Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, January 8, 2019
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: Approval of November 6, 2018 minutes (pp. 2-3).

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

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

IV. Business Items:
   A. Appointment to Academic Senate Grants Review Committee (p. 4).
   B. Appointment to Sustainability Advisory Committee (p. 5).
   C. Review and Approval of Editorial Reviews to Current University Faculty Personnel Action Document for placement in the Appendix of the New University Faculty Personnel Policies Document to Appear as Consent Agenda Item: Ken Brown, Chair Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 6-21).
   D. Resolution on Use of Campus for Visiting Speakers to Protect Core Operations and Provide Transparency: Margaret Bodemer, History Department and Carrie Langner, Psychology and Child Development Department (pp. 22-24).
   E. Resolution on Creation of New Department for Interdisciplinary Studies in the Liberal Arts: Elizabeth Lowham, Political Science Department Chair and Kathryn Rummell, Interim CLA Dean (pp. 25-34).
   F. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 1: Preface: Ken Brown, Chair Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 35-40).
   G. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 2: Faculty Appointments: Ken Brown, Chair Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 41-47).
   H. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 3: Personnel Files: Ken Brown, Chair Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 48-52).
   I. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 4: Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation: Ken Brown, Chair Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 53-60).
   J. Resolution on Endorsing Main Components of Cal Poly’s Strategic Plan: Sean Hurley, Chair Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee (pp. 61-69).

V. Discussion Items:
   A. [TIME CERTAIN 3:45 P.M.] Supporting Scholarly Electronic Resources Essential for Student and Faculty Success: Ken Brown, Chair Faculty Affairs Committee and Brett Bodemer, Library – PCS representative on Faculty Affairs Committee (p. 70).
   B. Campus Advisory Council Membership: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair.

VI. Adjournment:

805-756-1258 ~ academicsenate.calpoly.edu
Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, November 6, 2018
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the October 16, 2018 and October 23, 2018 Academic Senate Executive Committee meeting minutes.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, announced that Margaret Bodemer, History Department, was re-elected as the Academic Senate part-time academic employee representative for the 2018-2019 term.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: None.
B. President’s Office: None.
C. Provost: None.
D. Statewide Senate: None.
E. CFA: None.
F. ASI: Mark Borges, ASI Board of Directors Chair, reported that there is still money available for ASI Social Justice Program funding. Criteria and procedures for these funds can be found at asi.calpoly.edu. Jasmin Fashami, ASI President, reported that ASI Student Government hosted the California State Student Association November 10th and 11th. In addition, through an initiative of ASI Student Government, Cal Poly won the Secretary of State’s Ballot Bowl competition for highest number of registrations.

IV. Business Items:
A. Appointments to the eLearning Addendum Revision Task Force. M/S/P to appoint the following individuals to the eLearning Addendum Revision Task Force:
   - Kevin Lin, Food Science and Nutrition College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences
   - Christian Anderson, World Languages and Culture College of Liberal Arts
   - Hong Hoang, Management, HR & Info. Systems Orfalea College of Business
   - Samuel Frame, Statistics College of Science and Math
B. Appointment to Academic Senate Committees. M/S/P to appoint Aydin Nazmi, Food Science and Nutrition Department, to the Grants Review Committee for the 2018-2020 term.
C. Approval of Instruction Committee’s Recommendations for the 2020-2021 Academic Calendar. Hunter Glanz, Instruction Committee Chair, introduced the Instruction Committee’s Recommendations for the 2020-2021 Academic Calendar. M/S/P to recommend Option 2 (Monday start and no classes during Thanksgiving week) for Fall 2020 and Option 1a (January 18, 2021 to follow Monday schedule) for Winter 2021.
D. Approval of Two Additional WTUs for Tom Gutierrez, Physics Department, to serve as the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Chair. M/S/P to approve the addition of two WTUs for Tom Gutierrez, Physics Department, to serve as the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Chair.
E. Resolution on Proposed Organization of a New University Faculty Personnel Policies Document. Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, introduced a resolution that would create a new document called
the "University Faculty Personnel Policies" (UFPP), which would contain university-level faculty personnel policies from all faculty units on campus and outlines the structure the UFPP would follow. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on Proposed Organization of a New University Faculty Personnel Policies Document.

F. Honorary Degree. Keith Humphrey, Vice President for Student Affairs, discussed Honorary Degrees during closed session.

G. Resolution to Modify Section V. Meetings of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate. Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, proposed a resolution that would amend the Bylaws of the Academic Senate so that documents attached to resolutions cannot be removed or added. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution to Modify Section V. Meetings of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.

V. Discussion Items: None.

VI. Adjournment: 4:49 PM

Submitted by,

Mark Borges

Mark Borges
Academic Senate Student Assistant
Statement of Interest

Name: Sarah Lester                                      College: Library

Department: Academic Services

Status – please check one:
[X] Tenure track                                    [ ] Lecturer
[ ] Tenured                                         [ ] FERP

Number of Years at Cal Poly: 4 months

Which committee do you wish to serve on? Grants Review Committee

Senate committees ONLY
Would you be willing to chair the committee if released time was available? [ ] Yes [ X] No

Incumbent? [ ] Yes [ X] No
If you are presently ending your term on a committee, you must indicate your interest in continuing on that committee for an additional term by returning this form.

Statement of Interest
Please provide a brief statement of interest including accomplishments, expectations, projects, goals, etc., as they relate to the committee’s charge.

As a new tenure track faculty, I am interested in the opportunity to gain more background into the research activity here at Cal Poly. As a librarian, it’s a way for me to also look at where research needs are being met in terms or resources and tools. I previously have served on two ASEE committees, one reviewing papers for the annual conference and twice reviewing and recruiting officers for the Engineering Libraries Division.

PLEASE NOTE: If applying for more than one committee, candidates are required to submit a separate Statement of Interest form for each committee.

Please return statement of interest form to ggregory@calpoly.edu or the Academic Senate Office, 38-143.

11/28/2018
Statement of Interest

Name: Norm Dorin
College: OCOB

Department: Marketing

Status – please check one:
[ ] Tenure track
[ ] Tenured
[ ] Lecturer
[ x ] FERP

Number of Years at Cal Poly: 26

Which committee do you wish to serve on? Sustainability Advisory Committee

Senate committees ONLY
Would you be willing to chair the committee if released time was available? [ ] Yes [ x ] No

Incumbent? [ ] Yes [ x ] No
If you are presently ending your term on a committee, you must indicate your interest in continuing on that committee for an additional term by returning this form.

Statement of Interest

Please provide a brief statement of interest including accomplishments, expectations, projects, goals, etc., as they relate to the committee's charge.

I believe sustainable learning and practice is one of the more important, if not neglected, parts of a university student’s curriculum. The Cal Poly campus provides an excellent learning classroom for sustainability related topics through its infrastructure. The more the campus does in this area the more students can learn from state of the art practices.

I would like to be part of the team that works on these infrastructure projects. I have researched and published many sustainable related papers. For the last 6+ years I have served on the Academic Senate Sustainability Committee and helped develop the current rubric used to evaluate courses for inclusion in the SusCat. I have a strong passion for moving society forward in working towards a more sustainable future.

During my 26 years at Cal Poly I have served on countless committees and chaired many as well – including chair of my department for nine years. I feel I have a well documented history of helping committees move agenda items towards completion and would like to think I can do the same on this committee.

My one caveat is I am ferping and only available winter and spring. My understanding though is that this committee has not had OCOB representation for a few years so I hope it is better served with someone part of the time rather than none of the time.

Thanks for your consideration.

12/19/2018
The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies. This process specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda. Using the new process, FAC will replace the current University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document piece by piece to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document. FAC may then employ the same process to update sections of the new UFPP on an as-needed basis.

The guiding principles in reforming the UFPA into the new UFPP are the following:

- Clarify existing policies that are common and already in place across the university.
- Standardize procedures for faculty evaluation at the university level.
- Set baseline expectations and offer guiding principles with directives to the colleges and departments to specify their criteria accordingly attuned to the disciplinary considerations specific to their programs.
- Establish a common structure for all personnel policy documents across campus.

The Senate has approved a resolution (AS-859-18) establishing the general structure of the UFPP in the form of its main chapter divisions, each containing thematically unified selections of policy:

1. Preface
2. Faculty Appointments
3. Personnel Files
4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes
5. Evaluation Processes
6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns
7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria
8. Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services
9. Evaluation of Professional Development
10. Evaluation of Service
11. Governance
12. Workload
13. Appendices

FAC is proposing to the Senate individual chapters of UFPP, each covered by its own Senate resolution. FAC will also place the existing personnel document into the Appendix of UFPP. This action non-controversial and so FAC recommends that it should be placed on the Senate consent agenda.

What follows is a summary of the content, impact, and implementation, and feedback concerning this proposed addition to the appendix of UFPP.
Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: Appendix: University Faculty Personnel Actions (2013)

Summary of Appendix: University Faculty Personnel Actions (2013)
The current governing document of university-level personnel policies is called University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), and is available to the university on the Academic Personnel website. The document was formally approved by the Provost in 2009, and underwent editorial revision in 2011. In 2013 Academic Personnel consulted with FAC and the Academic Senate chair about some further editorial revisions, specifically removing some obsolete references to Campus Administrative Policies and recording some changes to student evaluation policies in light of revisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. This item for the Appendix of the new UFPP consists of that 2013 revision to the UFPA.

Impact on Existing Policy
The UFPA in its current state is the statement of university policy on the matters it covers. This action of placing it in the Appendix of the new UFPP is merely a change of venue rather than a change of policy.

Implementation
There is no implementation of policy entailed by the action of moving UFPA into the appendix of UFPP.

In all the work FAC has conducted in consulting about UFPP with the Senate and the Colleges, Library, Counseling, and Athletics, the project was to construct the UFPP alongside the existing UFPA, having sections of UFPP supersede UFPA as they are approved by the Senate. For reference, UFPA would be placed in the appendix of UFPP. That is all this proposal would implement.

Feedback from Faculty Units
When proposing personnel policies, FAC consults with faculty units about the proposed change so the faculty units may offer feedback on the proposal. FAC then considers this feedback when revising the proposed policy and sending it to the Senate.

This proposal warrants no specific consultation with faculty units as it implements something already advertised as part of the process the Senate has approved for creating the UFPP by merely relocating the current university-level policy document; it therefore makes no changes to policy.
Section I. Performance review: retention, promotion, and tenure

A. Performance evaluation procedures

1. Evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with Article 15 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) [the collective bargaining agreement for faculty employees between The California State University and Unit 3 Faculty] and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

2. Each college or other academic unit shall develop a written statement of procedures and criteria for each type of personnel action. (In this section, the use of the word “college” includes the Library, and use of the word “department” includes equivalent units covered under the MOU such as area, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Counseling.) Departments desiring to develop statements to serve as addenda to the college statement may do so. Full-time probationary and full-time tenured faculty may participate in the development and/or subsequent amendment of these procedures and criteria. College and department statements are subject to review and approval by the college dean and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. In the event a policy or procedure in a college or department statement is in conflict with a provision of the MOU, the provision in the MOU shall prevail.

3. Timetables for evaluations shall be published annually and shall be developed in consultation with the Academic Senate.

4. A faculty employee subject to performance or periodic review has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting evidence of their accomplishments to those charged with the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating faculty employees. Applicants should seek advice and guidance from their department chair (in this section, the use of the words “department chair” also includes department head) and dean to understand how criteria and standards are applied.

5. Evaluators will provide their written evaluation and recommendation to the faculty employee at least ten days before transmitting the evaluation to the next level of review.
6. Personnel Action File (PAF)

The PAF is the official permanent employment record of a faculty employee and resides in the office of the college dean.


The WPAF is initiated by the applicant to support consideration for a performance review for retention, promotion, tenure, or periodic review. The WPAF for tenure or tenure/promotion covers the entire employment period at Cal Poly. The WPAF for promotion shall emphasize the period since the last promotion at Cal Poly or appointment to the current rank. The Provost establishes a specific deadline by which the WPAF is declared complete for each type of personnel action. Insertion of materials after that date must have the approval of the college peer review committee (CPRC) and is limited to items that became accessible after the deadline. The table of contents or index should be updated to reflect any material added to the file during the course of the evaluation cycle. All supporting materials in the WPAF should be referenced and clearly explained.

a. The applicant shall submit the WPAF to the department chair by the established deadline. Materials shall include but be not limited to

(1) Index of materials contained in the WPAF

(2) Resume

   (a) The resume should be organized according to the categories to be evaluated including: teaching activities and performance or librarian/counselor effectiveness and performance; professional growth and scholarly achievement; service to the University and/or community; and any other activities which indicate professional commitment, service, or contribution to the discipline, department, college, or library (in the case of librarians).

   (b) The resume should be specific and distinguish between publications, submitted manuscripts, and manuscripts in preparation. A brief statement should describe the nature of the publication (type of journal/periodical, refereed or not) and the applicant’s specific role in the accomplishment.

