Meeting of the Academic Senate
Tuesday, March 6, 2018
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00 pm

I. Minutes: Approval of February 6, 2018 minutes (pp. 3-4)

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA:
G. ASI:

IV. Special Report:
A. [TIME CERTAIN 3:30 P.M.] Campus Update by President Jeffrey Armstrong.

V. Consent Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/ Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM 422 Professional Preparation (1-6), 1-6 activities</td>
<td>Reviewed 2/1/18 and recommended for approval.</td>
<td>On the 3/6/18 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(offer course online with topic Housing and Communities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 403 Multimedia Production for Public Relations &amp; Advertising (4), 3 mechanics, 1 laboratory</td>
<td>Reviewed 1/18/18; additional information requested from department. Recommended for approval 2/15/18.</td>
<td>On the 3/6/18 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 440 Cal Poly Student Bill Project (2), 2 seminar</td>
<td>Reviewed 1/18/18; additional information requested from department. Reviewed 2/1/18; additional information requested from department. Recommended for approval 2/15/18.</td>
<td>On the 3/6/18 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

805-756-1258 -- academicsenate.calpoly.edu
VII. **Business Items:**
A. **Resolution on Academic Program Review:** Ken Brown, Chair of the Program Review Task Force, second reading: (pp. 5-25).
B. **Resolution to Update Campus Policy on Faculty Office Hours:** Jennifer Klay, Chair of the Office Hours Task Force, first reading (pp. 26-41).
C. **Resolution on Modifications to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate Election of Part-Time Academic Employee Representative:** Dustin Stegner, Chair of the Academic Senate, first reading (pp. 42-43).

VIII. **Discussion Item(s):**

IX. **Adjournment:**
I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the January 23, 2018 minutes of the Academic Senate.

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

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: none.
   B. President’s Office: none.
   C. Provost (Enz Finken): Kathleen Enz Finken, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, reported on the dedication of the solar farm, which will produce 25% of Cal Poly’s total power needs.
   D. Vice President for Student Affairs: none.
   E. Statewide Senate (Laver/LoCascio): Gary Laver, Statewide Senator, reported that the Statewide Senate Executive Committee asked to meet with the Chancellor regarding shared governance and Executive Orders 1100 and 1110. Jim LoCascio, Statewide Senator, reported on discussions in the Statewide Senate Academic Affairs Committee regarding Project Rebound.
   F. CFA: none.
   G. ASI (Czerny/Nilsen): Daniela Czerny, ASI Chair of the Board, reported that the ASI Board of Directors have endorsed a resolution from the Office Hours Task Force. Riley Nilsen, ASI President, reported on the ribbon cutting of the Doerr Family Field attended by members of the University Union Advisory Board.

IV. Special Reports:
   A. Update on Budgeting Outlook. Cindy Villa, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, and Victor Brancart, Associate Vice President for Administration and Finance, presented the 2018-2019 Budget Update. The presentation is available for view at https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/BudgetPresentation.pdf
   B. Update on Cal Poly's GE Program. Brenda Helmbrecht, Chair of the Academic Senate GE Governance Board, and Andrew Morris and Gregg Fiegel, Co-Chairs of the GE Task Force, presented on the progress of the GE Program and the next steps, which include formulating a list of recommendations to the Academic Senate. Morris and Fiegel stated that, after collecting feedback and stakeholder input, the GE Task Force has curated a set of guiding principles that will provide rationale and ways to institute the recommendations.

V. Consent Agenda:
   The following items were approved by consent: Agriculture Leadership minor with new course proposals [AG 254 Introduction to Agricultural Leadership (2), AG 410 Advanced Agricultural Leadership Experience (1), AG 412 Advanced Leadership Practice – Poly Royal Rodeo (3), AG 413 Committee Management – Poly Royal Rodeo (2), AG 454 Agricultural Leadership Capstone (2)], AG 210 Agricultural Leadership Experience (1), AG 212 Leadership Practice – Poly Royal Rodeo (3), BUS 458 Solving Big World Challenges (4), EDUC 587 Educational Foundations and Current Issues (4), and SOC 431 World Population: Processes and Problems (4).
VI. **Business Items:**

A. **Resolution on Academic Program Review.** Ken Brown, Chair of the Program Review Task Force, presented the Resolution on Academic Program review, which would adopt the new Academic Program Review Policies and Procedures document created by the Program Review Task Force. **M/S/P to move to a first reading.**

VII. **Adjournment:** 5:00 P.M.

Submitted by,

Denise Hensley
Academic Senate Student Assistant
RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

BACKGROUND: In 2016, the Academic Senate convened the Program Review Task Force, consisting of faculty, college administrators, and representation from the office of Academic Programs and Planning to review current practice related to academic program review and recommend to the Senate revisions to the relevant policies and procedures. The Program Review Task Force obtained feedback from faculty recently or currently involved in program review about best practices. Careful consideration of this feedback strongly suggests that annual revisiting of the outcomes of the program review in action plans would allow for an extension of the program review cycle for non-accredited programs from six to seven years. Accredited programs should continue to conduct program review at least every five years according to the cycle for renewal of accreditation.

WHEREAS, The Academic Programs and Planning website provides information on academic program review, including revised templates developed for the current cycle and based on informed judgment about best practices in program review and feedback from faculty involved in program review; and

WHEREAS, Policies and procedures for academic program review were last formulated in 2000 (AS-552-00) and revised slightly in 2010 (AS-718-10) do not reflect current practices for academic program review; and

WHEREAS, Annual updates to program review action plans allow for the modest extension of the program review cycle for non-accredited programs from six to seven years; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate adopts the attached “Academic Program Review Policies and Procedures” superseding all prior policies about academic program review.

Proposed by: Program Review Task Force
Date: January 25, 2018
Revised: February 8, 2018
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Prepared by the Program Review Task Force
Winter 2018

Guiding Principles. Academic program review (APR) is a comprehensive and periodic review of academic programs, including General Education and interdisciplinary programs. APR is a function of the Provost, in conjunction with the College Deans, the Academic Senate, and the Dean of Graduate Education, and is coordinated by the office of Academic Programs and Planning (APP).

The goal of APR is to improve the quality and viability of each academic program by encouraging self study and strategic planning within programs. APR is not a review of academic departments as such, although it will inevitably address departmental issues. Each program, department, and college is responsible for making curricular decisions and programmatic offerings within existing resources. All such decisions shall be the purview of the faculty of the program, department, and/or college. Hence, APR should inform and be an essential component of academic planning and curriculum, budgeting, and accountability to internal and external audiences. APR provides information for planning decisions at every administrative level.

Academic program review of programs subject to professional or specialized accreditation or recognition will be coordinated to coincide with the accreditation/recognition review whenever possible. Documentation developed for accreditation/recognition reviews may already provide the essential requirements of APR, and, thus, may also be used for this purpose, but it is important to note that accreditation/recognition reviews can serve a different purpose than program reviews.

Definitions. The following definitions should help in distinguishing terms used throughout this document:

- **Academic Program**: a structured grouping of course work designed to meet an educational objective and usually leading to a baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree, or to a teaching credential. CSU policy defines General Education as an academic program.
- **Department**: an administrative unit that manages one or more academic programs.
- **Program Administrator**: the individual administratively responsible for the Program, whether a head, chair, or director.
- **Program Representatives**: the Program Administrator and other Program faculty members participating in the design and production of the self-study report.
- **Program Review Team**: the external reviewers appointed to conduct the site visit and compose the program review report.

