



## Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee

Thursday, February 16, 2017

38-114, 3:10 to 5:00pm

- I. **Minutes:** none.
- II. **Communication(s) and Announcement(s):** none.
- III. **Reports:**
  - A. Academic Senate Chair:
  - B. President's Office:
  - C. Provost:
  - D. Statewide Senate:
  - E. CFA:
  - F. ASI:
- IV. **Business Items:**
  - A. **Approval of GE Governance Board Charge:** In collaboration with the co-chairs of the Provost's Task Force on GE Design, GEGB is charged with producing by May 1, 2017 an MOU describing the nature of a combined effort between GEGB and the Task Force to create a joint report recommending a future vision of GE at Cal Poly.
  - B. **Appointment of Foaad Khosmood to the CENG caucus for spring quarter 2017.**
  - C. **Appointments to CENG Dean Search Committee.** (materials will be distributed later).
  - D. **Appointment to Office Hours Task Force:** (pp. 2-5).
  - E. **Approval of CENG Dean draft advertisement:** (pp. 6-8).
  - F. **Resolution on Proposed Faculty Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedures:** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair (pp. 9-20).
  - G. **Resolution on Aligning USCP Criteria to Diversity Learning Objectives with Oversight by GE Governance Board:** Bruno Giberti, Academic Programs and Planning and Denise Isom, Interim Associate Director of the Office of Diversity and Inclusivity (pp. 21-23).
- V. **Discussion Item:**

**Definition of Student Success:** Sean Hurley, Budget & Long-Range Planning Committee Chair as "Student success is the development of the foundational knowledge and skills necessary to achieve a student's potential in academic, civic, career, intellectual, and social pursuits."
- VI. **Adjournment:**

02.08.17

## **Office Hours Task Force**

### **Statements of Interest Received**

#### **MEMBERSHIP**

- One representative from the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
- One representative from the CFA
- One administrative representative from Academic Affairs
- Two Associate Deans from differing colleges
- Three faculty representatives from differing colleges
- One representative from the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
- One student representative nominated by ASI

#### **Al Liddicoat, Academic Personnel (15 years at Cal Poly) Academic Affairs**

I have been involved in faculty policy development through Academic Personnel and the AS Faculty Affairs Committee for many years and have a good understanding of the faculty collective bargaining agreement and university policies. I feel that I can help provide guidance to faculty in this area that would allow us to better meet the needs of faculty and students on campus and I am willing to serve on this committee.

#### **Catherine Waitinas, English Department (10 years at Cal Poly) Tenured**

I'm an Associate Professor in the English department. I normally teach undergrad and grad classes from the 200 through the 500 level, including small seminars, large lectures, and senior projects/independent studies. I usually teach face-to-face classes but have also taught hybrid courses (including this quarter) and supervised many students as grading/research assistants and grant assistants. I'm thus familiar with the many types of students who seek faculty help (undergrads, grads, current enrollees, former students, majors and non-majors), and the many ways they like to be able to access us (in person, via email, on Polylearn, etc.). I'm committed to helping create a workable, clear policy for office hours that recognizes student as well as faculty needs and goals, that is pedagogically fair, that acknowledges student and faculty obligations both in and outside of the classroom, and that is fair and transparent to all. As a former CLA Senator, I'm also familiar with the operating procedures of the Senate and its subcommittees. Please let me know if I can provide any further information.

#### **Debra Valencia-Laver, Dean's Office (25 years at Cal Poly) Tenured**

As an Associate Dean in the College of Liberal Arts (CLA), with purview over faculty assignments, I am very familiar with our college's policies and procedures regarding office hours. According to the 2015 Fact Book, across the university the CLA has the second largest number of faculty (n = 347), the second largest number of tenured/tenure track faculty (n = 153), and the largest number of lecturer faculty (n = 180). In addition, the college produces the largest number of SCUs (e.g., 91,675 in the 2015-16 academic year), about 30% of the university's SCU generation. Faculty availability, which includes access during office hours, is an important part of effective student learning and an area of teaching effectiveness upon which students often comment.

