I. Minutes: 
Approval of minutes for the Academic Senate meetings of February 1 and February 8 2011 (pp. 2-5).

II. 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:  

III. Special Reports: 

III. Consent Agenda: 
AERO 557 Advanced Orbital Mechanics (4) 4 lec; 
MU 168 Accompanying (1) 1 act; 
MU 368 Accompanying (1) 1 act; 
MU 178 Field Show Marching Skills (1) 1 act; 
MU 378 Field Show Marching Skills (1) 1 act; and 
UNIV 491 Appropriate Technology for the World's People: Development (4) 4 lec: at: 
www.ess.calpoly.edu/_records/curric-handbook/docs/Continuous_Course_Summary/Continuous-Course-Summary.doc

Kinesiology proposals at:  

IV. Business Item(s): 
A. Resolution on the Establishment of a Subcommittee of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to Review Graduate Curricula: Executive Committee, second reading (pp. 6-8).
B. Resolution on Guidelines for Academic Graduate Certificate Programs: Schaffner, chair of Curriculum Committee/Whiteford, chair of Certificate Programs Policy Task Force, first reading (pp. 9-14).

VI. Adjournment:
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
Tuesday, February 1, 2011
UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Regular Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Fernflores reported on the Academic Senate activities for the 2010-2011 academic year including the creation of several task forces tied to WASC accreditation. Some of the task forces include teacher-scholar model, integration and student learning, learn by doing and strategic plan. In addition, the GE task force will be conducting a truncated internal program review, and the assessment task force will look into the various levels of university assessment projects. The Academic Senate is also expecting resolutions addressing budget transparency, shared governance and collegiality, dropping classes, and cheating and plagiarism, to name a few.

B. President’s Office: Armstrong made the following remarks: “I am in a mode of consulting, listening and learning, as we move forwards that is what I want to do my first day and all the way thru my presidency. I am honored to meet everyone today and to serve as president. You have a great reputation for teaching excellence; your commitment to student success is outstanding. I know that you carry a high teaching load and know your resiliency as you have dealt with budget reductions over the past years, travel adjustments, pay freezes, lack of raises, furloughs, and admired you for maintaining a positive attitude, continuing to increase graduation rates, and continuing to move our students forward. Despite what you have been through, we all know that we are facing additional budget challenges. The CSU system has a budget now that is the same as it was 12 years ago with two big differences; the first is that there is no adjustment for inflation and the second is an additional 70,000 students. Transparency, communication, shared governance, and working together in a collaborative mode is what we are going to need to move forward. I am excited with the quality of faculty, administrative team, deans, and chairs and know we can move forward and meet these challenges. For shared governance, the goal is to have good governance and the key is three fold: (1) Basic agreement that indeed is shared, we all share the responsibility that our students succeed. Student success and learning is paramount. (2) Communication has to be open and that means dialogue, it cannot be one way, it has to be open, constructive, respectful and honest. (3) Transparency in decision-making; I can promise you two things. One, before making decisions I will consult as appropriate, I will listen, reflect and move ahead. As you know, the worse decision in many cases is not making a decision but we have to be thoughtful and we will listen. We will not always agree, but that is where open dialogue comes in. Transparency, I want to keep you as informed as possible. The reality is that you, as senators, sometimes know things before I do, but I do know that there are things that we are going to learn and we need to move those along to you as soon as we can. If there is ever a time when it needs to go in a different way, let Rachel Fernflores, Senate Chair know, let us know so we can move ahead. I do have an area where we need immediate counsel and that is strategic planning. You are already embracing that and I really respect the fact that you are doing that and Provost Koob and I are anxious to hear more and more from you as we move down the pathway. A lot of work has been done, but there is always work to do. Giving us dialogue and feedback will help us tremendously. One of my roles, with the deans, is to pick up the pace in development. People will give when they see a compelling vision and
people will give when they see what a difference our students are making, and many of
those individuals are former students. I made some comments this morning at the press
conference that I want to reiterate to you and that is the importance of learn by doing, our
hallmark, and getting back to budget, which is expensive. Cal Poly is an excellent
university in California, in any system, but it is expensive because of the “hands-on”
approach. In the realm of comprehensive polytechnic, we want to move forward and
continue the great work that you have been doing. Academic freedom is the core for our
work. I have been involved with great people in the past and had great success in
developing fundraising, which is a marathon, not a sprint, rooted in a vision of the work of
faculty, staff, and student. That is what makes it successful and you have that. You have
some good fundraising going on but we can all agree that we can take it to another level.
A key step is to hire a vice president for advancement, that search is underway, and very
soon you will be able to interact with candidates.”

