Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: Approval of January 8, 2019 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 Item(s):
A. Appointments to GWR Advisory Board (pp. 4-10)
B. Appointment to Curriculum Committee (pp. 11-12)
C. Retiring of Resolution on Definition of “Close Relative” AS-261-87/PPC: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair (pp. 13-19)
D. [Time Certain 3:30] Review and Consider “University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 8: Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services Subchapter 8.4: Student Evaluation of Instruction to Appear as Consent Agenda Item: Brett Bodemer, Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 20-24)
E. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 5: Evaluation Processes: Brett Bodemer, Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 25-33).
F. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 6: Evaluation Cycle Patterns: Brett Bodemer, Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 34-40).
G. Resolution on Supporting Library Collections Necessary for Faculty and Student Success: Brett Bodemer, first reading (pp. 41-45)
H. Resolution to Reinforce Sustainability in the Cal Poly Strategic Plan: Jonathan Reich, Academic Senate Sustainability Committee (pp. 46-78)

V. Discussion Item(s):
A. Campus Advisory Council Membership: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair
B. Extended Education Programs: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair

VI. Adjournment:

805-756-1258 ~ academicsenate.calpoly.edu
Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, January 8, 2019
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the November 6, 2018 Academic Senate Executive Committee minutes.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, introduced Sarah Best, new Administrative Support Coordinator for the Academic Senate.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: None.
B. President’s Office: None.
C. Provost: Kathleen Enz Finken, Provost, provided an update on the CLA Dean Search Committee, as well as the Vice President for Research Search Committee. She also stated that Tom Fowler, Architecture Department, was selected as a 2019 Wang Family Excellence Award recipient. The Wang Family Excellence Award is a prestigious CSU-wide faculty award.
D. Statewide Senate: None.
E. CFA: Lewis Call, CFA SLO Chapter President, reported that CFA has been meeting with Cal Poly administration to discuss faculty pay for summer teaching.
F. ASI: Mark Borges, ASI Board of Directors Chair, reported that members of the ASI Board of Directors would be looking into issues such as diversity and inclusion, textbook affordability, and parking and transportation during winter quarter. He reported that candidate filing for the ASI Board of Directors and ASI President would open on February 4th and close on February 23rd and asked members of the Academic Senate Executive Committee to encourage students to apply online at asi.calpoly.edu.

IV. Business Items:
A. Appointment to Academic Senate Grants Review Committee. M/S/P to appoint Sarah Lester, Academic Services, to the Grants Review Committee.
B. Appointment to Sustainability Advisory Committee. M/S/P to appoint Norm Borin, Marketing Area, to the Sustainability Advisory Committee.
B.1. Appointment to Academic Senate Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee. M/S/P to appoint Elizabeth Lowham, Political Science Department, to the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee.
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, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, presented a document that would be placed in the appendix of the new University Faculty Personnel Policies document. M/S/P for the 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.
D. 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, presented a resolution that would create a new CLA department, Interdisciplinary Studies in the Liberal Arts Department. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on Creation of New Department for Interdisciplinary Studies in the Liberal Arts.
E. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 1: Preface. Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, introduced a resolution that would set guidelines for Chapter 1: Preface of the University Faculty Personnel Policies.
Faculty Personnel Policies document. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 1: Preface.

F. **Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 2: Faculty Appointments.** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, introduced a resolution that would set guidelines for Chapter 2: Faculty Appointments of the University Faculty Personnel Policies document. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 2: Faculty Appointments.

G. **Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 3: Personnel Files.** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, introduced a resolution that would set guidelines for Chapter 3: Personnel Files of the University Faculty Personnel Policies document. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 3: Personnel Files.

H. **Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 4: Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation.** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, introduced a resolution that would set guidelines for Chapter 4: Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation of the University Faculty Personnel Policies document. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 4: Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation.

I. **Resolution on Endorsing Main Components of Cal Poly’s Strategic Plan.** Sean Hurley, Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee Chair, presented a resolution that would endorse the seven Strategic Priorities and accompanying goals of Cal Poly’s Strategic Plan, as well as the plan’s Strategic Implementation Plan. The resolution also asks that key performance indicators and metrics be established for each set of goals under the strategic priorities, and asks that administration have a final draft of the strategic plan by May 2019. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on Endorsing Main Components of Cal Poly’s Strategic Plan.

V. **Discussion Items:**

A. **Supporting Scholarly Electronic Resources Essential for Student and Faculty Success.** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, and Brett Bodemer, Library – PCS representative on Faculty Affairs Committee, discussed a lack of increased funds for scholarly electronic resources by the CSU. Various entities on the committee agreed to work on the issue in the following months.

VI. **Adjournment:** 5:00 PM

Submitted by,

Mark Borges
Academic Senate Student Assistant
Statements of Interest Received to serve on the Graduation Writing Requirement Advisory Board
(select one representative from each college)

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
Jerusha Greenwood, Experience Industry Management (12.5 years at Cal Poly) Tenured
As the undergraduate program coordinator as well as the curriculum committee chair for the Recreation, Parks, and Tourism administration degree program, I’m well familiar with the paths students follow to graduation. We currently incorporate a course that helps students complete their GWR requirement – ENGL 310 – while they also complete a helpful support course. Passage of the GWR is a prerequisite for their senior project course, which also demands a high level of writing proficiency from students. For 95% of our students, the GWR is not a significant barrier to graduation, because they’ve already had opportunities to complete it. However, some of our students do take the Saturday WPE because they completed ENGL 310 prior to their junior year, have been unable to take ENGL 310 in time to complete the GWR prerequisite for their senior project, and this causes significant stress for them.

I’ve also served as a grader for the WPE exam, and have been humbled by the submissions I’ve read. The bluster and frustration I came into that process were wiped clean when I came to understand how important the completion of the WPE is for students, and how stressful. When they have fewer and fewer opportunities (or incentives) to write with the frequency required to become proficient at it, and then to have to form an argument and write coherently about that stance...and then be graded on that effort by people who dedicate their lives to the frequent practice of written communication...yikes!

I’ve always had an interest in helping students succeed in areas where they tend to either downplay their own talents, have been told they have no talent or ability, or have convinced themselves they are bad at something.

"I’m a terrible writer."
"I’m such a bad writer."
"Uuugh. We have to write? I’m HATE writing."

Written communication is such an essential competency – especially when forms of communication are increasingly more about device-to-device rather than human-to-human – that these attitudes are unsustainable. As the internship coordinator for our department, I hear frequently from employers who ask that students are coming to them with strong communication skills – both written and oral. I also hear that these are skills students frequently lack.

Forced to reconcile their fears and misconceptions about writing, first by the University’s general education requirements and then by the high-stakes GWR, students are often dropped into the deep end of the pool with little more than an instructional video on the philosophical underpinnings of the breast stroke to guide them. I say this tongue in cheek, of course, and I don’t think students would make the effort to take writing courses voluntarily. But I do believe
we could provide more opportunities for students to complete their writing requirements in
ways that complement their knowledge and experience and play to their strengths.

In that respect, I'm interested in serving on the GWR advisory board to explore the many ways
that might make it easier for students to complete their writing requirements in a way that
enhances their knowledge, increases their professional competencies, and doesn't create
barriers for their progress toward graduation.

Bwalya Malama, Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (5 years at Cal Poly)
Tenured
I would like to serve on the committee because of my commitment to improvement of student
technical writing skills and establishing standards and metrics by which the university can
measure such skills.

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIROMENTAL DESIGN
Stacy Kolegraff, Construction Management (8.5 years at Cal Poly) Tenure Track
Having been a student, and currently an advisor to students who must take the GWR, the GWR
writing prompt and criteria may need a refresh depending on the type of writing considered
relevant and graduate level. Some department, like mine, emphasize corporate-level writing,
which seems to be inconsistent with the GWR. If there were additional criteria that could be
applied to the GWR, it might be considered more relevant.

I enjoy writing, and strongly believe that all students need to write and communicate well upon
graduation. I frequently review and edit student papers and provide feedback to improve their
writing. I would like to serve on a committee that is committed to student writing and
communication and its evaluation.

Doug Jackson, Architecture (11 years at Cal Poly) Tenured
I am very interested in serving on the GWR Advisory Board. During my 11 years at Cal Poly I have
consistently taught in the 5th year of the Architecture curriculum, which is focused on the
development of a written and design thesis. I have also served as the Area Coordinator for this
curricular area since 2013. In both my teaching in and coordination of the 5th year thesis I have
made efforts to improve student writing, to catalyze the use of writing in the thesis design
studio as a tool of design exploration and inquiry, and to raise the level of discourse among the
students in our Department. I believe that my expertise in writing and in improving the
application of writing within the architecture curriculum, as further described below, will enable
me to make a valuable contribution to the GWR Advisory Board.

As part of my teaching in the 5th year architectural thesis curricular area, I teach the Arch 492
Senior Design Thesis seminar class, which is focused on contemporary architectural discourse,
and within which students write a compelling and articulate architectural thesis which is
grounded in a thorough literature review, and which makes claims that must be defended by
written arguments situated within the context of contemporary and historical architectural
discourse. In addition, I also teach the Arch 420 Seminar in Architectural History, Theory, and
Criticism—which is a class intended not only to introduce students to specific aspects of
architectural history and theory, but also to prepare them to apply this theoretical and historical
knowledge to the development of convincing rhetorical positions in preparation for their 5th
year architectural thesis. One of the primary requirements of this course, therefore, is that the students must write a 3000-word (minimum) polemical essay that argues for new architectural applications of or responses to contemporary social, cultural, or technological phenomena. Since one of the objectives of this class is to prepare students to use writing as a form of persuasive argument, a portion of class time is devoted to working sessions devoted to faculty- and peer-review of their in-progress essays. Finally, I have also incorporated writing into my Arch 481 Senior Architectural Design Project thesis studio as a means of generating design thinking.

As a related matter, in 2013 I developed the 5th Year Architecture Student Committee, which is charged with raising the level of discourse in our Department. I have served as the Faculty Advisor to this committee from 2013 until the present, and during this time I have assisted these students in planning, organizing, and hosting various events, including lectures and exhibitions designed to introduce our students to contemporary ideas as debates important to architecture.

In addition to these efforts to improve writing and discourse within the Architecture department, I also served on the Editorial Board of the Journal of Architectural Education (JAE) from 2014 – 2017, and was the Issue Editor for the JAE issue “Environments” (October 2017).

I am also the editor and a contributing author to SOUPERgreen! – Souped-Up Green Architecture (Actar, 2017), which is a book of architectural design and architectural theory that articulates a critique of the prevailing architectural conception of architectural performance with respect to the environmental crisis.

Thank you very much for your consideration, and I hope to be able to serve with other colleagues on this important Advisory Board.

ORFALEA COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Gregg Fiegel, Civil and Environmental Engineering Director, University Honors Program (22+ years at Cal Poly) Tenured

My experiences as a Cal Poly student (B.S.C.E. 1990) and instructor have been wonderful. Cal Poly provides innovative, effective, and engaging educational programs. These programs have helped me become a successful engineer and instructor. I am extremely grateful for the opportunities this institution has provided, and I feel obligated to give back. I am interested in serving Cal Poly, the Academic Senate, the General Education Governance Board, and the GWR Advisory Board by helping to ensure the continued development and availability of high quality writing courses and instruction for our students.

I have served as a faculty member in the Civil and Environmental Engineering (CE/ENVE) Department since 1995. In addition, I am currently the Director of the University Honors Program (UHP). I have served Honors students in this role since 2013. I have extensive experience in course, curriculum, and program development. In addition, I am a past member of the CE/ENVE curriculum committee and the Cal Poly General Education Governance Board (engineering representative). I am currently a member of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (engineering representative). My second term on this committee ends later this
year, and I do not plan to reapply for the engineering representative position. I believe my experience and work ethic will benefit the CE/ENVE Department, the College of Engineering, the GWR Advisory Board, and Cal Poly. Upon request, I can provide examples of past curriculum and course development experience in Civil Engineering and the Honors Program.

My interest in and experience with writing instruction dates back to 2001 when I participated in Cal Poly’s Writing in Generally Every Discipline (WINGED) program. Knowledge gained and lessons learned from the program’s workshops and Learn By Doing activities allowed me to more confidently incorporate writing instruction into my engineering lecture and laboratory courses. I have emphasized writing skill development ever since. Writing in my discipline (geotechnical engineering) is important. Unlike other civil engineers, geotechnical engineers almost always write reports or memos to summarize project findings and design recommendations. Therefore, geotechnical engineers need to master both technical and professional skills to be successful. I strive to convey this point to my students every day, both in words and in actions.

More recently, I have spent considerable time developing writing assignments and assessing student work in HNRS 161/162/163 – Creating Sustainable Communities. This yearlong experience for first year Honors students qualifies as a General Education course under Comparative Social Institutions (GE Area D3). I developed this course in collaboration with Tom Trice (History) and Ryan Alaniz (Sociology). Students submit up to six (6) samples of their writing each term as they reflect on subjects related to sustainability, equity, global perspectives, justice, research, information skills, and service learning. In addition, students in these courses reflect on their own learning by self-assessing their work and writing skills.