The CLA has long made some adjustments to the office hour policy. Per policy, lecturer office hours are based on time base. For all faculty, one hour of the five per week (or 1/5 of the time base adjustment) can be unscheduled so as to take into account responding to student emails and for meeting in alternative appointment times outside of listed office hours. Faculty are encouraged to modify their final week office hours to better match student needs in light of when the final is actually scheduled. These adjustments seem to meet both faculty and student needs.

Although I will be bringing an administrator's perspective to the Task Force, I also have experience as a faculty member, and some insight into students' perspectives as well, from advising my own students and from dealing with student queries and complaints escalated to the dean's office. I would be interested in learning what other colleges do, how current office hour policies and practices (ours and others') affect students and faculty, and how online teaching and learning environments interact with more traditional face-to-face office hours. It is this last piece, especially, that may call for clarification in the review and possible updating of the current policy.

**Dustin Stegner, English Department (10 years at Cal Poly) Instruction Committee Chair**

I am interested in serving on the Office Hours Task Force for two reasons. First, as current chair of the Academic Senate Instruction Committee, I am familiar with the existing policies on office hours both at Cal Poly and across the Cal State system. During the past two years, the Instruction Committee introduced a senate resolution that would have made an adjustment to the current office hour policy; and it was during the period of time that it became clear to me that a larger examination of Cal Poly's office hour policy would be beneficial for students and faculty. As part of my service on the Instruction Committee, I also composed a committee report outlining current difficulties with the current policy as well as possible directions for moving forward. In addition, I met with several administrators and the president of the local CFA to discuss possible issues with changing the office hour policies in the light of the existing collective bargaining agreement.

My second reason for wanting to serve on the committee comes from my role as a faculty member. I believe that a great deal of learning takes place during office hours; and that they also provide an important means for interacting with students who may need additional help or guidance. Working on a new university-wide policy of office hours would provide an excellent opportunity for making the whole process clearer to both students and faculty.

My relevant experience includes serving as Vice Chair of the Academic Senate, as an academic senator for several years, and as a member of the Strategic Planning Task Force.

**Jennifer Klay, Physics Department (10 years at Cal Poly) Tenured**

I am a long-term member (2010-present) and past chair (2013-2016) of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Technology (FACT). While I was chair, our committee discussed faculty-student interactions outside of class time and their connection with newer communication technologies. Based on these discussions we sent a memo to the Academic Senate Executive Committee in Spring 2015 (see attached)

with recommendations for the development of new office hour policies. I feel that my involvement in that effort makes me an excellent candidate for the Office Hour Task Force and I am interested in serving on it to represent the faculty perspective. I think that my experience on FACT would be useful to the task force and I would like the opportunity to help draft a new policy that takes into account the need for both face-to-face interactions and the changing ways we communicate through enabling technology. I am optimistic that we can draft a policy that addresses the concerns of students, faculty, and the administration that is clear and broad enough to endure. I look forward to the opportunity to contribute to the task force.

**Pat Fidopiastis, Biology Department (10 years at Cal Poly) Tenured**

I volunteered to serve on this task force as a representative of the Faculty Affairs Committee. Also, this could be another opportunity to modernize an outdated set of office hour procedures that we follow. I see this as a good opportunity to integrate technology into the process, giving students more opportunities to interact with professors, and giving professors more flexibility on when and how they interact with students outside of class time.

02.13.17 (gg)

## Office Hours Task Force

An important element of our students' learning experience is their ability to engage with faculty during office hours. Yet Cal Poly's only formal guidance on office hours stems from Academic Senate Resolution AS-91-80, which inserted a policy in the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM). Since 1980, many campus constituencies—including faculty, their union representation, as well as students and campus administration—have come to recognize shortcomings in that policy. Furthermore, CAM has since been replaced by the Campus Administrative Policy (CAP), which includes no revised office-hour policy whatsoever. Given the campus-wide concern over the relevance of the decades-old policy to current campus life as well as many unsatisfactory attempts at piecemeal solutions, the Academic Senate is forming an Office Hours Policy Task Force to craft a new, comprehensive campus policy.

