate meeting of November 16 2011 (pp. 2-3).

II. Discussion Item(s): [TIME CERTAIN 3:10pm]
The proposed deletions of the OCOB Entrepreneurship concentration and the International Business concentration have been pulled from the consent agenda. This agenda has been ordered so that discussion of the pulled items will be heard first before business items, consent items, and reports. The discussion will begin promptly at 3:10 and continue to 4:00pm.

III. Consent Agenda:
Curriculum proposals for Orfalea College of Business: (pp. 4-7).

IV. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on RPT Report: Graham Archer, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, second reading (pp. 8-18; resolution with minor revisions to be distributed at the meeting).
B. Resolution on the Establishment of a Subcommittee of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to Review Graduate Curricula: Executive Committee, first reading (pp. 19-21).

V. Regular Reports: [TIME CERTAIN 4:30pm]
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:

VI. Adjournment:
I. Minutes: The minutes of September 17, October 5, and October 26 were approved as presented.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: Fernflores announced that the CENG Dean Search Committee will be composed of four elected-faculty members from CENG and two faculty selected by the Executive Committee. Dan Howard-Greene expressed his pleasure and admiration for the work done by the Academic Senate as he attended his last meeting prior to retiring in December.
   
   B. President’s Office: Howard-Greene reported that the presidential candidates’ visit to campus will begin Tuesday, November 30.
   
   C. Provost: none.
   
   D. Vice Provost for Student Affairs: none.
   
   E. Statewide Senate: LoCascio reported that six resolutions were passed at the Statewide Academic Senate meeting in addition; the Red Balloon Project was discussed at great lengths. Foroohar discussed some of the resolutions passed, including: a resolution about public education leadership and political neutrality; a resolution asking Governor Brown to appoint a faculty trustee; and a resolution on the decision by the Supreme Court that does not allow public employees to use their first amendment freedom to protect themselves when criticizing the institution. In addition, reports were presented on the possibility of midyear budget cuts and the Red Balloon Project.
   
   F. CFA Campus President: Thorncroft reported that bargaining negotiations continue and that the current proposal for FERP continues unchanged with possible limitations on its implementation.
   
   G. ASI Representative: Walicki announced that the UU Advisory Board continues its work on the Rec Center outreach.
   
   H. Caucus Chairs: Mehiel, chair of the Strategic Planning Task Force, reported that the survey regarding strategic planning will go to all faculty in early January.

IV. Special Reports:
   A. Jim Maraviglia: Update on MCA criteria and the impact of AB2401 is available at: www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen/minutes/10-11_minutes/new_student_update_nov2010.ppt
   
   B. Brian Tietje: Continuing Education is a service unit to the colleges that provides avenues for generating alternative sources of revenue that compliment funds coming in from the
state and college-based fees. Continuing Education works with individual faculty members, department chairs or deans to develop a financial plan for new courses, gets fees and pricing approved, and determines course feasibility. The plan for Summer 2011 is to offer a self-support program designed to offer courses that students need to make progress to degree. The main motive for proposing the discontinuance of the adult degree program is that such a program should not reside in Continuing Education due to their limited resources.

V. Consent Agenda: none.

VI. Business Item(s):
A. **Resolution on Academic Senate Operating Procedures for Its Committee (Executive Committee):** Fernflores, Academic Senate chair, presented this resolution, which states that modifications to sections VIII.D and VIII.E of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate supersede AS-306-89 “Resolution to Provide a Generic Set of Operating Procedures for Academic Senate Standing and Ad Hoc Committees” M/S/P to approve the resolution.

B. **Resolution on Initiatives in conflict with Cal Poly Mission Statement (Executive Committee):** Fernflores, Academic Senate chair, presented this resolution, which proposes a process for faculty to have complaints heard about initiatives perceived to be in conflict with the Cal Poly Mission Statement. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

C. **Resolution on Academic Senate Fairness Board Description and Procedures (Executive Committee):** Fernflores, Academic Senate chair, presented this resolution, which requests that the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the revised *Fairness Board Description and Procedures*. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

D. **Resolution on Academic Dishonesty: Cheating and Plagiarism Procedures (Executive Committee):** Fernflores, Academic Senate chair, presented this resolution, which requests that the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the revised Academic Dishonesty: Cheating and Plagiarism. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

E. **Resolution on RPT Report (Faculty Affairs Committee):** Fernflores, Academic Senate chair, presented this resolution, which requests that the Academic Senate endorse the Faculty Affairs Committee comments on items 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the RPT Focus Group Report and that it be forwarded to the Provost and the members of the Retention Promotion and Tenure Focus Group for attachment in the RPT Focus Group Report. This resolution will return as a second reading item.

F. **Resolution on the Establishment of a Subcommittee of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to Review Graduate Curricula (Executive Committee):** Due to lack of time, this item was not discussed.