As another example of relevant experience, I served as a Reader for the university’s Writing Proficiency Examination (WPE) from 2003 to 2006. In addition, I Co-Chaired the General Education Task Force (2016-18), and I currently serve on the GE Pathways Working Group (2019-Date). The Academic Senate and General Education Governance Board formed the Pathways group to support ongoing redesign efforts related to Cal Poly General Education. I am excited to support writing and writing education in the GE Program and across campus, especially during this unique time at Cal Poly when faculty are considering significant changes in our approach to providing breadth education and writing instruction.

I have a strong record of service at Cal Poly, having taken on leadership roles at the program, college, and university levels. I would like to represent the College of Engineering on the GWR Advisory Board, and I believe I would be a valuable team member. Thank you for considering me for this opportunity. Please feel free to contact me if you have questions or require additional information.

Rebekah Oulton. Civil and Environmental Engineering (5 years at Cal Poly) Tenure track

I am interested in serving on the GWR Advisory Board because effective communication is one of the most vitally important skills we can help our students develop. No matter their discipline or goals, our students will be better off if they can communicate their ideas successfully. While some people can effectively demonstrate this skill via the two-hour GWR exam, most of us communicate more effectively when we can consider, review, and revise our writing before presenting it to our intended audience.
In my own field of engineering, the single most common piece of advice offered to students by both graduates and professionals is: “develop your writing skills.” Students rarely understand how much effective writing skills will benefit them as professionals. Prior to coming to Cal Poly, I spent approximately 15 years working as a professional engineer, and I spent much more time writing than doing math or preparing design drawings. Very little of that writing went from topic to delivery within two hours (although that did happen occasionally!). In the “real world,” we more often have to collaborate with colleagues and conduct peer review, communicate and design in parallel, and revise our final written product to ensure that it is appropriate for the technical skills of our audience. These skills are better developed and demonstrated through an upper-division and/or discipline-specific class than a two-hour exam.

Based on my professional experience, I require my 400-level engineering students to write extensively as part of their learning process. Almost every homework assignment includes a requirement that students write a memo or letter to explain their methods, offer a recommendation, or interpret their results (on top of doing the calculations or design exercises, of course). I define the audience so students know if they are communicating with another engineer (technical audience) or a client (non-technical audience), and I guide them in consideration of how to change their discussion based on their audience. I offer students the opportunity to review and revise their work based on my feedback and peer review. These assignments build on their writing experience from their introductory English classes, GE classes and others. I help them focus on writing skills specifically appropriate to their discipline and become prepared for communication challenges unique to their future profession.

I understand that the GWR Advisory Board will be reviewing upper division GE classes and discipline-specific classes for their suitability as GWR classes. I believe my own writing experience as an engineering professional and in helping my engineering students develop their writing skills will allow me to effectively review classes across the curriculum and provide insight representing the College of Engineering. I have previously served on the Academic Senate Sustainability Committee (S 18), and both the CTLT Learning Community (AY 16-17) and Community of Practice (AY 17-18, 18-19) bodies focusing on Sustainability Across the Curriculum. I look forward to expanding my service to the University through involvement in the GWR Advisory Board.

**COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS**

**Brian Bates, English (4 years at Cal Poly) Lecturer**

I would be delighted to serve on this committee because it intertwines my passion for teaching first-year students with my interests in developing upper-division writing courses across the curriculum and collaborating with faculty who value writing as a cornerstone of rigorous academic inquiry. As a full-time lecturer at Cal Poly, I teach first-year composition courses and work closely with other writing instructors to design curriculum and assess student growth and learning outcomes. Before coming to Cal Poly, I taught as a full-time lecturer first at the University of Denver and then at CU Boulder. I also have served on several committees devoted to evaluating curriculum and learning outcomes for general education writing classes. Through these experiences, I have become passionately interested in helping students across the disciplines develop their investment in writing as an essential process for learning and thinking through knowledge acquisition. I look forward to collaborating with Cal Poly faculty to strengthen lines of communication across the disciplines, foster a shared investment in writing
as a highly generative and useful process, and help shape a university culture that deeply values excellence in writing.

I was hired at the University of Denver to develop and teach interdisciplinary writing courses for first-year and upper-division students. These new classes about satire, sports, revolutions, and gothic aesthetics were connected with the university’s mission to improve student writing at every grade level across the curriculum. One of the great joys of my job was collaborating with faculty members in different disciplines to develop interdisciplinary courses with rigorous writing standards. I also served on four faculty committees devoted to evaluating and restructuring the teaching strategies, writing assignments, and learning outcomes commonly used in first-year and upper-division writing intensive classes. These assessments of writing across the curriculum have influenced how I teach general education students composition, and they have sparked my interest in working more closely with colleagues in different disciplines to integrate the teaching of writing into other courses. Working with a wide variety of faculty at the university level has enabled me to grasp how essential clear communication, conflict management, conscientious assessment, and a distinct willingness to compromise are to the success of educational programs.

I look forward to having exploratory and formative conversations that involve disciplines such as architecture, engineering, math, and finance where written analysis often takes on markedly different forms than writing does in many arts, humanities and social sciences classes. Thank you for your time and consideration, and I look forward to hearing back about this service opportunity.

**Tyler Gardner, English (1 year at Cal Poly) Lecturer**

As a writing instructor at Notre Dame, Indiana University-South Bend, Holy Cross College, and now Cal Poly, I have engaged with various student populations and experienced the different degrees of preparation and motivation that students bring to their written work. In the process, I have become convinced that every student stands to benefit from the enhanced communicative power that attention to writing can help cultivate. At Cal Poly, I have taught A1 & A2 level courses as well as a C4 that satisfies the GWR course, and I am also serving as a consultant for the GWR Exam. I am interested in serving on this board because I am passionate about writing instruction and would like to contribute to discussions that will shape how writing is taught across the university.

In addition to my classroom experience, I was previously the assistant director of the writing center at Holy Cross College, where I also served on a committee responsible for restructuring the English Department. I was also a tutor and member of the Executive Committee in the Writing Center at Notre Dame, which included holding one-on-one student consultations with students from across the university and helping administer a variety of interdisciplinary writing initiatives, ranging from week-long writing camps to semester-long programs. I am currently collaborating on a research project in the writing center at Notre Dame that examines student expectations and assumptions for writing support.

**Grace Yeh, Ethnic Studies (11 years at Cal Poly) Tenured**

My experience and training in teaching composition began with experience as a Graduate Student Instructor for UCLA’s English Department, GE Cluster Program, and their Academic Advancement Program’s Transfer Student Summer Program. At Cal Poly, I teach in the Ethnic
Studies department. Thus, while my Ph.D. is in English, my research and teaching have been interdisciplinary. As a graduate student, I was fortunate to have taught composition and writing in the discipline courses but not without the support of mentoring and teaching seminars for graduate instructors. While I have not taught courses at Cal Poly in composition, I regularly teach a GE D5 course that is writing-intensive and have worked with students to write and revise thesis-driven close reading analysis essays. I also teach the ES senior project course, which is largely focused on writing. From my 11 years of working with Cal Poly students, I have found that most students are not confident in their ability to write thesis-driven essays. In our own department, we have developed a curricular map for our students, and writing instruction is one area where there is a large gap between first-year composition and senior project that current GWR options do not adequately fill. Even for the GE students our courses serve, all too often, D5 students—who are juniors and seniors—claim that my essays have been the first they have written at Cal Poly. I have tried to use my upper-division courses as an opportunity to reintroduce upper-class students to writing strategies, but realize that Cal Poly needs to provide students with more scaffolded and structured opportunities to develop their writing skills.

I am thus excited that Cal Poly is revisiting the GWR and expanding opportunities to fulfill this requirement. As someone who regularly teaches GE D3 and D5 courses and our senior project seminar, I feel that I can bring my experiences in understanding how specifically the junior-level/upper-division humanities courses can be reworked to become a part of a larger writing development plan for our students. I would appreciate the opportunity to work with others with expertise in writing instruction and with colleagues from other colleges on the GWR Advisory Board.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

PCS

Kaila Bussert, Academic Services (4.5 years at Cal Poly) Tenure track

I want to serve on the Graduation Writing Requirement Advisory Board as the Professional Consultative Services member because I believe strongly in the university supporting and strengthening writing across the curriculum and writing in the disciplines. I bring experience serving on the 2014-15 and 2015-17 GWR Task Forces and as a current member of the GE Governance Board.

Writing, research, and information use is intertwined and one of my goals would be to help make these connections explicit. I teach research skills related to writing and communication in General Education courses as the Foundational Experiences Librarian at Kennedy Library. I am responsible for the library’s instruction program in GE Area A courses, reaching over 3,500 students each academic year, as well as developing and integrating support for information literacy competencies across General Education. For example, in January 2019, I worked with my colleague Jesse Vestermark to propose information literacy learning outcomes included in the GE Work Group Area A Report and Recommendations (as part of the current revision of GE). I would be interested to offer my information literacy perspective, learn more deeply about writing at Cal Poly, and help efforts to improve our students’ writing experiences and abilities.
Statement of Interest

Name: Louise Torgerson
Department: Mustang Success Center, University Advising

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

Number of Years at Cal Poly:
5 (as of June 2019)

Which committee do you wish to serve on? Curriculum 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.

Guidelines for writing a Statement of Interest available at:

I am interested in serving on the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC) for a variety of reasons. As an academic advisor with the Mustang Success Center, specifically working with the NCAA student-athlete population, I meet with students from nearly all degree programs and across all six colleges. This unique viewpoint has given me insight into the details involved in curriculum and graduation requirements. Given that my strengths include being diligent, thorough and detail-oriented, I am interested in serving on the ASCC to offer consultation and add to discussions that the ASCC has surrounding graduation requirements, general education, learning objectives, cultural pluralism and curriculum matters. As an advisor for student-athletes, I monitor and track the intricacies of Cal Poly degree requirements for this population of students that span across all majors at the University. I will contribute to the ASCC given this lens that I understand Cal Poly graduation requirements and general education with. My goal of joining the ASCC is to offer my perspective as an advisor who works with students from all disciplines, provide insight on students in their pursuit of graduation requirements and further contribute to collaboration across campus.

My nearly 13 year career within higher education has been focused on academic advising and student support services. My master’s degree in Higher Education Administration has also prepared me to serve on a committee such as the ASCC. Now in my fifth year at Cal Poly, I have been fortunate to work with a number of college advising staffs, faculty members, and the evaluations unit within the Registrar’s Office. These relationships and partnerships have further provided me an appreciation and knowledge of the complexities of Cal Poly graduation requirements and curriculum. I have been a member of the following committees and workgroups at Cal Poly

Coordinated Community Response Team
Student Affairs Diversity and Inclusivity Workgroup

2/22/2019
Academic Support Network Initiative Workgroup
Graduation Initiative 2025 Advising Workgroup

I look forward to the opportunity to continue to expand and develop campus relationships with faculty and staff through ASCC and work together to make recommendations to the Academic Senate. It is with great excitement and gratitude that I write this statement of interest to join the ASCC. I look forward to collaborating with faculty and staff and having a positive impact on the work the ASCC puts forward to the Academic Senate.

**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.
WHEREAS, A resolution approved by Cal Poly's Academic Senate reflects the concerns and
campus organization of the time in which it is adopted; and

WHEREAS, With the passage of sufficient time an adopted resolution may no longer hold
relevance; and

WHEREAS, Such obsolete resolutions should be identified and formally removed from the set of
active resolutions; and

WHEREAS, No process currently exists for determining the obsolescence of Academic Senate
resolutions or for their formal retirement; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be amended as shown on the attached copy to
guide the formal retirement of resolutions by the Academic Senate.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: August 25, 2016
Revised: November 17, 2017
V. MEETINGS

E. RETIRING RESOLUTIONS

When an Academic Senate resolution is suspected of being out of date or no longer pertinent, at the Chair’s discretion the resolution may be submitted for review as to its current relevance by the Academic Senate committee that originally sponsored it or by an ad hoc committee. The Chair shall inform the full Senate via Chair’s Report of the intention to place a resolution under such review. The committee’s opinion regarding the resolution shall be forwarded to the Academic Senate Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee finds that the resolution in question should be retired, a proposal to this effect shall be placed on the Academic Senate’s consent agenda. If no senator pulls the resolution from the consent agenda, the resolution shall be considered retired. If pulled from the consent agenda, the proposal will appear as a business item for debate at the next meeting of the Academic Senate. The President shall be informed of any such action and the Academic Senate shall update its records.
MEMORANDUM
Cal Poly | Office of the President

To: Dustin Stegner
Chair, Academic Senate
Date: January 9, 2018

From: Jeffrey D. Armstrong
President
Copies: K. Enz Finken
M. Pedersen

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-842-17
Resolution on Retiring Obsolete Academic Senate Resolutions

This memo acknowledges my support of the above-entitled resolution. The process outlined in the revised text (reflected in the supporting documentation to the AS-824-17) to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, Section V, Item E, “Retiring Resolutions,” is judicious.

Please extend my thanks to the Academic Senate members for their attention to this matter.
I have reviewed the subject Academic Senate resolution, and this subject has also been the subject of discussion at Academic Deans' Council meetings. The Deans' Council (November 23, 1987 meeting) recommended that the term "close relative" for "University Interest" admissions be defined as "spouses, children, step-children, and individuals who qualify as dependents for income tax purposes." In addition, the Council recommended that the campus policy should identify the type of employee that would qualify for this benefit. It was recommended that the following definition be applied: "...all full-time permanent employees and part-time permanent employees."