Roles and Responsibilities. As required by the CSU Board of Trustees, academic programs should be reviewed every five to ten years. Wherever possible, APR will coincide with external accreditation/recognition. Programs with ten-year accreditation cycles will have an interim review. All non-accredited academic programs, including General Education, will be reviewed on a seven-year cycle. This schedule may be accelerated in individual cases either at the discretion of the Provost or College Dean, in consultation with the Program faculty, or in compliance with recommendations from prior program reviews. Programs in related disciplines or with similar missions may be reviewed on
concurrent cycles.

The Provost initiates APR through the Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, in collaboration with the College Dean and the Dean of Graduate Education.

Each APR is conducted by the Program Review Team (Team). Reviewers should be knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review while bringing a perspective that comes from outside of the college or institution. The Program Administrator submits reviewer nominations to the College Dean who makes the final Team selection. The Team will normally be composed of (at least) three members to be selected using the following guidelines:

- One member internal to Cal Poly from a college different than that of the program under review
- Two external members representing the discipline of the program under review

The Team Chair will be identified, and one Team member will be the designated assessment reviewer to ensure that appropriate attention is given to this topic. The composition of the Team may change when the academic program review coincides with an accreditation/recognition review. In these instances, the role of the internal reviewer will be negotiated based on allowances of the accrediting/recognition body.

The APR process is intended to close the circle of inquiry, review, and improvement. Program Representatives and the Program Review Team assume distinct roles in the APR process:

- The self-study report is completed by the Program Representatives.
- The review of the self-study report and the site-visit is conducted by the Program Review Team, which documents its findings in the Team report.
- The strategic action plan is prepared by the Program Representatives, based on the findings of the self-study and the Team reports.

Elements of the Self-Study Report. In preparation for the review, the Program will undertake a thorough self study that addresses the program’s mission, capacity (resources available to fulfill the mission), and effectiveness (the degree to which a program achieves its mission), all within the context of the College and University. To accomplish this objective, the inquiry-based self-study report consists of topics such as the following:

- Program Identity (e.g., history, context, mission, and progress since the last review)
- Program Elements (e.g., learning objectives, curriculum, and pedagogy)
- Program Resources (e.g., faculty, facilities, equipment, information resources, and budget)
- Program Effectiveness (e.g. student learning, persistence and graduation rates, student engagement, graduate success)
- Program Planning (e.g., admissions, instructional capacity, and employer demand)
- Program, University and/or System-Wide Themes (e.g., diversity and inclusion)

This outline is provided as an example. In the spirit of continuous improvement, specific elements of the self-study report template will be modified and improved as needed in response to institutional priorities and feedback provided by programs undergoing review. The current version of the self-
study report template will be accessible on the APP website.

Programs undergoing accreditation review may be asked to produce a supplemental document addressing the concerns of APR that are not addressed in the accreditation/recognition review.

APP will distribute the self-study report to the Team, College Dean, Provost, and the Dean of Graduate Education.

Site Visit and Team Report. Ideally, the Team will receive a copy of the self-study report around a month prior to the site visit. All Team members should read the self-study report and are encouraged to request additional materials as needed. A two-day site visit will be coordinated by the Department, in consultation with the College Dean and APP.

During the site visit, the Team will have access to the faculty, staff, students, and administrators, as well as any additional documentation or appointments deemed necessary for completion of the review. During the site visit, the Team should be provided with sufficient time to discuss their findings amongst themselves. The Team should also be given the opportunity to meet with the Program Representatives, including the Program Administrator, the College Dean, and the Provost to discuss possible outcomes of the review at the end of the site visit. It is the responsibility of the Team Chair to ensure that members of the Team work together throughout the review and that the final report reflects the input of all reviewers.

Within one month of the site visit, the Team will provide a draft report to APP for distribution to the Program Administrator, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable). In addition to commendations, the report should address the major issues facing the Program and the Program’s discipline and suggest strategies for improvement. The Program Representatives will review the draft report solely for accuracy. After this review, a final Team report will be submitted to APP for distribution to the Program Administrator, College Dean, the Dean of Graduate Education, and the Provost.

Strategic Action Planning. The effectiveness of APR depends on the implementation of the appropriate recommendations contained in the Team report as well as insights gained during the self-study process. Based on these factors, the Program Representatives will draft a strategic action plan that responds to the findings of the self-study and the Team reports. An action plan meeting will be scheduled by APP, to include the Department, the College Dean, representatives from APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable). The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the strategic action plan, obtaining input, feedback and support from the College Dean and others in attendance. Based on the feedback provided during the meeting, a finalized action plan is submitted to the College Dean, APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education. The Program Administrator and Program Representatives review the strategic action plan, update it if necessary, and provide APP with a copy on an annual basis, where it becomes a part of the program’s institutional record.
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A copy of the self-study report, Team report, and the strategic action plan will be kept on file with APP for two APR cycles. An annual APR summary will be prepared by APP for the Academic Senate.

**Process Summary.** The APR process can be summarized as follows:

1. The office of Academic Programs and Planning (APP) notifies the programs to be reviewed during spring quarter of the academic year before the academic year in which the department will produce the self-study.

2. For each program under review, a Program Review Team (Team) is appointed. The willingness to read the self-study report and conduct a site visit, the willingness to be involved and the availability of the Team members for the entire review process should be secured well in advance. The procedures and charge to the Team, including reading the self-study and conducting a site visit, must also be communicated prior to the review.

3. The Program Administrator, College Dean, APP, and Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable) establish a schedule for completion of the review.

4. APP, in consultation with the College Dean, Program Administrator, and the Dean of Graduate Education will determine whether an accreditation/recognition review process covers the essential elements of APR in accordance with any CSU or Cal Poly mandated requirements. As appropriate, a supplemental document may be required.

5. The Program Representatives conduct the self-study, and the Program Administrator submits copies of the initial draft of the self-study report to APP, the Associate Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education. Feedback on the initial draft is provided to the Program Administrator.

6. The Program Administrator submits a finalized self-study report to APP for distribution to the Team, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education around a month prior to the scheduled site visit.

7. The Team reviews the self-study report, requesting additional materials as needed, and conducts a two-day site visit. The visit is coordinated by the Department, in consultation with the College Dean and APP, and should include meetings with the Program faculty, staff, students, as well as administrators within the Department, College, and University.

8. The Team submits a draft report to APP within one month of the site visit for distribution to the Program. The Program Representatives review the draft for accuracy, and the Program Administrator requests corrections from the Team as necessary.

9. The Team submits the final report (if revisions are required) to APP for distribution to the Program, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education.

10. The Program Representatives draft a strategic action plan based on the findings of the self-study and Team reports. The draft plan is submitted to the Department, the College Dean, APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education.

11. A meeting is scheduled to discuss the draft action plan with the Department, the College Dean, representatives from APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education. Based on input provided during the meeting, revisions are made to the draft plan resulting in a finalized action plan that can be approved by the Dean.

12. The Program Representatives review and the Program Administrator updates the strategic action plan on an annual basis.

13. Copies of all finalized documents are kept on file with APP for two APR cycles.
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Program Review Task Force Membership

D. Kenneth Brown (chair), Faculty Affairs Committee chair
Doris Derelian, Food Science and Nutrition, CAFES
Bruno Giberti, Faculty Coordinator for Policies, Assessment & Accreditation
Kellie Hall, Associate Dean, CSM
Brenda Helmbrecht, GE Governance Board chair
Peter Livingston, Dept. Head, BRAE, CAFES
Stern Neill, Associate Dean, OCOB
Mary Pedersen, Senior Vice Provost, Academic Programs and Planning
Steven Rein, CSM, STAT
Geneva Reynaga-Abiko, Counseling Services
Amy Robbins, Academic Programs and Planning
Tal Scriven, Dept. Chair, PHIL, CLA
Debra Valencia-Laver, Associate Dean, CLA

February 1, 2018
Adopted: November 21, 2000

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

AS-552-00/IALA
RESOLUTION ON
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Background: In 1971, The California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees established an academic planning and program review policy (AP 71-32) requiring each campus to establish criteria and procedures for planning and developing new programs and conduct regular reviews of existing programs. CSU Executive Order No. 595 calls for "regular periodic reviews of general education policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs. The review should include an off-campus component." CSU Executive Order No. 729 also calls for periodic reviews of centers, institutes, and similar organizations. These policies have been reaffirmed in The Cornerstones Report and in the Cornerstones Implementation Plan. In 1992 Cal Poly adopted the Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines establishing procedures for the conduct of academic program reviews. These procedures and recommendations for external reviews of programs have since been modified. Currently, the information requested from programs that undergo internal review includes descriptions of educational goals, instructional designs and methods, assessment methods and the data so collected, and the procedures for utilizing the collected information.