(3) Professional development plan

Professional development is defined as the generation of knowledge or the acquisition of experience, skill, and
information that enables one to perform at a higher level of proficiency in one’s profession. Cal Poly recognizes and endorses the following four types of scholarship identified in the Carnegie Foundation report entitled Scholarship Reconsidered: Scholarship of Teaching; Scholarship of Discovery; Scholarship of Integration; and Scholarship of Application.

The professional development plan is a written narrative intended to serve as a guide to evaluators for understanding the faculty employee’s professional goals and values as a teacher-scholar. The plan should include short-and long-term goals and objectives on how the faculty employee intends to provide substantive contributions to their discipline, how those scholarly activities can keep their teaching current and dynamic, and a periodic external validation of those activities.

(a) A probationary faculty employee should emphasize what s/he intends to accomplish by the time s/he is considered for tenure.

(b) Applicants for tenure and/or promotion should articulate a long-term professional development plan noting how they intend to continue making a valuable contribution to the University, its instructional program(s), and the academic community.

(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.

(b) Evaluative statements and recommendations, along with any written statement or rebuttal by the applicant, will be added to the WPAF by the PRCs, department chair, and dean. At the end of the review cycle, the index, faculty resume, professional development plan, evaluation summaries, recommendations, and any responses or rebuttal statements will be filed in the permanent PAF.

8. Custodian of Files

During periodic and performance reviews, the department chair is the custodian of the WPAF at the department level (and, if appropriate, the PAF); at the college level, the custodian of the files is the dean; at the
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University level, the custodian is the Provost. Custodians of the files and members of PRCs shall ensure the confidentiality of the files. Normally, there shall be no duplication of file materials except for copies made for the applicant or appropriate administrator, or for distribution at PRC meetings. At the conclusion of each PRC meeting, the PRC chair is responsible for the collection of all duplicated materials. The only exception to this policy is that copies of an applicant’s resume may be distributed to PRC members for use at times other than PRC meetings. After the PRC has made its recommendations, the copies of the resume shall be collected by the chair. Only the applicant/designee, PRC members, department chair, dean, and the Provost/designee shall have access to the PAF and WPAF files.

9. All evaluators, as described in “8” above, must sign the logs in the PAF and the WPAF before they make their recommendations. It is the professional obligation of all evaluators to review the information in the files before they vote or prepare a written recommendation. Evaluative statements shall be based on information in the files and validated with evidence such as class visitation; course outlines and tests; and significant curricular, scholarly, and committee contributions. If, at any level, the evidence is judged unsatisfactory, or if it does not appear to support the recommendations made, the WPAF shall be returned to the appropriate level for clarification. No one shall have access to the files except the PRC, the applicant/designee, department chair, dean, and Provost.

10. PRCs and department chairs
   a. Membership of the PRC
      (1) The probationary and tenured department faculty will elect members to serve on PRCs. No one shall serve on more than one level of peer review for each faculty employee under review. For reappointment and tenure reviews, PRC members and the department chair must be full-time tenured faculty employees of any rank. For promotion reviews, PRC members and the department chair must have higher academic rank than those being considered for promotion.
      (2) Faculty employees being considered for promotion shall be ineligible to serve on promotion or tenure review committees.
      (3) When there are insufficient eligible members to serve on the PRC, the PRC and department chair shall select members from related academic disciplines in consultation with the faculty employee under review.
At the request of the department, the college dean may agree that faculty employees participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may be eligible to serve on a PRC, by election, as long as such service can be completed during the terms of the Faculty Early Retirement Program assignment. PRCs may not be composed solely of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program.

b. Responsibilities

Because of the importance of all personnel actions, members serving on a PRC and department chairs are expected to perform due diligence; observe strict confidentiality; review, understand, and apply the relevant criteria; and provide constructive written assessment of the applicant’s performance.

The PRC and department chair’s responsibilities include:

1. Review University, college, and any departmental personnel policies and procedures;

2. Review and sign the applicant’s PAF and WPAF;

3. Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the applicant at least ten days prior to transmittal of the file to the next level of review;

4. Within ten days following receipt of the recommendation, the applicants may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a meeting be held to discuss the recommendation. The PRC, or department chair at the second level of review, will consider the applicant’s rebuttal statement and meet with the applicant if requested. The committee or department chair will either revise the recommendation in writing or make no change to its prior recommendation. In the case of no change, no further statement is necessary from the committee or department chair. The rebuttal statement of the applicant under review shall be added to the WPAF.

c. PRC evaluations and recommendations

1. Each PRC evaluation and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee. For purposes of determining a simple majority vote of the PRC, the membership of the committee shall be defined as those committee members casting yes or no votes. If a member of the PRC or the department chair determines that s/he cannot
evaluate an applicant for some reason (e.g., conflict of interest, prejudice, bias, etc.), the committee member or department chair shall withdraw from the applicant's PRC. PRC members or the department chair who abstain from voting are expected to provide written rationale.

(2) Recommendations of a PRC at the college or department level must be accompanied by one of the following:

(a) A majority report and, if applicable, a minority report. Reports must include substantiating reasons for its recommendations and must be signed by those PRC members who support the report and its substantiating reasons.

(b) Individual recommendations from any PRC member must include substantiating reasons and signature.

(c) A combination of (a) and (b) above: a majority report, a minority report (if applicable), and/or individual recommendations. In all cases, each report or recommendation must include substantiating reasons and must be signed by those supporting it.

11. Department chairs shall use Form AP 109 (Faculty Evaluation Form) to evaluate faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. Department chairs are expected to conduct a separate level of review. Comments regarding student evaluations must be included in Section 1 of Form AP 109. College deans should use the final page of Form AP 109 or similar format appended to Form AP 109 to record their evaluation and recommendation.

Section II. Criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure

A. Standards

The quality of faculty performance is the most important element to consider in evaluating individual achievement. Although teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion, it alone is not sufficient for retention, promotion, and tenure. The degree of evidence will vary in accordance with the academic position being sought by the applicant. For example, the granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than retention, and promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor.
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B. University criteria

Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following University criteria as well as those approved for the college/department (See Section I.A.2):

1. Teaching performance or effectiveness as a librarian and/or other professional performance

Consideration is to be given to such factors as the applicant’s competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of courses, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student advising, and other factors relating to performance as an instructor.

In formulating recommendations for the promotion of teaching faculty, evaluators will place primary emphasis on success in instruction. The results of the formal student evaluation are to be considered in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance.

For librarians, consideration is to be given to such factors as furthering objectives of the library and the University by cooperating with fellow librarians; applying bibliographic techniques effectively to the acquisition, development, classification, and organization of library resources; initiating and carrying to conclusion projects within the library; demonstrating versatility, including the ability to work effectively in a range of library functions and subject areas; and supervisory and/or administrative abilities.

In formulating recommendations on the promotion of librarians, evaluators will place primary emphasis on effectiveness as a librarian as evaluated by colleagues and library users.

2. Professional growth and scholarly achievement

Consideration is to be given to the applicant’s educational background and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies, publications, presentation of papers at professional and scholarly meetings, and external validation of scholarly activities.

3. Service to University and community

Consideration is to be given to the applicant’s participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; co-curricular activities; department,
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college, and University committees; Academic Senate and its committees; individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and service in community affairs directly related to the applicant's teaching area as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

4. Other factors of consideration

Consideration is to be given to such factors as collegiality (working collaboratively and productively with colleagues and participation in traditional academic functions); initiative; cooperativeness; and dependability.

Section III. Performance review of probationary faculty for retention

A. Performance reviews for the purpose of retention shall be in accordance with Articles 13 and 15 of the MOU.

B. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide sufficient evidence that s/he has fulfilled the criteria for retention.

C. The normal probationary period is six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

D. Evaluation of probationary faculty involves a comprehensive assessment of performance during the entire probationary period with retention seen as leading to tenure. It should be understood that if a faculty employee has not demonstrated the potential to achieve tenure, then that individual should not be reappointed. This does not mean that retention is a guarantee of tenure.

E. In the event of a non-retention decision, a probationary faculty employee who has served a minimum of three years of probation (including any credit for prior service) will be extended a terminal year of employment with no further appointment rights.

Section IV. Performance review for tenure

A. Tenure represents the University's long-term commitment to a faculty employee and is only granted when there is strong evidence that the individual who, by reason of their excellent performance and promise of long-range contribution as a teacher-scholar to the educational purpose of the institution, is deemed worthy of this important commitment. Tenure means the right of a faculty employee to continue at Cal Poly unless voluntarily terminated or terminated for cause, lack of funds, or lack of work.

1. To be recommended for tenure, an applicant must be rated during the final probationary year within one of the top two performance categories listed in Section V of Form AP 109 (Faculty Evaluation Form).
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2. Tenure decisions are considered more critical to the University than promotion decisions. An applicant who does not have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor should not be granted tenure. This does not mean that retention is a guarantee of tenure nor is tenure a guarantee of promotion. The fact that a probationary faculty employee has received early promotion is not a guarantee of tenure.

3. Possession of the doctorate or other designated terminal degree from an accredited institution is required for tenure.

B. Tenure eligibility

Tenure eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 13 of the MOU.

1. Normal tenure

A tenure award is considered normal if the award is made after the applicant has accrued credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

2. Early tenure

a. A tenure award is considered “early” if the award is made prior to the applicant having achieved credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

b. In addition to meeting department, college, or library criteria for normal tenure, an applicant for early tenure must provide evidence of outstanding performance in each of the following performance areas: teaching or library effectiveness, professional growth and achievement, and service to the University and community.

c. In order to receive early tenure, an applicant should, at a minimum, receive a favorable majority vote from the department PRC.

3. Tenure upon appointment

Applicants for appointment with tenure shall normally be tenured professors or tenured librarians at other universities. Exceptions to this provision must be carefully documented. The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in a management position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by tenured faculty in the appropriate department.
Section V. Performance review for promotion

A. Eligibility

Promotion eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 14 of the MOU. Promotion in rank is not automatic and is granted only in recognition of teaching competency or effectiveness as a librarian, professional performance, and meritorious service during the period in rank. The application of criteria will be more rigorous for promotion to Professor or Librarian than to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian.

1. Normal promotion

a. An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered normal if the applicant is eligible and both of the following conditions hold:

(1) The applicant is tenured or the applicant is also eligible for and applying for normal tenure (see Section IV.B.1).

(2) The applicant has completed at least the equivalent of four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

b. Tenure is required for promotion to the academic rank of Professor or Librarian.

2. Early promotion

a. An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered “early” if one of the following is true:

(1) The applicant is a probationary faculty employee who is not in their sixth probationary year and is not eligible for normal tenure (see Section IV.B.1).

(2) The applicant is a tenured faculty employee and has not satisfied the equivalent service requirements of at least four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

b. Early promotion will be granted only in exceptional cases. The circumstances and record of performance which make the case exceptional shall be fully documented by the applicant and validated by evaluators. The fact that an applicant has reached the maximum salary in their academic rank or meets the performance criteria for promotion does not in itself constitute an exceptional case for early promotion.
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B. Ranking

In addition to their carefully documented recommendations, department PRCs, department chairs, college or library PRCs, and deans shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants who were positively recommended at their respective level.

Section VI. Periodic evaluation of faculty unit employees

A. Definition of periodic evaluation

A periodic evaluation of a faculty unit employee ("faculty employee") shall normally be required for the following purposes:

1. Evaluation of tenured faculty employees who are not subject to a performance review for promotion.

2. Evaluation of probationary faculty employees who are not subject to a performance review for retention. For example, a probationary faculty employee who receives an initial two-year appointment will undergo a periodic evaluation during their first year.

3. Annual evaluation of temporary faculty employees.

4. Evaluation of lecturers for range elevation.

B. Periodic evaluation procedures and criteria

1. Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees

   a. Eligibility

      (1) Tenured Professors, Librarians, and Student Services Professional-Academic Related III (SSPAR III).

          Tenured full Professors shall be subject to a periodic evaluation at least once every five years.

      (2) Tenured Assistant or Associate Professor, Senior Assistant or Associate Librarian; and Student Services Professional-Academic Related II (SSPAR II).

          A periodic evaluation is conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, or SSP-AR II. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist
and guide the Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, or SSP­AR II in their preparation for subsequent promotion review.

(3) Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees at any rank shall occur at least once every five years after promotion/appointment to their respective academic rank. Performance reviews for promotion can serve in lieu of periodic reviews for the purposes of this section. More frequent periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty employee may be requested by the employee, department chair, or dean. After such a request, the periodic evaluation shall be conducted as soon as possible.

b. Procedure for periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees

(1) Procedures for the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees are similar to the procedures for conducting performance reviews (see Section I.A) with the exception that the periodic review concludes at the level of college dean.

(2) A tenured faculty employee shall be provided a copy of the PRC report other/his periodic evaluation. The PRC chair, the department chair, and dean shall meet with the tenured faculty employee to discuss her/his strengths along with suggestions, if any, for improvement.