C. Provost: Koob reported that Governor Brown has put forward a very aggressive budget
proposal in which he is asking for tax increases equal to the number of dollars to be cut.
Whether or not the money will be raised is an open question as well as whether it will get
on the ballot. The source of the information I provide to you today is the proposed budget
that is the only information we have. The CSU has not given us our enrollment target, nor
has allocated our share of the budget reduction. We have taken several steps over the past
couple of years to minimize this, including last summer when we began a self-support
summer session, which we are going to continue. That shifted money out of the summer
session into the academic year and provided support for faculty positions during the
summer resulting in a higher number of positions available in the campus for our faculty to
serve our students. Second, when the state of California reduced the number of in-state
students it was willing to support, we replaced some of those students with out-of-state
students. Continuing to do that has generated an alternate source of income that allows us
to retain more faculty and staff, subsidizes to some degree the academic programs, and
certainly the financial aid of our in-state students. Last year we were able to achieve 10%
ext-of-state student enrollment for our incoming class and this year we are targeting that
number again. Third, we have behaved prudently and frugally with respect to what I
called the relief year. During the current budget, we held back some of the stimulus money
that came to the campus, in addition, we budgeted for mid-year reductions that are not
going to occurred and that will diminish the amount of cuts we will have to make in
subsequent years. We are thinking two years out, save some money this year to offset
whatever cuts come up, do not believe that will have to go to layoffs. We expect to have
some time to make decisions by using money that will carry over from this year to next
year. The full impact of the budget reductions will not occur until the second year out. I
do not want to diminish the fact that it is real, that is going to be difficult, but at this point
we do not know the final numbers. All I can assure you of is that the university is being
prudent and looking at the resources, at the choices we have, the rules under which we
must play the game, and trying to make sure, we do not do anything sudden. Sudden
change is really difficult for the university and we are working hard to make our moves
smooth. I have asked deans to submit a two-year plan on how we will get to the currently
scheduled bottom line and how we would do that between now and then. I have asked my
staff to do the same thing and to think more globally about how we employee groups of
people and find the best way to get most of each group. Truly believe that we have
opportunities to get more done, not work any harder, and improve the quality of our
product because we are a creative group of people. I want to be cautiously optimistic, I am
not suggesting that you should be complacent, these cuts are real and they are going to
have an impact but they are not a disaster. As your dean calls on you, work with them and
help them find the best way to get through these difficult times.
II. Business Item(s):
   A. **Resolution on a Working Definition of Learn by Doing: (Learn by Doing (LBD) Task Force):**
      Trice presented this resolution which requests that the Academic Senate adopt the attached
definition of Learn by Doing. The resolution will return as a second reading item.

   B. **Resolution on Defining and Adopting the Teacher-Scholar Model: (Teacher-Scholar Model (TSM) Task Force):** Fernflores presented this resolution, which request that Cal Poly adopt the
definition of Teacher-Scholar Model as presented. The resolution will return as a second reading
item.

III. Adjournment: 5:00 pm

Submitted by

[Signature]

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
Minutes: The minutes of January 18, 2011 were approved with one change added to the consent agenda: Curriculum proposals for Orfalea College of Business, with the exception of Entrepreneurship concentration and the International Business concentration, were approved.

Discussion Item(s): Fernflores recognized Jim Mueller and Don Rawlings from the Math Department, Dennis Derickson and Rakesh Goel from CENG, John Harris and Tal Scriver from the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee, and Andrew Schaffner, chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, as speakers on the proposed change to prerequisites for Math 143 – Calculus III. A complete transcript of the discussion can be requested from the Academic Senate Office.

