



CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, February 23 2010
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

- I. Minutes:
Approval of minutes for Executive Committee meeting of January 26 2010:
(pp. 2-3).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost:
 - D. Statewide Senate:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. ASI Representative:
 - G. Caucus Chairs:
 - H. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Filling of vacancies to the Academic Senate for 2010-2012:** CAFES-3 vacancies, CAED-1 vacancy, CLA-2 vacancies (please bring names to the meeting).
 - B. **Academic Senate committee vacancy for 2009-2010:** (p. 4).
 - C. **Approval of nominees to the Consultative Committee for the Selection of AVP for Academic Personnel:** (p. 5).
 - D. **Approval of committee procedures for Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee:** Geringer, DTAC chair (pp. 6-8).
 - E. **Approval of committee procedures for Research & Professional Development Committee:** Kurfess/Stankus, chair/member of the R&PDC (pp. 9-10).
 - F. **Resolution on Revision of Cal Poly Mission Statement to Include Staff:** Executive Committee (pp. 11-12).
 - G. **Approval of Internal Reviewers for CAED, CAFES, and CSM** (p. 13).
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - A. **Senate elections: paper vote or electronic vote?**
 - B. **Senate committee websites**
- VII. Adjournment:

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF
The Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, January 26, 2010
01-409, 3:10–5:00 p.m.

- I. Minutes: The minutes of January 5, 2010 were approved.
- II. Communications and Announcements: Fernflores announced the call for faculty to serve on Academic Senate and University Committees. Information is available at
 < <http://www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen/CommitteeNominations/CommNomDocs.htm> >
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair: Fernflores reported that the GE Task Force will be recommending a new governance model that more closely ties GE and the course proposal process to the Academic Senate. The model will include a new appeal process and should be presented to the Academic Senate for approval during spring quarter.
 - B. President's Office: Howard-Greene announced that President Baker submitted a letter to the op-ed section of the San Luis Obispo Tribune to comment on the nature of Cal Poly's relationships with members of industry. In the letter, Baker stated: "We (Cal Poly) do not permit strings to be attached to gifts that would in any way encroach on the faculty's authority over the curriculum or otherwise impinge on their academic freedom."
 - C. Provost: Koob announced that the enrollment model for next year is complete and includes a target of 3,100 in-state freshmen. Plans for summer session are moving forward with 5 and 8-week courses.
 - D. Statewide Senate: LoCascio reported that 23 resolutions were presented at the statewide academic senate meeting where all were approved with the exception of a resolution on the addition of a second faculty trustee to the CSU Board of Trustee which was tabled until May 6, 2010.
 - E. CFA Campus President: Saenz reported that the CFA continues to negotiate faculty raises for last year.
 - F. ASI Representative: Griggs announced that San Luis Obispo City Council held its first meeting relating to the new ordinance proposal on the 19th of January. While the end result and comments that were made during the meeting were not favorable in the eyes of students, the focus group was able to get a lot of our input and suggestions included into the new ordinance. A resolution passed on the Governor's budget proposal stating that while CSSA is appreciative of the Governor's notion to reinvest the State's priority in higher education, it cannot be supportive of a budget that under funds the CSU, proposes to cut Cal Grants, and raises student Fees. In addition, Assemblyman Paul Fong will be sponsoring CSSA's bill that will help Cal Grant B recipients receive both access and tuition awards in their first year of college as opposed to only access awards during their first year as it currently states. ASI will also be

working with David Conn and his team to help reach out to students regarding the WASC visit coming up in the beginning of February.

G. Caucus Chairs: none.

H. Other: none.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Business Items:

A. Academic Calendar for Summer Quarter 2011 to Spring Quarter 2012 (Instruction Committee): Lertwachara, Chair of the Instruction Committee, recommended that Winter 1 and Spring 1 be adopted as part of the proposed 2011-2012 academic calendar. Conn added that an additional proposal, requiring classes to start on other than a Monday, is being reviewed. It was decided to approve the Instruction Committee's recommendation with the additional proposal as a contingency until feasibility of implementation is reviewed.

B. Resolution on Campus Wide Change of Major Policy (Curriculum Committee): Hannings, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, presented the resolution which requests that the Academic Senate approve and recommend to President Baker the campus wide adoption of the Change of Major Policy. M/S/P to agendaize the resolution.

