

Adopted: May 9, 2017

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

AS-829-17

**RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICY CONSENT
AGENDA PROCEDURES**

1 WHEREAS, The University Faculty Personnel Actions document (UFPA) needs revision; and

2
3 WHEREAS, Revisions to the UFPA into a new university level faculty personnel policies and
4 procedures document include mere formalities of restating already established
5 policies and procedures from various sources beyond the Senate (e.g. changes to
6 the Collective Bargaining Agreement, administrative memos); and
7

8 WHEREAS, Many revisions amount to reformatting, consolidating, reorganizing, and restating
9 existing policies and procedures; and
10

11 WHEREAS, Some revisions involve the Senate enacting changes to university policies by
12 means of resolutions; and
13

14 WHEREAS, Presenting to the Senate a single new university level faculty personnel policies
15 and procedures document with all the sorts of changes noted above may prevent
16 the Senate from giving each significant change in policy and procedure its due
17 consideration; and
18

19 WHEREAS, Presenting to the Senate the change to university level faculty personnel policies
20 and procedures in many pieces would clog the Senate agenda with a barrage of
21 resolutions; and
22

23 WHEREAS, The attached Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedures would allow the
24 Senate to formulate its own informed decisions about which revisions to
25 university level faculty personnel policies and procedures should be passed as
26 mere formalities and which merit presentation and debate on the Senate floor; and
27

28 WHEREAS, Cal Poly would benefit in perpetuity by adopting a more flexible procedure for
29 securing Senate approval of changes to university level faculty personnel policies
30 and procedures; therefore be it
31

32 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached Personnel Policy Consent Agenda
33 Procedures, and be it further

34 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee use this procedure to
35 present to the Senate revisions to university level faculty personnel policies and
36 procedures in topically discrete pieces suited to focused discussion and debate.

Proposed by: Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: January 5, 2017
Revised: April 12, 2017

Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedure

To be appended to the Faculty Affairs Committee Procedures, and included in any future revisions to university faculty personnel policies documents.

1. University-wide faculty personnel policy proposals from the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee may appear on the Academic Senate meeting agenda as consent items, at the discretion of the Academic Senate Executive Committee.
 - a. The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee submits the personnel policy proposals to the Academic Senate Executive Committee.
 - b. The Academic Senate Executive Committee determines whether and how the personnel policy proposals shall be placed on the Academic Senate agenda.
2. Proposed revisions to university-wide faculty personnel policies should include as many of the following as are relevant to the proposal:
 - a. The text of the proposed policy.
 - b. The text of superseded policy (if available).
 - c. Summary of the proposed changes noting especially any of the following:
 - i. Revisions to reflect existing policy stated elsewhere,
 - ii. Proposed changes in policy.
 - d. Citation of relevant documents, which may include:
 - i. Senate resolutions,
 - ii. Provisions in the collective bargaining agreement,
 - iii. Administrative memos,
 - iv. Existing policy documents in need of revision,
 - v. Superseded policy statements.
 - e. Expected effects of the policy change on faculty units, including:
 - i. The nature of consultation with affected faculty units,
 - ii. Timeline and nature of implementation.
3. Queries from senators regarding policy proposals are directed to the chair of the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee.
4. When the Academic Senate Executive Committee places personnel policy revisions on the Academic Senate consent agenda, any senator may request an item be removed from the consent agenda no later than one week prior to the meeting.
 - a. Items removed from the Academic Senate consent agenda will be placed on the Senate agenda as business items.
 - i. Personnel policy revisions shall be presented as reports attached to resolutions.
 - ii. The report contains the new university policy and all background or explanatory information about the change in policy.
 - b. The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee chair (or designee) is responsible for presenting the policy proposal to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and to the Academic Senate.
 - c. The Academic Senate Chair (or designee) may invite interested parties concerning the policy proposals to be present at the meetings where pulled proposals will be discussed.
5. Items not removed from the consent agenda are considered approved on the meeting date of the consent agenda.

tally

D. Kenneth Brown

Tue 5/9/2017 6:11 PM

To: Gladys E. Gregory <gggregory@calpoly.edu>; Gary D. Laver <glaver@calpoly.edu>;

 3 attachments (3 MB)

res on personnel policy consent agenda.docx; Background on proposed Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedure 20170425.docx; FAC consent agenda procedures-FINAL 20170509.doc;

Hello Gladys and Gary -

What was the final vote count for the consent agenda procedure?