In 1999, the Provost appointed and charged the Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment "to propose a systematic and coordinated approach to addressing academic (and larger institutional) accountability and assessment issues" consistent with our institutional mission and values. The need to build upon, integrate and implement the perspective and approaches contained in existing Cal Poly documents, and the desire to keep these approaches clear, concise and simple were also emphasized. The revised academic program review process drafted by the Task Force, and attached to this resolution, is submitted for your consideration.

WHEREAS: The CSU has established policies requiring periodic review of the following academic programs: major programs, graduate programs, and general education. These policies have been reaffirmed in The Cornerstones Report, the Cornerstones Implementation Plan, and The CSU Accountability Process.

WHEREAS: Cal Poly's Academic Senate has also established procedures and guidelines for the conduct of academic program reviews, as evidenced by Senate resolutions: Academic Program Reviews (AS-383-92), Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines, Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines Change (AS-425-94), External Review (AS-496-98) and Procedures.
WHEREAS: The implementation of the Academic Senate resolutions on academic program review has resulted in a duplication of processes and inefficient use of resources.

WHEREAS: An effective academic program review should recognize program distinctiveness and different disciplinary approaches to student learning.

WHEREAS: An effective academic program review should also include the direct participation of the Deans, as recently noted in by the WASC Visiting Team in the WASC Visiting Team Final Report.

WHEREAS: Self-studies of interest and significance to the faculty are more conducive to program improvement than are formulaic exercises in compliance.

WHEREAS: Accreditation processes conducted by highly respected national agencies for 27 of the Cal Poly Academic Programs may already provide all the essential requirements of program review, including learning outcomes and accountability with respect to program goals; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That all Cal Poly programs with accreditation or recognition review processes, which cover the essential elements of academic program review in accord with any CSU and Cal Poly mandated requirements should be able to fulfill all IALA program review requirements, using the same accreditation documents; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Provost, in consultation with the college dean, the program administrator, and the Chair of the Academic Senate (or designee) determine whether the accreditation process covers the essential elements of academic program review in accordance with any CSU or Cal Poly mandated requirements; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate accept and adopt the academic program review process proposed in the "Report on Institutional Accountability: Academic Program Review."

Proposed by: The Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment (IALA)
Date: October 3, 2000
Revised: November 21, 2000
REPORT ON INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY: ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

TASK FORCE ON INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND LEARNING ASSESSMENT

Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Chair (Special Assistant to the Provost, Materials Engineering)
Denise Campbell (Special Assistant to the Provost)
W. David Conn (Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education)
Susan Currier (Associate College Dean, College of Liberal Arts)
James Daly (Statistics)
Myron Hood (Academic Senate Chair, Mathematics)
Steven Kane (Disability Resource Center)
Roxy Peck (Associate College Dean, College of Science and Mathematics)
Thomas Ruehr (Soil Science)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

After an extensive study of academic program review processes and practices statewide and nationwide, the Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment proposes a revised academic program review process for Cal Poly. Some of the key features include:

- a mission-centric focus of program reviews
- a discipline-based program review that recognizes program distinctiveness and different disciplinary approaches to student learning
- a self-study that is defined, designed and conducted by the program faculty and encourages serious reflection on issues of interest and significance that is more conducive to program improvement
- the combination of internal and external reviews (peer review and/or specialized accreditation/recognition)
- the involvement of program faculty, students, community, campus administrators, and external experts in the discipline
- the involvement of College Deans in helping to design the review
- a program review team composed of (at least) four members who are knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review
- a 1-2 day site visit conducted by the program review team and
- a feedback loop that includes the development of an action plan for improvement, jointly written by the program, the Dean and the Provost
- a six-year cycle for periodic reviews of all academic programs, including General Education, and centers and institutes
- the alignment of academic program review with planning, budgeting, and Cal Poly's accountability process for the CSU
INTRODUCTION

In 1971, the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees established an academic planning and program review policy (AP 71-32) requiring each campus to establish criteria and procedures for planning and developing new programs and conduct regular reviews of existing programs. CSU Executive Order No. 595 calls for "regular periodic reviews of general education policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs. The review should include an off-campus component." CSU Executive Order No. 729 also calls for periodic reviews of centers, institutes, and similar organizations. These policies have been reaffirmed in The Cornerstones Report and in the Cornerstones Implementation Plan. In 1992 Cal Poly adopted the Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines establishing procedures for the conduct of academic program reviews. These procedures and recommendations for external reviews of programs have since been modified. Currently, the information requested from programs that undergo internal review includes descriptions of educational goals, instructional designs and methods, assessment methods and the data so collected, and the procedures for utilizing the collected information. Thus, there is an increasing interest toward incorporating principles that make individual courses and the general programs in which they reside more accountable for student learning.

The Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment was appointed and charged by the Provost "to propose a systematic and coordinated approach to addressing academic (and larger institutional) accountability and assessment issues" consistent with our institutional mission and values. We have used as guiding principles the need to build upon, integrate and implement the perspective and approaches contained in existing (Cal Poly and CSU) documents, and the desire to keep these approaches clear, concise and simple. Establishing consistency, while maintaining flexibility, in internal accountability, external accountability and reporting is crucial. The Task Force has applied this approach in preparing this document, Report on Institutional Accountability: Academic Program Review. and used the following documents as resources:

Cal Poly Mission Statement
Cal Poly Strategic Plan
Commitment to Visionary Pragmatism
Academic Program Reviews (AS-383-92)
Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines
Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines Change (AS-425-94)
External Review (AS-496-98) and Procedures for External Review (AS-497-98)
Program Efficiency and Flexibility (AS-502-98)
Program Review and Improvement Committee Bylaws Change (AS-523-99)
Cal Poly Plan
Cal Poly's General Education Program
Cal Poly as a Center of Learning (WASC Self-Study)
Review of the Baccalaureate in the California State University
The Cornerstones Report
Cornerstones Implementation Plan
The CSU Accountability Process
Cal Poly's Response to the CSU Accountability Process
"Best Practices" Documents and Resources from Other Institutions
GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND DEFINITIONS

Academic program review (APR) is a comprehensive and periodic review of academic programs, General Education, and centers and institutes. APR is a function of the Provost, in conjunction with the College Deans and the Academic Senate, and is coordinated by the Vice-Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education (VP-APUE).

Academic program review has as its primary goal, enhancing the quality of academic programs. Hence, it is an essential component of academic planning, budgeting, and accountability to internal and external audiences. APR is not a review of academic departments or other such administrative units. Each program, department (administrative unit) and college is responsible for their curricular decisions and programmatic offerings within existing resources. All such decisions shall be the purview of the faculty of the program, department (administrative unit) and/or college. Interdisciplinary programs, centers, and institutes also fall within the purview of this policy.