Consent Agenda: Curriculum proposals for CAFES, CAED, CENG, CLA, CSM, and Library were approved.

Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Faculty Affairs Review of Retention Promotion and Tenure Focus Group Report (Faculty Affairs Committee): Ken Brown 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. M/S/P to approve the resolution.
B. Resolution on the Establishment of a Subcommittee of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to Review Graduate Curricula (Executive Committee): Fernflores presented this resolution, which establishes a standing subcommittee of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to review graduate course and program proposals. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: none.
B. President’s Office: none.
C. Provost: Koob reported that even though the CSU has not provided Cal Poly with an enrollment target for 2011-2012, admission is progressing and enrollment targets have been set for all colleges.
E. Statewide Senate: Foroohar reported that statewide academic senate met last month and passed several resolutions, including a resolution on “Amending the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University to Include a Statement Upholding Academic Freedom.” If approved by the ASCSU, this resolution will be sent to individual campuses for a vote and initiate a system wide referendum for its ratification.
F. CFA Campus President: none.
G. ASI Representative: Walicki announced that elections for student government are underway and all documents are available online. ASI will unveil a new logo with the opening of the new Rec Center.

Adjournment: 4:45 pm
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 Academic Senate 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), The Graduate Programs subcommittee
members shall not be comprised of a subset of the Curriculum Committee members, but instead, members the subcommittee 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 Graduate Programs subcommittee will forward recommendations regarding graduate courses and programs to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, who will, in turn, submit them which will consider them before making its recommendations to the Academic Senate for approval.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 27 2010
Revised: February 9 2011
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
RESOLUTION ON GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC GRADUATE CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate acknowledge the attached FAQ on Academic Certificate Programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the attached proposal University Guidelines for Academic Graduate Certificate Programs.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Date: January 25, 2011
University Guidelines for Academic Graduate Certificate Programs
(Guidelines Based on Executive Order 806)

Prepared by the Task Force for Certificate Programs and the ASCC, January 24, 2011

Scope

This policy does not apply to Continuing Education Units (CEUs) or other non-credit certificate programs offered by Continuing Education. This policy does not apply to existing academic certificate programs at Cal Poly, including Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL), Technical Communication, and Gerontology.

Definitions

An academic graduate certificate program:

1. declares that a student has satisfactorily completed a sequence of advanced academic courses that provide instruction in a stand-alone, coherent body of specialized knowledge; and
2. is designed to meet requirements for professional competence, expand access to specialized knowledge, or meet occupational needs for advanced interdisciplinary work.

An academic graduate certificate program:

1. is a stand-alone program that is distinct from a specialization taken in conjunction with or as part of a degree program;
2. provides a set of learning experiences with a specific set of educational objectives;
3. consists of 12-24 quarter units (3-6 courses);
4. may be provided via Special Sessions (self-support) through Continuing Education (see Executive Order 1047); and
5. has a formal application process and a distinct matriculation.

Specific Requirements

1. The educational background and prerequisites for admission into the graduate certificate program must be clearly stated.
2. The graduate certificate program advisor must verify that applicants have the appropriate and relevant background to meet the prerequisites of the program and to be successful in the program.
3. Admission to a graduate certificate program requires a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution with a major in a relevant field of study. The applicant must have attained a minimum GPA of 2.5 in the last 90 units attempted or have earned a GPA of at least 2.5 in the last degree completed. Work experience may substitute (at the discretion of the program) for the relevancy of the bachelor's degree and for the minimum GPA requirements.
4. Courses taken to satisfy the requirements of a graduate certificate program may be applied to the requirements of a graduate degree program; however, students must apply separately for admission into a graduate degree program.

5. Students who are enrolled only in a graduate certificate program are exempt from the continuous enrollment requirement for graduate students.

6. The graduate certificate program may allow a maximum of one 4-unit course in transfer credit, as determined by the graduate certificate program advisor.

Establishing Academic Graduate Certificate Programs

1. An academic graduate certificate program, and all its courses, must be approved by the Provost upon the recommendation of the Academic Senate through the regular curriculum approval process.