VII. Discussion Item(s): none.

VIII. Adjournment: 5:00 pm

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
### 2011–2013 Catalog Changes

**Orfalea College of Business**

**Note:** The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee has reviewed the following curriculum changes during Fall Quarter 2010, and recommends their approval.

Many of the entries reflect prerequisite changes as a result of the Prerequisite Project which occurred during the previous academic year, to be effective with the 2011-13 catalog. If a prerequisite change was included in that project but not included in the 2011-13 catalog proposals, it appears below in **blue**. If it was included in both the Prerequisite Project and in the 2011-13 proposals, a statement will appear for a course entry in the "Other" column (e.g., "same prereq as prereq project").

#### Summer 2011

### I. PROGRAM CHANGES (New, Deleted, Changes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Area</td>
<td>Financial Accounting Specialization, MS Accounting</td>
<td>Reinstate; approved several years ago by C.O. (as MS Accounting with specializations in Tax, and Financial Accounting; implementation of this specialization was delayed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics Area</td>
<td>Change Real Estate Economics Concentration, BS Economics to Real Estate Concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Quantitative Economics Concentration, BS Economics to Quantitative Concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualized Course of Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Economics (alternative to selecting a concentration)</td>
<td>Name change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name change</td>
<td>Name change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete</td>
<td>Add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Concentration</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies Area</td>
<td>International Business Concentration</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Area</td>
<td>Change Management Concentration, BS Business Administration to Management and Human Resources Concentration</td>
<td>Name change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. CURRICULUM CHANGES (addition/deletion of non-departmental courses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### III. COURSE CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number, Title from / to:</th>
<th>New, Delete, Change</th>
<th>(Total Units) Mode From: to:</th>
<th>CS #</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 302 Interntl &amp; Cross-Cit Mgt</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same prereq as prereq project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 342 Fund of Corp Finance</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same prereq as prereq project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS-346 Principles of Marketing</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added to prereq-project (9/23/10) Change withdrawn by department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS 384</td>
<td>Human Resources Mgmt</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 390</td>
<td>Data Structures for Business Systems to BUS 392 Business Application Development</td>
<td>Change (#, title, descr, prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 393</td>
<td>Database Sys in Bus</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 394</td>
<td>Sys Analysis &amp; Design</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 403</td>
<td>Adv Sem: Internatl Mgt</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 431</td>
<td>Security Analysis and Portfolio Management</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 433</td>
<td>International Finance</td>
<td>Change (descr, prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 443</td>
<td>Case Studies in Finance</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 444</td>
<td>Financial Engineering and Risk Management</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 451</td>
<td>Product Dev &amp; Launch</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 454</td>
<td>Dev/Presntng Mrkt Proj</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 488</td>
<td>Ping &amp; Managing New Ventures</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 311</td>
<td>Intermediate Microeconomics to Intermediate Microeconomics I</td>
<td>Change (title, descr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 313</td>
<td>Intermediate Macroeconomics</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 405</td>
<td>International Monetary Economics</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 260</td>
<td>Manufacturing Processes</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 329</td>
<td>Industrial Materials</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 341</td>
<td>Plastics Processes/Application</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td>GE Area F course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 402</td>
<td>Anlyzng/Prsnt Ops Indstry Ent</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td>Same as prereq project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 407</td>
<td>Product Design/Fabrictn/Sales</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td>Added to prereq project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 411</td>
<td>Industrial Safety and Quality Program Leadership</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td>Added to prereq project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 435</td>
<td>Packaging Development</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td>Added to prereq project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economics Area:

ECON 311 Intermediate Microeconomics to Intermediate Microeconomics I
- Change (title, descr)
- Added to prereq project

ECON 313 Intermediate Macroeconomics
- Change (prereq)
- Added to prereq project

ECON 405 International Monetary Economics
- Change (prereq)
- Added to prereq project

Industrial Technology Area:

IT 260 Manufacturing Processes
- Change (prereq)
- Added to prereq project

IT 329 Industrial Materials
- Change (prereq)
- Added to prereq project

IT 341 Plastics Processes/Application
- Change (prereq)
- GE Area F course

IT 402 Anlyzng/Prsnt Ops Indstry Ent
- Change (prereq)
- Same as prereq project

IT 407 Product Design/Fabrictn/Sales
- Change (prereq)
- Added to prereq project

IT 411 Industrial Safety and Quality Program Leadership
- Change (prereq)
- Added to prereq project