Academic program review of programs subject to professional or specialized accreditation/recognition will be coordinated to coincide with the accreditation/recognition or re-accreditation/recognition review, whenever possible. The document(s) developed for professional or specialized accreditation/recognition reviews may already provide the essential requirements of APR and thus, may also be used for this purpose. Although some programs may choose to use the self-study developed for their professional accreditation/recognition as one of the elements of the APR, it is important to note that accreditation/recognition reviews serve a different purpose than that of institutional academic program reviews.

The following definitions should help in distinguishing terms used throughout this document:

- **Academic program** is a structured grouping of coursework designed to meet an educational objective leading to a baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree, or to a teaching credential.
- **Centers, institutes and similar organizations** are entities under the aegis of an administrative unit that "offer non-credit instruction, information, or other services beyond the campus community, to public or private agencies or individuals."
- **Department** is an administrative unit which may manage one or more academic program, center, institute or similar organization.
- The term **program** is used to mean an academic degree program, General Education program, center, institute or similar organizations subject to institutional review.
- The **Program Administrator** is the individual responsible for administrative authority of the Program, and is usually referred to as the Program Head, Chair, or Director.
- The self-study is to be designed and prepared by the Program Administrator and representative Program faculty, referred to in this document as the **Program Representative(s)**.
- The **time schedule** for every academic program review is based on business, not calendar, days.
PURPOSE

The goal of academic program review is to improve the quality and viability of each academic program. Academic program review serves to encourage self-study and planning within programs and to strengthen connections among the strategic plans of the program, the College and the University. Academic program reviews provide information for curricular and budgetary planning decisions at every administrative level.

PROCESS SUMMARY

The academic program review process is intended to close the circle of self-inquiry, review and improvement. The basic components of APR are:

- a self-study completed by the faculty associated with the Program,
- a review and site-visit conducted by a Program Review Team chosen to evaluate the Program, and
- a response to the Program Review Team's report, prepared by the Program Representative(s), the Program Administrator, the College Dean and the Provost.

Although details are contained throughout this document, the process can be summarized as follows:

1. The Provost and College Dean select and announce the programs to be reviewed at least one year prior to the review.
2. For each program under review, a Program Review Team (Team) is appointed and a schedule is established for the review. Willingness and availability of the Team members for the entire review process should be secured well in advance. Procedures and charge to the Team must also be communicated and acknowledged by each member of the Team prior to the review.
3. The Program representative(s), Program Administrator, College Dean and Provost negotiate the content or theme of the self-study and establish a schedule for completion of the review. An essential element of the self-study must address student learning.
4. The Provost, in consultation with the College Dean, the Program Administrator, and the Chair of the Academic Senate (or designee) will determine whether the accreditation/recognition review process covers the essential elements of APR in accordance with any CSU or Cal Poly mandated requirements.
5. The Program representative(s) conducts the self-study and submits copies to the VP-APUE for distribution to the Team, College Dean and Provost at least 45 days prior to the scheduled site-visit.
6. The Team reviews the self-study, requesting additional materials as needed, and conducts a 1-2 day site-visit of the Program. The site-visit is coordinated by the VP-APUE and should include meetings with the Program faculty, staff, students and administrators.
7. The Team submits a draft report to the VP-APUE within 21 days of the site-visit for distribution to the Program. The Program representative(s) reviews the draft for accuracy and facts of omission.
8. The Team submits the final report (consisting of findings and recommendations) to the VP-APUE for distribution to the Program, College Dean and Provost within 45 days of the site-visit.
9. The Program representative(s) prepares a formal response to the Team report within 21 days and submits it to the VP-APUE for distribution to the College Dean and Provost.
10. The Program representative(s), the Program Administrator, the College Dean and the Provost hold a "follow-up" meeting to discuss final APR report (the Program's self-study, program review Team report, and program response).

11. The College Dean, in collaboration with the Program Administrator, submits to the Provost an action plan consistent with the recommendations of the APR report and how the program fits into the College mission and strategic plan.

12. A copy of the APR report and the action plan is forwarded to the Academic Senate.

---

**ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

Academic program review is a function of the Provost, in conjunction with the College Dean and the Academic Senate, and is coordinated by the VP-APUE. As required by the CSU Board of Trustees, academic programs "should be reviewed periodically at intervals of from five to ten years." While past campus practice required that program reviews be undertaken at five-year intervals, the inclusion of reviews of centers and institutes suggests that the review cycle be modified. Therefore, all academic programs, including General Education, centers, and institutes will be reviewed on a six-year cycle. This schedule may be accelerated in individual cases either at the discretion of the Provost or College Dean or in compliance with recommendations from prior program reviews. In addition to the selection of reviewers, the Academic Senate will have the opportunity to suggest programs or programmatic areas for review. Wherever possible, APR's will coincide with specialized accreditation/recognition, other mandated reviews, or with reviews for new degree programs. For example, engineering programs are subject to accreditation/recognition by ABET on a six-year cycle, whereas business programs are subject to accreditation/recognition on a ten-year cycle. Hence, it is appropriate to consider that engineering programs be reviewed every six years, and that business programs be reviewed every five years. Programs in related disciplines or with similar missions should also be reviewed concurrently.

Each academic program review is conducted by a singular Program Review Team. It is expected most reviewers be knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review. The Team will normally be composed of (at least) four members to be selected using the following guidelines:

- One member chosen by the Dean of the college whose program is under review. This person may be either a current Cal Poly faculty member (from a College different than that of the program under review) or an external reviewer.
- One or two current Cal Poly faculty members (from a College different than that of the program under review) chosen by the Academic Senate Executive Committee.
- Two external members representing the discipline of the program under review chosen by the President.

The composition of the Team may change when the academic program review coincides with a specialized accreditation/recognition review. In this case, it is incumbent on the individual(s) chosen by the Academic Senate Executive Committee to provide the necessary institutional review.

The VP-APUE will appoint one of the Team members to be Chair and will coordinate all reviews, in accordance with the established schedule, to ensure that the process is both efficient and fair.

The academic program review process can be summarized in three parts: the self-study, the review and site-visit, and the response (follow-up).
ELEMENTS OF THE SELF-STUDY

In preparation for the review, the Program will undertake a thorough self-study that is defined and designed by the Program faculty in conjunction with the College Dean and Provost. It establishes the program's responsibility for its own mission, purpose and curricular planning within the context of the College and University missions. To accomplish this objective the report should consist of two parts:

**Part I** - A inquiry-based, self-study, the content or theme of which is to be proposed by the Program and negotiated with the College Dean and Provost. An important element of the content or theme chosen for the self-study must address student learning. To accomplish this, the self-study should include the following points as appropriate or relevant to the Program mission.

- Statement of purpose, quality, centrality, currency, and uniqueness (where appropriate)
- Principles and processes for student learning outcomes and assessment methods
- Strategic plan for program development, planning and improvement

**Part II** - General information that consists of data appropriate and relevant to the Program mission. (Most of this data is part of that already required for *Cal Poly's Response to the CSU Accountability Process* and may be obtained with assistance from the office of Institutional Planning and Analysis.)

- Faculty, staff and students engaged in faculty research, scholarship and creative achievement, active learning experiences and academically-related community service or service learning
- Integration of technology in curriculum and instruction
- Evidence of success of graduates (e.g., graduates qualifying for professional licenses and certificates, graduates engaged in teaching, government, or public-service careers)
- Description of adequacy, maintenance and upkeep of facilities (including space and equipment) and other support services (library, and technology infrastructure)
- Alumni satisfaction; employer satisfaction with graduates

When requested by a program, the Provost, in consultation with the College Dean, the Program Administrator, and the Chair of the Academic Senate (or designee) will determine whether an accreditation/recognition review process covers the essential elements of APR in accordance with any CSU or Cal Poly mandated requirements.

The Program will provide copies of the two-part, self-study to the VP-APUE for distribution to the Team, College Dean and Provost.