### CHARGE:

- Identify various technological modes of student/faculty interaction that may serve as formal office hours in addition to traditional face-to-face interaction
- Develop guidelines for the minimum amount of office hours to be offered and for communicating faculty office-hour policies
- Develop a report and resolution by the end of Spring 2017 recommending a revised office-hour policy in CAP for Academic Senate approval

### MEETINGS:

Tentatively one-hour every other week

The Academic Senate Chair will appoint the chair of the task force.

### MEMBERSHIP:

Name	Position/Representing	Department	College/ Unit	Phone	Email
Czerny, Daniela	ASI		ASI	61281	dczerny
Fidopiastis, Pat	Faculty Affairs Committee	Biology	CSM	62883	pfidopia
Klay, Jennifer	Faculty	Physics	CSM	61250	jklay
Liddicoat, Al	Academic Affairs		Academic Personnel	65217	aliddico
Stegner, Dustin	Instruction Committee	English	CLA	61277	pstegner
Valencia-Laver, Debra	Associate Dean		CLA	62359	dlvalenc
Waitinas, Catherine	Faculty	English	CLA	62136	cwaitina
	CFA				
	Associate Dean				
	Faculty				



## **DEAN, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

**THE POSITION:** As the principal academic leader of the College, the Dean provides support for the faculty, staff and students by creating a positive environment and strong sense of community. Teaching, learning, scholarship, research and professional engagement, and service to the University and community are important priorities of the College and will be an important focus of the Dean. The Dean must have a genuine commitment to student success. The Dean is responsible for the quality of academic programs and for managing the fiscal, human and physical resources of the College. The College has a long-standing commitment to Learn by Doing and the dean is expected to seek funding to support student scholarships, faculty professional development, summer and academic year research programs and new undergraduate project-based learning facilities. The Dean will build partnerships with alumni, industry and the community, and seek supplemental financial support for both new and existing programs. The successful applicant must be prepared to demonstrate the leadership ability necessary to continue to distinguish the College of Engineering as a premier "Learn by Doing" college that is keeping pace with the ever-changing practice of engineering and is reflective of the comprehensive polytechnic character of the University. The Dean participates in the development of University-wide policy as a member of the Academic Deans' Council and the President's Strategic Leadership Team. The Dean works collaboratively and collegially with college deans and university leadership to develop and implement initiatives in support of the University's mission. The Dean is appointed by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the President of the University.

**QUALIFICATIONS:** Significant academic and administrative experience, an earned doctorate in an engineering related discipline, and credentials appropriate for a tenured appointment at the rank of professor within the College of Engineering. A demonstrated capacity for academic leadership and team building; capable of leading, supporting, and supervising a diverse faculty and staff by facilitating a collegial culture; fostering collaborative relationships and activities to cross disciplines and colleges; evidence of a strong commitment to excellent teaching and scholarship; commitment to supporting the use of technology to enhance student learning; capability to expand alliances with the private sector; experience in the strategic planning process; strong experience and a commitment to engage the College in a comprehensive program of advancement activities; ability to work effectively with and enhance a diverse campus community and strong commitment to support inclusive excellence throughout the University and community. A demonstrated ability and a strong personal commitment to student welfare and success, "Learn by Doing," excellence through continuous improvement and the comprehensive polytechnic university principles at Cal Poly.

**COMPENSATION:** Salary is commensurate with the background and experience of the individual selected. Cal Poly offers excellent fringe benefits, including health, dental and vision insurance, retirement participation in the Public Employees' Retirement System and educational benefits for eligible employees. All rights associated with the appointment are governed by the Management Personnel Plan adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees.