C. Resolution on Revision of Cal Poly Mission Statement to Include Staff (Executive Committee): Due to lack of time this item was not discussed.


VI. Discussion Items:

A. Senate elections: Due to lack of time this item was not discussed.

B. Harris Ranch controversy: Due to lack of time this item was not discussed.

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

Submitted by,


Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate

ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE VACANCIES FOR 2009-2010

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE

Instruction Committee (2009-2010)

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

Grants Review Committee

Instruction Committee

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Faculty Affairs Committee (2009-2010)

Eric Olsen, IT – John Dobson's replacement

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

Curriculum Committee

Instruction Committee

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW COMMITTEE – 2009-2011 term (University Committee)

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES

Distinguished Teaching Award Committee

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

CAL POLY PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE – 2 vacancies

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON AIDS AND HIV INFECTION - 1 vacancy

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW COMMITTEE – 1 vacancy from CSM

UNIVERSITY UNION ADVISORY BOARD – 1 vacancy

February 12 2010

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE FOR SELECTION OF AVP FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Interest Statements Received

DORIS DERELIAN

(CAFES, Food Science and Nutrition Department)

I would like to serve on the Academic Personnel VP search committee because I believe I can bring several different angles to the deliberations. I am both a full professor and an attorney and have extensive background in working in and around major universities in California and the Western US.

The person we select for this position will need skills in many areas given the multi-faceted aspects of this office. Serving on the committee would be an honor and a privilege and I believe a benefit to the outcome of the search.

RICH SAENZ

(CSM, Physics Department)

In both of my previous and current positions, chair of the physics department and president of the local CFA chapter, I have had to deal with the Academic Personnel office quite a bit. The vice president who runs this office, to a large degree, sets the tone for faculty-administration interaction, especially when things are in dispute. It is important to have a person in this position who knows the rules (and the contracts), can explain them, and knows when it makes sense to challenge them. My experience with this office gives me the background to help the committee decide which of the candidates will be able to do all of these things in a way that promotes resolution and diffuses confrontation. I have previously served on search committees for a provost and a CLA dean.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING DTA COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR 2009-2010

Governance Principles

1. The committee members strongly believe that the Distinguished Teaching Award is one of, if not the, foremost award on this campus, particularly given that the CSU's mission is primarily teaching-focused. In that spirit, we strongly embrace the principle that the committee be run in an objective, apolitical, non-departmentally-biased, consensus-driven manner.

Committee membership:

2. This year, after the unfortunate loss of Professor Thomas Ruehr, we had 5 continuing faculty members (all appointed by the Senate Executive Committee) and 2 student members (appointed by ASI). Last year, the Executive Committee suggested that we expand the number of faculty members to 7 or 8, with only 1 member per college, so that all colleges and professional services are represented.

The size and composition of the committee affects the breadth of perspectives represented, as well as process issues such as setting meeting times, making decisions (e.g., achieving consensus), and influencing the number of committee "visitors" attending finalists' classes. After our experience this year, we considered whether the committee size should be adjusted. It is our opinion that diverse perspectives (e.g., college, pedagogy) are adequately served by a committee of 5 to 6 faculty members plus 2 to 3 student members, and that a larger committee size is likely to suffer from diseconomies of scale that outweigh any benefits from broader college-based representation. Therefore, we recommend that the committee have a minimum of 5 appointed faculty members and a maximum of 6 appointed faculty members in any given year. For colleges not represented in a particular year, it is recommended that a rotational approach be adopted whereby suitable candidates would be appointed from non-represented colleges in the next appointment cycle, if appropriately qualified candidates from the non-represented colleges are willing to serve. In those exceptional circumstances where an insufficient number of qualified volunteers are available to serve on the committee and reach the minimum size of 5 faculty members, we recommend that the Executive Committee consider making an interim, 1-year appointment of an appropriately qualified, willing volunteer from a college already represented on the committee (i.e., having up to 2 committee members from a single college).