(3) A written copy of the periodic evaluation report shall be placed in the tenured faculty employee’s PAF, and a copy shall be provided to her/him.

c. Criteria for periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees

(1) The purpose of periodic evaluation of tenured faculty employees is to maintain and improve their effectiveness.

(2) Criteria are similar to the criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure (Section II.B.2).

2. Periodic evaluation of probationary faculty employees

a. Procedures for periodic evaluation of probationary faculty employees

(1) Periodic evaluation of probationary faculty employees shall be conducted by the elected department PRC composed of tenured faculty, the department chair, and the college dean in any year in which the probationary faculty employee is not subject to a performance review for retention.
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Normally the evaluation will be scheduled during the second year of appointment.

(5) Lecturers who are no longer eligible for a service salary increase (SSI) in their current range and who have served at least five years in their current range may apply for range elevation.

c. Procedures for periodic evaluation of temporary faculty employees

(1) Academic Personnel will distribute a list of temporary faculty employees eligible for periodic review, including those eligible for range elevation, and the timetable for conducting the reviews.

(2) The temporary faculty employee shall submit a WPAF to the department chair by the established deadline. The file should include supporting materials to document the accomplishments of the work assignment of the temporary faculty employee including but not be limited to:

(a) Resume
(b) Summary of results of student evaluations of teaching
(c) Course syllabi and examples of course materials
(d) Examples of examinations
(e) Grading schemes and grade assignments
(f) Statement of teaching philosophy
(g) Professional accomplishments which contribute to maintaining currency in the faculty employee’s field of expertise such as research, scholarship, and/or creative activity
(h) Service activities, if applicable

(3) All evaluators must sign the logs in the PAF and the WPAF before completing their written evaluative statements and recommendations.

(4) Evaluators shall provide their written evaluation and recommendation to the temporary faculty employee at least ten days before transmitting materials to the next level of review.

(5) The temporary faculty employee under review may submit a written rebuttal statement in response to the evaluation and/or request a
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meeting be held to discuss the evaluation within ten days following receipt of the evaluation.

(6) A written record of a periodic evaluation shall be placed in the temporary faculty employee’s PAF. The temporary faculty employee shall be provided a copy of the written record of the evaluation.

(7) College deans are delegated authority to approve range elevation.

(8) Range elevation becomes effective at the beginning of the subsequent fall quarter.
RESOLUTION ON USE OF CAMPUS FOR VISITING SPEAKERS TO PROTECT CORE OPERATIONS AND PROVIDE TRANSPARENCY

Background
While invited speakers have the potential to supplement intellectual exchange at the university, the core mission of the university is education. One of the core operations on campus is in-class instruction and certain past speaker events have disrupted this activity. In our role as educators we seek to emphasize the priority of educational activities over entertainment-focused events held on campus as well as the need for transparency and accountability for spending on campus speakers, especially given the financial constraints of the public university.

While the University Administration is in the process of finalizing the revised Campus Administrative Policy (CAP) (expected to be approved in Fall 2018), in particular Chapter 100, Section 140 entitled "Use of University Property and Time, Place and Manner," this resolution seeks to support and expand those policies pertaining to guest speakers and use of campus facilities. The revised CAP states that "use of campus facilities or other property may be subject to a fee and/or require liability insurance or indemnity agreement," and that when this is the case, persons or groups granted the use of campus facilities are responsible for reimbursing the University, and must assume responsibility for any damage. Additionally, it outlines that event permissions should be evaluated on a "content and viewpoint neutral basis." Section 141 sets forth "reasonable time, place, and manner regulations regarding the use of University property to ensure that individuals and groups exercising their legitimate rights do not disrupt the educational process or other operations of the University." Section 146 states that "activities that restrict or disturb the routine business of the University are generally prohibited or closely monitored and as such, may be directed to cease or continue in a different location should it be determined that such activity is disrupting the routine business of the University." This resolution further recommends that outside speakers deemed potentially disruptive and needing extra security measures be held on weekends when the majority of classes do not meet, so as to potentially reduce security costs and minimize disruption of the educational process.

That mission has been disrupted by recent speakers on campus: In April of 2018, the Cal Poly College Republicans and the Cal Poly chapter of Turning Point USA, hosted an event featuring Milo Yiannopoulos at Cal Poly. Cal Poly ended up spending $46,600 and the CSU spent
$39,600, for a total of $86,200 for security for the event.\(^1\) Security costs included wages and overtime for 17 University police officers, 54 officers from other CSU campuses and 58 officers from other law enforcement agencies. Additionally, Cal Poly faculty and students reported that the event, held in Mott Athletic Center, disrupted classes and created what many felt was a hostile work environment.

The previous year, in January of 2017, the Cal Poly Republicans invited Milo Yiannopoulos to campus. The University (with funds from the CSU), spent more than $55,000 and the city of San Luis Obispo spent more than $9,000\(^2\) on security due to concerns over protesters and counter-protesters. Furthermore, Yiannopoulos was using the campus tours as a book promotion vehicle, in essence making his own profit from taxpayers’ money. The Office of University, Diversity and Inclusivity (OUDI) and the College of Liberal Arts created a counter-event - UNITE Cal Poly with speaker W. Kamau Bell - which successfully diverted attention from Yiannopoulos, but also cost the university additional money. In September of 2017, Milo Yiannopoulos' visit to the University of California at Berkeley ended up costing approximately $800,000 for security, including police officers from eight law enforcement agencies and campuses across the state.\(^3\) UC Berkeley ended up spending nearly 4 million dollars for its “free speech week” in 2017.\(^4\) Furthermore the University ended up incurring unreported damage costs when counter-protestors destroyed university property.

While the revised CAP sets guidelines and criteria for on-campus events, it does not address the process by which decisions are made about the speaker applications, nor about budgeting and financial considerations, that is, where the money is coming from as well as the comparative cost-estimates about each event’s potential location and date. Although Cal Poly has been responsive to inquiries, the administration should regularly and promptly make this information public, in order to provide transparency and accountability, in the appropriate places such as the Cal Poly website and/or Mustang News.

WHEREAS, A core operation on campus is in-class instruction; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly, as a public university faces financial constraints; and

WHEREAS, The revised CAP calls for policies pertaining to guest speakers' use of campus to be evaluated on a “content and viewpoint neutral basis”; and

WHEREAS, The revised CAP sets forth "reasonable time, place and manner" regulations regarding the use of University property; and


WHEREAS, The revised CAP states that "activities that restrict or disturb the routine business of the University are generally prohibited or closely monitored"; and

WHEREAS, Student clubs have invited speakers which have cost the university and the city large sums of money for security, and based on other campuses' experiences, these costs could be even higher; and

WHEREAS, University business has been interrupted by security needs at past events; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That outside speakers deemed potentially disruptive and needing extra security measures should be restricted to weekends, and be it further

RESOLVED: The Cal Poly administration makes public, in a timely manner, the process by which decisions are made about speaker applications, budgeting and financial considerations, and comparative cost-estimates about each event's potential location and date, and be it further

RESOLVED: This information is put into the public record in appropriate places such as the Cal Poly website and/or Mustang News, and be it further

RESOLVED: The faculty supports the revised CAP, with the resolutions listed above.

Proposed by: Margaret Bodemer, History Department and Carrie Langner, Psychology and Child Development Department

Date: August 5, 2018
ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS--__--19

RESOLUTION ON CREATION OF NEW DEPARTMENT FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES IN THE LIBERAL ARTS

Impact on Existing Policy: \(^1\) NONE.

WHEREAS, Interdisciplinary Studies is currently an interdepartmental major within the College of Liberal Arts (CLA); and

WHEREAS, The Science, Technology and Society program is a set of four minors within the College of Liberal Arts (CLA); and

WHEREAS, The College of Liberal Arts (CLA) has identified several benefits for formally combining two programs – the Interdisciplinary Studies (BA) program and the Science, Technology and Society (minors) program and elevating the combined programs into one new department called Interdisciplinary Studies in the Liberal Arts Department; and

WHEREAS, The benefits and the structure of the new department are provided in the attachment to this resolution; and

WHEREAS, Said change in status and name has been approved by the college of Liberal Arts department chairs/program directors and the CLA Interim Dean; and

WHEREAS, Approval for combining these two programs into a new department has been given by all college Deans and the Provost; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo approve the creation of a new CLA department, Interdisciplinary Studies in the Liberal Arts Department.

Proposed by: Interdisciplinary Studies Program and Science, Technology and Society Program
Date: November 27, 2018

\(^1\) (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
Overview

As part of the CLA’s commitment to Vision 2022 and the mission, core values and strategic goals of the university, both the Interdisciplinary Studies (IS) B.A. and the Science, Technology and Society (STS) Minors empower students with holistic, interdisciplinary experiences that prepare them for success in the global economy. Further, the CLA has repeatedly reaffirmed its commitment to ensure that students “develop the ability to understand, appreciate, and engage with the ways that different disciplines approach common problems.”¹

In open communication with all department chairs and program directors and the Interim Dean of CLA, we propose a reorganization to form a new department housing the Interdisciplinary Studies B.A. program and the Science, Technology and Society minors program. Reorganization will allow the college to support, teach and provide learning opportunities for students to develop an integrated understanding of important problems. Further, it provides students and faculty with interdisciplinary interests an intellectual home that allows them to develop their complementary and collaborative expertise. Finally, a single department structure provides the resources and support capable of addressing the increased demand in the minors and major programs in the most efficient manner.

Background

The Chancellor’s Office approved the revision of the Interdisciplinary Studies (IS) B.A. on 18 August 2018.² The IS program is designed to be flexible enough to accommodate students transferring from other majors, yet also focused enough to provide students with a coherent and rigorous baccalaureate education. The goal of the Interdisciplinary Studies program is to meet the needs of two student populations: (1) students whose major was not a good fit and who have had difficulty transferring into a new major, and (2) students whose academic goals cannot be best met through pre-existing major and minor options. The IS major is open to internal transfers only and provides an intellectual interdisciplinary home that supports the university’s Graduation Initiative goals. In addition to a set of core courses, IS students must select one of seven areas of expertise: Arts & the Human Experience; Ethics, Law & Justice; Global Studies; Health, Culture & Society; Science, Technology & Society; Social Sustainability; or Technology & Human Expression.

The Academic Senate approved four new Science, Technology & Society Minors in 2015 to encourage interdisciplinary integration, knowledge and experiences at the intersection of science, technology and society. The four minors are, in alphabetical order, (1) Ethics, Public Policy, Science, Technology and Society; (2) Gender, Race, Culture, Science, Technology and Society; (3) Media Arts, Science, Technology and Society; and (4) Science and Risk

² As part of the revision process, the Chancellor’s Office also approved the conversion of the existing, but suspended BA in Interdisciplinary Studies major from self-support in Extended Education to state-support in the College of Liberal Arts.
Communication. The four minors are united around a common introductory and capstone course with a separate set of required core courses and electives for each minor.

Starting in 2015, the four STS minors have been administered by a program director. In some cases, the director also served as the director of the Interdisciplinary Studies in the Liberal Arts program. As of fall 2018, both the Interdisciplinary Studies major and the Science, Technology and Society minors are run under the auspices of one director. During the 2018-2019 academic year, the ISLA program is hiring for Director of the STS minors and the IS major.

Rationale for a New Department

The new department is necessary to provide an intellectual hub for students to pursue interdisciplinary work efficiently, minimizing time to graduation while providing a set of robust and meaningful integrative experiences. Importantly, from the student perspective, a department reduces barriers in navigating Cal Poly’s organizational complexity, provides resources to ensure appropriate career and post-graduate related learning, increases targeted advising, and enables meaningful mentorship for senior projects and research. Each of these is important in achieving Cal Poly’s Graduation Initiative goals. Each of these is also particularly important for the success of interdisciplinary programs.

While most departments and programs within the college are to some degree interdisciplinary, there is also ample evidence to suggest that such work and learning are better supported in environments and processes underpinned by interdisciplinary thinking and approaches. The goal of the new department is not to isolate faculty and students from other departments within the CLA but rather to create a department that serves as a natural hub for interdisciplinary work in its teaching, research and service.

Further, the IS major is currently the only major fully housed within the College of Liberal Arts that does not operate within a department structure and still only exists as a program. As evidenced in the table below, we anticipate increasing student demand for the IS major as it becomes fully operational. As evidenced by the success of the Science, Technology and Society minors demonstrated in the table below, students at Cal Poly are clearly seeking opportunities to pursue interdisciplinary work focused on issues and skills they wish to develop. Combined with the increasing success of the STS minors, such growth places tremendous pressure on programs that do not have the opportunity to retain dedicated tenure line faculty or the ability of students to efficiently complete degree requirements and graduate in a timely manner.

---

3 In 2016, the Humanities (HUM) program and prefix courses were renamed Interdisciplinary Studies in the Liberal Arts (ISLA) to better reflect the offerings and programs existing under the prefix.
Table 1. Student Demand Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>STS Enrollment</th>
<th>Anticipated STS Enrollment</th>
<th>Anticipated IS Enrollment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2023</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the most basic level, a department is necessary to ensure that the Interdisciplinary Studies major and the Science, Technology and Society minors can continue to provide holistic, experiential and vibrant learning opportunities for students. The departmental structure ensures that these students and programs are not relegated to lesser positions within the college and university structure. It creates opportunities for faculty to continue to invest in providing interdisciplinarily rich environments by recognizing the value and centrality of such work. It provides students avenues through which they can graduate in a timely manner with a degree that supports a wide variety of career-ready skills.