**THE COLLEGE:** Highly selective and known especially for its hands-on focus and graduates who contribute immediately in the workplace, Cal Poly Engineering enjoys an excellent national reputation. U.S. News & World Report has ranked the college as one of the top four public-master's engineering schools every year since 2000. The College is the largest of Cal Poly's six colleges with eight academic departments and one academic program that offers 13 Bachelor of Science degrees, nine Masters of Science degrees, and six blended/joint bachelor and master's degree programs. The College employs approximately 50 staff and 230 tenured/tenure-track faculty and part-time lecturers. The College currently educates over 6,000 undergraduate and graduate students and admission is extremely competitive. The College manages and administers a complex set of revenue and funding sources including: State General Funds of approximately \$24 million, Academic Fees of \$8 million, Endowments over \$44 million, University Campus Programs funds over \$8 million and Cal Poly Corporation funding of over \$2 million. The College has been successfully growing its philanthropic activities; yielding \$15 million in gifts and pledges in FY 16. The College's areas of distinction include: assistive technologies, autonomous flight, Cubesat, cybersecurity, fire protection engineering, HVAC, human motion biomechanics, innovation and entrepreneurship, multicultural engineering programs, regenerative medicine, and women in engineering.

Campus facilities include more than 80 state-of-the-art laboratories and eight buildings, providing students access to advanced technological systems. Students also participate in real-world engineering problem solving through internships, class projects and the senior project capstone design experience, and by participating in design competitions. Cal Poly teams have recently won national championships in the ASCE Concrete Canoe Competition, AIAA Aircraft Design competition and the Society of Women Engineers Team Tech. The school's project-based learning emphasis helps ensure that graduates are accustomed to working in diverse, goal-oriented teams. The mission statement for the college is: "To provide an excellent Learn by Doing education and graduate in-demand, Day One ready professionals."

**REVIEW, APPLICATIONS AND NOMINATIONS:** The search committee will review nominations and applications until the position is filled. Applicants are encouraged to submit materials by March 30, 2017. The anticipated starting date for the position is August 1, 2017. Nominations and inquiries should be made to Brett Barbour, Consultant, Isaacson Miller via the weblink [www.imsearch.com/XXXX](http://www.imsearch.com/XXXX) or phone (415) 655-4952. To apply, visit [www.calpolyjobs.org](http://www.calpolyjobs.org) to complete the required online Cal Poly Management Employment Application. Completed applications must be submitted to Requisition Number 104349. In addition, each applicant must provide as separate attachments to the online application the following documents: (1) cover letter; (2) detailed curriculum vitae or resume; and (3) personal statement of the applicant's view on academic administration and the role and responsibilities of engineering faculty.

**FOR ASSISTANCE WITH ONLINE APPLICATION PROCESS:** Contact Academic Personnel via e-mail [academic-personnel@calpoly.edu](mailto:academic-personnel@calpoly.edu) or phone (805) 756-2844. Cal Poly Website: [www.calpoly.edu](http://www.calpoly.edu)

*At California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, we believe that cultivating an environment that embraces and promotes diversity is fundamental to the success of our students, our employees and our community. Bringing people together from different backgrounds, experiences and value systems fosters the innovative and creative thinking that exemplifies Cal Poly's values of free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.*

*Cal Poly's commitment to diversity informs our efforts in recruitment, hiring and retention. California Polytechnic State University is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.*

Adopted:

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

**AS-\_\_-17**

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

- 1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached Personnel Policy  
2 Consent Agenda Procedures.

Proposed by: Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs  
Committee Chair

Date: January 5, 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. All university-wide faculty personnel policy proposals from the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee appear on the Academic Senate meeting agenda as consent items.
2. Senators are given two weeks' notice that the consent items will appear on the Senate meeting agenda, and are expected to review the documents related to the policy proposal.
3. When the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee proposes revisions to university-wide faculty personnel policies, the documents presented to the Senate for consent 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.
4. Queries from senators regarding policy proposals are directed to the chair of the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee.
5. 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 Senate consent agenda will be placed on the Senate agenda as discussion or business items.
    - i. Revisions to reflect existing policy or procedure shall be discussion items.
    - ii. Revisions to formulate new policy or procedure shall be business items.
      1. Business items shall be presented as reports attached to resolutions.
      2. 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.
  - c. The Senate Chair (or designee) may invite interested parties concerning the policy proposals to be present at the meetings where pulled proposals will be discussed.
  - d. Following discussion in the Senate, the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee chair (or designee) will make the decision to return the items to committee for further development or propose to the Senate Chair that the items be treated as normal Senate business items at the stage of a first reading.
6. Items not removed from the consent agenda are considered approved on the meeting date of the consent agenda.