Here are clean versions of all the items that passed today.

—Ken Brown
Associate Professor
Philosophy, CLA
Cal Poly

Background on proposed
Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedure
Faculty Affairs Committee
Spring 2017

In Fall 2013 the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate charged the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to update the University Faculty Personnel Actions document (UFPA). In commencing with the work on this charge, members of FAC reviewed the following:

- Current university level personnel policies contained in UFPA,
- Proposed revisions to UFPA,
- All current college personnel policies and procedures documents,
- Proposed changes to some college personnel policies and procedures documents.

The goals for this project included consideration of practices in the colleges to determine which offered models of best practices to include in statements of university level policies and procedures. In formulating university level policies FAC sought to provide direction for the colleges to specify in more detail their criteria and procedures. Such changes would improve the utility of university and college level personnel policy and procedure statements as guide for faculty as they undergo review or participate in the review of their colleagues.

Initially, completion of this project was set to consist of a completed revision of the UFPA which would then be presented to the Senate for feedback and approval. Of course, such a change to university level policies and procedures needs much more than Senate approval. Prior to sending this package of changes to the Senate the proposed changes would be presented to college councils and the deans council so the Provost, Deans, and Program Chairs/Heads could provide their feedback as well. Suffice it to say that this would be a large project to tackle in one shot.

There are other significant downsides to proposing revisions to the entire UFPA for a single act of approval. Proposing potentially very many changes in one document may obscure particular changes of policy and procedure which merit direct and focused consideration by the Senate and college leadership. Also, policy documents at the university level are subject to a variety of occasions for revision, some of which are entirely beyond the scope of local faculty approval (e.g. changes to the collective bargaining agreement, directives from the Chancellor). Breaking the changes to the UFPA into bite-sized chunks allows each to receive its due consideration, but then clogs the pipeline of the Senate agenda with a swarm of resolutions, some of which would be mere formalities.

FAC wishes to be responsive to these issues while ensuring that the Academic Senate remains properly informed and able to offer due consideration in its approval of changes to faculty personnel policies. We therefore propose a consent agenda procedure as effective, appropriate, and efficient for bringing to the Senate changes to personnel policies.

The proposed procedure for Senate approval of personnel policy revisions appropriates existing procedures already familiar to senators, including allowing for some proposed revisions to come to the Senate on a consent agenda at the discretion of the Academic Senate Executive Committee. The timeline for informing the Senate of a consent agenda item, for senators to consider and pose questions to the FAC chair, and for pulling items from the consent agenda are essentially the same as for items on the curriculum consent agenda. When a senator pulls an item from the consent agenda, it becomes a standard business item as a resolution endorsing a report at the stage of first reading. From there normal Senate procedures apply concerning deliberation and voting the change up or down.

This consent agenda procedure would allow senators to decide for themselves what counts as significant enough of a change to merit subsection to normal Senate deliberative processes while allowing the high threshold of unanimous informed consent to pass items thereby considered to be minor enough not to merit occupying time at a Senate meeting. The proposed allowance for using a consent agenda procedure includes the requirement that FAC provide the senators with significant detail about proposed changes so their consent would be properly informed and their retraction of consent may focus subsequent discussion on the key provisions of the change. The proposed requirements for engendering informed consent also provide a clear and logical assemblage of the documents that established the policy or which are being subject to the proposed revision. Such references to policy documents would aid any subsequent enterprise of revising or invoking policy documents.

A consent agenda procedure for bringing personnel policy matters to the Senate reduces the steps otherwise necessary for placing Senate resolutions on the Senate agenda while preserving the deliberative process of the Senate according to the discretion of individual senators. This proposed procedure assumes that the Academic Senate Executive Committee considers faculty personnel policies to be a *per se* function of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and therefore personnel policy revisions approved by FAC and accompanied by the variety of information required in this procedure would thereby be appropriate to be brought to the Senate. The Academic Senate Executive Committee's normal oversight concerning the agenda for Academic Senate meetings would continue by means of being the body which ultimately decides whether and how personnel policy revisions submitted by FAC are placed on the Academic Senate agenda.