2. A graduate certificate program will generally consist of courses at the 500 level. No more than half of the courses may be at the 400 level. No course-work may be below the 400 level.

3. A proposal template, similar to that used for Specializations, will be used.

4. The Financial Aid Office should be contacted prior to the establishment of a new graduate certificate program to ensure that federal regulations regarding “Gainful Employment” are satisfied.

5. Academic graduate certificate programs do not require approval by the CSU Chancellor’s Office.

6. Typically graduate certificate programs do not undergo WASC review; however, the WASC Accreditation Liaison Officer should be contacted to determine if the new graduate certificate program is subject to a WASC Substantive Change Review.

7. Academic graduate certificate programs will be published in the catalog.

8. A graduate certificate program will be required to undergo program review at a frequency determined by Academic Programs.

Awarding an Academic Graduate Certificate

1. A minimum GPA of 3.0 is required for successful completion of a graduate certificate program. Students may not elect to take courses required for the certificate as credit/no credit.

2. A graduate certificate program must be completed within 3 years.

3. The title of the graduate certificate will appear on the student’s official transcript.

4. Completion of the graduate certificate program will be commemorated by a document bearing the University seal and signed by the program’s college dean(s).
Frequently Asked Questions regarding Academic Graduate Certificate Programs
January 24, 2011

Prepared by: the Task Force for Academic Graduate Certificate Programs and
the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

This document is intended to elaborate on the requirements of the policy titled University
Guidelines for Academic Graduate Certificate Programs

1. Why are Academic Graduate Certificate Programs needed?
Academic graduate certificate programs are designed to provide a specialized area of
study that meets the requirements for professional competence and to expand access to
specialized knowledge. The subject matter is advanced and narrow in focus.

The programs are typically designed for working professionals who are seeking to
advance their career opportunities by obtaining specialized knowledge in their field or in
a new field.

2. Are we authorized to establish academic graduate certificate programs?
Per Executive Order 806 and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Cal Poly is
authorized to establish academic certificate programs and to award academic certificates
to students who have completed a prescribed course of study.

3. Why does the Academic Senate have to approve academic graduate certificate
programs?
According to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, “the Board of Trustees, upon
recommendation of the faculty on campus, shall issue the appropriate diploma,
certificate, or degree to a student who has completed the prescribed course of study.”

Therefore, the recommendation of the faculty is provided through the curriculum
approval process of the Academic Senate. Once the Academic Senate approves the
prescribed course of study, the Registrar is authorized to issue academic certificates to
students who complete this course of study.

4. What are examples of career development opportunities available through academic
graduate certificate programs?
Academic graduate certificate programs are designed to provide new career opportunities
for students who complete the course of study. The programs may prepare students for
career advancement by:
• increasing their knowledge and abilities in a career area;
• introducing them to new developments in a field;
• providing them with the initial knowledge/skills needed to enter a new field;
• providing them with the knowledge/skills needed to make a significant change in an existing career;
• providing them with the knowledge/skills for positions in new and emerging employment fields;
• providing them the opportunity to acquire skills needed for interdisciplinary work.

5. Why do students have to be formally admitted to pursue an academic graduate certificate program?
Since an academic graduate certificate program is a stand-alone program, an admissions process is required to ensure that the applicants have the appropriate prerequisites to be successful in the program.

6. Does this policy apply to non-academic certificates?
This policy does not apply to non-academic certificates, for example, Continuing Education Units (CEUs) or non-credit courses offered through Continuing Education.

7. Why do graduate students have to apply separately for admission into a degree program after acceptance into an academic graduate certificate program?
Even though the course-work for an academic graduate certificate program and a graduate degree might overlap, the degree program might have different admission standards. Therefore, an academic graduate certificate program is not intended as a way to be admitted to a degree program. However, course-work completed in a certificate program may be transferable to a degree program.

8. Are international or exchange students eligible to pursue academic graduate certificate programs?
Yes, but only if international students are admitted into an academic graduate certificate program. International or exchange students may also pursue non-academic certificates offered through Continuing Education.