IT 435 Packaging Development
- Change (prereq)
- Added to prereq project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Change Type</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT 531</td>
<td>Lean Six Sigma Value Chain Management</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Note for UCSchedulers: Standardize prereq (to state &quot;OCOB graduate standing or approval from the Associate Dean of OCOB Graduate Programs&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 532</td>
<td>Technology Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 533</td>
<td>Industrial Processes and Materials</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 534</td>
<td>Adv Pkgs Dynamics for Dist.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 545</td>
<td>Product Conceptualization and Execution Using Rapid Prototyping</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 591, 592</td>
<td>Applied Industry Project I, II</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 599</td>
<td>Industrial and Tech Studies Thesis</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 500, 521, 522, 523, 527, 570, 571, 594, 595, 596</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate Programs Area:

(GSB, GSA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Change Type</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSA 535</td>
<td>Legal Aspects of Commercial Transactions</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 536</td>
<td>Taxation of Trusts, Estates, and Transfer Taxes</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 537</td>
<td>State and Local Taxation</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 538</td>
<td>Current Developments in Taxation</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 540</td>
<td>Taxation of Corporations and partnership</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 543</td>
<td>Advanced Financial Reporting Issues II</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>(4) 4 sem (5) 5 sem For prereq, add standardized prereq to existing prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 546</td>
<td>Tax Research and Administrative Procedures</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 547</td>
<td>Corporate Taxation</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Add standardized prereq to existing prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 548</td>
<td>Adv Individual Taxation and Tax Planning</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 549</td>
<td>Adv Taxation of Flow-Through Entities</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 551</td>
<td>International Taxation</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>(standardize and change prereq)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 552</td>
<td>Fraud Auditing and Examination</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>(4) 4 lec 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 553</td>
<td>International Accounting</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>(4) 4 lec 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 554</td>
<td>Advanced Spreadsheet Modeling for Accounting</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>(4) 4 lec 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 555</td>
<td>Accounting Database and Analysis</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>4 lec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 556</td>
<td>Financial Statement Analysis and Valuation</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>4 lec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 570</td>
<td>Selected Adv Topics</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA 539, 541, 542, 544, 545, 550</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSB 531</td>
<td>Managerial Finance</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSB 533</td>
<td>Aggregate Economics Analysis and Policy</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSB 562</td>
<td>Seminar in General Management and Strategy</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSB 567</td>
<td>Adv Seminar in International Business Management</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSB 596</td>
<td>Economic Forecasting</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSB 597</td>
<td>Seminar in Selected Economic Problems</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSB 500, 501, 503, 511, 512, 513, 514, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 534, 537, 538, 539, 541, 555, 556, 560, 563, 564, 569, 570, 574, 576, 577, 578, 579, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 589, 595</td>
<td>Change (prereq)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standardize prereq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee during 2009 did a review of the Retention Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Focus Group Report; and

WHEREAS, On May 1 2009 the Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee endorsed recommendations 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the RPT Focus Group Report; and

WHEREAS, On June 2 2009 the Academic Senate endorsed recommendations 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the RPT Focus Group Report; and

WHEREAS, On March 16 2010 the Academic Senate Instruction Committee submitted its comments to recommendations 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the RPT Focus Group Report; and

WHEREAS, On April 6 2010, recommendations 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the RPT Focus Group Report were forwarded to the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee for its review; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee concluded its review and submitted its comments to recommendations 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the RPT Focus Group Report; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the Faculty Affairs Committee comments on items 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the RPT Focus Group Report as attached; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Affairs Committee comments be forwarded to the Provost and the members of the Retention Promotion and Tenure Focus Group for attachment in the RPT Focus Group Report.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: October 25 2010
Revised: November 2 2010
Focus Group’s Recommendation #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.”

FAC observations:

The Faculty Affairs Committee agrees with the Focus Group’s Recommendation #4. However the FAC members have the following concerns:

1. As in the current system, only students that are actually attending class should be permitted to evaluate the faculty.
2. The Provost designated committee should contain significant faculty involvement.
3. The Provost designated committee should include ASI representation.
4. Faculty must volunteer to participate in the pilot study.
5. A faculty member’s student evaluation results are confidential. The confidentiality of the data must be ensured.
6. To aid in data mining, a student’s eventual grade in the class should be linked to their evaluation.
7. Automatically normalizing or scaling the results should be controlled by faculty committee.
8. The pilot study should consider whether it is necessary for the students to enter the data online or if similar results and efficiencies can be gained through an improved scanned form.
9. The evaluation of the effectiveness of the pilot study must be accomplished with significant faculty involvement.

Focus Group’s Recommendation #5. “The University should explore the use of electronic faculty evaluation processes and set up a pilot process in one college.”

FAC observations:

Faculty Affairs Committee agrees with the Focus Group’s Recommendation #5. However the FAC members have the following concerns:

1. Faculty must volunteer to participate in the pilot study.
2. The Administration must provide appropriate support to the faculty to ensure that faculty workload does not increase due to participation in the pilot study.
3. The Provost designated committee should contain significant faculty involvement.
4. As in the current system, WPAF files must be returned to the faculty member. The system must ensure that no copies are maintained elsewhere.