Background on proposed  
**Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedure**  
Faculty Affairs Committee  
Winter 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 consent agenda procedure appropriates existing procedures already familiar to senators. 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 discussion or business item, and in the latter case 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 subjection 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 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 the process of posing questions about an item or removing it from the consent 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 on the proposed consent agenda. Both are on related topics (student evaluation of instruction) one of a business item and the other of a discussion item:

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

Each example is offered below as it would be presented to senators on the proposed consent agenda. Note that the key distinction here concerns the nature of the process for implementing the change. In the example of the 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 consent agenda, the resolution and report would have been formulated differently, but the action of the Senate to implement the policy would have been functionally the same as before: by passing a resolution. Were no senator to pull it from the consent agenda, then the item would be passed by unanimous consent. But were at least one senator to wish to subject the change to normal Senate deliberative process, all that senator need do is pull it from the consent agenda. It then becomes a normal Senate business item. The members of FAC would have expected that this change be pulled from the consent agenda. Had the proposed consent agenda procedure been in place this matter would have reached the Senate earlier in Fall quarter.

The other example of the discussion 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. The function of having it on the Senate consent agenda concerns informing the Senate of the mere formality of placing the change 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 discussion 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 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 consent agenda procedure. In the case of business items, the Senate would be approving the policy itself and the placement of the policy into official documents. In the case of discussion items, Senate consent amounts to approval only of the placement of the policy into official policy documents.

Example of a Faculty Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Discussion 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:** KathleenENZ 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 Consent Agenda 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**

- 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.

Adopted:

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

**AS-\_\_-17**

**RESOLUTION ON ALIGNING USCP CRITERIA TO DIVERSITY LEARNING OBJECTIVES  
WITH OVERSIGHT BY GE GOVERNANCE BOARD**

**Background Statement**

AS-395-92 Resolution Relating to a Cultural Pluralism Requirement determined that, beginning with the 1994-96 catalog, Cal Poly undergraduates must fulfill a cultural pluralism baccalaureate requirement consisting of a single course satisfying defined criteria.

In a related action, AS-396-92/CC Resolution on the Formation of a Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee established a subcommittee for the initial review of USCP courses. This subcommittee consisted of seven voting members representing the colleges and professional staff, as well three ex officio members representing Ethnic Studies, the Curriculum Committee, and what was then called the General Education and Breadth Committee. AS-433-95/CC added ex officio members representing ASI and Women's Studies.

AS-651-06 Resolution on Cal Poly Learning Objectives established the University Learning Objectives as a broadly shared set of performance expectations for all students who complete an undergraduate or graduate program at Cal Poly.

AS-663-08 Resolution on Diversity Learning Objectives established the four DLOs as an addendum to the ULOs. ULO 6 states that all Cal Poly graduates should be able to "make reasoned decisions based on an understanding of ethics, a respect for diversity, and an awareness of issues related to sustainability."

AS-671-08 Resolution on Changes to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate changed the membership of the USCP Subcommittee to consist of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee chair, as well as the chairs of Ethnic Studies and Women's Studies. This was intended to simplify the formation of the subcommittee and expedite its business.

AS-676-09 Resolution on United States Cultural Pluralism Requirement revised the USCP criteria to make them simpler, broader, and more reflective of more recent statements: the DLOs and the Cal Poly Statement on Diversity.

The ULO project on Diversity Learning was conducted from 2008 to 2011. The project involved the design and analysis of separate surveys for the first three of the four DLOs, the use of focus groups to assess the fourth, and an analysis of the influence of service learning and the USCP requirement on diversity learning. Each of the three surveys provided evidence of value added, with seniors and juniors scoring higher than freshmen, but neither service learning nor satisfaction of the USCP requirement were found to have had substantial influence on students' diversity learning, at least as defined by the DLOs. In 2012, Cal Poly described these results in its WASC Education Effectiveness Review Report, which made the following recommendation: "Align the USCP requirement with the DLOs and review USCP courses to see whether they address the DLOs."