Based upon my review of both the Academic Senate resolution, which is less restrictive in its definition of close relative, and the Deans' Council recommendation, I recommend that the campus policy be developed in accordance with the Academic Deans' Council recommendation.
Subject: ADMISSION POLICY FOR CLOSE RELATIVES OF EMPLOYEES

It is my recommendation that you approve the Academic Senate Resolution AS-261-87 as amended to read:

"Admission shall be granted to the spouse, child, stepchild, brother, sister, parent, grandchild, niece, or nephew of any full-time employee or part-time permanent employee or emeriti of Cal Poly or any of its official auxiliary organizations, when said admittee meets the CSU admission requirements."
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background statement:

In a memo dated January 8, 1987, Malcolm Wilson, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, requested the Academic Senate's advice on the definition of "Close Relative" for University Interest Admits. This memo was forwarded to the Personnel Policies Committee for comment and any action deemed appropriate. The Personnel Policies Committee has reviewed the situation and submits the following resolution.

AS-261-87/PPC

RESOLUTION ON
DEFINITION OF "CLOSE RELATIVE"

WHEREAS, There has been a practice to provide admission to "close relatives" of employees of Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, Such policy represents a benefit to the employee; and

WHEREAS, There is a need for a definition of "close relative" to be applied in the implementation of the campus admissions policy which grants automatic admission to CSU qualified "close relatives" of employees; and

WHEREAS, A policy setting forth such a definition does not exist in the Campus Administration Manual (CAM); therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the following be added as CAM 601.8:

Admission shall be granted to the spouse, child, brother, sister, parent, grandchild, grandparent, niece, or nephew of any full-time employee or part-time permanent employee or emeriti of Cal Poly or any of its official auxiliary organizations, when said admittee meets the CSU admission requirements.

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
On September 30, 1987
Revised October 13, 1987
Memorandum

To: Charles T. Andrews, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker

Subject: Academic Senate Resolution 261-87 Regarding Admission Policy for Close Relatives of Employees

In October of 1987 the Academic Senate approved the subject resolution which provided for a change in the statement in the Campus Administrative Manual regarding the definition of close relatives for purposes of admission consideration. This resolution was reviewed by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Dean's Council and was modified. Subsequently the Chair of the Academic Senate requested that action on the resolution be delayed pending further discussion by those involved. The Dean's Council did reconsider the issue and proposed further modification to clarify that close relatives of full-time and permanent part-time employees would qualify.

While the modifications recommended by the Dean's Council and the Vice President of Academic Affairs is somewhat more restrictive than that originally recommended by the Academic Senate, I believe it fulfills the intent of the Academic Senate's recommendation. Accordingly I am approving the revised statement as follows:

"Admission shall be granted to the spouse, child, stepchild, brother, sister, parent, grandchild, niece or nephew of any full-time employee or part-time permanent employee or emeriti of Cal Poly or any of its official auxiliary organizations, when said admittee meets the CSU admission requirements."

This revised policy will be added to the appropriate section of CAM dealing with the admissions area when it is next revised.

cc: Paul Murphy 2/17/89
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.

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 placing existing policies about student evaluation of instruction into UFPP as a subchapter of Chapter 8. This action of moving existing policy into UFPP is non-controversial and so FAC recommends that it should be placed on the Senate consent agenda. This proposal takes the form of an incomplete draft of Chapter 8, including its summary sections, the proposed text of subchapter 8.4, and placeholders for sections 8.2 and 8.3 subject to future drafting.
Summary of Subchapter 8.4: Student Evaluation of Instruction

Chapter 8 of UFPP concerns the evaluation of teaching for instructional faculty and professional services for librarian, counseling, and coaching faculty. For instructional faculty the conducting of student evaluation of instruction and the filing of its results is mandated by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Cal Poly has various university-level policies about student evaluation originating in Academic Senate resolutions, administrative memos, and the University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document. This subchapter gathers all those policies into one place and simplifies and updates the formulation of those policies.

Impact on Existing Policy

This action of consolidating, simplifying, and updating the language of existing policies imposes no change of policy.

Implementation

There is no implementation of the policies in question since they remain in effect. Subsequent lower-level polices (e.g. faculty unit policy documents) would need to update their citations to university-level 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.

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 current university-level personnel policies into UFPP and then advertising this change to the rest of the university.

What follows is the proposed text of Chapter 8 consisting of its summary section and policy text for subchapter 8.4, with placeholders for subchapters not contained in this proposed edit of UFPP...
8. Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services

8.1. Summary

8.1.1. This chapter includes general requirements and guiding principles for how the evaluation of teaching for instructional faculty and professional services for other faculty should be conducted by evaluating bodies. University level policies for conducting student evaluation of instruction are also included in this section. Colleges and departments would expand on these requirements presented in this chapter and apply its principles to offer concrete guidance and clear expectations for how teaching would be evaluated. Library, Counseling and Coaches would do likewise for the evaluation of their relevant professional services.

8.1.2. CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION.

8.2. [Reserved for requirements in the evaluation of teaching/professional service]

8.3. [Reserved for general principles and criteria for evaluation of teaching/professional service]

8.4. Student Evaluation of Instruction

8.4.1. CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION FOR SUBCHAPTER 8.4

8.4.2. Student Evaluation Instruments

8.4.2.1. The requirements for student evaluation instruments were established by AS-759-13. The formulation in this subchapter supersedes that resolution.

8.4.2.2. All student evaluation instruments must include the following two prompts with responses on an agreement scale:
   - "Overall, this instructor was educationally effective,"
   - "Overall, this course was educationally effective."

8.4.2.3. All student evaluation instruments must include an opportunity for students to provide narrative comments. Student evaluation instruments may include additional prompts and opportunities for comments at the discretion of departments and colleges. All student evaluation instruments must be proposed by the department and approved by the college and the office of academic personnel.

8.4.3. General Criteria for Conducting Student Evaluations

8.4.3.1. The criteria for conducting student evaluations is established in CBA 15.15-15.19, which allows for Campus Presidents to exempt some courses from student evaluations. Memo from Provost February 22, 2013, available on the Academic Personnel website, establishes the exceptions for Cal Poly. This subchapter presents those exceptions.

8.4.3.2. Student evaluations are required for all classes taught by each faculty unit employee except for the following:
   - Courses with low enrollment (fewer than five students) such as individual senior projects and independent study.
   - Capstone senior project classes will be evaluated if there are more than 5 students enrolled.
   - Student evaluations will not be administered for individually supervised senior projects.
   - Cooperative Education courses that do not include direct instruction shall not be evaluated using the student evaluation process. Academic departments or the
Career Services Office may use a survey to evaluate the students’ co-op experience, but this is not part of the student evaluation process.

- Team-taught classes: In situations when classes are team-taught, the instructor of record shall conduct student evaluations. If there is more than one instructor of record, then copies of the evaluation results shall be placed in each of the instructor’s personnel files with a memo indicating that the course was team-taught. Faculty team teaching a course will have the opportunity to write narrative descriptions to accompany the student evaluation results for the team-taught course to add context to the results. Faculty who team-teach a course and believe that the results are not representative of their contributions to the course may request that the dean not include the results associated with this team-taught course in their PAF. After reviewing this request, the dean has the discretion to determine if the student evaluation results of the team-taught course shall be placed in the instructor’s file.

8.4.4. Procedure for Conducting Student Evaluation of Instruction

8.4.4.1. The procedure for conducting student evaluation of instruction was established by AS-821-16. This subchapter presents those procedures and supersedes that resolution.

8.4.4.2. Student evaluations of instruction occur during the last week of instruction as defined by the official academic calendar. The evaluation period opens the weekend immediately prior to the last week of instruction and closes at the end of the last day of the last week of instruction. The last week of instruction and final exam week are defined by the official academic calendar. This period may be adjusted on an ad hoc basis to accommodate for academic holidays.

8.4.4.3. For courses whose official final assessment is during the last week of instruction according to the academic calendar (e.g. labs or activities with their own final exam or assessment), their evaluation period may be the penultimate week of instruction according to the academic calendar. Requesting the earlier timeline for the evaluation of courses with early final assessments should occur by means of standard procedures of scheduling evaluations as determined by the office of Academic Personnel and communicated to the relevant college and/or program department staff.

8.4.4.4. Students shall receive notifications of the opening and closing of the evaluation period, and reminders at appropriate intervals during the evaluation period.

8.4.4.5. Faculty shall receive response rate reports for their evaluated courses during the evaluation period.

8.4.4.6. Faculty are encouraged to announce to their classes that the evaluation period is underway, and to address questions from students about the nature of the evaluation process clarifying the role of student evaluations in processes of faculty review.

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

8.4.5. Student Evaluation Results

8.4.5.1. Placement of student evaluation results in Personnel Action Files is governed by CBA 11.1, 15.15, 15.17.
8.4.5.2. Results of student evaluations shall be stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the Personnel Action File. The dean is the custodian of the PAF and will provide secure access to this information.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
CHAPTER 5: EVALUATION PROCESSES

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

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 5: EVALUATION PROCESSES" be established as Chapter 5: Evaluation Processes of UFPP, and be it further

RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents by Spring 2020 to have chapter 5 of their documents cover evaluation processes as per chapter 5 of UFPP.
Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date:  [Sometime in 2019]

\[1\] (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 5: EVALUATION PROCESSES

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 5: Evaluation Processes

This chapter defines all the evaluation sequences allowed for any sort of faculty evaluation currently used by the Colleges, Library, Counseling, and Athletics. University-level definition of these processes
Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:

CHAPTER 5: EVALUATION PROCESSES

allows for the Colleges and Library to formulate their policy and procedure documents using common definitions of these processes. Standard and familiar evaluation processes include lecturer evaluations and the periodic, retention, promotion, and tenure evaluations of tenure-track faculty.

Each of these processes consists of a sequence of different levels of evaluation. The levels of evaluation were defined in Chapter 4, as the responsibilities of various evaluating bodies, such as department and college peer committees, department chairs or heads, or administrative evaluators. The scope of the processes covered in this section includes all faculty evaluation processes for instructional faculty, library faculty, counsellors, and coaches. Exceptions to the normal sequence of evaluation levels are also covered.

This chapter also includes in each definition of an evaluation process whether it is required or permitted for different forms of evaluation. The requirements are set by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Where there is permission to choose, those allowances are based on CBA and conform to differences between colleges in their choices of how to evaluate faculty within the scope of those allowances.

Impact on Existing Policy

This chapter on the evaluation processes provides standard definition to all the evaluation processes allowed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement that are currently used by the Colleges, Library, Counseling, and Athletics. This chapter therefore does not establish new policies.

Implementation

The establishment of UFPP by the Academic Senate would oblige the Colleges and 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, the Colleges and the Library will now have a focused area of new or revised policy that they must consult and, if necessary, use to revise their documents accordingly.

This chapter defines the evaluation processes already used by the Colleges and the Library. The only scope of implementation therefore is in the use in policy documents of the standardized vocabulary for these evaluation processes.

The Colleges and the Library would need to update their descriptions of these evaluation processes in their personnel policy documents. In doing so, UFPP provides the scope of permitted options for different forms of evaluation.

The Colleges and the Library would include in this chapter a specification of which evaluation processes they use for different forms of review. For example, the Colleges can choose between a Four-Stage Performance Evaluation or a Five-Stage Performance Evaluation for tenure decisions. For lecturer range elevation colleges may also choose between a Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation or a Four-Stage Lecturer Range Evaluation process.
Material in this chapter may form the basis for process guides the Colleges and the Library can draft and include in the appendices of their personnel policy documents.

What follows is the proposed text of the chapter...
5. Evaluation Processes

5.1. Summary

5.1.1. This chapter defines all the evaluation sequences allowed for any sort of faculty evaluation currently used by all the colleges. Standard and familiar evaluation processes include lecturer evaluations and the periodic, retention, promotion, and tenure evaluations of tenure-track faculty. Each of these processes consists of a sequence of different levels of evaluation. The levels of evaluation were defined in Chapter 4, as the responsibilities of various evaluating bodies, such as department and college peer committees, department chairs or heads, or administrative evaluators. University-level definition of these processes allows for colleges to formulate their policy and procedure documents using common definitions of these processes. The scope of the processes covered in this section includes all faculty evaluation processes including instructional faculty, library faculty, counselors, and coaches. Exceptions to the normal sequence of evaluation levels are also covered. Colleges must establish in their personnel policy documents which of the permissible evaluation processes they elect to use in their faculty evaluations.

5.1.2. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].

5.2. Instructional Faculty Evaluation Processes

5.2.1. Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation

5.2.1.1. Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation provides feedback and guidance to the faculty member.

5.2.1.2. Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   - Department Chair/Head
   - Dean

5.2.1.3. Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation is PERMITTED for periodic evaluation of part-time lecturers appointed in all three terms of an academic year.

5.2.1.4. Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation is PERMITTED for periodic evaluation of part-time lecturers appointed in fewer than three terms of an academic year.

5.2.2. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation

5.2.2.1. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation provides feedback and guidance to the faculty member in support of future personnel actions.