THE PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM
SITE-VISIT AND REPORT

The Team will receive a copy of the Program's self-study document at least 45 days prior to a proposed site-visit. All members of the Team should read the self-study and are encouraged to request additional materials as needed. A 1-2 day site-visit will be coordinated by the VP-APUE, but travel arrangements and expenses for external reviewers are the responsibility of the College Dean whose program is under review. These might include travel, lodging, meals, and honorarium, etc.
The Team should also be provided with sufficient time to discuss among themselves how to proceed with the visit. This would preferably occur at the beginning of the site-visit. It is expected that during the site-visit, the Team will have access to faculty, staff, students and administrators, and any additional documentation or appointments deemed necessary for the completion of the review. The Team should also be given the opportunity to meet with the Program representative(s), the Program Administrator, the College Dean and/or Provost to discuss possible outcomes of the review at the end of the site-visit. It is the responsibility of the chair of the Team to ensure that all members of the Team work together throughout the review and that the final report reflects the recommendations of all reviewers.

Within 21 days of the site-visit, the Team will provide a draft of the report to the VP-APUE for distribution to the Program. The report should address the major issues facing the program and the program's discipline within the larger context of the College and University mission and strategic plan, and should suggest specific strategies for improvement. The Program representative(s) will then review the draft report solely for accuracy and facts of omission. The final Team report (consisting of findings and recommendations) should be completed within 45 days of the site-visit and forwarded to the VP-APUE for distribution to the Program, the College Dean and the Provost.

RESPONSE (FOLLOW-UP) TO ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

The effectiveness of academic program review depends on the implementation of the appropriate recommendations contained in the APR report. Hence, a follow-up meeting will be scheduled by the VP-APUE, to include the Provost, the Program Administrator, the Program Representative(s) and the College Dean. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the recommendations of the Team report, the Program's response, and to develop an action plan for achieving compliance and improvement by the program. The results of this meeting will be summarized in a written document to be prepared by the College Dean and distributed to the Program and the Provost. This document will inform planning and budgeting decisions regarding the Program.

A copy of the APR report and the action plan will be forwarded to the Academic Senate. The Provost will prepare a narrative summary of Cal Poly's academic program review activity for the CSU Chancellor's Office as part of the annual reporting for the CSU Accountability Process, with a copy to the Academic Senate.
A visual description of the academic program review process.

1. College Deans and the Provost select/announce the programs to be reviewed (at least one year prior to the review) and a timetable is set.

2. College Deans, Academic Senate Executive Committee and President appoint a Program Review Team.

3. The Program representative(s), College Dean and Provost negotiate the content or theme of the self-study.

4. The Provost, in consultation with the College Dean, the Program Administrator, and the Chair of the Academic Senate (or designee) will determine whether the accreditation/recognition review process covers the essential elements of APR in accordance with any CSU or Cal Poly mandated requirements.

5. The Program representative(s) conducts the self-study. The self-study is distributed to the Program Review Team, College Dean and Provost at least 45 days prior to the scheduled site-visit.

6. The Program Review Team conducts a 1-2 day site-visit. The Team is provided access to the Program faculty, staff, students and administrators.

7. The Program representative(s) reviews draft report from the Program Review Team for accuracy and facts of omission. The Team submits the final program review report for distribution to the Program, College Dean and Provost.

8. The Program representative(s) prepares a formal response to the Team report for distribution to the College Dean and Provost.

9. Program Administrator, College Dean, Provost and VP-APUE hold a “follow-up” meeting to discuss APR report and program response.

10. Program Administrator and College Dean submit to the Provost an action plan for Program improvement. A copy of the APR report and action plan is forwarded to the Academic Senate.

11. The VP-APUE maintains a record of all academic program reviews.
A CHECKLIST FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

A sample timetable and checklist for the academic program review process is presented here. Some of these events may occur concurrently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET DATE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Programs scheduled for review are selected and announced one year prior to the review, and a timetable is set.</td>
<td>College Deans and Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to site visit</td>
<td>Program Review Team is appointed.</td>
<td>College Deans, Academic Senate Executive Committee, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to site visit</td>
<td>Participation of Team members is confirmed, Chair of Team is appointed</td>
<td>VP-APUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to site visit</td>
<td>Content/theme of self-study is proposed and negotiated.</td>
<td>Program representative(s), College Dean and Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to site visit</td>
<td>If requested, determination of concordance between essential elements of APR and accreditation/recognition review process</td>
<td>Provost, College Dean, Program representative(s), and Academic Senate Chair (or designee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to site visit</td>
<td>Program representative(s) conducts the self-study.</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 45 days prior to site visit</td>
<td>Self-study document is provided to VP-APUE for distribution to Team, College Dean and Provost.</td>
<td>Program and VP-APUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 45 days prior to site visit</td>
<td>Team reviews the Program's self-study.</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visit</td>
<td>The Team conducts a 1-2 day site-visit and is provided access to the Program faculty, staff, students and administrators.</td>
<td>Team, Program, College Dean, Provost and VP-APUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 21 days after the site visit</td>
<td>Team's draft report is submitted to VP-APUE for distribution to the Program.</td>
<td>VP-APUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 45 days after the site visit</td>
<td>Program representative(s) reviews the Team draft report for accuracy and facts of omission.</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 45 days after the site visit</td>
<td>Team submits final program review report to VP-APUE for distribution to Program, College Dean and Provost.</td>
<td>Team and VP-APUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 60 days after the site visit</td>
<td>Program representative(s) prepares response to the Team Report and submits the response to VP-APUE for distribution to College Dean and Provost.</td>
<td>Program and VP-APUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 90 days after site visit</td>
<td>Follow-up meeting to discuss academic program review report.</td>
<td>Program Administrator, College Dean, Provost and VP-APUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 120 days after site visit</td>
<td>Action plan for Program improvement is submitted to the Provost and forwarded to the Academic Senate.</td>
<td>Program Administrator and College Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October (of following year)</td>
<td>Programs scheduled for review are selected and announced</td>
<td>College Deans and Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Myron Hood
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-552-00/IALA
Resolution on Academic Program Review

Date: January 8, 2001

Copies: Paul Zingg
David Conn
Army Morrobel-Sosa
College/Unit Deans

I am pleased to approve the above-subject Resolution. I commend the Senate for adopting the Academic Program Review Resolution proposed by the Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning (IALA). Specifically, the Resolution calls for:

- A discipline-based program review that recognizes program distinctiveness and different disciplinary approaches to student learning;
- The combination of internal and external reviews (peer review and/or specialized accreditation/recognition);
- The involvement of college deans in helping to design the review;
- A feedback mechanism that includes the development of an action plan for improvement, jointly written by the program, the dean, and the Provost and
- The alignment of academic program review with planning, budgeting, and Cal Poly's accountability process for the CSU.