To clarify how this consent agenda procedure would work, here are two examples of changes to personnel policies and procedures as they would have been presented to the Senate. Both are on related topics (student evaluation of instruction) one would be appropriate for the consent agenda and the other should be a normal business item:

- Consent: Student Evaluation Requirements
- Business: Procedures for Online Student Evaluation of Instruction

Each example is offered below as it would be presented to senators. Note that the key distinction here concerns the nature of the process for implementing the change. In the example

of the normal business item the proposed change to faculty personnel policies would require the Senate to adopt new official procedures. The Senate already ruled on this matter by voting to implement the policy in AS-821-16. Were this item to have been presented to the Senate by means of the proposed, the resolution and report would have been formulated and packaged differently by including more information about the nature and impact of the change as well as the nature of the consultation with affected colleges and programs, but the action of the Senate to implement the policy would have been functionally the same as before: by passing a resolution.

The other example of the consent agenda item differs in that the change in policy came from the administration and so implementing it is not a matter of Senate resolution. Instead, the Senate would be informed of the nature of the change and the Senate action would be to approve the language expressing the policy in the official personnel policy document. The function of having it on the Senate consent agenda concerns informing the Senate of the mere formality of placing the revisions into the official faculty personnel policy document. Were at least one senator to wish to have the matter presented in more detail on the Senate floor, all that senator need do is pull it from the consent agenda. It would then become a normal business item. The function of having the item on the consent agenda is to report to the Senate the exact language of the policy change including an account of its background and impact. Consent in this case amounts to mere approval of the placement of the proposed language expressing the existing policy into the official faculty personnel policy document.

Each of these examples of proposed policy changes would be packaged in a resolution with a resolved clause stating that the Senate approve the changes to the official faculty personnel policies document as stated in the resolution's attached report. The attached report would provide the relevant information about the change in policy as specified in the proposed personnel policy revisions procedure.

Example of a Faculty Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Item

SAMPLE OF REPORT:

SUMMARY OF CHANGE IN POLICY ON STUDENT EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

This change in policy implements the discretion granted to the President in section 15.15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement to specify exceptions to the general requirement that all courses be subjected to student evaluation of instruction. This change in policy was set by the attached administrative memo of February 22, 2013. The placement of this policy in official policy documents at Cal Poly is thus a mere formality. The memo states and briefly explains the nature of the change, its basis in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the nature of the consultation with faculty on the change, and the timeline for implementation (Winter 2013).

STATEMENT OF NEW POLICY:

Student evaluations are required for all classes taught by each faculty unit employee except for the following:

- a. Courses with low enrollment (fewer than five students) such as individual senior projects and independent study.
- b. Capstone senior project classes will be evaluated if there are more than 5 students enrolled.
- c. Student evaluations will not be administered for individually supervised senior projects.
- d. Cooperative Education courses that do not include direct instruction shall not be evaluated using the student evaluation process. Academic departments or the Career Services Office may use a survey to evaluate the students' co-op experience, but this is not part of the student evaluation process.
- e. Team-taught classes: In situations when classes are team-taught, the instructor of record shall conduct student evaluations. If there is more than one instructor of record, then copies of the evaluation results shall be placed in each of the instructor's personnel files with a memo indicating that the course was team-taught. Any faculty member team teaching the course will have the opportunity to write a narrative description to accompany the student evaluation results for the team-taught course if he/she desires to add context to the results. A faculty member who team-teaches a course and believes that the results are not representative of his/her contributions to the course, may request that the dean not include the results associated with this team-taught course in his/her PAF. After reviewing this request, the dean has the discretion to determine if the student evaluation results of the team-taught course shall be placed in the instructor's file.

SUPERSEDES BOLDFACE TEXT IN THE FOLLOWING:

University Faculty Personnel Actions (section I.A.7.a.4)

Student Evaluations

- a. A summary of results from student evaluations **for all courses taught** during the period under review shall be included. **The only exceptions to this requirement are classes with fewer than 5 students enrolled (such as individual senior project and**

independent study courses), and Cooperative Education courses that do not include direct instruction.