5.2.2.2. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   - DPRC
   - Department Chair/Head
   - Dean

5.2.2.3. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is REQUIRED for full-time periodic/cumulative lecturer evaluation.

5.2.2.4. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is PERMITTED for review of probationary faculty who are not subject to performance review.

5.2.2.5. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is PERMITTED for post-tenure review.

5.2.2.6. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is PERMITTED for lecturer range elevation.

5.2.2.7. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is PERMITTED for periodic evaluation of part-time lecturers appointed in all three terms of an academic year.

5.2.3. Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation
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5.2.3.1. Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation is an evaluation process that results in lecturer range elevation and includes an additional peer review committee between the department and the Dean.

5.2.3.2. Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   • DPRC
   • Department Chair/Head
   • CPRC
   • Dean

5.2.3.3. Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for lecturer range elevation.

5.2.4. Four-Stage Performance Evaluation

5.2.4.1. Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is a performance that results in the retention or tenure for tenure-track faculty.

5.2.4.2. Four-Stage Performance Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   • DPRC
   • Department Chair/Head
   • Dean
   • Provost.

5.2.4.3. Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for tenure of tenure-track faculty.

5.2.4.4. Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for retention of tenure-track faculty.

5.2.5. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation

5.2.5.1. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is a performance evaluation that results in promotion to higher rank for tenure-track faculty, and includes a college level peer review committee as an additional level of review between the department and the Dean.

5.2.5.2. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   • DPRC
   • Department Chair/Head
   • CPRC
   • Dean
   • Provost.

5.2.5.3. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is REQUIRED for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

5.2.5.4. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for tenure of tenure-track faculty

5.2.5.5. Five-Stage Promotion Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for retention of tenure-track faculty

5.3. Library Faculty Evaluation Processes

5.3.1. Library Faculty Periodic Evaluation

5.3.1.1. Library Faculty Periodic Evaluation is a periodic evaluation that provides feedback and guidance to the library faculty member in support of future personnel actions.

5.3.1.2. Library Faculty Periodic Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   • DPRC
   • Associate Dean
   • Dean
   • Vice-Provost
UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES

5.3.2. Library Faculty Performance Evaluation
5.3.2.1. Library Faculty Performance Evaluation results in retention, promotion, or tenure of library faculty.
5.3.2.2. Library Faculty Performance Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   • DPRC
   • Associate Dean
   • Dean
   • Vice-Provost
   • Provost

5.4. Counseling Services Faculty Evaluation Processes
5.4.1. Counseling Services Periodic Evaluation
5.4.1.1. Counseling Services Periodic Evaluation provides feedback and guidance to the counseling services faculty member in support of future personnel actions.
5.4.1.2. Counseling Services Periodic Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   • DPRC (optional)
   • Director
   • Health Center Director
   • Vice President of Student Affairs

5.4.2. Counseling Services Performance Evaluation
5.4.2.1. Counseling Services Performance Evaluation results in retention, promotion, or tenure of counseling services faculty.
5.4.2.2. Counseling Services Performance Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   • DPRC (optional)
   • Director
   • Health Center Director
   • Vice President of Student Affairs
   • Provost

5.5. Athletic Faculty Evaluation Process
5.5.1. Athletic Faculty Periodic Evaluation provides feedback and guidance to the athletic faculty member in support of future personnel actions.
5.5.2. Athletic Faculty Periodic Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
   • Athletic Director

5.6. Exceptions
5.6.1. If the department chair/head is not a tenured faculty member or academic administrator, then this level of evaluation is skipped and the evaluation will move to the next level of review. (CBA 15.43)
5.6.2. If the department chair/head does not hold a higher rank than the faculty member under evaluation for promotion, then this level of evaluation is skipped and the evaluation will move to the CPRC. (CBA 15.43)
5.6.3. If a conflict of interest exists between the faculty member under review and chair/head or administrator, such as close relationship, prejudice, bias, etc., the chair/head or administrator should withdraw from this level of evaluation and provide a written rationale for withdrawal.
5.6.4. Deans withdrawing from their level of evaluation may designate an associate dean in their college to perform the duties of the dean’s level of evaluation.
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5.7. University Evaluation Process Calendar

5.7.1. The office of Academic Personnel will publish the annual evaluation process calendar. This process calendar will provide the dates by which levels of review should be concluded.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
CHAPTER 6: EVALUATION CYCLE PATTERNS

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

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 6: EVALUATION CYCLE PATTERNS" be established as Chapter 6: Evaluation Cycle Patterns of UFPP, and be it further

RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents by Spring 2020 to have chapter 6 of their documents cover evaluation processes as per chapter 6 of UFPP.
Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date:  [Sometime in 2019]

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 6: EVALUATION CYCLE PATTERNS

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 6: Evaluation Cycle Patterns

Evaluation cycle patterns are multi-year sequences of annual evaluation processes leading to personnel actions. For instance, the sequence of annual evaluations that lead to retention, promotion,
Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:
CHAPTER 6: EVALUATION CYCLE PATTERNS

and tenure for tenure-stream faculty comprise an evaluation cycle pattern, as does the sequence of
lecturer evaluations that lead towards a three-year contract or range elevation. This chapter defines all
evaluation cycle patterns and allows colleges to choose the patterns that best serve their needs and
expectations.

Impact on Existing Policy

This chapter describes evaluation cycle patterns that are currently in use in colleges and other faculty
units, in conformity with the University Faculty Personnel Actions document. These patterns conform
with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and in the case of lecturer evaluations especially, are
largely driven by the CBA. Another evaluation cycle pattern not currently used at Cal Poly, but
allowable by the CBA is offered as a default pattern.

This chapter therefore imposes no policy changes on the colleges since the colleges already have
established for themselves their own evaluation cycle patterns and would have to change their own
policies to revert to the proposed default or choose an alternative evaluation pattern.

Implementation

The establishment of UFPP by the Academic Senate would oblige the Colleges and 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, the Colleges and the Library
will now have a focused area of new or revised policy that they must consult and, if necessary, use to
revise their documents accordingly.

This chapter defines existing evaluation cycle patterns and allows the Colleges and Library to choose
between options. It provides options to the Colleges and Library that might not have been apparent to
them, and so this chapter would allow them to revisit their past practices and decide whether to
continue with them or to change.

For those compliant with university policy, implementation would be exceedingly minimal. For those
who are non-compliant this chapter provides the occasion for them to update the policies specific to
this chapter and thereby come into compliance with the policies that have long been in place at Cal
Poly.

Colleges and the Library may include in this chapter their choice of evaluation cycle patterns, and any
necessary alternatives (e.g. for faculty hired with credit towards tenure). Material in this chapter may
form the basis for process guides the Colleges and the Library can draft and include in the appendices
of their personnel policy documents.

What follows is the proposed text of the chapter...
6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns

6.1. Summary

6.1.1. Evaluation cycle patterns are multi-year sequences of annual evaluation processes leading to personnel actions. For instance, the sequence of annual evaluations that lead to retention, promotion, and tenure for tenure-stream faculty comprise an evaluation cycle pattern, as does the sequence of lecturer evaluations that lead towards a three-year contract or range elevation. This chapter defines all evaluation cycle patterns and allows the Colleges and the Library to choose the patterns that best serve their needs and expectations.

6.1.2. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].

6.2. Probationary Faculty Evaluation Patterns

6.2.1. Evaluation patterns for probationary faculty consist of a sequence of periodic and performance evaluations. The periodic evaluations must consist of Three-Stage Periodic Evaluations. The retention evaluations must be either Four-Stage or Five-Stage Performance Evaluations. Colleges and the Library must specify in their personnel policies whether Four-Stage or Five-Stage Performance Evaluations would be used for retention of probationary faculty. In the descriptions of evaluation patterns that follow, “Performance Evaluation” could be either Four-Stage or Five-Stage Performance Evaluation. Tenure and Promotion occurring together in one evaluation requires a Five-Stage Performance Evaluation. “Periodic Evaluation” for probationary faculty is always a Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation.

6.2.2. A Three-Year Retention Pattern starts with Periodic Evaluations in the first two years of appointment. In the third year of appointment a Performance Evaluation results in a decision of whether to retain the candidate for another three years or to another one year. Candidates retained for three years undergo a Periodic Evaluation in the fourth and fifth years followed by a Promotion and Tenure evaluation in their sixth year. Candidates retained for one year undergo annual Performance Reviews in their fourth and fifth years followed by a Promotion and Tenure evaluation in their sixth year.

6.2.3. The Three-Year Retention Pattern proceeds as follows for each year of appointment for faculty retained for three years:

- Year 1: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 2: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 3: Retention to fourth, fifth and sixth year
- Year 4: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 5: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 6: Tenure/Promotion

6.2.4. The Three-Year Retention Pattern proceeds as follows for each year of appointment for faculty retained for one year:

- Year 1: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 2: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 3: Retention to fourth year
- Year 4: Retention to fifth year
- Year 5: Retention to sixth year
- Year 6: Tenure/Promotion

6.2.5. A Two-Year Retention Pattern starts with a Periodic Evaluation in the first year of appointment. In the second year of appointment a Performance Evaluation results in a
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decision of whether to retain the candidate for a third and fourth year of appointment. Candidates retained to a third and fourth year undergo a Periodic Evaluation in the third year followed in the fourth year by another Performance Evaluation for retention to a fifth and sixth year of appointment. Candidates retained to a fifth and sixth year undergo Periodic Review in the fifth year, followed by a Promotion and Tenure review in their sixth year.

6.2.6. The Two-Year Retention Pattern proceeds as follows for each year of appointment:
• Year 1: Periodic Evaluation
• Year 2: Retention to third and fourth year
• Year 3: Periodic Evaluation
• Year 4: Retention to fifth and sixth year
• Year 5: Periodic Evaluation
• Year 6: Tenure/Promotion

6.2.7. An Annual Retention Pattern starts with a Periodic Evaluation in the first year of appointment. From the second through the fifth year of appointment candidates undergo Performance Evaluation for retention to the next year. In the sixth year of appointment the candidate undergoes Promotion and Tenure evaluation.

6.2.8. The Annual Retention Pattern proceeds as follows for each year of appointment:
• Year 1: Periodic Evaluation
• Year 2: Retention to third year
• Year 3: Retention to fourth year
• Year 4: Retention to fifth year
• Year 5: Retention to sixth year
• Year 6: Promotion and Tenure

6.2.9. The Three-Year Retention Pattern shall be the default evaluation cycle pattern for tenure-track professors. Colleges and the Library may choose the Two-Year or the Annual Retention Patterns at their discretion, and must state that choice in their personnel policies document.

6.2.10. Choosing the Two-Year Retention Pattern requires establishing comparable patterns for faculty hired with credit towards tenure.

6.3. Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

6.3.1. Associate Professors in their third year after tenure undergo a Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation.

6.3.2. Every fifth year after tenure every tenured faculty member undergoes a Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo a periodic evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator (CBA 15.35).

6.3.3. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires a Five-Stage Performance Evaluation.

6.4. Instructional Lecturer and Temporary Librarian Evaluation Patterns

6.4.1. Full-time instructional lecturers and temporary librarians appointed for the entire academic year that do not hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement must be evaluated each year by a department PRC, the department chair, and dean.
• Years 1–5: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Annual)
• Year 6: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (6 year cumulative)
6.4.2. Part-time instructional lecturers and temporary librarians appointed for the entire academic year that do not hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement must be evaluated each year by the department chair, and dean. Tenured faculty members should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements shall be written and signed (CBA 15.24). Department and college personnel policies may require evaluation by a DPRC in addition to the department chair/head and dean levels of review.
   - Years 1–5: Two or Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Annual)
   - Year 6: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (6 year cumulative)

6.4.3. Full-time or part-time instructional lecturers and temporary librarians appointed for one or two academic quarters or a partial year for 12-month temporary faculty employees that do not hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement may be evaluated at the discretion of the temporary faculty member, department chair/head or dean (CBA 15.25). These evaluations must include the department chair/head and dean levels of review and may include a department PRC. Tenured faculty members not participating on the PRC should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements shall be written and signed (CBA 15.24).

6.4.4. Full-time and part-time instructional lecturers and temporary librarians that hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement must be evaluated at minimum in the third year of their three-year appointment. The temporary faculty member may be evaluated more frequently at the request of the temporary faculty member or dean (CBA 15.26).
   - Year 3: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Cumulative)

6.4.5. Part-time faculty members must be evaluated by the department chair, and dean. Tenured faculty members should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements shall be written and signed (CBA 15.24). Department and college personnel policies may require evaluation by a department PRC in addition to the department chair/head and dean levels of review.
   - Year 3: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Cumulative)

6.4.6. Lecturers eligible for range elevation must undergo at least a Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation. A Four-Stage Lecturer Range Elevation is permissible. Colleges must specify in their personnel policy documents which evaluation process they use for lecturer range elevation.
Adopted:

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

AS-___-19

RESOLUTION ON SUPPORTING LIBRARY COLLECTIONS NECESSARY FOR
FACULTY AND STUDENT SUCCESS

Impact on Existing Policy: NONE

WHEREAS, A primary obligation of the Robert E. Kennedy Library is to provide access to scholarly content essential to student and faculty success in all Colleges, supporting excellence in teaching, learning and research at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, Faculty at Cal Poly are directly impacted by the funding necessary to support resources essential to success in the teacher-scholar model, and should be apprised of improvements or detriments to collections funding; and

WHEREAS, The Chancellor’s Office has provided a set of essential resources for all CSU campuses through centralized funding of the Electronic Core Collection (ECC); and

WHEREAS, The ECC has not received a funding increase since 2008, resulting in further and deeper cuts to the ECC due to inflation; and

WHEREAS, Such cuts force individual campuses to either terminate access to resources or pay for them locally, often at a higher price; and

WHEREAS, In January 2019, the Academic Senate of the California State University, unanimously passed resolution (AS-3351-18/FGA/AA (Rev)), calling on the Chancellor’s Office to increase funding for the ECC to address rising costs and continue to reap the advantages of collective purchasing power; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate of Cal Poly affirm its support of the resolution passed by the Academic Senate of the California State University, calling on the Chancellor’s Office to increase funding for the ECC; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the Dean of Library Services* be invited to address the Academic Senate annually to provide a report on the state of collections expenditures at both the centralized and local levels.