The committee members reinforced the desirability of active participation of a range of appropriately qualified and committed student representatives on the committee, in order to ensure that their perspectives are incorporated in deliberations. We believe that it may be advisable to ask ASI to appoint up to 3 (versus the current 2) student representatives to serve on the DTA committee in a particular year. However, as is the case with faculty representatives, we want to ensure that such representatives voluntarily serve on the committee and are aware of the workload commitment and fully prepared to meet these requirements. If adequate numbers of qualified, committed student representatives are not available, then we would prefer to have only 1 or 2 student representatives rather than achieving a larger number of student representatives by appointing students who would not devote the time and energy to the important evaluation task that the committee undertakes.

3. Historically, all faculty committee members were prior award winners and were volunteers. Last year, the guidelines were modified by the Executive Committee to allow non-award recipients as long as there was evidence of sustained instructional excellence by the

candidate. We want to continue this experiment, but emphasize the importance of only appointing willing volunteers who have clear evidence of sustained instructional excellence.

4. This committee takes quite a bit of time and passion. We want to reinforce the importance of retaining the “voluntary, fully participative” guideline for committee membership. We do not encourage the appointment of members who are not aware of the workload and who are not committed, in a voluntary and complete manner, to fully undertaking these tasks.

Nominations for DTA Award

5. Currently, nominations are made exclusively by students or alumni, in an effort to recognize that students are the “consumers” of teaching efforts and are best positioned to assess the quality and effectiveness of an instructor’s teaching performance. Some people in the past have suggested that we accept nominations from deans or faculty members, or perhaps even have a college committee or body select finalists for the award. The committee strongly and unanimously supports the continued practice of requiring that ALL valid nominations be received *exclusively* from current students or alumni.
6. Currently, only tenured faculty members are eligible for the DTA award. After discussing the merits and demerits of part-time or full-time lecturers or untenured faculty members for eligibility for this award, the committee unanimously recommends that only tenured faculty members be eligible for the DTA award. While other instructors on campus clearly have achieved outstanding instructional performance, the differing nature of their professional assignments and other factors caused us to make this recommendation. It should be noted that other recognitions are available on campus for distinctive performance by lecturers or untenured faculty.

Evaluation Process

7. Currently, the committee reviews all eligible nominations and selects the best candidates for finalists, regardless of college, discipline, or gender. Some people in the past have suggested that we consider establishing a “quota” type of system that would, for example, guarantee finalists from each college, each year. The committee members unanimously and strongly rejected this latter notion and recommends that we continue with our current approach.
8. Currently, it is expected that all committee members personally visit classes of all finalists, so that they will have direct experience in observing the instructional approaches used by the finalists in their various course preparations. Some people have suggested that this is excessively time-intensive and that perhaps we can use alternative metrics such as quantitative teaching evaluations or a rotational schedule that has each committee member seeing only a subset of the finalists. Due to the unique nature of the evaluative task at hand, the committee members strongly and unanimously supported the importance of having each committee member visit the classes of each finalist, on a multiple visitation and multiple preparation basis, as practiced currently.
9. This past year, the Distinguished Scholarship Award (DSA, which recognizes research and professional development, rather than teaching, performance) attempted to co-align their time frame with our own. There was some indication that co-promotion of the awards resulted in some confusion by students, who did not understand which award to nominate faculty for. The DSA, unlike the DTA, does not involve visitations to faculty classes and is not constrained to the same temporal schedule (e.g., last 5 weeks of Winter, first 5 weeks of Spring) as the DTA is. We recommend that this year’s experiment of co-alignment of award

promotion cycles with the DSA be ended, and that we revert to a separate promotional approach for the DTA as we have done historically.

Recognition

10. As part of the recognition of instructional excellence achieved by DTA recipients, we recommend the initiation of efforts to collect and post information on all prior DTA recipients on the Senate website. It is recommended that the committee chair and the Senate administrative assistant (currently Gladys Gregory) undertake efforts in this regard. It is recommended that, whenever possible, each prior award recipient have the following items included in his/her listing: photo, name, rank, college/department, academic training (i.e., degree type and issuing university), professional experience (what schools/classes taught), other key awards received, the year the DTA was received, and perhaps a brief listing of representative student comments that were part of the initial nomination materials. The entire listing should comprise approximately one full frame on a computer screen, and listings should be searchable by year, college, and alphabetically. Since collection and preparation of these listings will take some time, we recommend that such listings be prepared in reverse chronological order, starting with the most recent year's award recipients.