State of California
Memorandum

CAL POLY
SAN LUIS OBISPO

To: Philip Bailey, Dave Christy, Douglas Epperson, Debra Larson, Christine Theodoropoulos, David Wehner

Date: February 22, 2013

From: Kathleen Enz Finken
Provost



Copies: Jeffrey Armstrong
Department Heads/Chairs
All Faculty Employees
College Analysts
Al Liddicoat
Glen Thorncroft
Steve Rein
Dustin Stegner
Kenneth Brown
Academic Personnel Staff

Subject: New Student Evaluation Requirement Effective Winter Quarter 2013

Provision 15.15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement states that student evaluations shall be required for all classes taught by each faculty unit employee, unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after considerations of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s). The new requirement for faculty to evaluate all classes taught will take effect Winter Quarter 2013, as communicated in the memo dated 10/19/12 from Al Liddicoat, AVP Academic Personnel (available at <http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policies/procedures>).

After consulting with the Academic Senate Instructional Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee, President Armstrong and I have reviewed and endorse the following exceptions for conducting student evaluations in low enrollment courses (individual senior project, independent study), capstone, and cooperative education courses:

1. Courses with low enrollment (less than five students) shall not be evaluated. Typical of these courses would be:
Individual senior projects
Independent study
2. Cooperative Education courses that do not include direct instruction shall not be evaluated using the student evaluation process. Academic Departments or the Career Services Office may use a survey to evaluate the students' co-op experience, but this is not part of the student evaluation process.
3. Capstone senior project courses, which usually have larger enrollment, shall be evaluated if there are more than 5 students enrolled.
4. Team-taught classes: In situations when classes are team-taught, the instructor of record shall conduct student evaluations. If there is more than one instructor of record, then copies of the evaluation results shall be placed in each of the Instructor's personnel files with a memo indicating that the course was team-taught. Any faculty member team teaching the course will have the opportunity to write a narrative description to accompany the student evaluation results for the team-taught course if they desire to add context to the results. A faculty member who team-teaches a course and believes that the results are not representative of their contributions to the course, may request that the dean not include the results associated with this team-taught course in his/her PAF. After reviewing this request, the dean has the discretion to determine if the student evaluation results of the team-taught course should be placed in the Instructor's file.

As a reminder, all student evaluations are to be conducted utilizing the questions and format that have been vetted and approved by your college. All other requirements and processes outlined in the Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty (available at <http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policies/rpt>) remain applicable.

Example of a Faculty Personnel Policy Business Item

Procedures for Online Student Evaluation of Instruction

SAMPLE OF RESOLUTION:

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

AS-XXX-16

**RESOLUTION ON PROCEDURES FOR
ONLINE STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION**

- WHEREAS: [NORMAL STUFF HERE, AND THE RESOLUTION CONCLUDES WITH
RESOLVED CLAUSES SUCH AS THOSE BELOW]
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt the attached “Procedures for Conducting Student
Evaluation of Instruction” as the official procedure for online student evaluation of
instruction starting Fall 2016; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That this procedure shall be included in university personnel policy documents that cover
student evaluation of instruction; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate require FAC to report to Academic Senate no later than Fall
2017 on response rate data for student evaluation participation in academic year 2016-
2017 for advisement on further changes to these procedures.

Proposed by: Faculty Affairs Committee

Date: XXX

SAMPLE OF REPORT:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGE IN POLICY:

This proposed change of the faculty policy establishes a university level procedure for conducting the student evaluations of instruction as mandated by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (articles 15.15-18). Currently colleges had established their own procedures for running their various paper or online student evaluations of instruction. The attached background report explains the need for the Senate to establish university level procedures along with the campus-wide rollout of the online system for student evaluation of instruction. The background report also explains the nature of consultation with faculty over the formulation of the proposed procedure and the rationale for implementing the change effective Fall 2016. The background report concludes by explaining the requirements for assessing these procedures included in the resolution.