*As the title sometimes shifts over time through reorganizations (e.g., University Librarian), the current title used here is meant to indicate the top leadership position within Kennedy Library at any time, regardless of the specific title.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: TBD

---

(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.
Background

RESOLUTION ON SUPPORTING LIBRARY COLLECTIONS NECESSARY FOR FACULTY AND STUDENT SUCCESS [AS-—-19]

A primary obligation of Kennedy Library is to provide access to the 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 comes chiefly from two sources: the Chancellor’s Office and Cal Poly.

The Chancellor’s Office has provided system-wide funding since 1999 for a core collection of electronic resources available to all 23 campuses, called the Electronic Core Collection (ECC). The Chancellor’s Office has not increased the base amount of $5 million for the ECC since 2008. Inflation has continually eroded the purchasing power of that static base funding, resulting in the loss of resources. When a database is excised from the ECC, any campus wishing to maintain access must pay for it, typically at a much higher price. For example, when LexisNexis was cut from the ECC three years ago, the Robert E. Kennedy Library diverted other funds to maintain access to accommodate campus demand. In the three years since, Cal Poly’s access to this resource has risen from about $30,000 annually to nearly $40,000. To address such erosion of resources and shifting of costs due to inflation, the Academic Senate of the California State University in January 2019 unanimously passed resolution (AS-3351-18/FGA/AA (Rev)), calling on the Chancellor’s Office to increase funding for the ECC.

The Robert E. Kennedy Library also provides access to a breadth of databases and journals never supported by the ECC, and purchasing power for these resources is equally subject to erosion through inflation. The 2012 Cal Poly Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) generated for the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) noted a disparity of funding for Kennedy Library as compared with identified peer institutions (ranking 15 out of 16 for expenditures per FTE) and even within the CSU (ranking 9th lowest). The report listed as a specific action item the channeling of new funds towards the Robert E. Kennedy Library specifically for collections.

An increase in Chancellor’s Office funding for the ECC will offset losses of resources due to inflation for the system as a whole, reap the full advantage of collective purchasing power, and stem the shifting of costs to individual campuses if an excised resource is retained. An annual report to the Academic Senate by the Dean of Library Services will ensure that any improvement or detriment to the support for these vital resources at both the local and consortial levels will gain the continued visibility they merit in light of their importance to student and faculty success.

---

1 The Academic Senate of the California State University. Increased Funding for the Electronic Core Collection (ECC)

2 Examples: a campus subscription to the premier science journal, Nature, has risen 19% since 2015, costing Cal Poly campus $48,000 over four years; two titles from the American Association for the Advancement of Science have risen 38% in four years, costing Cal Poly $57,000 over that interval.


Increased Funding for the Electronic Core Collection (ECC)

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that the CSU Council of Library Directors (COLD) is faced with major cuts to the Electronic Core Collection (ECC) due to inflation and lack of funding increases, thereby damaging teaching, learning, research, and creative activities by faculty and students in the CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) urge the Chancellor to increase the funding for the Electronic Core Collection (ECC), in order to address increasing costs and continue to reap the advantages of collective purchasing power; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, Council of Library Directors (COLD), CSU ERFSA, and the California State Student Association (CSSA).

RATIONALE: The ECC started in 1999 and in 2008, the Academic Senate of the California State University endorsed the Virtual Library AS-2854-08/AA of which the Electronic Core Collection (ECC) collection is part for CSU students and faculty. Since 2008, the budget has stagnated at $5 million with no augmentations in ten years. As a result, due to increasing costs of information resources and inflation, the purchasing power of the ECC has diminished and information sources cut to keep within the budget.

The ECC allows all CSU students access to materials no matter the size and budget of their campus, which in turn leads to their success. Further, the value of this collection helps campuses meet accreditation standards of WASC in information literacy and critical thinking. Notably, fiscally this is the most efficient way to maintain library collections because this combined purchasing power saves the CSU an estimated $15 million annually.

The ECC currently includes 52 online collections and databases (list attached). During the 2017-18 academic year, there were 17,774,233 full-text downloads from the CSU Libraries online resources by CSU students and faculty.

Resources in the Electronic Core Collection

- ABI Inform (ProQuest)
- Academic Search Premier (EBSCO)
- Academic Complete eBooks (ProQuest)
Approval Unanimously – January 17-18, 2019

Background

RESOLUTION ON SUPPORTING LIBRARY COLLECTIONS NECESSARY FOR FACULTY AND STUDENT SUCCESS [AS-___-19]
WHEREAS, In May 2003, the Academic Senate endorsed the Talloires Declaration; and
WHEREAS, In August 2003 President Warren Baker signed the Talloires Declaration; and
WHEREAS, By signing the Talloires Declaration, Cal Poly endorsed its 10 point action plan to create a sustainable future; and
WHEREAS, The 2014 CSU Sustainability Policy “aims not only to reduce the university’s impact on the environment and educate our students, faculty and staff on sustainable practices, but also to incorporate sustainability principles and climate science in our educational offerings;” and
WHEREAS, In 2016, President Armstrong “chose to commit Cal Poly to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 and integrate these efforts into curriculum, research, and student experience through Learn by Doing;” and
WHEREAS, In 2016, Cal Poly adopted the AASHE (Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education) STARS (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment, and Rating System) as a framework for implementation, measurement, and improvement of sustainable practices across the entire university; and
WHEREAS, For Earth Day 2016, President Armstrong signed the Second Nature Climate Leadership Commitment, committing Cal Poly to achieve carbon neutrality and climate resilience as soon as possible and infuse these topics into curriculum, research, and student experience; and
WHEREAS, The Sept. 10, 2018 draft Cal Poly Strategic Plan reduces our commitment to sustainability to only one item, namely goal 7D, “Make the whole campus environment smart, resilient, and carbon neutral;” and
WHEREAS, The Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) Board of Directors as the official voice of the student body (20,560 students) unanimously passed Resolution #19-02 which “strongly advocates university leadership to increase and prioritize content regarding sustainability within the (Strategic) Plan,” therefore be it

RESOLUTION TO REINFORCE SUSTAINABILITY IN THE CAL POLY STRATEGIC PLAN

Adopted:

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

AS-____-19
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorses the Associated Students, Inc. Resolution #19-02 To Support the Cal Poly 2018-23 Strategic Plan; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the strategic plan be revised to more accurately reflect Cal Poly’s commitment to the Talloires Declaration, the CSU Sustainability Policy, and the AASHE-STARS framework; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the strategic plan add strategic priority 8: “Foster comprehensive sustainability.”

Proposed by: Academic Senate Sustainability Committee
(Unanimously approved)
Date: February 1, 2019
Revised:
Introduction

Thank you for your interest in the Cal Poly Strategic Plan! The final version of the plan will benefit from your feedback.

As you review the draft, please keep in mind that it is most finished at the strategic priority and goal levels. These are what most deserve your attention as a campus stakeholder. The lower levels of the plan, the potential initiatives and tactics as well the potential measures of success, are less finished and are presented more as illustrations of how goals might be achieved than as specific commitments by the university. Working groups will be formed and continue to develop these aspects of the plan during the 2018-19 academic year, after the final version is complete and adopted by the university.

After you have concluded your review, there are several ways to provide feedback:

1. Visit the strategic planning website (strategicplanning.calpoly.edu) and submit your written feedback at the bottom of the page.
2. Attend an open forum and provide feedback in person. Two open forums will be held: on October 4 and 25, from 11:10 a.m. to 12 noon, in the Berg Gallery (05-105).

All feedback will be cataloged and provided to the appropriate working group. Feedback about the strategic priorities and goals will be shared with the Steering Committee (the President’s Cabinet) for their review, consideration and potential adoption. Feedback about the potential initiatives, tactics and measures of success will be provided to the Executive Champions and Senior Sponsors for their review, consideration and potential adoption later this year as initiatives, tactics, and measures are finalized.

Thank you for your investment in Cal Poly’s future!
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.

---

1 The American Association of Colleges and Universities promotes a series of teaching and learning practices — first-year seminars and experiences; common intellectual experiences; learning communities; writing-intensive courses; collaborative assignments and projects; undergraduate research; diversity/global learning; ePortfolios; service learning and community-based learning; internships, capstone courses and projects — all of which have been shown to promote increased levels of student engagement and success.
Goal 3B: Create and sustain a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive university community that reflects the people of California.

Goal 3C: Prepare all students for their future through an education that includes diversity learning and reflects the principles of Inclusive Excellence².

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.

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, both local and global, 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: Develop an ethos of individual social responsibility in every campus community member, with an emphasis on students.

Goal 5B: Ensure that all students are engaging in effective, new opportunities outside of the classroom, which serve as a foundation 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 for students, faculty and staff.

² The concept of Inclusive Excellence was adopted by Cal Poly in 2009. It is based on an initiative of the American Association of Colleges and Universities that was designed to help institutions integrate their dedication to educational quality with their commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
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 regarding data and technology.

**Goal 6C**: Enable student success by creating a digital environment that empowers learning, teaching, and living at Cal Poly, while supporting engagement of future students and alumni to empower success at any stage of life.

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 facilities that promote a sense of pride and confidence in the campus environment.

**Goal 7D**: Make the whole campus environment smart, resilient, and carbon neutral.

**Goals 7E**: Ensure transparency of operations through clear and frequent communications at all levels.
Potential Initiatives, Tactics, and Measures of Success

The section that follows provides additional detail for each Strategic Priority. This includes identification of Executive Champions and Senior Sponsors as well as potential initiatives, tactics, and measures for each Goal.

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

**Executive Champions:** Kathleen Enz Finken, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and Keith Humphrey, Vice President for Student Affairs

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

**Senior Sponsor:** Christine Theodoropolous, Dean, College of Architecture and Environmental Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and promote our LBD identity and brand</td>
<td>Consistent campus understanding of the value of LBD and how it can and should be utilized with external constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make LBD a distinct focus of fundraising efforts at all levels</td>
<td>Knowledge and resources in place to capitalize on LBD in marketing efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the educational effectiveness of LBD at Cal Poly</td>
<td>Rubric developed to measure the effectiveness of LBD. Faculty development offered to support LBD effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand opportunities, especially industry partnerships, service learning, and international programs.</td>
<td>Every student will experience at least three high-impact practices, including the senior project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Senior Sponsors:** Beth Merritt Miller, Assistant Vice Provost for University Advising and Eileen Buecher, Executive Director, Career Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate campus efforts to educate undergraduates about options and opportunities beyond graduation (e.g., grad school, professional school).</td>
<td>Increase in students seeking advice, and ultimately enrolling in graduate school within the first five years after graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translate and connect knowledge and skills learned within the undergraduate curriculum and co-curriculum to the workforce and/or post-graduate education.</td>
<td>Increase in positive feedback on the undergraduate experience from alumni in post-graduate surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide intentional emphasis on leadership development within a student’s academic career.</td>
<td>Graduates report advancement within companies or organizations at greater rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage industry partners in understanding emerging trends in the workforce.</td>
<td>Potential shifts in curricular and co-curricular experiences to ensure students have the most current experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal 1C: Ensure access to an excellent education for all California students by providing financial aid support for those with the greatest economic need.