Special Procedures for the Senate R&PD Committee

Committee Description

The Senate Research and Professional Development Committee ("R&PD Committee") reviews and discusses activities and issues relevant to research and professional development at Cal Poly. Of particular interest is the balance of teaching activities with those that are of a more scholarly or professional nature (which may vary for different fields).

Objectives

- ensure that university-wide initiatives and activities address the relevance of research and professional development for the mission of Cal Poly as a whole
- foster a campus environment where faculty can effectively pursue research and professional development activities that are complementary to their teaching responsibilities
- identify areas of weakness or deficiencies in the campus environment that are related to research and professional development
- provide advice and guidance to university entities and individuals concerning initiatives, activities, policies, or decisions that may affect research and professional development at Cal Poly; in particular, this relates to (a) Kennedy Library, (b) Information Technology Services, (c) Cal Poly Technology Park, (d) University committees, and (e) campus research centers and institutes

Procedures

Meetings

The committee meets on a regular basis, typically four to five times per quarter. An agenda identifies topics to be discussed, and informal meeting notes capture the main points of the discussions. In general, an attempt is made to reach decisions by consensus. If needed, votes are held either openly or in secret.

Tasks

The yearly agenda for the committee is driven by the charges as provided by the Senate Chair. Additional issues of interest can be brought up by committee members. Suggestions from constituents should be raised via the respective representative or the committee chair. The results of the deliberations are submitted to the Senate in quarterly and annual reports. Some deliberations result in resolutions proposed to the Senate.

Initiatives in Conflict with Cal Poly's Mission Statement

In the R&PD Committee Report 2009, the committee included the following

statement: "On an interim basis, the Research and Professional Development Committee will hear complaints from faculty about initiatives that are perceived to be in conflict with Cal Poly's Mission Statement. If the Committee finds merit in a complaint, it will forward it to the Academic Senate Executive Committee. This is a temporary increase in the Committee's duties. We urge the Academic Senate to find a more permanent way to resolve such concerns."

Membership

The general composition of the committee as well as its current members are described at the Senate Web page for the R&PD Committee.

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

AS-__-09

**RESOLUTION ON
REVISION OF CAL POLY MISSION STATEMENT TO INCLUDE STAFF**

- 1 WHEREAS, The current Cal Poly Mission Statement neglects to mention the contributions of
2 staff; and
3
- 4 WHEREAS, Page 28 of the 2009-10 WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report entitled
5 "Our Polytechnic Identity in the Twenty-First Century," states that "These [i.e.,
6 multiple learning venues] are consistent with the Cal Poly Mission Statement,
7 which recognizes the importance of the co-curriculum but fails to explicitly
8 acknowledge the staff as a partner in the development of the Cal Poly graduate";
9 and
10
- 11 WHEREAS, It is well-known that the contributions of staff in realizing Cal Poly's mission are
12 always crucial and often superlative; therefore be it; and
13
- 14 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends for approval the attached Cal Poly Mission
15 Statement in which the contributions of staff are recognized.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: January 18, 2010

CAL POLY
MISSION STATEMENT

Cal Poly fosters teaching, scholarship, and service in a learn-by-doing environment in which students and faculty, with the support and contributions of dedicated staff, are partners in discovery. As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly promotes the application of theory to practice. As a comprehensive institution, Cal Poly provides a balanced education in the arts, sciences, and technology, while encouraging cross-disciplinary and co-curricular experiences. As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.

Revised: January 18, 2010

Academic Senate Executive Committee
February 23 2010

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) SELECTION OF INTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR 2009-2010

[Background materials on each reviewer have been sent electronically. Please review these forms and CVs prior to the meeting.]

College of Architecture & Environmental Design

<u>program</u>	<u>recommended reviewer</u>	<u>approval</u>
----------------	-----------------------------	-----------------

BArch	David Gillette (English, CLA)	_____
-------	-------------------------------	-------

College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences

<u>program</u>	<u>recommended reviewer</u>	<u>approval</u>
----------------	-----------------------------	-----------------

Multiple and Single Subject, Ag Spec Credential Programs	Brian Tietje (Marketing, OCOB)	_____
--	--------------------------------	-------

College of Science & Mathematics

<u>program</u>	<u>recommended reviewer</u>	<u>approval</u>
----------------	-----------------------------	-----------------

Physics, BA and BS	David Braun (ElecEngr, CENG)	_____
--------------------	------------------------------	-------