The Provost's staff will begin the implementation stage immediately by meeting with each of the college/unit deans to determine an appropriate timeline for their respective program reviews.
WHEREAS, Academic program review procedures for baccalaureate and graduate programs were first implemented in 1992 along with the formation of an Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee; and

WHEREAS, Procedures for adding and selecting internal reviewers (Cal Poly faculty members outside the program who are "knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review") and external reviewers (individuals from other educational institutions) to academic program review were drafted and approved in 1996; and

WHEREAS, In 2000, after extensive study of academic program review practices nationwide, a new process for academic program review was proposed for Cal Poly by the Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment; and

WHEREAS, The 2000 academic program review process—which eliminated the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee—was approved by the Academic Senate on November 21, 2000 as “Resolution on Academic Program Review,” resolution number AS-552-00; and

WHEREAS, The 2000 academic program review process calls for the Academic Senate Executive Committee to be the final approving body for the program’s internal reviewers; and

WHEREAS, A Kaizen ("continuous improvement") pilot project reviewed the current academic program review process in early 2010 and recommended “removing Senate [Executive Committee] approval” from the process in order to remove steps that resulted in redundant approval since the internal reviewer nominations are already "selected and vetted by the program faculty and endorsed by the college deans and the vice provost"; and

WHEREAS, Waiting for Academic Senate Executive Committee approval often delays the appointment of the internal reviewer(s) and causes the academic program review process to run behind schedule; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Executive Committee be removed as the final approving body in the appointment of internal reviewers for academic program review; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Programs Office provide annual summaries to the Academic Senate on the findings of academic programs that underwent academic program review in that year, including a list of internal reviewers as part of the report.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: September 21, 2010
Revised: October 19, 2010
To: Rachel Femflores  
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Robert Glidden  
Interim President

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-718-10  
Resolution on Modification to Academic Program Review Procedures

Date: November 15, 2010 
Copies: R. Koob, E. Smith

This memo acknowledges receipt and approval of the above-entitled Academic Senate resolution.
RESOLUTION TO UPDATE CAMPUS POLICY ON FACULTY OFFICE HOURS

WHEREAS, The Campus Administrative Policy (CAM) 370.2.F.1 regarding faculty office hours has not been updated since 1980; and

WHEREAS, Methods for interacting with students outside the classroom and for communicating office hours to the University community have evolved significantly since the policy was last revised; and

WHEREAS, Individual departments and programs as well as student constituencies may have different needs with regard to the purpose and delivery of office hours; and

WHEREAS, Colleges and their individual departments and programs, in consultation with faculty members, others working in an instructional capacity, and students, are best suited to determine the optimal method(s) and delivery of office hours to meet students' needs; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorses the adoption of the attached Office Hour Policy Language for the Campus Administrative Policy (CAP) to replace CAM 370.2.F.1.

Proposed by: Office Hours Task Force
Date: February 1, 2018
The primary goal of office hours is to provide instructional assistance to students. In meeting this goal, office hours can take many forms. Each college, in consultation with its academic departments and programs, will set an appropriate office hour policy. Departments and programs will consult with individual faculty members and others working in an instructional capacity, as needed, to set expectations for delivery of office hours. All faculty members and others working in an instructional capacity will have regularly scheduled office hours throughout each quarter as part of their instructional responsibilities. A schedule of office hours and contact information will be included on each course syllabus, communicated to the department and program, and made readily available through official University-wide communication channels.
Supporting Documentation

The Office Hours Task Force (OHTF) was formed in Winter 2017 to develop new language for the Campus Administrative Manual to replace the current policy, which has been in place since 1980. After review and discussion of office hour policies from other CSU campuses at several meetings throughout Winter, Spring, and Fall 2017, and considering input from the ASI board of directors received in Fall 2017, the OHTF developed the preceding policy language. The aim was to clarify the intent of office hours and establish a general process for the development of specific office hour policies appropriate to individual departments or programs. Expectations for the dissemination of office hour information are also provided.

This supporting documentation is intended to provide suggestions and guidance for individual colleges, in consultation with departments and programs, to consider as they develop specific office hour policies appropriate to their students' needs.

In developing office hour policies, the OHTF encourages colleges, in consultation with departments and programs

• To determine the specific constituencies of students served by office hours and seek to ensure that these students' needs will be met by their policies. *Examples include introductory service course students vs. upper division students vs. graduate students vs. distance learning or online course students, etc.*

• To consider reviewing practices from other CSU campuses or institutions of similar size and composition when developing or revising their office hour policies. *(See the attached Office Hours Report for links to other CSU campus policies.)*

• To draft policies that clearly communicate to faculty members or others working in an instructional capacity the expectations regarding when office hours must be held, and where and in what manner student consultations outside of class may be considered office hours. *Examples include hours held during the first week of classes, final exams week; in-person vs. online interactions; asynchronous communications such as responding to student emails, etc.*

• To draft policies that clearly delineate expectations for part-time instructors or faculty members teaching reduced loads during a given term. *Examples include pro-rated office hours, online vs. in-person interactions, etc.*
• To review periodically their policies and solicit feedback and input from faculty members, others serving in an instructional capacity, and students on the efficacy of current policies to determine if they require revision.

• To provide an easy-to-find single source for disseminating office hour information campus-wide. Examples may include publication alongside faculty directory information, campus calendar, etc.
Report on Office Hours at Cal Poly  
Prepared by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee  
February 23, 2016

1. Background  
The current office hour policy at Cal Poly is governed by the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM), which states,

In addition to scheduled classes, each full-time faculty member must schedule and conduct at least five (5) office hours each week (not more than two hours each day) for consultation with students. The faculty members will post their office hours outside their office doors. This section does not preclude pre-arranged appointments with students. Part-time faculty and full-time faculty with reduced teaching loads will have office hours proportional to their assignments.

The CAM policy was created as part of the "Faculty Office Hour Resolution" (AS-91-80), which was approved by President Baker in 1980 as part of his "interest in creating an atmosphere at Cal Poly which will be more conducive to research" (see Appendix A).

Since the implementation of the CAM policy, different colleges have interpreted how the five office hours may be administered. The College of Liberal Arts, for instance, offers faculty "the option of offering 4 hours per week of face-to-face office hours plus 1 hour per week of alternative, but demonstrable, contact with students, such as email or other on-line communication," and states that faculty have a "responsibility to respond to student emails, even if it is to let students know about regularly scheduled office hours and ways to schedule an alternate appointment." In order to communicate office hours to students, "the Academic Senate passed a "Resolution on Course Syllabi" (AS-644-06), which required faculty to indicate their office hours on their syllabi (see Appendix B).

The California Faculty Association's (CFA) collective bargaining agreement (CBA) does not identify office hours explicitly, but includes them under the category of professional duties and responsibilities. According the CBA, "The composition of professional duties and responsibilities of individual faculty cannot be restricted to a fixed amount of time, and will be determined by the appropriate administrator after consultation with the department and/or the individual faculty member" (20.2.a.). Since the current CAM policy was implemented before the formation of the CFA and has not been explicitly addressed in successor CBAs, the past practice regarding office hours have remained in effect.

Across the CSU system, there are a variety of office hour policies, some of which mandate a set number of hours and some of which connect the number of office hours per week to the teaching load of faculty members. No campuses require more than 5 office hours per week, and very few, such as Long Beach, include the option for office hours to be held in alternative formats (see Appendix C).

2. Problems with Current Office Hour Policy  
Faculty, students, administration, and the local representation of the California Faculty Association have all identified problems with the current office hour policy.
**Faculty:** As part of a discussion in Academic Senate last year regarding a resolution on office hours during the final examination period, several faculty members critiqued the lack of flexibility in incorporating alternative methods of meeting with students for consultation in office hours. In particular, several senators argued that the university is still using a twentieth-century policy for twentieth-first-century faculty and students. And these faculty members would like to see more options available to the faculty. By contrast, other faculty stated that one-on-one, face-to-face consultation in office hours was the most beneficial for student learning.

**Students:** The fundamental issues about office hours raised by students are the availability of faculty during office hours and the communication of office hours throughout the quarter – particularly changes to a faculty member’s office hours. In short, they pointed to the importance of a faculty member making his or her policies clear, such as whether emails would be answered over the weekend.

**Administration:** The primary issues raised by both Al Liddicoat, Associate Vice Provost, Academic Personnel, and Patricia Ponce, Student Ombuds, are the communication of faculty members’ office hours to students and the availability of faculty to students during their scheduled office hours, especially during the first week of classes and the final examination period.

**CFA:** The central issue identified by the Graham Archer, President CFA-SLO, regarding the current office hour policy is the lack of consultation between the administration and the individual faculty members regarding office hours.