**Senior Sponsor:** James Maraviglia, Vice Provost for Enrollment Development and Chief Marketing Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish financial aid packaging to attract and retain academically qualified students with the highest economic need.</td>
<td>Increased yield of low income admitted students; Increased retention of low-income students; Increased timely graduation of low-income students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure resources, including staffing, evolves to support a growing low income, first generation population</td>
<td>Adequate staffing to manage increased and more complicated institutional aid and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore flexibility of funding sources both institutionally and from the Chancellor’s Office</td>
<td>Develop funding sources with maximum flexibility to award high need students up-front to impact yield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance technical infrastructure at the campus level to meet the needs of a complex financial aid system</td>
<td>Timely awarding and reporting of financial aid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

**Senior Sponsors:** Mary Pedersen, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Debi Hill, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop integrative models for both student advising and academic support</td>
<td>Students can access all advising and academic support via a single virtual hub; Increased number of students accessing tutoring services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand free tutoring services to all Cal Poly students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand Academic Skill Center to provide more Supplemental Instruction for all high fail rate courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide high level consistent comprehensive training for instructional student assistants, tutors, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove or reduce barriers to graduation</td>
<td>Improved retention and graduation rates; Faculty and staff have a full understanding of their impact on student success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify the major impediments to student success (see Academic Policy Diagnostic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop specific measures and timeline to address removing these barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a more supportive campus community for students</td>
<td>Improved retention and graduation rates; Improved campus climate survey results; Decrease in bias incidents; Improved retention and graduation rates for transfer students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a sense of belonging among all students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a two-year residential experience for nearly all students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRATEGIC PLAN 2018 - 2023
- Development of a Transfer Student Center to provide comprehensive support and services
- Develop specific measures to eliminate four- and six-year achievement gaps based on gender, ethnicity, and Pell Status.
- Identify campus-specific causes of achievement gaps; in Academic Year 2018-19, focus on students who leave Cal Poly
- Develop targeted retention efforts that are available to all students
- Expand CP Scholars program to provide support for students with the greatest financial need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish a strategic goal within each college for the percentage of students involved in high-impact practices</td>
<td>Colleges address high-impact practices in their strategic plans with specific targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a more integrated approach to managing internship and leadership opportunities</td>
<td>More of a one-stop shop that provides increased access to information and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create more opportunities within the General Education (GE) and major curricula to encourage student participation in high-impact practices</td>
<td>Many off-campus programs are designed to provide the opportunity to complete upper-division GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish scholarships to support study abroad and develop a varied collection of domestic off-campus programs and internships.</td>
<td>Students have the support they need to participate in high-impact practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an expanded Learn by Doing Fund in every college to support faculty and students involved in undergraduate research or other high-impact experiences</td>
<td>Faculty have the support they need to mentor students in high-impact practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Senior Sponsor: Dean Wendt, Dean, College of Science and Mathematics
Strategic Priority 2: Cultivate the Excellence of All Employees

Executive Champions: Kathleen Enz Finken, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and Cindy Villa, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance

Goal 2A: Recruit and retain the best employees.

Senior Sponsors: Al Liddicoat, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Personnel and Beth Gallagher, Associate Vice President for Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of tenure-track faculty across all colleges</td>
<td>Progress toward a university average of 75% tenure-density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work toward more competitive salaries for all employees</td>
<td>Additional funds, beyond negotiated general salary increases, are allocated towards local compensation efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, implement and evaluate the Faculty Diversity Cluster Hire</td>
<td>Successful recruitment of 8-10 tenure-track faculty; New faculty engagement with cohort and programming; Develop curricular support diversity and inclusion broadly across the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen recruitment processes for faculty and staff</td>
<td>Use analytics to review and track the diversity of applicant pools through the recruitment stages and to determine effectiveness of advertising and outreach to attracting diverse and qualified applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve outreach to diverse prospects.</td>
<td>Identify learning objectives for all training modules; Assess achievement of learning outcomes; Track completion of trainings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve use of Diversity Statement and rubric for faculty searches</td>
<td>Track top issues affecting job satisfaction and retention for faculty, staff, and management, and analyze responses by demographic categories; Develop best practices to better support all employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the review of candidate pools by the Office of University Diversity &amp; Inclusion (OUDI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise training for search committees, Employment Equity Facilitators, and hiring managers to include best practices in unconscious bias and Equal Opportunity requirements, policies and practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct stay and exit interviews to assess job satisfaction and identify obstacles that might affect employee retention. Use results to improve retention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop comprehensive mentoring programs within each college to support the development of new faculty</td>
<td>Increased retention and job satisfaction as measured by stay and exit interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Goal 2B:** Foster inclusive and excellent teaching practices through continued faculty development.

**Senior Sponsors:** Kathryn Rummell, Interim Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Scott Dawson, Dean, Orfalea College of Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a culture where innovative and inclusive teaching practices are embraced by the entire campus community rather than a select few</td>
<td>Increased utilization of innovative and inclusive teaching practices across campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner with CTLT and other experts to offer workshops on inclusive and innovative instruction with a particular emphasis on new faculty.</td>
<td>New workshops developed targeting new faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market and incentivize existing resources such as diversity &amp; inclusion modules in the digital commons and CTLT universal design workshops</td>
<td>Increased utilization of existing resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Senior Sponsor:** Chris Kitts, Interim Dean of Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade infrastructure to identify and implement the most current technical approaches and resources to support scholarship.</td>
<td>Appropriate tools selected and utilized to connect and share faculty scholarship; Achieve 50% engagement 2-3 years beyond initial implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide expanded training and support for grant development.</td>
<td>Increased number of faculty engaged in grant-related training programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In partnership with university marketing, communicate &amp; recognize scholarly activity more broadly.</td>
<td>Communication strategy developed to share research accomplishments more broadly both on and off campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 2D:** Promote professional development opportunities for all employees.

**Senior Sponsors:** Elena Morelos, Director of Academic Employment and Beth Gallagher, Associate Vice President for Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a workshop for managers to learn how to establish individual learning plans to support professional development for staff.</td>
<td>An effective professional development program that includes resources for managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate individual learning plans into employee's annual goal setting</td>
<td>Results include clear expectations for the next evaluation period, specifically in terms of development; better communication; demonstrated progress; focused and engaged employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile a campus wide inventory of all training opportunities for staff.</td>
<td>A comprehensive list of all campus-wide training with topics, delivery method, target audience and other parameters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 2E: Communicate and share more broadly the significant achievements of all employees.
Senior Sponsor: James Maraviglia, Vice Provost for Enrollment Development and Chief Marketing Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner with University Communications to develop a proactive Public Relations program.</td>
<td>Year-over-year increase in media placements and increased domain authority for web.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and curate a dedicated News website for Cal Poly that can highlight faculty and staff achievements.</td>
<td>Year-over-year increase in website traffic and sharing of stories across digital media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the promotion of faculty and staff achievements across University and college print, digital publications, and social media.</td>
<td>Increased awareness of faculty and staff achievements across college and divisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Priority 3: Enrich the Campus Culture of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
Executive Champion: Jozi De Leon, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion

Goal 3A: Create an aligned and cohesive focus on diversity and inclusion across the university.
Senior Sponsor: Julie Garcia, Interim Associate Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use a Collective Impact Framework to bring synergy to diversity and inclusion work across campus</td>
<td>Identification of gaps, assets and potential linkages, increased involvement and representation across campus, increased buy-in and enthusiasm about D&amp;I, longevity and sustainability of D&amp;I at Cal Poly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a diversity plan that will enable integration of diversity and inclusion across divisions, colleges, departments and other units (Diversity becomes everyone’s business)</td>
<td>Aligned D&amp;I goals across the university and visible in every area of the university, greater impact by moving forward key goals in a shorter amount of time, progress reported on our Inclusive Excellence Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an Inclusive Excellence Progress Report</td>
<td>Annual progress monitoring and reporting, ability to highlight the positive and target efforts in areas that need improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Goal 3B:** Create and sustain a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive university community that reflects the people of California.

**Senior Sponsors:** Jamie Patton, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs; Elena Morelos, Director of Academic Employment; and Beth Gallagher, Associate Vice President of Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct faculty and staff focus groups to identify areas of support, challenges, and barriers, and use this information to strengthen our retention strategies to be consistent with the knowledge gained.</td>
<td>Understanding of faculty and staff retention factors to improve culture through sense of belonging, engagement and retention (above group mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize diverse applicant pools by having candidate lists reviewed by OUDI.</td>
<td>Emphasize diverse applicant pools; New hires committed to diversity &amp; inclusion; Positive experience from applicants demonstrated through feedback; More compelling diversity statements for recruitment will be evident during OUDI review; Better assessment of diversity &amp; inclusion statements enhanced by training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategies to engage and retain staff which may include providing mentors, networking and professional development opportunities.</td>
<td>Improved culture that fosters better sense of belonging, engagement and lower turnover rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategies to strengthen our pipeline of faculty, staff and leadership with a demonstrated commitment to diversity and inclusion.</td>
<td>Become members of Southern and Northern California Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC); Better strategies for active recruitment using networking and other means; Connecting with Ford Foundation and other Postdoctoral Fellows Program to identify potential faculty; Summer institute for potential faculty hires; Active recruitment at conferences; More associate/assistant deans for diversity across university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain close partnership with the Graduation Initiative 2025 team.</td>
<td>Alignment and collaboration to achieve the Graduation Initiative 2025 goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal 3C: Prepare all students for their future through an education that includes diversity learning and reflects the principles of Inclusive Excellence.

**Senior Sponsor:** Bruno Giberti, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create multiple touchpoints in the co-curriculum, including housing and orientation programs, which foster an awareness of relevant issues, skills to navigate differences (i.e., cultural competency), and a sense of community</td>
<td>Every student acquires the knowledge, skills, and values to flourish in a diverse world and a global economy, as described by the University Learning Outcomes and Diversity Learning Outcomes, as well as by diversity- and inclusion-specific PLOs and CLOs; Lessons relating to diversity and inclusion are well scaffolded across the undergraduate curriculum and co-curriculum, including General Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infuse outcomes related to diversity and inclusion throughout the GE curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)/Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) in every degree program to assure that students learn about diversity &amp; inclusion in the disciplines and professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the Intergroup Dialogues (IGD) to reach a wider range of students</td>
<td>80% of students have an IGD experience and IGD occurs in curricular and co-curricular areas; Students who have had an IGD experience outperform students who have not in demonstrated empathy, communication skills, friendship network, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Senior Sponsor:** Julie Garcia, Interim Associate Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate clear expectation that everyone is responsible for diversity work, campus-wide, and should be recognized for such work at the individual and unit level.</td>
<td>Opportunities to report in RPT for faculty; Merit evaluations forms have diversity and inclusion components; Proposals to create courses related to diversity, inclusion, and curriculum; A “diversity and inclusion” scorecard that is evaluated by Chief Diversity Officer annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategies to assess more immediate campus climate needs.</td>
<td>Feedback via portal; Focus groups with students, faculty, staff; Questionnaires; Exit Surveys; Relationship building between students and administrators that do not see students as often as faculty; New climate survey that will lead to an action plan and scorecard in Fall 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create policies, programs and initiatives to enable a university environment that facilitates respect, belonging, and civility</td>
<td>Solidify time, place, manner policies; Create faculty committee on diversity and inclusion through faculty senate; Create staff and faculty Ombuds to mediate and mitigate instances of bias; Create an environment where everyone feels safe; Greater retention of students, staff, and faculty; Greater productivity of staff and faculty; More content and happy student, staff, and faculty; Bias Incident Response Team would see</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*STRATEGIC PLAN 2018 - 2023*
Develop diversity and inclusion branding for university, and integrate it into CP brand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infuse diversity and inclusion (D&amp;I) throughout the GE curriculum</td>
<td>Students have the knowledge, skills, and values to thrive in a diverse world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hardwire D&amp;I outcomes into the GE curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revise, refocus, and rebrand United States Cultural Pluralism (UCSP) requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students to create more meaningful connections in the GE curriculum</td>
<td>Students approach the GE curriculum with intention and reflect on their varied experiences to create greater meaning and deeper learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop thematic pathways and linked courses</td>
<td>Establish a GE e-portfolio along with a conscious strategy of integrative learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish a GE e-portfolio along with a conscious strategy of integrative learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that GE prepares students for success in their academic and professional lives</td>
<td>Students choose to attend Cal Poly because of the strength and distinctiveness of the GE program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a &quot;Writing Across Cal Poly&quot; program</td>
<td>Students achieve the GE Program Learning Objectives at expected levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Update GE templates to reflect Executive Order (EO) 1100</td>
<td>Students are able to enroll in the GE courses that they want and need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Update GE area outcomes to reflect EO 1100 and a current understanding of what students should know and be able to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve GE enrollment management practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a more robust partnership between the GE Governance Board, Academic Programs &amp; Planning, and the academic departments to assure the educational effectiveness of GE areas and courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion Learn by Doing (LBD) in GE</td>
<td>Students perceive GE as a robust locus for LBD that is equivalent to their majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiously infuse LBD in all GE areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 4B: Develop innovative and sustainable undergraduate degree programs that meet the present and future needs of society and industry.

**Senior Sponsors:** Andy Thulin, Dean, College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences and Brian Tietje, Vice Provost for International, Graduate and Extended Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research new undergraduate interdisciplinary program opportunities</td>
<td>White paper that identifies and evaluates several new interdisciplinary undergraduate program opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop funding model to incentivize programmatic innovation.</td>
<td>Budget model that encourages programmatic innovation, including both pruning and expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish working group to review Cal Poly’s current portfolio of programs and recommendations for new programs, and to make recommendations to the Dean’s Council.</td>
<td>Findings will be brought to Dean’s Council for recommendations about future direction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Senior Sponsor:** Rich Savage, Dean of Graduate Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish business model that clearly supports and incentivizes excellence and growth in graduate programs including support for student recruitment, Teaching Assistants and Graduate Assistants.</td>
<td>Growth in enrollments with all programs achieving at least 30 new admits and 30 degrees awarded each academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a fitness report that identifies and tracks key performance metrics for each graduate program and get buy-in from graduate coordinators.</td>
<td>• 90% of graduates either secure employment or are accepted in additional graduate education at the time of graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2-year graduation rates of &gt;90%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Graduate programs that achieve high performance metrics during each program review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No blended students that leave Cal Poly without a bachelor’s degree and 90% that complete both their bachelor and master degrees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize integrated data-base that tracks students from admission to graduation; including tracking progress to degree completion with interactive dashboard.</td>
<td>Improved tracking and longitudinal data on progress to degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create faculty workload model that supports graduate students and the Teacher Scholar Model</td>
<td>• Increase in publications in peer review journals and professional conference proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty who can support thesis research and integrate the outcomes into their undergraduate curriculums. (Immersive Learning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Goal 4D**: Address real-world problems, both local and global, through interdisciplinary and international experiences, as well as, community and industry partnerships.