**Resource Implications of a new Interdisciplinary Studies in the Liberal Arts Department**

Many of the resources to support the new department are already in place or secured. There are currently five tenure-line faculty attached to the STS Program via Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs). There is currently a search underway for a STS/IS Director. The budget for the STS Program and IS Major have already been approved and accounted for as part of the approval process for the new major and as regular operating practices of the CLA.

**Faculty, Administrative, and Staff positions**

*Department Chair*

The makeup of the faculty will be reorganized in the new department under a Department Chair.

*Faculty*

We anticipate meeting the faculty needs for the new department in a number of ways. First, faculty within the CLA engaged in interdisciplinary work will have the opportunity to move all or part of their tenure-line appointment to the new department via a process approved by all department chairs, program directors and the Interim Dean.

---

Second, there are a number of faculty formally attached to the existing Science, Technology and Society minors. Between 2014 and 2018, the CLA hired five faculty (Coleen Carrigan, Matthew Harsh, Jim Werner, Brian Beaton and Martine Lappe') who share their primary teaching, research and service responsibilities between the four minors and tenure-home departments within the college. The division of teaching, research and service responsibilities between the tenure departments and STS is outlined within each faculty member's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). We anticipate that the STS component of their MOUs would transfer over from the existing STS Program to the new department. In addition, the STS/IS Director to be hired in the 2018-2019 academic year will likely be 1.0 FTE in the new department, assuming a new department is formed.

Finally, there are a number of lecture- and tenure-line faculty attached to specific course proposals within the new IS major. The table below presents faculty for the core courses in the IS Major and the STS Minors as identified in the course proposals or by offerings since Fall 2016.5

Table 2. Core Courses in Interdisciplinary Studies B.A. and/or Science, Technology and Society Minors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Current/Previous Teaching Faculty</th>
<th>Listed Teaching Faculty on Course Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLA 123 Introduction to Science, Technology and Society</td>
<td>Beaton, Harsh, Lehr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLA 201 Introduction to Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>Bodemer</td>
<td>Adan, Askay, Murphy, Razi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLA 240 Introduction to Media Arts and Technologies</td>
<td>Johnston, Ruszczycky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLA 303 Values and Technology</td>
<td>Johnston, Moon, Scarborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLA 305 Public Engagements with STEM</td>
<td>Kolodziejski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLA 320 Topics and Issues in Values, Media and Culture</td>
<td>Pierce, Westwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLA 340 Media Arts and Technologies: Storytelling</td>
<td>Barros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLA 341 Media Arts and Technologies: Cinematic Processes</td>
<td>Barros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLA 355* Interdisciplinary Research Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adan, Askay, Bodemer, Lowham, Murphy, Navarro, Razi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Please note that ISLA currently houses many interdisciplinary study-abroad courses not included in the second table.
Staff

We believe that the majority of the support staff required for the new department are currently in place or were approved as part of the proposal for the IS major.

**Administrative Support Staff**

Since the launch of the STS Minors in 2015, the staff support for the HUM/ISLA programs has gone through several iterations, most of which were combinations of part-time support from other departments. Currently, the programs are supported by a single ASC I, Nicole Rivera (FTE 1.0). Importantly, the transition to a full-time ASC coincided with the launch of the new IS major, and includes staff support for the Center for Expressive Technologies. During the first two years of the new department, the college has agreed to continue to provide administrative support staff through existing resources.

**Budget**

We anticipate that the new department will require few additional resources above those previously approved for the STS program and IS major. The college currently supports the STS Director, the Administrative Support Coordinator, and the STS courses with the ISLA designation. The budget for the already-approved IS major includes the resources to support the IS major coordinator, additional administrative staff required for the program, and a budget to staff major courses in ISLA and in other departments. We anticipate that these combined resources should largely cover the operational costs of the new department.

**Space**

---

6 The Center for Expressive Technologies is a college level center closely related to the work of the STS minors. It is currently directed by Dr. Matthew Harsh, associate professor in Social Sciences and STS.
The ASC already has an office space and the new IS/STS director will come in with a faculty office as part of the hiring process. We will use regular CLA processes for determining office space to move the program's Administrative Support Coordinator and Chair in proximity to each other as space and resources allow. As indicated in the proposal for the IS major, we do not anticipate requiring additional specialized classroom spaces or other facilities. The STS faculty already have access to existing research space in Building 52 and we anticipate that they would still have access to this space as part of the new department. Space resources and maintenance of these spaces have already been accounted for in the normal operations of the CLA.
6 November 2018

Academic Senate
Cal Poly — San Luis Obispo

Dear Members of the Academic Senate,

Thank you for your consideration of the proposed reorganization and change of administrative status for the Interdisciplinary Studies Program and the Science, Technology and Society Program. As department chairs, program directors and members of the College Council, we enthusiastically and unanimously support this proposal for the ways it will support student success and faculty development.

We believe that reorganization will allow the college to support, teach and provide learning opportunities for students based in an interdisciplinary and integrated understanding of important problems. Importantly, the new department creates an intellectual hub for students to pursue interdisciplinary work efficiently, minimizing time to graduation while providing a set of robust and meaningful integrative experiences.

From the student perspective, a department reduces barriers in navigating Cal Poly’s organizational complexity, provides resources to ensure appropriate career and post-graduate related learning, increases targeted advising, and enables meaningful mentorship for senior projects and research. By providing students and faculty with interdisciplinary interests an intellectual home in the college, a department encourages the development of their complementary and collaborative expertise.

Finally, we believe a single department structure provides the resources and support capable of addressing the increased demand in the minors and major programs in the most efficient manner. As evidenced by the success and growth of the Science, Technology and Society minors, students at Cal Poly are clearly seeking opportunities to pursue interdisciplinary work focused on issues and skills they wish to develop. Combined with the approval of the new Interdisciplinary Studies major, such growth places tremendous pressure on programs that do not have the opportunity to retain dedicated tenure-line faculty or the ability of students to efficiently complete degree requirements and graduate in a timely manner. A department would provide a stable and coherent structure for these two programs, and we support the creation of this department in the College of Liberal Arts.

Sincerely,
Giancarlo Fiorenza  
Chair, Art & Design

Richard Besel  
Chair, Communication Studies

Catherine Waitinas  
Interim Chair, English

Denise Isom  
Chair, Ethnic Studies

Ken Macro  
Chair, Graphic Communication

Kate Murphy  
Chair, History

Brady Teufel  
Interim Chair, Journalism

David Gillette  
Program Director, Liberal Arts and Engineering Studies

W. Terrence Spiller  
Chair, Music

Ken Brown  
Chair, Philosophy

Elizabeth Lowham  
Program Director, Interdisciplinary Studies, Science, Technology and Society Chair, Political Science

Jasna Jovanovic  
Chair, Psychology and Child Development

Terry Jones  
Chair, Social Sciences

Josh Machamer  
Chair, Theatre and Dance

Jane Lehr  
Chair, Women’s & Gender Studies

Fernando Fabio Sanchez  
Chair, World Languages & Cultures
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dustin Stegner
   Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Kathryn Rummell
     Interim Dean, College of Liberal Arts

DATE: November 29, 2018

CC: Kathleen Enz Finken, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
    Scott Dawson, Dean, Orfalea College of Business
    Amy Fleischer, Dean, College of Engineering
    Christine Theodoropoulos, Dean, College of Architecture & Environmental Design
    Andrew Thulin, Dean, College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences
    Dean Wendt, Dean, College of Science and Mathematics

SUBJECT: Resolution on Creation of New Department for Interdisciplinary Studies in the Liberal Arts

This memo formally acknowledges approval of the above-entitled Academic Senate resolution and proposal to create a new department, Interdisciplinary Studies in the Liberal Arts, by the Deans’ Council. The Deans’ Council endorsed the proposal at its November 26, 2018 meeting.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
CHAPTER 1: PREFACE

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution establishes a statement of policy about the proposal and revision of university-level faculty personnel policies. Policies and statements in the attached policy document are derived from AS-650-06, AS-725-11, AS-752-12, and AS-859-18. It supersedes AS-829-17.

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee is constructing a document entitled “University Faculty Personnel Policies” (UFPP) to house all university-level faculty personnel policies; and

WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that “The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee construct UFPP by proposing university-level faculty personnel policies to the Senate in the form of chapters or portions of chapters of UFPP according to the procedures approved in AS-829-17”; and

WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that “By the end of Spring 2020 Colleges and other faculty units reorganize their faculty personnel policy documents to conform their documents to the chapter structure of UFPP”; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy document contained at the end of the attached report “Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: CHAPTER 1: PREFACE” be established as Chapter 1: Preface of UFPP, and be it further

RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents by Spring 2020 to have chapter 1 of their documents be a Preface modeled after that of UFPP.

Proposed by: Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: December 17, 2018

(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:
CHAPTER 1: PREFACE

The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies. This process specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda. Using the new process, FAC will replace the current University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document piece by piece to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document. FAC may then employ the same process to update sections of the new UFPP on an as-needed basis.

The guiding principles in reforming the UFPA into the new UFPP are the following:

- Clarify existing policies that are common and already in place across the university.
- Standardize procedures for faculty evaluation at the university level.
- Set baseline expectations and offer guiding principles with directives to the colleges and departments to specify their criteria accordingly attuned to the disciplinary considerations specific to their programs.
- Establish a common structure for all personnel policy documents across campus.

The Senate has approved a resolution (AS-859-18) establishing the general structure of the UFPP in the form of its main chapter divisions, each containing thematically unified selections of policy:

1. Preface
2. Faculty Appointments
3. Personnel Files
4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes
5. Evaluation Processes
6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns
7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria
8. Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services
9. Evaluation of Professional Development
10. Evaluation of Service
11. Governance
12. Workload
13. Appendices

FAC is proposing to the Senate individual chapters of UFPP, each covered by its own Senate resolution. A draft of one of these chapters follows in this document, preceded by a summary of its content, impact, and implementation, and a description of feedback received on this proposed chapter.

Summary of Chapter 1: Preface

The Preface of UFPP offers the guiding principles for its faculty policies in the form of Cal Poly's vision and mission statements and the statement of Cal Poly's commitment to the teacher-scholar model. It
Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:
CHAPTER 1: PREFACE

also includes an account of the purpose and scope of the document in relation to the various forms of legislation, contract provisions, local Academic Senate resolutions, or any other documents that inform and establish our faculty personnel policies. The Preface directs colleges and the Library to maintain and update their own personnel policy documents in accord with UFPP. It closes with a statement of the Academic Senate established procedures for composing and revising sections of UFPP.

Impact on Existing Policy

This Preface gives a new form of expression to pre-existing policies, values, provisions and requirements, but does not establish new policies. The statements of policies in the Preface were established by Academic Senate resolutions. The Preface states that by the Senate action establishing the Preface as a chapter of UFPP, its formulation of those policies supersedes those in its originating resolutions. It thereby clarifies the policy history related to the provisions of this portion of UFPP.

Implementation

The establishment of UFPP by the Academic Senate would oblige the Colleges to restructure their faculty personnel policy documents into the same chapter division as UFPP. When a chapter of UFPP is approved by the Academic Senate and ratified by the President, colleges will now have a focused area of new or revised policy that they must consult and, if necessary, use to revise their documents accordingly.

Current college documents typically begin with guiding statements and include provisions for revising the policy document.

For colleges with up-to-date formulations of their values and mission, procedures for policy revision, etc., this imposition on the colleges would be as insignificant as placing the heading of "Chapter 1: Preface" over their existing statements of guiding principles and and their procedures for revising their documents. Colleges with out-of-date prefatory statements and policy revision procedures would take on the task to update them, now with some guidance of what is expected for this portion of their personnel policies document.

Colleges should cover the topics in UFPP, but may add additional subdivisions as necessary.

Feedback from Faculty Units

When proposing personnel policies, FAC consults with faculty units about the proposed change so the faculty units may offer feedback on the proposal. FAC then considers this feedback when revising the proposed policy and sending it to the Senate.

Faculty units provided no specific feedback on the elements of the Preface.

What follows is the proposed text of the chapter...
1. Preface

1.1. Summary

1.1.1. The prefatory materials in the document include a general statement of Cal Poly's vision and mission statements, along with Cal Poly's commitment to the teacher-scholar model. It states the hierarchy of policy in the CSU. It also includes the formal statement of the Senate personnel policy revision process by which portions of this document are composed and revised. Colleges and departments can put in the Preface of their personnel policies documents their own mission/vision statements, any guiding principles that inform their understanding and implementation of the teacher/scholar model, and any policies or procedures for revising their policy documents.