5. The pilot study must allow for, and support, a reviewer who wants to use paper copy instead of the electronic format.

6. The evaluation of the effectiveness of the pilot study must be accomplished with significant faculty involvement.

Focus Group's Recommendation #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."

FAC observations:

Faculty Affairs Committee agrees with the Focus Group's Recommendation #10, provided that the recommendation refers to faculty participation in learning assessment rather than learning assessment itself. The policy should be articulated at the department level, rather than college or University.

FAC Recommendations on Focus Group recommendation #10:

The departments should articulate policies indicating how or if faculty participation in assessment can be linked to teaching, service, professional development or some combination of them all.

Focus Group's Recommendation #11. "The University or colleges should provide direction for faculty members to better evaluate teaching effectiveness."

FAC observations:

Faculty Affairs Committee agrees with the Focus Group's Recommendation #11, as formulated in the above sentence. FAC members, however, do not agree with linking "instructor's process of defining learning outcomes for their courses" to the RPT process.

FAC opposes the Focus Group's assertion that "All faculty members should include the course learning outcomes in their syllabi so that teaching effectiveness can be evaluated against course learning outcome."

FAC opposes the standardization of "student evaluations, grade distributions, and other relative evaluative parameters," as recommended by the Focus Group. FAC recommendation:

Departments and colleges should continue their work to update and further clarify their RPT criteria and processes and provide direction for faculty members to evaluate teaching effectiveness in the peer review framework.
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
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 WPAF 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. 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 WPAF 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>4. Pilot online student evaluations</td>
<td>Provost Committee</td>
<td>Winter and Spring 2009</td>
<td>Summer 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pilot Electronic RPT evaluations</td>
<td>Provost Committee</td>
<td>Winter and Spring 2009</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Support for scholarship</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Winter and Spring 2009</td>
<td>AY 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WHEREAS, Faculty members who serve on the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, who are always experienced in undergraduate education, do not always have experience teaching in graduate programs or in thesis supervision; and

WHEREAS, Some recent newly proposed graduate programs have been nontraditional programs, offered to working professionals, in special session, or online; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly anticipates more graduate programs, traditional and nontraditional, over the next several years; and

WHEREAS, Newly proposed graduate programs and courses warrant careful review by faculty members with experience in graduate teaching and thesis supervision; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate establish a standing subcommittee of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to review graduate course and program proposals; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Constitution of the Faculty and Bylaws of the Academic Senate be amended as follows:

To be added under VIII.H.2

2. Curriculum (and its subcommittees: U.S. Cultural Pluralism and Graduate Programs subcommittees)

To be added under I.2.b.

Graduate Programs Subcommittee

There will be a standing subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee responsible for the review of proposals for new/revised graduate courses and programs. As with the Cultural Pluralism subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee (AS-396-92-CC), Graduate Programs subcommittee members shall not be comprised of a
subset of the Curriculum Committee, but instead, members shall include one faculty member from each college with experience in graduate level teaching and supervision, the chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (or a designee of the chair), and as an ex officio member, the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs. Recommendations from this subcommittee will be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee who will, in turn, submit them to the Academic Senate for approval.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 27 2010
adopted December 1, 1992
AS-396-92/CC

RESOLUTION ON THE FORMATION OF A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Background Statement:

This resolution is a companion to that above and addresses the composition and responsibilities of the committee which will evaluate the content of courses submitted for fulfillment of the cultural pluralism baccalaureate requirement. We propose a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee because all new courses and substantial changes to old ones should be considered by the CC; yet this is a specific area of review which merits its own deliberations.

WHEREAS, The establishment of a subcommittee of a standing academic senate committee involves a change in the Constitution and By-Laws of the Academic Senate; be it

RESOLVED, That said Constitution and By-Laws be amended as follows:

To be added under 1.3.b.

1. Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee:
There will be a standing subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee for the initial review of courses proposed to fulfill the Cultural Pluralism Baccalaureate requirement. This subcommittee shall consist of seven voting members, one from each college and one from the professional staff.
Terms shall be for two years, staggered to ensure continuity.

Senate caucuses will solicit and receive application for membership. The slate of candidates will be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee who will appoint members.

A chair of this subcommittee will be elected from the subcommittee members each academic year.

Ex officio members shall be the Director of Ethnic Studies and a representative from the General Education and Breadth Committee and the Curriculum Committee.

Selection of courses to fulfill the requirement shall follow the criteria listed in AS-395-920

Recommendations from this subcommittee will be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee who will, in turn, submit them to the Academic Senate for a vote.

submitted by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Christina A. Bailey, Chair