**Senior Sponsor**: Brian Tietje, Vice Provost for International, Graduate and Extended Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify/compile existing classes, programs, projects, centers, offices, and other activities and entities that already operate on campus and are designed to address real-world problems.</td>
<td>A verifiable system is in place to confirm that every Cal Poly undergraduate and graduate student engages in at least one real world application project during their Cal Poly career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and evaluate potential methods we could use to compile, report, and publicize these activities more broadly.</td>
<td>Information and news about student activities that are addressing real-world problems would be systematically and broadly collected and shared in a manner that does not require additional effort or formal coordination (e.g., #CPreal-world).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce the concept of sponsored interdisciplinary projects to the campus community for consideration (drawing on exemplars such as College of Engineering’s industry-sponsored interdisciplinary projects)</td>
<td>Policies, forms, processes, and funding mechanisms in place that make it relatively easy for faculty and students to help address real-world problems through existing curricular and co-curricular models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate more interdisciplinary curricular and co-curricular experiences.</td>
<td>A higher number of available courses beginning in the first year and continuing through the final year of study that facilitate and encourage students and faculty to work in interdisciplinary teams to tackle real-world problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Executive Champion**: Keith Humphrey, Vice President for Student Affairs

**Goal 5A**: Develop an ethos of individual social responsibility in every campus community member, with an emphasis on students.

**Senior Sponsor**: Jamie Patton, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Implement online and in-person diversity and inclusion track for new Cal Poly students (First-year and transfer) throughout orientation programming. | • Students will understand university expectations of our core values of cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.  
• Students will have greater awareness, understanding, and appreciation of cultural and human differences to personal situations.  
• Students will develop an awareness of social problems and actively engage in civic, political, and community activities. |
Establish the Cultural Humility Workshop with specific tracks for students, faculty, Student Affairs staff, and other university employees.

- Participants will deeply explore race and race dynamics, social class, and systemic oppression. Further, they will discuss how they each impact the university experience and create recommendations to improve our practice.
- Participants will have the ability to demonstrate, model, and champion our university core values.
- Participants will identify strategies that will enable them to serve as change agents to advance and sustain a healthy campus climate.

Implement diversity and inclusion online and in-person follow-up sessions for athletes, student leaders and members of the Greek Life community.

- Students will understand university expectations of our core values of cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.
- Students will have greater awareness, understanding, and appreciation of cultural and human differences to personal situations. They will be aware of social problems and actively engage in civic, political, and community activities.

Create a Foundational Equity and Inclusion Seminar for Student Affairs Staff that can be shared with other divisions and colleges.

- Staff will develop and promote a respectful, well-informed campus climate by creating or deepening knowledge about various diversity-related themes.
- Staff will increase their ability to effectively connect with diverse student populations in new ways.
- Staff will be able to take information presented and use it to develop their own programming, for use in residence halls, departmental meetings, and other student service-oriented settings.

**Goal SB**: Ensure that all students are engaging in effective, new opportunities outside of the classroom, which serve as a foundation for a life-long relationship with Cal Poly.

**Senior Sponsor**: Kathleen McMahon, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand programmatic offerings that engage under-represented students, particularly in the first and second years</td>
<td>Increased sense of belonging among under-represented students, resulting in increased retention and graduation rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop efforts that enhance school-spirit for undergraduates and increase connections of alumni in the first five years after graduation</td>
<td>Increased alumni participation in programs and activities (ex. Homecoming) and increased alumni giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand support tools for university staff and club officers that include club management dashboards, communication tools, training, and skill development.</td>
<td>Stronger club leadership and management, including communications to members and alumni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize technology to monitor student involvement to ensure that a picture of an engaged student is developed.</td>
<td>Ensuring that every student is engaged in a meaningful way outside of class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Goal SC:** Create the extracurricular facilities and co-curricular programs anchored in Learn by Doing that create a vibrant residential campus community.

**Senior Sponsor:** Jo Campbell, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Executive Director of University Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand the out-of-class facility footprint to include enhanced student housing, cross-cultural, health and wellbeing, and career and professional development space</td>
<td>Additional student housing and appropriate support spaces to sustain a residential campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality and variety of dining options</td>
<td>Student opinion of food quality changes and results in more voluntary meal plan purchases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of and satisfaction with events that make on-campus experiences the focus for student activity</td>
<td>Increased attendance at on-campus events, reduction in high-risk activity off campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a Greek Village for all social fraternities and sororities</td>
<td>Safer, healthier, and more leadership focused Greek organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal SD:** Cultivate a campus environment that emphasizes all aspects of personal and community wellbeing for students, faculty and staff.

**Senior Sponsor:** Tina Hadaway-Mellis, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs, Health and Wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand the offerings of the health center to include satellite locations, wellbeing focused living-learning communities, and mobile vaccination clinics. Create a basic needs hub to address student needs around food, housing, health and wellbeing</td>
<td>Increased usage of health center and reduction in wait times for service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the feasibility of providing specialty care clinics to students, faculty and staff</td>
<td>Increased quality of life for students, faculty, staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce harmful events related to substance abuse through expanded bystander intervention programming, outreach, and research</td>
<td>Reduction in hospitalizations for alcohol poisonings, sexual assaults, and violence on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the wellness ambassador concept to more students, as well as faculty and staff</td>
<td>Improved public health education efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to improve student engagement with the greater San Luis Obispo and Central Coast community through collaborating with community partners</td>
<td>Continued reduction in off-campus violations, noise violations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Priority 6: Leverage Data and Technology to Support the Institution's Mission

**Executive Champion:** Bill Britton, Vice President and Chief Information Officer

**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.

**Senior Sponsor:** Alison Robinson, Associate Vice President for Information Technology Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Focus on customer success through implementation of Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) Principles. | • Service Catalog – % of services listed  
• Improved service assistance process – service survey  
• Transparent prioritization of project requests and reporting project completion |
| Enhance the cybersecurity profile of the campus by using analytics, threat intelligence, and proactive measures. | • National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Standards-based measures  
• International Traffic In Arms Regulations (ITAR)/Export Control environment established |
| Ensure robust wired and wireless networks to enable teaching, learning, living, research, and administration. | • Connectivity granted successfully, network uptime, bandwidth consumption stats  
• Wi-Fi Saturation %  
• Firewall rearchitected and implemented  
• Network rearchitected and implemented  
• Rewire campus network |
| Modernize Identity and Access Management (IAM) Program to enable efficient access to resources and services. | • Successful automation of on-boarding and off-boarding student and employees  
• Effective integrations of campus Identity and Access Management and cloud services  
• Improve campus security profile |
| Modernize administrative systems to foster student success and enable collaboration across the campus. | • Develop with all affected administrative offices a strategic plan for modernization efforts  
• Strategic Plan must be supported by Vision, Priority, Pace decisions made by the cabinet and enabled with funding  
• Fund Information Technology Strategically |
| Implement a cohesive campus website strategy that provides a consistent look, feel, navigation and builds the Cal Poly brand. | • Official campus websites exist within new template design  
• Unofficial sites relocated  
• Decommissioning of the Drupal7 web environment  
• Decommission of the Unix web environment |
**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 regarding data and technology.**

**Senior Sponsor:** Alison Robinson, Associate Vice President for Information Technology Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a connected campus vision through the implementation of a Customer Relationship Management service that allows Cal Poly to better serve the needs of their students, staff, alumni, and donors.</td>
<td>Stronger relationships with all members of the Cal Poly community are developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Because of scalability, lower capital expenditure, flexibility, ability to streamline processes, and increase IT productivity, adopt "Cloud First" strategy for technical infrastructure. | • Number of home-grown systems replaced by cloud-based service providers  
   • 80% of campus data center services relocated to Amazon Web Services  
   • Redundancy in network connectivity and providers  
   • Robust bandwidth availability |
| Establish an Information Technology Governance structure that enables the vision, priority and pace of campus Information technology efforts. | Successful prioritization of projects.                                             |
| Through the California Cybersecurity Institute, educate the next generation cyber workforce and provide faculty and students with a new, hands-on research and learning environment. | • Certification Courses Completed  
   • # of courses taught  
   • Number of Partnerships with Public & Private entities |
| Connect public sector organizations with engaged students and world-class technology expertise through Digital Transformation Hub services. | • Number of completed challenges  
   • Number of Institutions assisted in their AWS efforts |

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

**Senior Sponsors:** Alison Robinson, Associate Vice President for Information Technology Services; Dave Dobis, Chief Data Officer; and Patrick O'Sullivan, Director, Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Provide "Learn by Doing" Information Technology experiences for students by developing a comprehensive ITS Student Employee Program. | • Number of students that participate in employment  
   • Number of students that receive Information Technology badges and/or certifications. |
### Modernize academic systems to foster student success and enable collaboration across the campus.

- Learning Management System that is cloud-based and enables efficient and effective integration of additional services.
- # of services integrated in to the Learning Management System

### Enable Cal Poly's decision-making ability through a university-wide approach to analytics, reporting, and business intelligence.

- Establishment of Data governance
- Establishment of Data Dictionary
- Modernization of data warehouse
- Enterprise tools to facilitate analytics and reporting

### Provide anywhere/anytime/any device access to tools and resources needed to be successful in teaching and learning.

- Virtualization of computer labs
- Availability of software download tool
- Develop a mobile strategy

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

**Executive Champions:** Cindy Villa, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance and Matthew Ewing, Vice President for Development

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

**Senior Sponsors:** Victor Brancart, Associate Vice President for Administration and Finance and Dru Zachmeyer, Assistant Vice President for Administration and Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Continue development of robust campus budget communication, management, monitoring and reporting tools and processes. Create a multi-year financial planning and forecasting process. | - Documented, uniform campus budget processes that are followed by campus community.  
- Implementation of budget training program for all campus budget managers.  
- Publish comprehensive “budget book” on an annual basis.  
- Implementation of electronic budget management solutions to improve budget management, monitoring and reporting for campus budget managers and leadership.  
- Develop a multi-year budget forecasting and planning process. |

| Drive cost savings and efficiency measures across the organization. | - Partner with campus units to achieve annual procurement cost savings objectives ($3.5m for FY 18/19)  
- Expand Administration and Finance (AFD) “efficiency taskforce” concept into a campus-wide program designed to involve employees across campus in business innovation and continuous improvement. |
Goal 7B: Foster a robust culture of philanthropy that allows the university to generate private gifts in support of institutional goals.
Senior Sponsor: Adam Jarman, Associate Vice President for Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete the university's second comprehensive campaign</td>
<td>Surpass stated goals; Completed projects across campus; Major gift pipeline to support a future campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create lifelong engagement of various constituencies</td>
<td>Robust &quot;alumni and welcome center&quot;; Implementation of new campus-wide Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system; Increased engagement programs that feed the philanthropic pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance communications efforts related to philanthropy to better tell the story of its impact</td>
<td>Enhanced giving web site; Greater partnership with Cal Poly Magazine to highlight stories of philanthropic impact; Increased media coverage of stories of impact; Increased messaging related to philanthropy targeted at Cal Poly Alumni Association chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the capacity of our deans, unit leaders, and lead gift officers to ensure we are maximizing fundraising potential</td>
<td>Increased philanthropic support of the university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Goal 7C**: Develop facilities that promote a sense of pride and confidence in the campus environment.

**Senior Sponsor**: Juanita Holler, Associate Vice President for Administration and Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a comfortable, safe, and inviting campus environment. Develop and implement campus standards that establish aesthetic and functional parameters for future development of the campus.</td>
<td>Improved campus signage, aesthetically pleasing and innovative new buildings, enhanced pedestrian circulation utilizing a comprehensive system of outdoor connections. An improved living, learning and working environment for faculty, staff and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create and sustain a robust Preventive Maintenance (PM) Program to enhance existing facilities. Expand and mature current PM Program. Utilize Planon (integrated workplace management system software) capabilities to set up and publish useful metrics to monitor performance and assess for future changes.</td>
<td>Reduction in service calls from failed equipment. Improved environmental conditions in classrooms, offices, etc. Reduced maintenance costs and service outages from critical equipment break-down repairs. Reduction in backlog of deferred maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the Campus Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report which will serve as the framework for campus growth in a thoughtful and coordinated manner.</td>
<td>New governance structure to review and prioritize campus projects. Improved 5-year Capital Planning Process to incorporate master planning initiatives. Orderly growth of student population in conjunction with student related support facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the Campus Utility Master Plan so that the campus can support future growth of students and buildings by having adequate capacity for water, wastewater, sewer, electrical, etc.</td>
<td>Utility resources will be available when expansion of campus facilities is required. Secondary source of water will be procured in advance of new construction activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 7D**: Make the whole campus environment smart, resilient, and carbon neutral.