1.2. Vision Statement

1.2.1. Cal Poly will be the nation's premier comprehensive polytechnic university, an innovative institution that develops and inspires whole-system thinkers to serve California and help solve global challenges. (CAP 110.2)

1.3. Mission Statement

1.3.1. Cal Poly fosters teaching, scholarship, and service in a Learn by Doing environment in which students, staff, and faculty are partners in discovery. As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly promotes the application of theory to practice. As a comprehensive institution, Cal Poly provides a balanced education in the arts, sciences, and technology, while encouraging cross-disciplinary and co-curricular experiences. As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility. (CAP 110.1, AS-650-06)

1.4. Teacher-Scholar Model

1.4.1. Cal Poly faculty have adopted the Teacher-Scholar Model defined as participation in both teaching and scholarship (AS-725-11). The Teacher-Scholar Model includes, when possible, meaningful student engagement in faculty scholarly activity and inclusion of scholarship in teaching to create vibrant learning experiences for students. The resolution defined scholarship in general terms as the scholarships of discovery, application, integration, and teaching/learning (Boyer, Scholarship Reconsidered, 1990), implemented in a discipline-specific manner while mindful of Cal Poly's mission. The Teacher-Scholar Model allows for individual variations in the balance between teaching and scholarly activities. The personnel policies in this document promote the development of teacher/scholars.

1.5. Purpose and Scope of this Document

1.5.1. University level personnel policies for faculty are contained in this document, titled "University Faculty Personnel Policies" (abbreviated as UFPP). It includes the University statement of policy, criteria and university-wide procedures for faculty personnel actions. This document is based on Title V, Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), and the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If Title V, HEERA and/or the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement is in conflict with the provisions in these criteria and procedures, the terms of Title V, HEERA and/or the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement, and not the provisions of these procedures and criteria, shall govern.

1.5.2. Policies in this document are derived largely from the 2013 revision of University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), which is included in the appendices to this
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document. Policies stated in UFPP supersede their prior formulations in UFPA. Until superseded by policies in UFPP, the policies in UFPA remain in effect.

1.5.3. Personnel policies established by Academic Senate resolutions are commonly cited throughout this document following the form of “AS-XXX-YY”. Since each chapter of UFPP is established by Academic Senate action, the formulation of policies in UFPP supersedes the formulations of those policies in prior Academic Senate resolutions.

1.5.4. Policy statements contained in UFPP are also derived from sources beyond the scope of the Academic Senate, such as provisions in the CBA, HEERA, or Title V. Policies derived from the Collective Bargaining Agreement (i.e. the CSU faculty contract) are cited by CBA article and section. Policies from Cal Poly’s Campus Administrative Policies (CAP) are cited by their CAP numbers. Other documents establishing policies are cited by descriptive titles (e.g. administrative memos cited by their source and date). In these cases, the verbal formulation of the policy is approved by the Senate, but the statement of these policies in their original source governs.

1.5.5. Colleges and the Library shall have their own personnel policy documents to extend, develop, and apply university level policies in ways that are suited to the programs within the college. In the case of any conflict between college and university policies, the university policy shall govern. College personnel policies should remain current in relation to the policies that govern over the college policies, including university policies, the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement, HEERA, and Title V. Colleges shall define a process for reviewing and updating their personnel policies. College personnel policies must be approved by the Dean and the Provost. College personnel policies that are currently in effect shall be made available on the Academic Personnel website.

1.5.6. Departments may also have personnel policy documents. Department level personnel policies extend, develop, and apply college level policies in ways that are suited to the disciplines within the department. In the case of any conflict between a department’s policies and college or university policies, the college or university policies shall govern. Departments opting to draft their own personnel policies shall define the process for composing and approving such policies. Department level personnel policies shall be approved by their college Dean and the Provost. Department personnel policies that are currently in effect shall be made available on the Academic Personnel website.

1.6. Procedure for Updating University Faculty Personnel Policies

1.6.1. This section of the Preface states the policies related to the composition and revision of sections of UFPP. The policies in this section are established by AS-XXX-19 which is based on the following Academic Senate resolutions:

1.6.2. Cal Poly’s university-level faculty personnel policies are composed and approved by means of shared governance between faculty and administration. Personnel policies are established or revised either by means of Academic Senate resolutions or consent agenda items, both of which must be ratified by the university President.

1.6.3. The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee proposes university level faculty personnel policies to the Senate in the form of chapters or portions of chapters of the University Faculty Personnel Policies document (UFPP).

1.6.4. University-wide faculty personnel policy proposals from the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee may appear on the Academic Senate meeting agenda as consent items at the discretion of the Academic Senate Executive Committee. The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee submits the personnel policy proposals to the
Academic Senate Executive Committee. The Academic Senate Executive Committee determines whether and how the personnel policy proposals shall be placed on the Academic Senate agenda.

1.6.5. When the Academic Senate Executive Committee places personnel policy revisions on the Academic Senate consent agenda, any senator may request an item be removed from the consent agenda no later than one week prior to the meeting. Items removed from the Academic Senate consent agenda will be placed on the Senate agenda as business items. Items not removed from the consent agenda are considered approved by the Academic Senate on the meeting date of the consent agenda.

1.6.6. Personnel policy revisions that are on the Senate agenda shall consist of reports attached to resolutions. The report contains the proposed revision to university policy and all background or explanatory information about the change in policy. The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee chair (or designee) is responsible for presenting the policy proposal to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and to the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate Chair (or designee) may invite interested parties concerning the policy proposals to be present at the meetings where pulled proposals will be discussed. Queries from senators regarding policy proposals are directed to the chair of the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee.

1.6.7. Proposed revisions to university-wide faculty personnel policies should include as many of the following as are relevant to the proposal:

- The text of the proposed policy.
- The text of superseded policy (if available).
- Summary of the proposed changes noting especially any revisions to reflect existing policy stated elsewhere, or any proposed changes in policy.
- Citation of relevant documents, which may include: Academic Senate resolutions, provisions in the collective bargaining agreement, administrative memos, existing policy documents in need of revision, superseded policy statements.
- Expected effects of the policy change on faculty units.
- The nature of consultation with affected faculty units.
- The timeline and nature of implementation.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
CHAPTER 2: FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution establishes the statement of policy about faculty appointments. Its impact on existing policy is described in the attached report.¹

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee is constructing a document entitled “University Faculty Personnel Policies” (UFPP) to house all university-level faculty personnel policies; and

WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that “The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee construct UFPP by proposing university-level faculty personnel policies to the Senate in the form of chapters or portions of chapters of UFPP according to the procedures approved in AS-829-17”; and

WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that “By the end of Spring 2020 Colleges and other faculty units reorganize their faculty personnel policy documents to conform their documents to the chapter structure of UFPP”; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy document contained at the end of the attached report “Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: CHAPTER 2: FACULTY APPOINTMENTS” be established as Chapter 2: Faculty Appointments of UFPP, and be it further

RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents by Spring 2020 to have chapter 2 of their documents cover faculty appointments as per chapter 2 of UFPP.

Proposed by: Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: December 17, 2018

¹ (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies. This process specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda. Using the new process, FAC will replace the current University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document piece by piece to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document. FAC may then employ the same process to update sections of the new UFPP on an as-needed basis.

The guiding principles in reforming the UFPA into the new UFPP are the following:

- Clarify existing policies that are common and already in place across the university.
- Standardize procedures for faculty evaluation at the university level.
- Set baseline expectations and offer guiding principles with directives to the colleges and departments to specify their criteria accordingly attuned to the disciplinary considerations specific to their programs.
- Establish a common structure for all personnel policy documents across campus.

The Senate has approved a resolution (AS-859-18) establishing the general structure of the UFPP in the form of its main chapter divisions, each containing thematically unified selections of policy:

1. Preface
2. Faculty Appointments
3. Personnel Files
4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes
5. Evaluation Processes
6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns
7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria
8. Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services
9. Evaluation of Professional Development
10. Evaluation of Service
11. Governance
12. Workload
13. Appendices

FAC is proposing to the Senate individual chapters of UFPP, each covered by its own Senate resolution. A draft of one of these chapters follows in this document, preceded by a summary of its content, impact, and implementation, and a description of feedback received on this proposed chapter.

Summary of Chapter 2: Faculty Appointments

This chapter covers university-level requirements for all forms of faculty appointments, including:
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- Tenure-track
- Full-time lecturer
- Part-time pool lecturer
- Non-instructional faculty

It includes the required application elements and the baseline recruitment policies, referring to the separate recruitment procedures document maintained by Academic Personnel. It directs the Colleges and Library to determine their criteria for appointment.

Impact on Existing Policy

This chapter on Faculty Appointments gives a new form of expression to pre-existing policies and requirements, but does not establish new policies. Many of the provisions of this chapter are driven by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (especially for lecturer appointments).

Implementation

The establishment of UFPP by the Academic Senate would oblige the Colleges and the Library to restructure their faculty personnel policy documents into the same chapter division as UFPP. When a chapter of UFPP is approved by the Academic Senate and ratified by the President, they will now have a focused area of new or revised policy that they must consult and, if necessary, use to revise their documents accordingly.

Current College and Library personnel policy documents typically include sections on faculty appointment. The establishment of this chapter of UFPP would require these provisions to be contained in Chapter 2, which would be called “Faculty Appointments.” For those with well-developed personnel policy documents whose appointment policies are up-to-date, the implementation of this change would be insignificant. Those whose policies are out-of-date would now have some guidance for taking on the task of updating their policies.

The Colleges and the Library may subdivide this chapter to clarify distinctions between appointment requirements for different classifications of faculty according to their needs.

Feedback from Faculty Units

When proposing personnel policies, FAC consults with faculty units about the proposed change so the faculty units may offer feedback on the proposal. FAC then considers this feedback when revising the proposed policy and sending it to the Senate.

The College of Liberal Arts provided editorial suggestions to clarify policy statements.

CLA also raised questions about practices in the colleges that were not reflected as university policy. The response from FAC about these questions consisted of expressing the goal of revising the policy
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statements without revising policies. Practices common among the Colleges (and the Library) that are not reflected in university policy would remain college-level (or library) policy until some later date when FAC can consider whether to revise university-policy accordingly. The practice in questions concerns the requiring of statements of a commitment to diversity and inclusion in faculty recruitment processes.

The Library also offered some editorial suggestions.

What follows is the proposed text of the chapter...
2. Faculty Appointments

2.1. Summary

2.1.1. This chapter provides university-wide recruitment and appointment policies for faculty. Policies in this chapter refer to but do not include the more detailed hiring procedures maintained by Academic Personnel. Colleges and departments include in this chapter any specific hiring policies that go beyond the university-level policies, including any statements of their own specific criteria and requirements for their faculty appointments.

2.2. Tenure-Track Recruitment

2.2.1. Current University tenure-track recruitment procedures, as well as information about contract updates concerning academic appointments, are accessible at the Academic Personnel website.

2.2.2. Advertising and Recruitment: Tenure-track positions must be advertised nationally. Academic Personnel will place an advertisement for all tenure-track searches in publications listed in documents on the Academic Personnel website. These advertisements meet the requirement to advertise the position nationally. Departments must also place all additional advertisements listed in the required recruitment plan. A minimum 30-day period is required between the latest of all ad publication dates (whether online or print) and the closing date or review begin date. For online advertising the 30 days is counted from the first day of appearance.

2.2.3. Applications for tenure-track faculty positions must be submitted to the university’s applicant tracking system. Application packages must include at least the following items:

- Current Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- At least three letters of reference
- Unofficial transcripts at the time of application (Official transcripts required for appointment)
- Cover Letter (preferred)
- Other materials required by the college or department

2.2.4. The Search Committee, consisting of elected tenured or probationary faculty, shall use procedures as determined by the University’s Procedure for Recruiting Tenure-Track Faculty and any approved college or departmental recruitment policies and procedures in addition to those listed below. With the department’s recommendation and the dean’s permission, FERP faculty may serve on the Search Committee. With the department’s recommendation, probationary faculty may serve on the Search Committee (CBA 12.22.a).

2.2.5. Each search committee must have one trained Employment Equity Facilitator (EEF) who shall normally be a tenured faculty member and may not be the department chair/head or the chair of the Search Committee. Information about the role of the EEF and about training for the EEF positions is available on the website of the Office of Equal Opportunity.

2.2.6. The Search Committee members shall give careful consideration to temporary employees who have been evaluated by the department or equivalent unit. The search committee members, or screening sub-committee members, and department chair/head shall review and sign the Personnel Action File for these candidates.
2.2.7. The Search Committee shall provide a list of acceptable candidates as finalists to the department chair/head. The department chair/head shall provide appointment recommendations to the dean.

2.3. Tenure-Track Qualifications

2.3.1. Normally, a doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree shall be required for appointment to a tenure-track position. The appropriate terminal degree will be determined by the department and approved by the dean. In the areas where a doctorate is required, candidates who have completed all doctoral requirements but the dissertation (ABD) may also be considered during the recruitment process. However, all minimum degree requirements must be completed prior to the appointment start date.