9. Are students admitted to an academic graduate certificate program eligible for financial aid?
Yes. However, when proposing new academic certificate programs, there are federal regulations regarding “Gainful Employment” that must be adhered to. The information that must be reported to the Department of Education is generally related to demand and career opportunities. When proposing an academic graduate certificate program, clarification should be obtained from the Financial Aid Office on the information that
must be submitted and this information should be included on the certificate proposal form.

10. Does this policy apply to academic undergraduate certificate programs?

   No. This policy only addresses academic graduate certificate programs. Policy may be developed for academic undergraduate certificate programs.
RESOLUTION ON DEFINING AND ADOPTING THE TEACHER-SCHOLAR MODEL

WHEREAS, Cal Poly is a predominantly undergraduate university committed to the highest possible quality of education; and

WHEREAS, in support of the mission of Cal Poly, the faculty engage in teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activities (RSCA); and service; and

WHEREAS, a balance of faculty talents and activities is essential to meet the objectives and goals of the institution, resulting in a range of duties and responsibilities among faculty; and

WHEREAS, continued intellectual/professional growth of faculty, such as through Research Scholarship and Creative Activities, is central to providing a vibrant learning environment for students; and

WHEREAS, the Teacher-Scholar Model as proposed in Boyer (1990) characterizes the engagement of faculty in both teaching and scholarship, be it

RESOLVED, that Cal Poly faculty adopt the Teacher-Scholar Model, defined as participation in both teaching and scholarship; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Teacher-Scholar Model include, when possible, meaningful student engagement in faculty scholarly activity and inclusion of scholarship in teaching to create vibrant learning experiences for students; and be it further

RESOLVED, that scholarship be defined in general terms as the scholarships of discovery, application, integration, and teaching/learning (Boyer, 1990), implemented in a discipline-specific manner while mindful of Cal Poly’s mission; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Teacher-Scholar Model allow for individual variations in the balance between teaching and scholarly activities; and be it further

RESOLVED, that in support of the Teacher-Scholar Model, the Administration work with the Faculty to remove impediments and provide appropriate resources to implement the Teacher-Scholar Model.

Proposed by: WASC/Academic Senate TSM Task Force
Date: January 25 2011
Revised: February 4 2011
BACKGROUND:

The Teacher-Scholar Model essay in the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report (Dec. 2009) begins by recognizing that though Cal Poly is a teaching-centered institution, scholarship has taken on a greater importance as the mission of the institution has evolved. The essay finds that Cal Poly faculty and staff appear to engage in a high level of scholarly activity that enhances student learning, according to the results of the 2009 Cal Poly Student and Faculty/Staff Surveys, the Department Head/Chair Survey, and the literature. Progress toward enacting the teacher-scholar model at Cal Poly, however, has been hampered by the lack of: 1) a comprehensive understanding of scholarship, and 2) an accepted working definition of the model.

Cal Poly has traditionally been a teaching-centered institution, but, over the last thirty years, scholarship has gradually taken on a role of greater importance. The University’s mission is tied to that of the CSU, and the system’s mission has changed significantly since the days when faculty scholarship was proscribed in keeping with the strict vision of the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education. In 1989, with significant leadership provided by Cal Poly and the Cal Poly President’s Cabinet, the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education concluded that research, scholarship, and creative activity are central to the mission of the CSU, and the Educational Code was changed to reflect this conclusion. The Cornerstones Report of 1997 acknowledged this change when it stated that “faculty scholarship, research and creative activity are essential components” of the CSU’s teaching-centered mission (Principle 4). A decade later, the 2007 CSU Provosts’ Statement asserted the economic value of what has come to be known as the “teacher-scholar model,” whereby teaching and scholarship are understood to be mutually reinforcing. The statement identified the model as an important way to keep California’s citizens competitive in a global marketplace based on human capital economies—an important consideration for an institution that has always played a major role in preparing the state’s workforce. In turn, Cal Poly’s current mission statement emphasizes fostering teaching and scholarship.

The literature on student learning supports the value of an increasing emphasis on scholarship within the CSU and at Cal Poly. Student involvement in undergraduate research is a form of active learning, and it has been deemed a high impact practice that enhances student retention and engagement. Though undergraduate research is more common in the sciences, student involvement in faculty scholarship is possible in all disciplines and yields encouraging results. According to the provosts, it increases the frequency of meaningful interactions with faculty and peers; encourages students to spend more time and effort on research, writing, and analytic thinking; and involves them in more collaborative forms of learning.