**Senior Sponsor**: Dennis Elliot, Director, Energy, Utilities and Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Continue implementation of the campus Climate Action Plan | • Reduced greenhouse gas emissions  
• Number of LEED Certified buildings  
• Improved transportation survey results |
| Grow Cal Poly participation and leadership in the Central Coast Climate Collaborative | • Increased Central Coast Climate Collaborative membership  
• Increased UC and CSU participation in Central Coast Climate Collaborative  
• Number of Central Coast Climate Collaborative projects, studies, reports completed |
| Incorporate climate projects and initiatives in curriculum, applied research, student orientation, and Residential Life | • Number of tours and guest lectures  
• Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System (STARS) Gold Rating  
• Courses in the Sustainability Course Catalog (SUSCAT)  
• Sustainability research and grant awards |
**Goals 7E: Ensure transparency of operations through clear and frequent communications at all levels.**

**Senior Sponsor: Jessica Darin, Associate Vice President and Chief of Staff to the President**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Initiatives and Tactics</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form a working group of campus representatives to meet to create a process- to approve, prioritize and triage information to be shared with campus community and public via C/P website/Twitter/Cal Poly Report.</td>
<td>An easily accessible forum and means to find out specific information – as well as a place for campus community and the public to provide suggestions, input and questions; as well as finding out about future projects and plans. Stronger trust and support of long-range plans as well as greater understanding of decisions will be established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add new specific areas to main Cal Poly web page (individual tabs) where current and real-time information will be posted and can be found: i.e. Current building projects on campus Administrative Initiatives ASI Initiatives Faculty Senate Initiatives Union updates CSU (budget information) Emergency Services</td>
<td>The campus community will all be on the same page regarding the goals and initiatives of the Administration and the CSU via a user-friendly resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update and maintain all campus Organizational Charts for divisions across campus with cross references and clear lines of positional authority.</td>
<td>A user-friendly site where campus and public can access information regarding what division to contact regarding a specific need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
<p>| Category                        | Subcategory                        | Credit Number and Title                                                                 | Points available | Applicable to:                                                                                    | Minimum requirement                                                                                       | Recycled completion of a separate inventory survey? | Timeframe | Persuasive? |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| Institutional Characteristics  | IC 1 Institutional Boundary        | Required All institutions.                                                              | Institution has defined the boundary to be used for its STARS report.   | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | IC 2 Operational Characteristics  | Required All institutions.                                                              | Institution has current operational data (e.g. campus area, green squares, footprints of their area, environment lab). | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | IC 3 Academics and Demographics   | Required All institutions.                                                              | Institution has current demographic data (e.g. FTE enrollment, FTU employees, number of people living on-campus). | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
| Curriculum                     | AC 1 Academic Courses             | 14 All institutions.                                                                   | Institution conducts an inventory to identify its sustainability course offerings. | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | AC 2 Learning Outcomes            | 8 All institutions that have degree programs.                                          | Institution offers at least one sustainability-themed, undergraduate-level major, degree program, minor, concentration. | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | AC 3 Undergraduate Program        | 3 All institutions that have undergraduate majors, academic programs, of the institution. | Institution conducts an assessment of the sustainability literacy of its students. | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | AC 4 Graduate Program             | 3 All institutions that offer at least 25 students graduate programs.                  | Institution offers at least one sustainability-themed, graduate-level major, degree program, minor, concentration or certificate. | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | AC 5 Immersive Experience         | 2 All institutions that offer immersive educational programs.                          | Institution offers at least one immersive, sustainability-focussed educational study program. | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | AC 6 Biodiversity Literacy Assessment | 4 All institutions.                                                   | Institution has a formally adopted open access policy that ensures that versions of future scholarly articles (e.g., faculty and staff are deposited in a designated online library repository. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | AC 7 Incentives for Developing Courses | 2 All institutions.                                                               | Institution has an ongoing program that offers incentives for faculty in multiple disciplines or departments to develop new sustainability courses and/or incorporate sustainability into existing courses or departments. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | AC 8 Campus as a Living Laboratory | 4 All institutions whose students attend the physical campus.                         | Institution is offering its infrastructure and operations for multi-stakeholder student learning and applied research that contributes to understanding campus sustainability challenges or advancing sustainability on campus. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
| Research                       | AC 9 Research and Scholarship     | 12 All institutions where research is considered in faculty and/or staff promotion or tenure decisions. | Institution conducts an inventory to identify its sustainability research activities and initiatives. | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | AC 10 Support for Research        | 4 All institutions where research is considered in faculty and/or staff promotion or tenure decisions. | Institution has programs to encourage and/or support sustainability research. | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | AC 11 Open Access to Research     | 2 All institutions whose research is considered in faculty and/or staff promotion or tenure decisions. | Institution has a formally adopted open access policy that ensures that versions of future scholarly articles (e.g., faculty and staff are deposited in a designated online repository) are freely available. | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | EN 1 Student Education Program    | 4 All institutions that have students enrolled in credit.                              | Institution conducts an ongoing peer-to-peer sustainability outreach and education program for students (termed &quot;Eco-Rep&quot;) in an &quot;Eco-Rep&quot; program. | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | EN 2 Student Orientation          | 2 All institutions that hold student orientation.                                     | Institution includes sustainability prominently in its student education activities and programming. | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | EN 3 Student Life                 | 2 All institutions.                                                                  | Institution has co-curricular sustainability programs and initiatives. | Yes                                                                                             | Most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.            |               |            |
|                                | EN 4 Outreach Materials and Publications | 2 All institutions.                                                               | Institution produces outreach materials and publications that foster sustainability learning and knowledge. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | EN 5 Outreach Campaign            | 4 All institutions.                                                                  | Institution conducts outreach campaigns directed at students and/or employees that yields measurable, positive results in advancing sustainability. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | EN 6 Assessing Sustainability Culture | 1 All institutions.                                                               | Institution conducts an assessment of campus sustainability that focuses on sustainability values, behaviors and beliefs. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | EN 7 Employee Education Program   | 3 All institutions.                                                                  | Institution administers or oversees an ongoing faculty/staff peer-to-peer sustainability outreach and education program. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | EN 8 Employee Orientation         | 1 All institutions.                                                                  | Institution conducts sustainability training in new employee orientation and/or in academic and guidance materials distributed to new employees. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | EN 9 Staff Professional Development | 2 All institutions.                                                               | Institution's staff participates in sustainability training or professional development opportunities that are provided or supported by the institution. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | EN 10 Community Partnerships      | 3 All institutions.                                                                  | Institution has an established formal community partnership with at least one community member. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | EN 11 Inter-Campus Collaboration  | 3 All institutions.                                                                  | Institution collaborates with other colleges and universities to support and help build the campus sustainability community. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | EN 12 Outreach and Collaboration  | 5 All institutions that offer continuing education or community education programs. | Institution offers continuing education courses that address sustainability and/or has at least one sustainability-themed certificate program through its continuing education or extension department. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | EN 13 Community Service           | 5 All institutions that have undergraduate students.                                   | Institution has data on student engagement in community service. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | EN 14 Participation in Public Policy | 2 All institutions.                                                               | Institution advocates for public policies that support campus sustainability or that advance sustainability. | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |
|                                | EN 15 Trademarks and Licensing    | 2 All institutions whose logos or trademarks are prominently displayed on campus and that are eligible for FAA and/or WRC membership. | Institution is a member of the Fair Labor Association (FLA) or the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC). | Yes                                                                                             | Projects and initiatives currently in progress or conducted within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission. |               |            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Credit Number and Title</th>
<th>Points available</th>
<th>Applicable to</th>
<th>Minimum requirement</th>
<th>Requires completion of a separate inventory assessment survey?</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Person(s) to Pursue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air &amp; Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has conducted a greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory that includes, at minimum, Scope 1 and Scope 2 and indirect Scope 3 emissions; and has developed a greenhouse gas reduction strategy or plan to reduce Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by at least 5% by 2025.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 2 Outdoor Air Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) adopted policies or guidelines to improve outdoor air quality; 2) conducted an air pollution analysis for on-campus sources of air pollution; and 3) compiled a list of significant air emissions from on-campus sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current programs, policies and practices and inventory of local emissions compared or updated within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 3 Building Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of existing buildings; 2) completed a report on energy consumption for existing buildings; and 3) implemented an energy efficiency program to reduce energy consumption by at least 5% within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current certification status of buildings as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 4 Building Design and Construction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; and 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current certification status of buildings as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 5 Building Energy Consumption</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings and has developed a plan to reduce energy consumption by at least 5% within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 6 Clean and Renewable Energy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) adopted policies or guidelines to use clean and renewable energy sources; and 2) implemented a plan to increase the use of clean and renewable energy sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Dining</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 7 Food and Beverage Purchasing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current certification status of buildings as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 8 Sustainable Dining</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current certification status of buildings as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations (OPE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 9 Landscape Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current certification status of buildings as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations (OPE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 10 Biodiversity</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 11 Sustainable Procurement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 12 Equipment Purchasing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 13 Energy Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 14 Office Paper Purchasing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 15 Campus Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 16 Student Commute Modal Split</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 17 Employee Commute Modal Split</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 18 Support for Student Transportation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 19 Waste Minimization &amp; Diversion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 20 Construction and Demolition Waste Diversion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission and data from the prior two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 21 Hazardous Waste Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current programs as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 22 Water Use</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current programs as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 23 Wastewater Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>Institution has 1) conducted an energy audit of new buildings; 2) implemented green building guidelines or practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current programs as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To participate, select "Add" > Download as... "(Excel version)" or "File > Make a copy" (Google Drive option).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Credit Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Points available</th>
<th>Applicable to:</th>
<th>Minimum Requirement</th>
<th>Response requirement of a separate inventory assessment or survey?</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Pursuing? (Yes, No, NA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination &amp; Planning</td>
<td>PA 1 Sustainability Coordination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institution has at least one sustainability committee, office, and/or officer tasked by the administration or governing body to advise on and implement policies and programs related to sustainability on campus.</td>
<td>Current sustainability committee/operational and practice office status, and/or officer position status as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA 2 Sustainability Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Institution has formally adopted policies that include measurable sustainability objectives.</td>
<td>Current and formally adopted plans as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA 3 Student Affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Institution has adopted: (1) a framework for engaging internal stakeholders (i.e., students, staff, faculty, and community members); (2) a framework for engaging external stakeholders (e.g., local community members) in the institution's governance, strategy, and operations.</td>
<td>Current policies and procedures as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity &amp; Affordability</td>
<td>PA 4 Diversity and Equity Coordination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Institution has a diversity and equity committee, office, and/or officer tasked by the administration or governing body to advise on and implement policies and programs related to diversity and equity on campus.</td>
<td>Current practice and status and participation during the two years prior to the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA 5 Assessing Diversity and Equity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institution has engaged in a structured assessment process to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA 6 Support for Underrepresented Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Institution has policies, programs, or initiatives to support underrepresented groups and/or to improve diversity and inclusion across campus communities.</td>
<td>Current program offerings and status as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment &amp; Finance</td>
<td>PA 7 Affordability and Access</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Institution has policies and programs in place to make affordable (i.e., lower-income) students and/or support non-traditional students and/or support full-time equivalent (FTE) employees.</td>
<td>Current practices, policies, and procedures and the most recent data available within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA 8 Committees on Investor Responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All institutions with endowments of US $1 million or larger</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Institution has a formally established and active committee on investor responsibility (CIR) and/or body that has a formal obligation to fund sustainability initiatives and social, environmental, and governance (E/S) issues.</td>
<td>Current committee composition and practices as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA 9 Sustainable Investment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All institutions with endowments of US $1 million or larger</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Institution has had a positive sustainability investment and/or has investor engagement policies and practices.</td>
<td>Current policies and actions taken within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA 10 Investment Disclosure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions that have an investment component</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institution maintains a record of its investment holdings available to the public.</td>
<td>Current holdings (i.e., most recent snapshot available) as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing &amp; Work</td>
<td>PA 11 Employee Compensation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Institution has had data on the hourly wage and total compensation provided to its employees.</td>
<td>Current compensation status and offerings as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA 12 Assessing Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institution conducts a survey or other evaluation that allows for anonymous feedback to measure employee satisfaction and engagement.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA 13 Wellbeing Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institution has a wellness and/or employee assistance program that enables employees to address physical, mental, and emotional health issues.</td>
<td>Current program status and offerings as of the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA 14 Workplace Health and Safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Institution may use data on workplace injury and occupational disease cases and full-time equivalent (FTE) employees.</td>
<td>Most recent data available from the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary Practice</td>
<td>Center of credits available</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Institution has one or more new, extraordinary, unique, groundbreaking, or unexpected outcomes, policies, or practices that address sustainability challenges and are not covered by an existing credit or exemplar practice option.</td>
<td>Innovative practices, policies, programs, or outcomes that are emerging or occurred within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Poor credits available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institution has one or more new, extraordinary, unique, groundbreaking, or unexpected outcomes, policies, or practices that address sustainability challenges and are not covered by an existing credit or exemplar practice option.</td>
<td>Innovative practices, policies, programs, or outcomes that are emerging or occurred within the three years prior to the anticipated date of submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>