2.3.2. Colleges and departments shall specify the relevant evidence of potential for excellence in university-level teaching, scholarship and service. Evidence of potential for teaching excellence in the department and/or college may include experience or potential to teach using learn by doing, project-based learning, service learning and other teaching methods that are common at Cal Poly. Evidence of potential for ongoing research, scholarship, and/or creative activity should show how candidates will remain current and contribute to the knowledge and developments within their discipline/professional field, and obtain promotion. Evidence of service should show potential to make substantive contributions to the department, college, and/or university.

2.3.3. Applicants for appointment with tenure shall normally be tenured professors or tenured librarians at other universities. Exceptions to this provision must be carefully documented. The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in a management position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by tenured faculty in the appropriate department (CBA 13.17).

2.4. Lecturer Recruitment

2.4.1. Department chairs make the hiring recommendation to the deans who are the appointing authorities in the colleges responsible for approving and hiring lecturers. Department faculty may be involved in screening or vetting applicants for the part-time pools or by serving on search committees for full-time lecturer recruitments.

2.4.2. Full-time lecturer appointments require a search with a process similar that of tenure-track searches. Colleges or departments determine the appropriate interview format for the full-time lecturers.

2.4.3. Advertisements need to be posted and the requisition must be open for a minimum of 4 weeks before review of applicants can begin.

2.4.4. Required documents for full-time lecturer recruitment:
   - Application
   - CV
   - Cover letter (preferred)
   - List of CSU courses taught
   - Transcripts
   - Name and email address of 3 references.

2.4.5. Criteria for appointment for full-time lecturers are determined by the college or department. Initial appointment is for 1 academic year with a possible 1-year extension. Full-time lecturer appointments are unconditional and their work
assignment cannot be reduced once these appointments are made. The department must meet the entitlements of other lecturers listed in the order of assignment in article 12.29 of the CBA.

2.4.6. Most departments create a part-time lecturer pool that allows candidates to apply for consideration for appointments throughout the academic year as needed to fill positions. Applicants may apply at the start of the academic year for consideration of work assignments in any quarter or they may apply prior to the winter or spring terms. These pools are opened in April for the subsequent academic year after the spring quarter appointments have been made. Department chairs may review qualifications of the applicants and make quarter-by-quarter appointments following the order of assignment in accordance with article 12.29 of the CBA. Applicants who have worked for the department and been evaluated should be given careful consideration according to article 12.7 of the CBA. Those who have had a part-time assignment for all three quarters of an academic year and are appointed to teach in the fall quarter of the following academic year shall be appointed with a one-year part-time entitlement per article 12.3 of the CBA.

2.4.7. Advertisements must to be posted and the lecturer pool must be open for a minimum of 2 weeks before review of candidates can begin. Part-time pools stay open until the first week of spring quarter.

2.4.8. Required documents for part-time lecturer pool recruitment:
- Application
- CV
- Cover letter (preferred)
- List of CSU courses taught
- Transcripts
- Name and email address of 3 references.

2.4.9. Criteria for appointment and level of appointment are determined by colleges or departments. Initial appointments for part-time pool lecturers can be for 1, 2 or 3 quarters. Initial appointment for 3 quarters should be for less than 45 units.

2.4.10. Emergency lecturer appointments may occur for urgent and unplanned needs when no qualified candidates are available in the part-time lecturer pool and there isn’t time to run a part-time lecturer pool recruitment. Such urgent and unplanned needs to appoint a lecturer may arise from another faculty member’s unplanned leave of absence or a last-minute course section being opened. If this need is expected to continue, the department should plan ahead for future terms and either run a recruitment or advertise to increase the part-time pool to meet the anticipated needs of the department.

2.5. Other Faculty Recruitments for Library, Counseling, and Athletics

2.5.1. Other faculty units should identify in their personnel policy documents the recruitment policies pertinent to their assignments.

2.5.2. Other faculty recruitments should conform at least with the policies for instructional lecturer recruitments.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
CHAPTER 3: PERSONNEL FILES

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution establishes the statement of policy about the faculty personnel action file and working personnel action file. Its impact on existing policy is described in the attached report.1

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee is constructing a document entitled “University Faculty Personnel Policies” (UFPP) to house all university-level faculty personnel policies; and

WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that “The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee construct UFPP by proposing university-level faculty personnel policies to the Senate in the form of chapters or portions of chapters of UFPP according to the procedures approved in AS-829-17”; and

WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that “By the end of Spring 2020 Colleges and other faculty units reorganize their faculty personnel policy documents to conform their documents to the chapter structure of UFPP”; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy document contained at the end of the attached report “Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: CHAPTER 3: PERSONNEL FILES” be established as Chapter 3: Personnel Files of UFPP, and be it further

RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents by Spring 2020 to have chapter 3 of their documents cover personnel files as per chapter 3 of UFPP.

Proposed by: Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: December 17, 2018

1 (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards. (2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions. (3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
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The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies. This process specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda. Using the new process, FAC will replace the current University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document piece by piece to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document. FAC may then employ the same process to update sections of the new UFPP on an as-needed basis.

The guiding principles in reforming the UFPA into the new UFPP are the following:

- Clarify existing policies that are common and already in place across the university.
- Standardize procedures for faculty evaluation at the university level.
- Set baseline expectations and offer guiding principles with directives to the colleges and departments to specify their criteria accordingly attuned to the disciplinary considerations specific to their programs.
- Establish a common structure for all personnel policy documents across campus.

The Senate has approved a resolution (AS-859-18) establishing the general structure of the UFPP in the form of its main chapter divisions, each containing thematically unified selections of policy:

1. Preface
2. Faculty Appointments
3. Personnel Files
4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes
5. Evaluation Processes
6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns
7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria
8. Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services
9. Evaluation of Professional Development
10. Evaluation of Service
11. Governance
12. Workload
13. Appendices

FAC is proposing to the Senate individual chapters of UFPP, each covered by its own Senate resolution. A draft of one of these chapters follows in this document, preceded by a summary of its content, impact, and implementation, and a description of feedback received on this proposed chapter.

Summary of Chapter 3: Personnel Files

This chapter covers university-level requirements concerning the Personnel Action File (PAF) and Working Personnel Action File (WPAF).
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It is media neutral, and so it conforms with the new implementation of Interfolio electronic WPAF and evaluation processes.

Its provisions state baseline expectations common across campus with directives and allowances to the Colleges and Library to augment these baseline requirements according to the nature of their programs.

Impact on Existing Policy

This chapter on Faculty Appointments gives a standard and clarified expression to pre-existing policies and practices, but does not establish new policies. Many of the provisions of this chapter are driven by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Implementation

The establishment of UFPP by the Academic Senate would oblige the Colleges and the Library to restructure their faculty personnel policy documents into the same chapter division as UFPP. When a chapter of UFPP is approved by the Academic Senate and ratified by the President, they will now have a focused area of new or revised policy that they must consult and, if necessary, use to revise their documents accordingly.

Current College and Library personnel policy documents typically include sections on personnel files. The establishment of this chapter of UFPP would require those documents to contain these provisions into Chapter 3 and call it “Personnel Files.” Implementation of this change would be insignificant for those with well-developed personnel policy documents with up-to-date policies and expectations about personnel files. Those whose policies are out-of-date would now have some guidance for taking on the task of updating their policies.

Material in this chapter may form the basis for process guides the Colleges and Library can draft and include in the appendices of their personnel policy documents.

Feedback from Faculty Units

When proposing personnel policies, FAC consults with faculty units about the proposed change so the faculty units may offer feedback on the proposal. FAC then considers this feedback when revising the proposed policy and sending it to the Senate.

The College of Liberal Arts provided editorial suggestions to clarify policy statements.

What follows is the proposed text of the chapter...
3. Personnel Files

3.1. Summary

3.1.1. This chapter defines the university-wide requirements and policies for the Personnel Action File (PAF) and Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). Colleges and departments may augment these university-level requirements to address their discipline-specific needs.

3.2. Personnel Action File (PAF)

3.2.1. The Personnel Action File (PAF) is the one official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee. (CBA 11.1)

3.2.2. The college dean or equivalent supervising administrator is the custodian of the PAF. Contents of the Personnel Action File stored in electronic format shall be stored securely, and access to the file shall be limited to those individuals authorized to view the file under the terms of the CBA. (CBA 11.1)

3.2.3. Contents of the PAF include:

- Hiring materials/letters of appointment
- CV retained from WPAF
- Index retained from WPAF
- Performance and periodic evaluation reports (AP 109, dean and provost letters)
- Leaves/grants/awards reports
- Results of student evaluations of faculty
- Institutional data about teaching assignments
- Other personnel related material.

3.3. Purpose of Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

3.3.1. During the time of periodic evaluation and performance review of a faculty unit employee, the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), which includes all information, materials, recommendations, responses and rebuttals, shall be incorporated by reference into the Personnel Action File. (CBA 11.8).

3.3.2. The WPAF is compiled by the applicant to support consideration for a periodic evaluation or performance review. Contents of the WPAF stored in electronic format shall be stored securely, and access to the file shall be limited to those individuals authorized to view the file. All supporting materials in the WPAF should be referenced and clearly explained.

3.3.3. The WPAF for retention and tenure reviews shall cover the entire employment period at Cal Poly. The WPAF for promotion and lecturer range elevation shall cover the period at rank or range at Cal Poly.

3.3.4. The Provost establishes a specific deadline by which the WPAF is declared complete for each type of personnel action. Insertion of materials after that date must have the approval of the college peer review committee (CPRC) and is limited to items that became accessible after the deadline. The table of contents or index should be updated to reflect any material added to the file during the course of the evaluation cycle.

3.4. Contents of WPAF

3.4.1. Minimum requirements for a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) for Instructional Faculty

- Index
- CV
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- Professional Development Plan
- Evidence for Teaching
- Evidence for Professional Development, (Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity)
- Evidence for Currency in Field
- Evidence for Service

3.4.2. Any student communications or evaluations provided outside of the regular student evaluation process must be identified by name to be included in a PAF or WPAF (CBA 15.17). Anonymous surveys from students conducted outside the official university-run student evaluation process shall not be included in WPAFs. Anonymous communications shall not be included in WPAFs. Candidates may summarize their own assessment of any unofficial anonymous student surveys in their narrative documents.

3.4.3. Colleges and departments may specify additional required contents of WPAFs.

3.4.4. Colleges shall define in their personnel policies the appropriate evidence for Teaching, Professional Development, and Service appropriate to the nature of faculty appointments.

3.4.5. The Library, Counseling, and Athletics shall define in their personnel policies the appropriate evidence categories for their faculty.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
CHAPTER 4: RESPONSIBILITIES IN FACULTY EVALUATION

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution establishes the statement of policy about the responsibilities of all those involved in faculty evaluation. Its impact on existing policy is described in the attached report.¹

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee is constructing a document entitled "University Faculty Personnel Policies" (UFPP) to house all university-level faculty personnel policies; and

WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that "The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee construct UFPP by proposing university-level faculty personnel policies to the Senate in the form of chapters or portions of chapters of UFPP according to the procedures approved in AS-829-17"; and

WHEREAS, AS-859-18 resolved that "By the end of Spring 2020 Colleges and other faculty units reorganize their faculty personnel policy documents to conform their documents to the chapter structure of UFPP"; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy document contained at the end of the attached report “Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: CHAPTER 4: RESPONSIBILITIES IN FACULTY EVALUATION” be established as Chapter 3: Personnel Files of UFPP, and be it further

RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents by Spring 2020 to have chapter 4 of their documents cover responsibilities in faculty evaluation as per chapter 4 of UFPP.

Proposed by: Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: December 17, 2018

¹ (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:
CHAPTER 4: RESPONSIBILITIES IN FACULTY EVALUATION

The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies. This process specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda. Using the new process, FAC will replace the current University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document piece by piece to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document. FAC may then employ the same process to update sections of the new UFPP on an as-needed basis.

The guiding principles in reforming the UFPA into the new UFPP are the following:

- **Clarify existing policies** that are common and already in place across the university.
- **Standardize procedures** for faculty evaluation at the university level.
- **Set baseline expectations and offer guiding principles** with directives to the colleges and departments to specify their criteria accordingly attuned to the disciplinary considerations specific to their programs.
- **Establish a common structure for all personnel policy documents across campus.**

The Senate has approved a resolution (AS-859-18) establishing the general structure of the UFPP in the form of its main chapter divisions, each containing thematically unified selections of policy:

1. Preface
2. Faculty Appointments
3. Personnel Files
4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes
5. Evaluation Processes
6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns
7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria
8. Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services
9. Evaluation of Professional Development
10. Evaluation of Service
11. Governance
12. Workload
13. Appendices

FAC is proposing to the Senate individual chapters of UFPP, each covered by its own Senate resolution. A draft of one of these chapters follows in this document, preceded by a summary of its content, impact, and implementation, and a description of feedback received on this proposed chapter.
### Summary of Chapter 4: Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation

This chapter covers university-level requirements concerning the responsibilities of all those involved in faculty evaluation, including: the candidate under evaluation, department and college peer committees, department chairs and heads, and administrators involved in the evaluation processes.