STATEMENT OF NEW POLICY:

Procedures for Conducting Student Evaluation of Instruction

- 1) Evaluations for courses occur during the last week of instruction.
 - a) The last week of instruction and final exam week are defined by the official academic calendar.
 - b) For courses whose official final assessment is during the last week of instruction according to the academic calendar (e.g. labs or activities with their own final exam or assessment), their evaluation period may be the penultimate week of instruction according to the academic calendar.
 - i) Requesting the earlier timeline for the evaluation of courses with early final assessments should occur by means of standard procedures of scheduling evaluations as determined by the office of Academic Personnel and communicated to the relevant college and/or program department staff.
- 2) The evaluation period opens the Sunday immediately prior to the last week of instruction and closes at the end of the last day of the last week of instruction.
 - a) Students will be allowed to complete their evaluations during this period.
 - b) This period may be adjusted on an ad hoc basis to accommodate for academic holidays.
- 3) Students shall receive notifications by email on the day the evaluation period opens, and at appropriate intervals until the evaluation period closes.
 - a) The initial email explains the evaluation procedure, includes links to all the classes which the student may evaluate, and indicates that the evaluation period has opened.
 - b) Subsequent emails follow at appropriate intervals until the student has formally submitted evaluations for all classes with scheduled evaluations.
 - i) What would count as appropriate intervals should balance any positive effect reminders have on response counts and the potential negative effect of badgering students with emails they may come to ignore.
 - c) For students who still have remaining evaluations to complete, a final email notification would occur on the day the evaluation period closes.
 - d) Other modes of notification (e.g. notifications within the portal) may be implemented as they become feasible.
- 4) Faculty shall receive by email a response rate report for their evaluated courses partway through the evaluation period.
 - a) Faculty are encouraged to announce to their classes that the evaluation period is underway.
 - b) Faculty are encouraged to address questions from students about the nature of the evaluation

- process clarifying the role of student evaluations in processes of faculty review.
- c) Faculty may at their discretion reserve time in class for students to complete the evaluation on the student's own computer, phone or tablet.
 - i) Faculty shall comply with any college level procedures about how to implement student evaluations in their classrooms.
 - ii) Whenever practical realities require faculty to remain in the classroom (e.g. lab safety requirements), completion of the evaluation outside of class time is preferable.

SUPERSEDES THE FOLLOWING POLICIES:

All college or program level procedures for conducting student evaluation of instruction.

Background About the Pilot of Online Student Evaluation of Instruction

The 2015-2016 pilot of the online student evaluation of instruction included programs from each college at Cal Poly. The faculty in the programs that volunteered to participate in the pilot agreed to uniform evaluation procedures that would comprise an approximation of existing practices across colleges. The acknowledged compromises in this uniform procedure included the following:

- Insensitivity to the practice of conducting lab/activity evaluations prior to their final assessment occurring during the last official week of instruction.
- Commencing with the evaluation period earlier in the quarter than many faculty would prefer the evaluation to occur.

The participating faculty judged the efficiencies of uniformity to be worth these compromises. Now that the pilot is over and full university implementation is on hand we have an occasion to revisit these procedures.

During and after the pilot the software for the online system has been updated and our ability to configure the software used to implement the evaluations has increased. We now have the ability to implement different timelines for opening and closing the evaluation periods for broad categories of courses (viz. allowing programs to select lab/activity courses as meriting an earlier evaluation timeline than courses whose evaluation occurs in final exam week). We can now resolve the compromises of the procedure used during the pilot. To implement such a change right at the start of the university wide rollout of the online system requires prompt action by the Academic Senate. That is the function of this resolution. The procedure proposed by this resolution adequately resolves the compromises of the procedure used in the pilot. In the absence of immediate Senate action to adopt a new procedure, the procedure used during that pilot would continue to be implemented in the Fall 2016 university wide rollout of the online system.