- 1 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate determined that, beginning with the 1994-96 catalog, Cal Poly  
2 undergraduates must fulfill a US cultural pluralism (USCP) requirement consisting  
3 of a single course satisfying defined criteria (1992); and  
4
- 5 WHEREAS, The revised criteria (2009) do not fully align with the Diversity Learning Objectives  
6 (2008); and  
7
- 8 WHEREAS, The ULO Project on Diversity Learning (2008-2011) found that satisfaction of the  
9 USCP requirement did not have a substantial influence on students' diversity  
10 learning as defined by the DLOs; and  
11
- 12 WHEREAS, The DLOs have not been revised since their passage in 2008, and were written as an  
13 extension to the University Learning Objectives; and  
14
- 15 WHEREAS, 83% of USCP-designated courses in the Cal Poly catalog are also GE-designated  
16 courses; and  
17
- 18 WHEREAS, In AY 2015-16, 2383 students took a course that satisfied the USCP and a GE  
19 requirement, which was equivalent to 91% of the total number of students taking a  
20 USCP courses; therefore be it  
21
- 22 RESOLVED: That the USCP policy be revised to incorporate the DLOs, as shown in the  
23 attachment, and be it further  
24
- 25 RESOLVED: That the revised policy will become effective immediately for all newly proposed  
26 courses and course revisions, and be it further  
27
- 28 RESOLVED: That the current USCP classes retain their designation and be subject to future  
29 review and compliance with the revised criteria, and be it further  
30
- 31 RESOLVED: That the USCP Subcommittee be renamed the USCP Review Committee, comprising  
32 the Chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, the Chair of Ethnic Studies,  
33 the Chair of the General Education Governance Board (GEGB), the Chair of Women's  
34 & Gender Studies, the Vice President and Chief Officer for Diversity and Inclusion,  
35 and the CTLT Inclusive Excellence Specialists, or their designee, and be it further  
36
- 37 RESOLVED: That the oversight of USCP courses, including the review of new course proposals  
38 and modifications, be added to the responsibilities of the GEGB, and be it further  
39
- 40 RESOLVED: That the USCP Review Committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the GEGB,  
41 which will decide on new USCP course proposals and modifications, and be it  
42 further  
43
- 44 RESOLVED: That the USCP Review Committee will work with the GE curriculum to design and  
45 implement a plan for the curricular review of all existing courses with a USCP  
46 designation.

Proposed by: USCP Task Force  
Date: January 26, 2017

## USCP Criteria

United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) courses must focus on all of the following:

1. One or more diverse groups, as defined in the Cal Poly Statement on Diversity, whose contributions to contemporary American society have been impeded by ~~cultural~~-conflict or restricted opportunities
2. Contemporary social issues resulting from ~~cultural~~-conflict or restricted opportunities, including, but not limited to, problems associated with discrimination based on age, ethnicity, gender, nationality, abilities, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, or race
3. Critical thinking skills used by students to approach these contemporary social issues, examine their own attitudes, and consider the diverse perspectives of others
4. The contributions of people from diverse groups to contemporary American society

**In addition to satisfying these criteria, USCP courses must also address the Diversity Learning Objectives.**

## Diversity Learning Objectives

All Cal Poly graduates should be able to:

1. Demonstrate ~~an~~ understanding of relationships between diversity, inequality, and social, economic, and political power both in the United States and globally
2. Demonstrate **understanding** ~~knowledge~~ of contributions made by individuals from diverse and/or underrepresented groups to our local, national, and global communities
3. **Critically examine their own attitudes and/or underrepresented groups**
4. Consider perspectives of diverse groups to inform **reasonable** decisions
5. Function as members of society and as professionals with people who have ideas, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors that are different from their own