### Impact on Existing Policy

This chapter on the responsibilities in faculty evaluation gives a standard and clarified expression to pre-existing policies and practices, but does not establish new policies.

Many of the provisions of this chapter are driven by the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The policies not directly specified by the CBA but left to campus discretion remain as they were in our prior University Faculty Personnel Actions document, which is the current university-level governing policy document.

### Implementation

The establishment of UFPP by the Academic Senate would oblige the Colleges and the Library to restructure their faculty personnel policy documents into the same chapter division as UFPP. When a chapter of UFPP is approved by the Academic Senate and ratified by the President, they will now have a focused area of new or revised policy that they must consult and, if necessary, use to revise their documents accordingly.

Current college documents typically describe the responsibilities of the participants in faculty evaluation. Sometimes these descriptions are combined with policies and procedures for conducting the evaluation. This form of guidance is more of a process guide than a policy statement. The establishment of this chapter of UFPP would require colleges to focus their policies on the responsibilities of those involved in evaluation to chapter 4 and call it “Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation.”

For colleges whose account of the responsibilities of those involved in faculty evaluation are clear and up-to-date, and comply with university policy and CBA provisions, placing the statements of those responsibilities into this chapter would be the scope of implementation. Colleges with out-of-date or non-compliant policies about these responsibilities would have some guidance from UFPP about how to bring their documents into compliance. FAC and Academic Personnel have discussed some focused areas of non-compliance with the affected units and they have already taken the necessary steps to become compliant.

Material in this chapter may form the basis for process guides the colleges can draft and include in the appendices of their personnel policy documents.
Feedback from Faculty Units

When proposing personnel policies, FAC consults with faculty units about the proposed change so the faculty units may offer feedback on the proposal. FAC then considers this feedback when revising the proposed policy and sending it to the Senate.

The College of Liberal Arts provided editorial suggestions to clarify policy statements.

What follows is the proposed text of the chapter...
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4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes

4.1. Summary

4.1.1. Faculty evaluation processes have various definable functions that are common across the university, such as the roles of candidates undergoing evaluation, Department Peer Review Committees, Department Chair/Heads, College Peer Review Committees, and administrators such as the Deans and the Provost. This chapter defines the responsibilities of these roles in faculty evaluation. Colleges and departments may specify additional responsibilities of the various roles within the college or department in faculty evaluation.

4.2. Candidates

4.2.1. Faculty subject to evaluation are candidates in the evaluation process. Candidates must provide a complete set of materials that includes evidence appropriate for the nature of the evaluation process and narrative reports pertinent to the purpose of the evaluation. (CBA 15.12)

4.2.2. While faculty scheduled for a mandatory review will be notified by the college, faculty intending to be considered for early promotion to associate professor or professor or early tenure must notify the dean in writing (email is acceptable). This notification shall also be copied to the department chair/head.

4.2.3. Candidates under review must view their own Personnel Action File (PAF) according to access requirements prior to the commencement of a periodic evaluation and sign the PAF Log.

4.2.4. Candidates must assemble and submit a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) by the University established deadline for their evaluation process.

4.2.5. Candidates must provide an updated curriculum vita for placement in their PAF.

4.2.6. Candidates must provide an updated professional development plan for their WPAF.

4.2.7. The ten days following the receipt of an evaluation report from any level of review comprises a rebuttal period during which the candidates may submit a written rebuttal or request to meet with the evaluator(s) to discuss the evaluation. (CBA 15.5)

4.2.8. To acknowledge receipt of an AP 109 evaluation report, candidates must sign the report within the specified timeframe of ten days.

4.3. Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC)

4.3.1. For evaluation processes using a Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC), the initial level of review of the candidate is conducted by the DPRC. Evaluation of tenure-track instructional faculty shall commence with a DPRC level of review. Lecturer faculty evaluation may commence with a DPRC level of review, according to College requirements.

4.3.2. For Periodic Evaluations the department’s probationary and tenured faculty shall elect members of the tenured faculty to serve on DPRCs. Both tenured and probationary faculty may vote on DPRC membership.

4.3.3. Faculty may serve on only one level of review (department PRC, department chair/head, or college PRC). (CBA 15.29) Faculty unit employees being considered for promotion themselves are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees (CBA 15.42). A potential DPRC member with a clear conflict of interest with a faculty member scheduled for review (e.g., partner, very close friend or collaborator) should not stand as a candidate for that DPRC. DPRC members typically will be from the candidate’s own department. However, DPRC members will sometimes need to be recruited outside the department when there is an inadequate
number of faculty in the department who are eligible and available to serve on the DPRC.

4.3.4. For Retention, Promotion or Tenure Performance Evaluations, the DPRC shall consist of at least three elected members of the tenured faculty. DPRC members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. At the request of a department, the President may agree that a faculty unit employee participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program may also engage in deliberations and make recommendations regarding the evaluation of a faculty unit employee. However, faculty committees established for this purpose may not be comprised solely of faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program. Approval shall be obtained from the Dean if a department requests to have faculty in FERP participate as an evaluator member of the DPRC. (CBA 15.2)

4.3.5. All DPRC members shall review both the PAF and the WPAF, signing the log sheet in each file. At least a subset of the DPRC shall observe classroom instruction. The DPRC shall review any professional development plan and offer guidance to the candidate for any needed modifications to that plan. This feedback on the professional development plan is especially important in helping faculty develop a compelling record for eventual promotion. All deliberations of the DPRC shall be confidential (CBA 15.10).

4.3.6. The DPRC shall use forms provided by Academic Personnel for their evaluation report. This report shall critically analyze the evidence on each performance dimension (teaching, professional development, service, and other), and offer any suggestions for improvement. The report shall clearly establish the basis for the conclusions of the report and how any recommendations resulted from the assessment of the evidence.

4.3.7. DPRC evaluation recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee (CBA 15.44). The DPRC shall vote for or against the proposed action (retention, promotion and/or tenure), or, under very rare circumstances, abstain. Abstentions require written explanation. In cases of split votes, the report should reflect the relevant perspectives on the committee and the rationale for the majority decision. In rare instances when agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report, the minority committee member(s) may submit a signed minority report.

4.3.8. The DPRC report shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before sending the evaluation to the department chair/head. If the candidate requests a meeting concerning a rebuttal to the DPRC report, the DPRC shall meet with the candidate within the 10-day rebuttal period. The DPRC shall review any written rebuttal with the option of revising the recommendation or correcting errors in the original report. No other written response, other than acknowledgment of receipt of the rebuttal, shall be provided to the candidate.

4.3.9. Library, Counseling, and Athletic faculty units shall specify in their personnel policies the composition of their peer review committees.

4.4. Department Chair/Head

4.4.1. Department chairs/heads shall conduct their own separate level of review. For evaluation processes using a DPRC, the Department chair/head review shall follow the DPRC review. For evaluation processes not using a DPRC, the Department chair/head level of review initiates the review process.

4.4.2. The department chair/head shall review both the PAF and the WPAF, signing the logs in each file. The department chair/head shall review any DPRC evaluation. The
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department chair/head shall review any rebuttal to the DPRC evaluation from the candidate. The department chair/head shall review any professional development plan and offer guidance to the candidate for any needed modifications to that plan. This feedback on the professional development plan is especially important in helping faculty develop a compelling record for eventual promotion.

4.4.3. Department chairs/heads shall use forms provided by Academic Personnel for their evaluation report. This report shall critically analyze the evidence on each performance dimension (teaching, professional development, service, and other), and offer any suggestions for improvement. The report shall clearly establish the basis for the conclusions of the report and how any recommendations resulted from the assessment of the evidence. The report from the chair/head shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before sending the evaluation to the dean.

4.4.4. If the candidate requests a meeting concerning a rebuttal to the department chair/head’s report, the department chair/head shall meet with the candidate within the 10-day rebuttal period. The department chair/head shall review any written rebuttal with the option of revising the recommendation or correcting errors in the original report. No other written response, other than acknowledgment of receipt of the rebuttal, shall be provided to the candidate. (CBA 15.5)

4.5. College Peer Review Committee (CPRC)

4.5.1. The CPRC provides an additional level of evaluation for candidates undergoing a Performance Evaluation. The CPRC shall consist of up to one full professor from each department. Approval shall be obtained from the Dean if departments will not have a representative. Each member of the CPRC shall be elected by their department’s tenured and probationary faculty for appointment to the CPRC. Colleges may specify further means of selecting CPRC members.

4.5.2. Each CPRC member shall review both the PAF and the WPAF and sign the logs in each file. Each CPRC member shall review the prior levels of evaluation (DPRC and department chair/head) and any rebuttals submitted. All deliberations of the CPRC shall be confidential (CBA 15.10).

4.5.3. Based on the review of the PAF, WPAF, and prior levels of evaluation, the CPRC shall vote for or against the proposed retention, promotion, and/or tenure, or, under rare circumstances, abstain. Abstentions require written explanation. A simple majority of the voting members constitutes the recommendation of the CPRC. The committee shall also rank the promotion candidates in one list. (CBA 15.44-45)

4.5.4. The CPRC shall produce an evaluation report for each candidate under review. This report will critically analyze the evidence on each dimension of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service), both favorable and unfavorable, and produce a narrative clarifying how the evidence was weighed and the conclusions and recommended actions derived. In cases of split votes, the report should reflect the relevant perspectives on the committee and the rationale for the majority decision. In rare instances when agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report, the minority committee member(s) may submit a signed minority report.

4.5.5. The CPRC report shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before sending the evaluation to the dean (CBA 15.5). Candidates may request a meeting and/or submit a rebuttal to the CPRC report within the 10-day rebuttal period. The CPRC shall review rebuttal material with the option of revising the recommended action or correcting errors in the original report; no other written response, other than acknowledgment of receipt of the rebuttal, shall be provided to the candidate.
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4.6. Administrative Evaluators

4.6.1. Administrative evaluators include College Deans, Associate Deans, Library Deans, Department Directors, Vice-Provosts, or the Athletic Director. For instructional tenure-track faculty the administrative evaluator is the College Dean. For lecturer faculty the Dean may designate an Associate Dean to serve as the final level of administrative evaluation.

4.6.2. Administrative evaluators shall review both the PAF and WPAF, signing the logs in each file, as well as all previous levels of evaluation and any rebuttals submitted. The dean shall provide a separate written evaluation. The administrative evaluator’s report shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before placing the evaluation in the faculty member’s PAF.

4.6.3. Candidates may request a meeting and/or submit a rebuttal to the administrative evaluator within the 10-day rebuttal period. The administrative evaluator shall review rebuttal material with the option of revising the recommendation or correcting errors in the original report; no other written response, other than acknowledgement of receipt of the rebuttal statement, shall be provided to the candidate.

4.7. Provost

4.7.1. The Provost is the final level of administrative evaluation for evaluation processes that conclude with the personnel actions of retention, promotion, and/or tenure.

4.7.2. The Provost shall review the candidate’s PAF, WPAF and reports from all levels of evaluation for final evaluation for retention, promotion and/or tenure.

4.7.3. The Provost’s letter to the candidate constitutes the final decision on retention, promotion and/or tenure.
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-___-18

RESOLUTION ON ENDORSING MAIN COMPONENTS OF CAL POLY'S STRATEGIC PLAN

Impact on Existing Policy:

WHEREAS, In May 2011, the Academic Senate Passes resolution AS-728-11, which endorsed The Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7, as a strategic framework; and

WHEREAS, AS-728-11 defined the key components of a strategic plan to be “a vision statement, a mission statement, a set of goals to achieve the mission and vision, and a set of key performance indicators”; and

WHEREAS, AS-728-11 called upon the Academic Senate to establish a committee to collaborate with the administration in further developing the Cal Poly Strategic Plan; and

WHEREAS, Resolution AS-812-16 adopted in March 2016 charged the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee to work with the administration to further develop the University's Strategic Plan; and

WHEREAS, AS-812-16 requested the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee to ensure that the Administration developed a "succinct set of specific measurable goals and actions, key performance indicators for these goals and actions, and a timeline for the goals and actions to be accomplished"; and

WHEREAS, The Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee has worked with the administration to update the strategic objectives and goals of the University's Strategic Plan which can be found in the accompanying appendix; and

WHEREAS, The administration has reached out to the campus community to build a new set of strategic objectives and goals that align with the University's mission and vision; and

WHEREAS, The administration and the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee agree that the strategic objectives and goals of the current strategic plan capture the key goals the university would like to achieve; and
WHEREAS, The Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee believes that a strategic map, which is a visual representation of the links among the key objectives across the seven priorities, would be a useful component to add to the strategic plan for communication how the priorities align; and

WHEREAS, The current draft of the strategic plan does not have a set of key performance indicators and metrics developed and finalized; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the seven Strategic Priorities and accompanying goals of the current draft plan, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the Strategic Implementation Plan in the current draft plan, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate encourage the Administration to allocate adequate funding to achieve the plan and its targeted goals, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate call upon the Administration to develop committees comprising faculty, staff, and students to finish the key performance indicators and accompanying metrics for each set of goals under the seven strategic priorities, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate call upon the Administration to have a final draft of the University's Strategic Plan completed by May 2019, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate call upon the Administration to develop a strategic map that brings together the seven key strategic priorities.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee
Date: January 8, 2019

(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
Appendix

Strategic Plan 2018-2023

Brief Version (11/5/18)

Foundations

The Strategic Plan for Cal Poly is designed to provide direction for the future of the university through 2023. This plan is grounded in Vision 2022 as well as the Academic Plan for Enrollment and the Master Plan, as well as the university’s mission, vision and values.