The provisions of the proposed procedure were shaped by broad consultation with faculty, deans, associate deans, and program and college staff. In late Spring and throughout Summer 2016 Ken Brown (Faculty Affairs Committee chair) met with the college councils of CLA, CSM,

CENG, CAED, and CAFES, with an associate dean of OCOB, and with chairs and staff from every program in CLA and several in CSM and CENG (with a few more meetings forthcoming). The key staff from the Office of Academic Personnel (most notably, Jen Myers) attended nearly all of these meetings to clarify the procedural matters and keep staff apprised of details about their crucial role in this project. These meetings offered chairs and heads from each program to provide their feedback on the implementation of the online system, both its apparent benefits and shortcomings as it was implemented in the pilot. Ken Brown also led a session at the Academic Senate Fall Conference Retreat presenting information about the pilot of the online program, describing the procedures used during the pilot, and offering alternative procedures, and soliciting feedback on ideas for alternative procedures. The procedure proposed in this resolution was shaped by all this feedback. The proposed procedure was then supported unanimously by the attending members of the Faculty Affairs Committee at their meeting on 9/30/2016.

As we move forward with this online system, we should take note that the percentage of students completing the evaluations is markedly lower with the online system than with the paper system. A drop in response rates has been reported by other CSU campuses that have moved to online systems, and so this drop is not unexpected. Many faculty have responded to these lower response rates with significant concern. This resolution requires FAC to report back to the Senate by Fall 2017 with an assessment of data about the implementation of the online system in 2016-2017. Adopting a procedure for implementing the online system for Fall and continuing using it through the academic year would allow for a better basis of assessing response rates given that the paper system experienced significant quarterly fluctuations in response rates.

Prior Procedure for Conducting Student Evaluation of Instruction Used During the 2015-2016 Pilot of the Online Student Evaluation System

The following is an account of the procedure used during the 2015-2016 pilot of the online system. It is here formatted to correlate with the proposed policy attached to **RESOLUTION ON PROCEDURES FOR ONLINE STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION** for purposes of easy comparison. Were that resolution not passed, this procedure from the pilot would continue as an interim procedure indefinitely until some official statement of procedure supersedes it.

- 1) Evaluations for courses occur during the last two weeks of instruction, as determined by the academic calendar.
- 2) The evaluation period opens the Sunday immediately prior to the penultimate week of instruction and closes at the end of the last day of the last week of instruction.
 - a) Students will be allowed to complete their evaluations during this period.
 - b) This period would be adjusted on an ad hoc basis to accommodate for academic holidays.
- 3) Students shall receive notifications by email on the day the evaluation period opens, and at appropriate intervals until the evaluation period closes.
 - a) The initial email explains the evaluation procedure, includes links to all the classes which the student may evaluate, and indicates that the evaluation period has opened.

- b) Subsequent emails follow at appropriate intervals until the student has formally submitted evaluations for all classes with scheduled evaluations.
 - i) What would count as appropriate intervals should balance any positive effect reminders have on response counts and the potential negative effect of badgering students with emails they may come to ignore.
 - c) For students who still have remaining evaluations to complete, a final email notification would occur on the day the evaluation period closes.
 - d) Other modes of notification (e.g. notifications within the portal) may be implemented as they become feasible.
- 4) Faculty shall receive by email a response rate report for their evaluated courses partway through the evaluation period.
- a) Faculty are encouraged to announce to their classes that the evaluation period is underway.
 - b) Faculty are encouraged to address questions from students about the nature of the evaluation process clarifying the role of student evaluations in processes of faculty review.
 - c) Faculty may at their discretion reserve time in class for students to complete the evaluation on the student's own computer, phone or tablet.
 - i) Faculty shall comply with any college level procedures about how to implement student evaluations in their classrooms.
 - ii) Whenever practical realities require faculty to remain in the classroom (e.g. lab safety requirements), completion of the evaluation outside of class time is preferable.

MEMORANDUM

Cal Poly | Office of the President



To: Gary Laver
Chair, Academic Senate

Date: June 23, 2017

From: Jeffrey D. Armstrong
President

Copies: K. Enz Finken
M. Pedersen
A. Liddicoat

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-829-17
Resolution on Proposed Faculty Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedures

This memo acknowledges receipt and acceptance of the above-entitled resolution. The proposed changes provide a mechanism to update the University Faculty Personnel Action Policies (UFPA) more readily so it is compliant with the collective bargaining agreement. Additionally, the resolution allows for focused updates to sections of the UFPA on a more timely basis to better serve the faculty and the university. I appreciate the potential positive outcomes of this resolution.

Please extend my thanks to the Senate for its prompt attention to this matter.

RECEIVED

AUG - 1 2017

ACADEMIC SENATE