3. **Recommendations**
   The fact that university’s office hour policy has not been revisited for thirty-six years suggests that it would be advantageous to update it for today’s faculty and students. The Instruction Committee supports existing policy of five (5) office hours a week spread over several days during the work week. However, it recognizes that the interaction between faculty and students has changed with the increased use of email correspondence and other forms of technology. The changes in classroom delivery models, specifically online and hybrid courses, also has the potential to alter the way that faculty consultation of students. Moreover, the absence of administrative consultation with academic programs and faculty may not be reflective of the different methods of faculty consultation with students across the colleges and programs.

The committee therefore recommends the following areas for updating the current office hour policy with the aim of ensuring student success:

1. For administration to consult with academic programs and faculty to determine what the best methods in their respective programs are for faculty to deliver five office hours per week;
2. For faculty to communicate clearly to students through their syllabi and other methods their face-to-face and online office hours as well as their availability through email;
3. For clarification about expectations for faculty to hold office hours at the start and conclusion of academic terms, and to communicate clearly office hour schedules to students.
4. Inclusion of revised office hour policy in the Campus Administrative Policies (CAP)
FACULTY OFFICE HOUR RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, CAM 370.2.F.1. states that "each faculty member must schedule and conduct at least one office hour each day (Monday through Friday) for consultation with students . . . " even if the faculty member has no classes on that day; and

WHEREAS, Other campuses in the CSUC do not require faculty to keep office hours every day of the week; and

WHEREAS, President Baker is interested in creating an atmosphere at Cal Poly which will be more conducive to research (memo from Baker to Jones, April 4, 1980, Incentives for Faculty Research and Development); and

WHEREAS, CAM already permits office deviations with Department Head and Dean approval; and

WHEREAS, Schedules on some days are often very full, therefore, the concept addressed in this resolution would be beneficial to the faculty members and their students; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That CAM 370.2.F.1. be deleted and replaced with the following statement:

"In addition to scheduled classes, each full-time faculty member must schedule and conduct at least five (5) office hours each week (not more than two hours each day) for consultation with students. The faculty members will post their office hours outside their office doors. This section does not preclude pre-arranged appointments with students. Part-time faculty and full-time faculty with reduced teaching loads will have office hours proportional to their assignments.

APPROVED May 6, 1980
WHEREAS, Campus Administrative Policy requires that faculty provide a syllabus for each course that they teach; and

WHEREAS, Students have a need and a right to know the expectations and assessment methods of the courses they are taking; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That every instructor shall make available to each student in her/his class, during the first class meeting, a written course syllabus providing:

• Instructor's contact information including office hours and office location
• A list of required text(s) and supplementary material for the course
• Methods and expectations for assessing/grading student performance for the course
• Attendance requirements and make up policy (if applicable)
• Other information the instructor deems necessary to assure the student's understanding of the nature, requirements, and expectations of the course; and be it further

RESOLVED: That each instructor shall be required to spend a portion of the first meeting of the class discussing the course syllabus; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution recognizes that faculty hold final responsibility for grading criteria and grading judgment and does not restrict the right of faculty to alter student assessment or other parts of the syllabi during the term; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the above three Resolved clauses shall become part of the Campus Administrative Policy; this policy shall be included in the Faculty Handbook; and this policy shall be communicated to all faculty at least once each year by the Provost or her/his designee.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: March 14, 2006
Revised: March 28, 2006
Revised: April 11, 2006
Revised: May 2, 2006
MEMORANDUM

TO: Joe Vaccaro, Chairman of the Board
FROM: Jared Samarin, College of Agriculture

DATE: 2/3/06

COPIES: Rick Johnson, Executive Director
Tylor Middlestadt, ASI President
John Azevedo, College of Engineering

SUBJECT: Resolution 06-09 ASI Supports Guidelines for Course Syllabi

This memo is presented in accordance with the ASI bylaws and is intended to offer background to ASI Resolution 06-09. This resolution was written to provide student perspective to course syllabi use at Cal Poly we have cited as supporting documentation the Academic Senate resolution on course syllabi use as well as the guidelines established by the Senate's curriculum committee. This resolution was also drafted to provide support for the Academic Senate Resolution as well as describe the importance to students of a minimum standard for course syllabi.
Associated Students, Inc.
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo

Resolution #06-09

ASI Supports Guidelines for Course Syllabi

WHEREAS: Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) is the official voice of Cal Poly students, and

WHEREAS: The Cal Poly Academic Senate Instruction Committee has recommended approval of Guidelines for a Course Syllabus, and

WHEREAS: Course syllabi are integral to student success by providing important information about academic expectations, grading standards, and course requirements, and

WHEREAS: Course syllabi are a contract between the instructor and student regarding the above stated items, and

WHEREAS: There is not currently public access to course syllabi making it difficult for students to determine which courses best meet their individual educational objectives, and

WHEREAS: A consistent standard for course syllabi would enhance student success and progress, and

THEREFORE

BEIT

RESOLVED: ASI urges the Faculty of Cal Poly to establish and adopt a standard for course syllabi, and

FURTHERMORE

BEIT

RESOLVED: ASI recommends the guidelines include at a minimum: academic expectations, grading standards, and course requirements, and

FURTHERMORE

BEIT

RESOLVED: ASI urges that a written hard copy of the syllabi be distributed to all students enrolled in the course and made available upon request for review by administration, faculty, and students.

CERTIFIED as the true and correct copy, in witness thereof, I have set my hand and Seal of the Associated Students, Inc. this ___ day of________, 2006.

ASI Secretary

ASI Chair of the Board

ASI President

ADOPTED at the regular meeting of the Board of Directors by ______ vote on ___ ________, 2006.

Sponsored by: Jared Samarin, ASI Board of Directors, College of Agriculture
John Azevedo, ASI Board of Directors, College of Engineering
Todd Maki, ASI Board of Directors, College of Engineering
To:        David Hannings  
           Chair, Academic Senate

From:     Warren J. Baker  
           President

Date:     June 21, 2006

Copies:   R. Detweiler, M. Suess,  
           D. Howard-Greene,  
           R. Johnson, T. Maki,  
           G. Mueller

Subject:  Response to Senate Resolution AS-644-06---Resolution on Course Syllabi

This memo formally acknowledges receipt and approval of the above-referenced Academic Senate resolution. By copy of this memo, I direct that the first three resolved clauses are to be included in the Campus Administrative Policy and the Faculty Handbook, and that they are to be disseminated to the faculty annually by the Provost or his/her designee.