Scholarship also benefits student learning by helping to maintain faculty and staff enthusiasm. As the CSU Provosts have stated, “When faculty [members] are at the cutting edge of their disciplines, they remain connected with the source that feeds their intellectual curiosity and creative abilities and are able to establish and maintain partnerships with other scholars around the world.” This scholarly currency, in turn, enhances faculty teaching and interactions with students, from freshman through doctoral levels.
Frequently Asked Questions Regarding the Resolution on Defining and Adopting the Teacher-Scholar Model

1. Why do we need to define the Teacher-Scholar Model?
   In the BACKGROUND statement we discuss how and why scholarship has become a more significant expectation of faculty. Reasons for this trend include maintaining currency within a faculty member's discipline, that faculty seek out scholarly activities to maintain their own enthusiasm. Further, and perhaps most important, these activities have been identified in the literature and through surveys as high impact activities that enhance student learning. Cal Poly has never formally defined the Teacher-Scholar Model. It is important to define so that faculty can begin to have a clearer picture of expectations during their career. A formal definition is also important for justifying the changes necessary to implement a Teacher-Scholar Model as departments, programs, colleges, and administration seek to acquire the needed resources (e.g. faculty time, infrastructure).

2. Will this resolution affect the expectations for lecturers?
   Article 20 (re: Workload), Section 1, Paragraph d of the contract states that the instructional faculty as a whole (including lecturers, librarians, coaches) without delineating ranks or positions do research and other professional activities to remain current in the disciplines they teach (see excerpt and "faculty" definition below). The resolution should be thought of as a mere elaboration on this paragraph. It would allow for recognition of various forms of scholarship as viable means to maintaining currency in their disciplines for any faculty member. Lecturers may want to be recognized for a higher level of scholarship than their contract requires because they wish to obtain a tenure-track position here or elsewhere. Because of their background, lecturers with PhD's (or other graduate degrees) may desire to maintain a high level of scholarship and be credited with those activities as they progress through the promotion process. Unless a lecturer is being paid/supported to perform professional development, they cannot be punished for not having developed professionally as a result of this resolution.

20.1 d. The professional responsibilities of faculty members include research, scholarship and creative activity, which contribute to their currency, and the contributions made within the classroom and to their professions. The professional responsibilities of faculty members are fulfilled by participation in conferences and seminars, through academic leaves and sabbaticals that provide additional opportunities for scholarship and preparation, and through a variety of other professional development activities.

3. What constitutes “faculty” in the resolution?
   Article 20.1.d referenced above is under the subheading of Instructional Faculty: Professional Responsibilities. The resolution refers to “faculty” in a broad sense as the contract defines it when defining Faculty Unit employee. It is defined as follows:

   Faculty Unit Employee - The term "faculty unit employee" or "employee" as used in this Agreement refers to a bargaining unit member who is a full-time faculty unit employee, part-time faculty unit employee, probationary faculty unit employee, tenured faculty unit employee, temporary faculty unit employee, coaching faculty unit employee, counselor faculty unit employee, faculty employee, or library faculty unit employee.

4. How would this resolution affect existing retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) policies?
The resolution would formally define a generalized Teacher-Scholar Model that would be more refined at the program or department level for RPT purposes. This is necessary because Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA) are discipline specific and there is no single definition of RSCA that apply to all disciplines. The intent of this resolution is to state that Cal Poly recognizes the importance of RSCA for student learning and faculty currency but also that the TSM embraces a flexible balance between teaching, scholarship, and service.

5. Why are “meaningful student engagement” and “inclusion of scholarship in teaching” conjoined in the second RESOLVED clause?

These two activities are both important to the single goal of creating vibrant learning experiences for students. Therefore, the work group thought the conjoined statement is more powerful than splitting them into two RESOLVED clauses. In essence, this RESOLVED clause is the single most essential statement of the importance of defining and adopting a Teacher-Scholar Model at Cal Poly.