♦ Mission and Values

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

♦ Vision
Cal Poly will be recognized as the premier comprehensive polytechnic university, with an unmatched reputation for promoting Learn by Doing and nurturing student success.

As the premier comprehensive polytechnic university, Cal Poly will play a critical role in shaping the future of California through the professional contributions of its graduates, faculty and staff. Through their innovations, leadership and commitment to social and political inclusion, Cal Poly graduates, faculty and staff will improve their local communities and the broader world that their actions touch.

To achieve our vision Cal Poly will focus on student success by continuing to create and nurture a diverse and inclusive learning community. Student success is achieved only with faculty and staff success. The culture of success requires infrastructural strength, sustainable practices, local and state economic development and financial health.

Vision 2022. Introduced to the campus by President Armstrong in May of 2014, Vision 2022 provided the groundwork for the master-plan process and several divisional strategic plans. The following founding and guiding principles from Vision 2022 function as four dimensions along which strategic decisions will continue to be evaluated:

- Learn by Doing
- Student Success
- Excellence Through Continuous Improvement
- Comprehensive Polytechnic State University

These founding and guiding principles are the basis of the university’s strategic plan, as are the vision’s six strategic objective:

- Enhance student success
- Create a vibrant residential campus
- Increase support for the Teacher-Scholar Model
- Create a rich culture of diversity and inclusivity
- Secure the financial future of the university
- Develop a greater culture of transparency, collaboration, and accountability

♦ Learn by Doing

Conceived as a Learn by Doing institution in 1901, Cal Poly was described at the time by journalist Myron Angel as a school that would “teach the hand as well as the head.” Today Cal Poly remains committed to its Learn by Doing philosophy, which the Academic Senate has defined in this way: “Learn by Doing is a deliberate process
whereby students, from day one, acquire knowledge and skills through active engagement and self-reflection inside the classroom and beyond it."

Learn by Doing at Cal Poly takes many forms. Through curricular and co-curricular experiences faculty and staff work closely with students to meet learning objectives through experiential learning and provide opportunities for students to participate, often simultaneously, in discovery learning through problem solving. For many students, the capstone senior project, which was introduced to the curriculum in 1942, exemplifies the intentional blend of experiential and discovery learning that is the signature of Cal Poly's Learn by Doing philosophy.

From the practice of the Learn by Doing philosophy emanates all success for faculty, staff, and students. Cal Poly students are motivated high-achievers who arrive with a commitment to a major, indicating that they have a clear vision of their academic and professional future, which they expect the university to support. The side-by-side Learn by Doing curriculum is designed to provide students with concrete experience in their majors and in general education from day one. Cal Poly faculty and staff have built programs that have positioned the university as one of the most selective public universities in the United States. Faculty hone their skills in the classroom, co-curricular activities, in their research and creative activities and through collaborations with each other.

✦ Teacher-Scholar Model

As practiced at Cal Poly, the Teacher-Scholar Model includes meaningful student engagement in faculty scholarly activity and inclusion of scholarship in teaching to create vibrant learning experiences for students. Scholarship is defined in general terms as the scholarships of discovery, application, integration, and teaching/learning (Boyer, 1990), implemented in a discipline-specific manner while mindful of Cal Poly's mission.

✦ Student Success

The outcome of Learn by Doing and the Teacher-Scholar Model is student success. Cal Poly is uniquely focused on the student experience, both inside and outside of the classroom. Most easily defined through the Graduation Initiative 2025, the system-wide effort to facilitate student retention and timely graduation, student success at Cal Poly comes to life at annual commencement ceremonies, but it is also vibrantly on display on the athletic fields, in community service activity throughout San Luis Obispo, in student leadership opportunities and in senior projects among many other examples.
Every person who works and supports Cal Poly is dedicated to student success. Our faculty and staff operate in a collective partnership designed to maximize each other’s expertise in advancing the student experience. As we continue to remain focused on student success, we emphasize student needs and their success as a decision-making factor over all others.

Student success cannot happen without a commitment to creating the most inclusive campus climate possible. Every person, no matter the identities they have, must feel welcome and valued at Cal Poly. This element of student success is critical because, at our core, Cal Poly is a collection of focused human beings who thrive on the collective impact we have when we support each other and our larger goals.

**Strategic Priority 1: Enhance the Success of All Cal Poly Students**

**Goal 1A:** Maintain and enhance Cal Poly’s signature pedagogy of Learn by Doing.

**Goal 1B:** Assure that all students attain the knowledge, skills, and understanding to thrive in a diverse, evolving, and competitive environment.

**Goal 1C:** Ensure access to an excellent education for all California students by providing financial aid support for those with the greatest economic need.

**Goal 1D:** Improve first year and transfer student graduation rates and eliminate achievement gaps for all students to meet the goals of the CSU’s Graduation Initiative 2025.

**Goal 1E:** Provide an additional high-impact experience for every undergraduate student.

**Strategic Priority 2: Cultivate the Excellence of All Employees**

**Goal 2A:** Recruit and retain the best employees.

**Goal 2B:** Foster inclusive and excellent teaching practices through continued faculty development.

**Goal 2C:** Encourage innovative scholarship in all its forms — discovery, application, integration, and engagement, as well as teaching and learning.

**Goal 2D:** Promote professional development opportunities for all employees.
Goal 2E: Communicate and share more broadly the significant achievements of all employees.

✦ Strategic Priority 3: Enrich the Campus Culture of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Goal 3A: Create an aligned and cohesive focus on diversity and inclusion across the university.

Goal 3B: Create and sustain a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive university community that reflects and serves the diverse people of California.

Goal 3C: Prepare all students for their future through an education that includes diversity learning and reflects the principles of Inclusive Excellence.

Goal 3D: Further develop a campus climate that reflects the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion, as well as free inquiry and mutual respect.

✦ Strategic Priority 4: Strengthen our Portfolio of Academic Programs

Goal 4A: Make the General Education program a distinctive, mission-driven experience that prepares students for their personal and professional lives.

Goal 4B: Develop innovative and sustainable undergraduate degree programs that meet the present and future needs of society and industry.

Goal 4C: Pursue innovative and sustainable initiatives in graduate, post-baccalaureate, and alternative academic programs that build on the university’s mission and expertise.

Goal 4D: Address real-world problems, such as environmental sustainability, through interdisciplinary and international experiences, as well as, community and industry partnerships.

✦ Strategic Priority 5: Create an Engaged, Vibrant, and Healthy Community for Students

Goal 5A: Encourage the development of an ethos of individual social responsibility in every student.

Goal 5B: Ensure that all students engage in effective, out-of-the-classroom experiences that prepare them for a life-long relationship with Cal Poly.
Goal 5C: Create the extracurricular facilities and co-curricular programs anchored in Learn by Doing that create a vibrant residential campus community.

Goal 5D: Cultivate a campus environment that emphasizes all aspects of personal and community wellbeing.

✧ Strategic Priority 6: Leverage Data and Technology to Support the Institution’s Mission

Goal 6A: Create a robust technological experience that enables engagement within and beyond the borders of campus, connects people with university data and resources, and provides a secure, stable and modern technological ecosystem.

Goal 6B: Build relationships locally, nationally and globally to showcase the power of collaboration, support and advance the university’s mission, and create alignment in the vision, priority, and pace of campus initiatives.

Goal 6C: Enable student success by creating a digital environment that empowers learning, teaching, and living at Cal Poly, while supporting the engagement of and alumni and prospective students.

✧ Strategic Priority 7: Secure Our Future by Improving Finances, Facilities, and Systems

Goal 7A: Ensure the economic viability of the institution through a resilient and sustainable business model, including public and private partnerships that enhance revenue.

Goal 7B: Foster a robust culture of philanthropy that allows the university to generate private gifts in support of institutional goals.

Goal 7C: Develop and maintain facilities that promote a sense of pride and confidence in the campus environment.

Goal 7D: Ensure the sustainability of the whole campus environment by making it smart, resilient, and carbon neutral.

Goals 7E: Ensure transparency of operations through clear and frequent communications at all levels.
2018-2023 Strategic Plan Implementation

The President’s Cabinet will serve as the Steering Committee for the Strategic Plan and will oversee all aspects of the development and implementation of the plan. This includes prioritizing the implementation of goals, obtaining resources to achieve success, and making modifications to the plan as unforeseen conditions arise. Many goals will have natural overlap in tactics, and this consistency and focus is positive. The Steering Committee will ensure that where overlap exists, collaboration is occurring.

Each aspect of the plan will have an Executive Champion and a Senior Sponsor(s). Executive Champions are members of the President’s Cabinet who will assume responsibility for selecting senior sponsors for the goals, establishing timelines for implementing the goals, and determining the metrics of success for each goal.

Executive Champions, with the support of the Senior Sponsor(s) will also be required to report on an annual basis the status of implementation and progress towards success metrics for each goal under their responsibility, and the university will provide a comprehensive and transparent update on the progress made under this plan.

Senior Sponsors are members of university leadership with expertise relevant to the goal and are charged with creating cross-divisional/college implementation teams that do the work of operationalizing the goal towards success, convening their teams, and making recommendations to President’s Cabinet or other appropriate group when obstacles prevent achieving success or the context has shifted requiring a change in the goal.

Senior Sponsors report to the Executive Champion(s) for their goal and provide regular reporting on the progress of the implementation team.
To: Academic Senate Executive Committee  
From: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee  
Date: December 13, 2018  
RE: Supporting scholarly electronic resources essential for student and faculty success

Since the advent of academic electronic resources in the 1990s, a primary obligation of Kennedy Library has been to provide access to online scholarly content essential for student and faculty success, supporting excellence in teaching, learning and research at Cal Poly. Base funding for these vital resources has chiefly come from two sources: Cal Poly and the CSU. The purpose of this memo is to prompt a call to faculty and student action in light of the fact that neither source has increased funding since the 1990s, resulting in the loss of resources and prospect of further incapacitation of access to the scholarly content necessary for student and faculty success.

The Chancellor’s office has provided system-wide funding since 1999 for a core collection available to all 23 campuses, called the Electronic Core Collection (ECC). Licensing databases consortially allows for economy of scale and so provides access to content that most individual campuses could not accomplish on their own. The ECC annual base funding amount was initiated at 5 million dollars in 1999, and has not increased since. Even taking the broadest measure of inflation, that $5 million has lost over half its value in that time (- $2.7 million). This does not take into account that inflation for scholarly academic content habitually exceeds general inflation. Frequent cuts to databases in the ECC have been necessary, and though in some years the Chancellor’s Office “saves the day” by providing last-minute funds, this is anything but a stable model for success. A more robust and stable funding model that allows for inflation would restore access to excised content and afford more favorable consortial negotiating terms.

When a database is excised from the ECC, any campus wishing to maintain access must pay for it, typically at a much higher price per capita. For example, LexisNexis was cut from the ECC three years ago, and due to high local user demand, Kennedy Library diverted funds from other electronic content to maintain access. In the intervening three years the annual price for our campus for access has risen from about $30,000 to nearly $40,000. Similarly, the ECC has recently excised subsets of JSTOR costing our campus $18,000 over the last three years to maintain access.

Just as importantly, Kennedy Library provides access to a breadth of databases and journals never supported by the ECC, and just as the statewide Senate is drawing attention to the funding of the ECC, this is a crucial moment for Cal Poly to examine and address its own commitment to supporting electronic resources. Kennedy Library has not received a base budget increase this century. Inflation has eroded the purchasing power of that last-century budget. Here are two simple examples: 1) the premier journal Nature has risen in price 19% since 2015, and online access to its content has cost the campus $48,000 in four years; 2) two titles from the American Association for the Advancement of Science have risen 38% in 4 years, with access to that content costing Cal Poly $57,000 in four years. This is not sustainable.

In fact, the only recent funding increase for library collections has come through student success fee money provided by ASI, contingent on the funds being spent on electronic resources. Students clearly recognize the huge importance of electronic resources, and this committee urges the Academic Senate to explore and take steps to encourage faculty and administration to follow the leadership shown by the students, and advocate for the funding to support the electronic resources necessary. Robust and stable funding of library resources at Cal Poly is essential for student success and support of the Teacher/Scholar model.

---

1 The statewide Academic Senate raised a recent resolution to draw attention to the issue of inadequate ECC funding (AS-3351-18/FGA). More than 40 databases are currently included in the ECC, with content across a range of disciplines, and including broadly important databases such as JSTOR and Academic Search Premier.