I appreciate the efforts of the Academic Senate in addressing this issue.
CSU CAMPUSES OFFICE HOUR POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Available Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bakersfield       | 303.1.3 Scheduling Office Hours  
  Full-time teaching faculty shall schedule at least five (5) office hours each week at times convenient for students enrolled in their classes, and these shall be clearly posted. Full-time teaching faculty shall schedule their time so that they are on campus no fewer than three (3) days of each week. Deviations from this policy that would result in fewer days and/or hours per week require the formal written approval of the department chair and the appropriate school dean.” CSUB Handbook 1/21/2008 |
| Channel Islands   | YOUR OFFICE ASSIGNMENT: Please check with the department office for office assignments. Adjunct faculty members generally share an office and adjust their office hours to accommodate other occupants. Note: All faculty members are required to maintain five hours of office hours per week. Hours for less than full-time appointments should be prorated appropriately. http://www.csuci.edu/academics/faculty/facultyaffairs/documents/resources/quickreferenceguidefacultyfall2011.pdf |
| Chico             | Full-time faculty will hold office hours for four (4) hours per week. The minimum time period that can be counted as part of the required office hours is thirty (30) minutes. The periods must be held within the normal interval of instruction — from 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM. Office hours for part-time faculty will be on a pro rata basis, in periods of no less than thirty (30) minutes. Exceptions to holding office hours for periods of less than thirty minutes or at times outside the normal 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM may be made only by the instructional dean. Any exceptions must be made in advance and must be of benefit to students. |
| Dominquez Hills   | I. Full-Time Faculty - All full-time faculty members, regardless of teaching modality, shall maintain an average of at least five office and consultation hours per week during which faculty members are available to either meet personally in their offices (office hours) or communicate electronically (consultation hours) with students. Full-time faculty members with reduced teaching assignments shall maintain office and consultation hours consistent with the table below.  
  II. Part-Time Faculty - Although there is no specific requirement for office and consultation hours for part-time faculty members, they should be reasonably available to the students consistent with the table below.  
  III. Office Hours – Approximately sixty percent of office and consultation hours shall be specifically posted to inform students when the professor is available for advising without an appointment. This portion of office hours shall be face-to-face. These office hours cannot be met, entirely or in part, by stipulating “by appointment only.”  
  IV. Consultation hours – Approximately forty percent of office and consultation hours can be available for email or other electronic communication with students. http://www.fresnostate.edu/aps/documents/338.pdf |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Education Institution</th>
<th>Office Hours Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>The Department has adopted (08 February 1985) the following policy on office hours: Full-time and part-time faculty will schedule office hours at times when their students are likely to be available. <strong>Full-time faculty will schedule a minimum of 3 hours a week.</strong> It is assumed that, except in unusual cases, the 3 hours will be scheduled on 3 different days. Part-time faculty teaching 6 or more hours/units will schedule a minimum of 2 office hours a week; those teaching 3-5 hours/units will schedule a minimum of 1 office hour a week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td><strong>Section 302.1 Faculty Office Hours Policy</strong> For the purpose of consulting with students, <strong>full-time faculty members shall hold office hours totaling at least 5 hours per week.</strong> Office hours shall be scheduled on at least 3 weekdays at times that adequately serve the needs of students. Office hour schedules on fewer than 3 weekdays must be endorsed by the department chair and approved by the dean or director; they should be requested for reasons directly related to faculty workload, such as committee responsibilities, research, special assignments and other professional demands. When an office hour schedule is disapproved by the chair or dean, reasons must be provided in writing to the faculty member within 5 working days of the request. Office hour schedules (in terms of number of hours and number of days) shall be commensurate with the teaching fraction for part-time faculty. Problems that are related to office hour schedules are to be resolved by the dean or director in consultation with the department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td><strong>FACULTY OFFICE HOURS</strong> &quot;<strong>Full-time faculty are required to schedule three (3) office hours each week</strong> plus the opportunity for students and colleagues to make appointments.&quot; [For faculty with less than full-time appointments, this policy has been interpreted as requiring 45 minutes of scheduled office hours each week for each three (3) units of instructional assignment.] Carried unanimously by the Academic Senate 2/13/85. Approved by the President 2/22/85.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Office Hours <strong>Each faculty member shall schedule five office hours per week. Four hours shall be scheduled in advance and at least one scheduled by appointment each week.</strong> This schedule will be posted outside the faculty member's office, shall be filed with the Department Chair and College Dean and shall be strictly followed. Office hours should be scheduled at times and on days when affected students are normally in attendance. They should also be scheduled to ensure that departmental faculty are available for student consultation and advisement each day of the week and during as many hours of the day as possible. Where part-time Lecturers cannot maintain appropriate pro-rated office hours due to lack of an office, they should arrange to be available to students before and after each class for discussion of matters related to the instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>9. <strong>Office Hours</strong> All faculty members are required to have regularly scheduled office hours as part of their assigned direct instructional workload. A schedule of office hours and office phone number should be posted next to your office door, with a copy provided to the department. <strong>Although no minimum number of hours is mandated by the Policy File or CBA, departments/schools and colleges may have established policies or practices.</strong> In general, faculty members are expected to provide students in their classes reasonable access to the professor for questions and discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td><strong>Faculty are expected to keep a minimum of four office hours per week, during which they will be available for conferences with students and advisees.</strong> Where non-teaching obligations require additional office hours, these should be provided. Each faculty member should post office hours and teaching schedules on the office door, supply the department secretary with similar information, and adhere strictly to the schedule posted. <a href="http://academic.sfsu.edu/facaffairs/">http://academic.sfsu.edu/facaffairs/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| San Jose | 2/27/12: This policy adjusts the minimum number of scheduled office hours required, to account for the fact that faculty do a considerable amount of advising and consultation through email and other electronic media. The policy requires that **full-time faculty members teaching a normal load schedule a minimum of 2 office hours per week, but allows departments to develop departmental guidelines for office hours that differ from this policy, to best meet the needs of their faculty and students.** |
| San Luis Obispo | **Full-time faculty members conduct at least five office hours each week for student consultation. Part-time and full-time faculty with reduced teaching loads schedule office hours in proportion to their assignments.** [http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/handbook/workingconditions](http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/handbook/workingconditions) |
| San Marcos | N/A |
| Sonoma | Teaching - Office Hours: Faculty notify students of their office hours which may be revised each semester. Notification may include posting hours on office doors, bulletin boards and web pages, listing in the course syllabus, or by e-mail to students enrolled in their classes. Office hour activities may include consulting with students regarding grades, progress, and providing academic advising functions. |
| Stanislaus | N/A |

WHEREAS, The participation and voice of part-time lecturers in an academic department/teaching area and part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services, other than those who are members of the General Faculty, is encouraged and valued; and

WHEREAS, Part-time lecturers in an academic department/teaching area and part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services, other than those who are members of the General Faculty, are represented by one voting member in the Senate; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be modified as shown on the attached copy.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: January 24, 2018
CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY

ARTICLE III. THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Section 1. Membership

(c) Part-time lecturers in an academic department/teaching area and part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services, other than those who are members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I, will be represented by one voting member in the Senate.

BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

I. INTRODUCTION

B. DEFINITIONS

4. Part-time Academic Employees
Part-time lecturers in academic departments/teaching areas in the University and part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services (Professional Consultative Services classifications: librarians, counselors, student service professionals I-, II-, III-academically related, student service professionals III and IV, physicians, and coaches) who are not members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I of the Constitution of the Faculty.

II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

A. ELIGIBILITY

3. Representative of Part-time Academic Employees
A voting member of the Academic Senate representing part-time academic employees shall be elected by vote of all university part-time academic employees during fall quarter of each academic year. Such representative must have an academic year appointment in order to serve in this position.

B. TERMS OF OFFICE

1. Terms of office for senators: the elected term of office for senators shall be two years. A senator can serve a maximum of two consecutive, elected terms and shall not again be eligible for election until one year has elapsed. A senator appointed to fill a temporary vacancy for an elected position shall serve until the completion of that term or until the senator being temporarily replaced returns, whichever occurs first. If this temporary appointment is for one year or less, it shall not be counted as part of the two-term maximum for elected senators. The term of the representative for part-time academic employees shall start immediately after the election and last until elections are held the following academic year. The representative for part-time academic employees shall serve a one-year term with a maximum of four consecutive one-year terms.

III. VOTING AND ELECTION PROCEDURES

B. ELECTION CALENDAR

8. Election of representative for part-time academic employees:
(a) during the first weeks of fall quarter, the Academic Senate office shall solicit nominations for the position of Academic Senate representative for part-time academic employees.
(b) after nominations have been received, election to this position shall be conducted. A runoff election, if needed, shall be conducted the week following the conclusion of the election. Said position shall be elected by vote of all university part-time academic employees unless only one nomination to this position is received, in which case the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall have the authority to appoint said nominee to the position.
(c) the term of the elected member shall start immediately after the election and serve until the end of the academic year elections are held the following academic year.