Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Tuesday, November 6, 2018  
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: Approval of October 16 and October 23, 2018 minutes: (pp. 2-4).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Results of election of part-time employee representative for the 2018-2019 academic year.

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 the eLearning Addendum Revision Task Force: (pp. 5-6).
   B. Appointment to Academic Senate Committees: (p. 7).
   C. Approval of Instruction Committee’s Recommendations for the 2020-2021 Academic Calendar: Hunter Glanz, Instruction Committee Chair (pp. 8-15).
   D. Resolution on Proposed Organization of a New University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: Ken Brown Faculty Affairs Committee Chair (pp. 16-22).
   E. [TIME CERTAIN 3:45 P.M.] Resolution on Use of Campus for Visiting Speakers to Protect Core Operations and Provide Transparency: Margaret Bodemer, History Department and Carrie Langner, Psychology and Child Development Department (pp. 23-25).
   F. [CLOSED SESSION, TIME CERTAIN 4 P.M.] Honorary Degree: Keith Humphrey, Vice President for Student Affairs (Materials will be sent electronically).
   G. Resolution to Modify Section V. Meetings of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair (p. 26).

V. Discussion Item(s):

VI. Adjournment:
I. **Minutes:** M/S/P to approve the September 25, 2018 Academic Senate Executive Committee minutes.

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

III. **Reports:**
A. Academic Senate Chair: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, reported that at the Academic Senate Chairs’ Conference at CSU Long Beach, key points of discussion included General Education compliance with EO 1100 (revised) and the CSU budget.

B. President’s Office: None.

C. Provost: Refer to page 4 in agenda packet.

D. Statewide Senate: Refer to pages 5-22 in agenda packet.

E. CFA: None.

F. ASI: Refer to page 23 in agenda packet.

IV. **Business Items:**
A. Appointment of Ken Brown, Philosophy Department as CLA Caucus Chair for the 2018-2019 academic year. M/S/P to appoint Ken Brown, Philosophy Department, as CLA Caucus Chair for the 2018-2019 academic year.

B. Appointment of Grace Yeh, Ethnic Studies Department to the CLA Caucus for the 2018-2019 academic year. M/S/P to appoint Grace Yeh, Ethnic Studies Department, to the CLA Caucus for the 2018-2019 academic year.

C. Appointment of Gregory Schwartz, Bioresource and Ag Engineering Department to the CAFES Caucus for the 2018-2020 term. M/S/P to appoint Gregory Schwartz, Bioresource and Ag Engineering Department to the CAFES Caucus for the 2018-2020 term.

D. Election of Chairs for the GE Area Workgroups. M/S/P to approve the following individuals as chairs to the respective GE Area Workgroups:
   - Lauren Kolodziejski, Communication Studies: GE Area A Workgroup
   - Paul Choboter, Mathematics: GE Area B Workgroup
   - Rachel Fernflores, Philosophy: GE Area C Workgroup
   - Kris Jankovitz, Kinesiology & Public Health: GE Area D/E Workgroup
   - José Navarro, Ethnic Studies: Diversity and Inclusion Workgroup

E. Appointments to Academic Senate Committees. M/S/P to approve the following individuals to the respective Academic Senate Committee:
   - Christy Chand, Theatre and Dance: Faculty Affairs Committee (2018-2020)
   - Allison Ellis, MHRIS: Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee (2018-2019)
F. **Appointment to University Committees.** M/S/P to approve the following individuals to the respective University Committees:

Christopher Woodruff, Music Campus Parking & Transportation Advisory Committee (2018-2019)
Hong Hoang, Mgmt, HR & Info Sys Academic Assessment Council (2017-2020)
John Thompson, World Lang & Cultures International Programs Committee (2018-2019)

G. **Resolution on Use of Campus for Visiting Speakers to Protect Core Operations and Provide Transparency:** Margaret Bodemer, History Department, presented a resolution that would require speakers deemed potentially disruptive and needing extra security measures to be restricted to speak on weekends. The resolution also asks that the decision-making and funding logistics of campus speakers be made public. This resolution will return to the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

H. **Resolution on Campus Climate: OUDI Collective Impact Report, Funding, and Student Fees:** Harvey Greenwald, Emeritus Academic Senate Chair, and Dianne DeTurris, Aerospace Engineering Professor, presented a resolution on campus climate which would acknowledge the acceptance of OUDI's Collective Impact Year End Report, call for the raising of funds in support of diversity and inclusion with targeted goals, and asks that the Vice President for Student Affairs and Provost report annually to the Academic Senate the uses of all Campus Academic Fees and Student Success Fee. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on Campus Climate: OUDI Collective Impact Report, Funding, and Student Fees.

I. **Resolution on Senior Project Policy:** Dawn Janke, Senior Project Task Force Chair, presented a resolution that would create a new policy for Senior Projects and asks the university to adopt a standard designation for senior project courses. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on Senior Project Policy.

J. **Resolution on Minors:** Brian Self, Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Chair, presented a resolution that would create a new policy on Minors. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on Minors.

V. **Discussion Item(s):** None.

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

Submitted by,

*Mark Borges*

Mark Borges
Academic Senate Student Assistant
Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Tuesday, October 23, 2018  
Continuation of the October 16, 2018 Meeting  
38-114, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, encouraged caucus chairs to provide feedback on the University Strategic Plan.

III. Reports: none.

IV. Business Items:
   A. Appointments to Academic Senate Committees. M/S/P to appoint the following individuals to the respective Academic Senate Committee:
      - Thomas Gutierrez, Physics Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Committee (Chair)
      - Mahdi Rastad, Finance Sustainability Committee
   B. Resolution on Campus Climate: University Ombuds and Training. Paul Choboter, Math Department, Harvey Greenwald, Emeritus Academic Senate Chair, and Camille O'Bryant, Associate Dean, CSM, presented a resolution that would expand the responsibilities of the Student Ombuds Services Office to all university constituents. The resolution also asks that all Cal Poly employees undergo periodic sexual harassment anti-harassment, discrimination, retaliation training and implicit bias training. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on Campus Climate: University Ombuds and Training.
   C. Resolution to Modify Section VII. Committees of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate. Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, presented a resolution that would modify Section VII. Committees of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate to allow the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee members sit on one other Academic Senate Committee. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution to Modify Section VII. Committees of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.
   D. Resolution to Modify the Bylaws of the Academic Senate: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, presented a resolution that would create a subsection in Section V. Meetings of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate to formally add the Consent Agenda. M/S/P to Modify the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.

V. Discussion Items:
   A. Modification of Attachments. The Academic Senate Executive Committee discussed the process of modifying attachments. The committee agreed that the language behind modifying attachments to resolutions needs to be clarified and the discussion will return in the form of a resolution.
   B. Waitlist Changes. The Academic Senate Executive Committee discussed changes to the waitlist process for obtaining classes. M/S/P to charge the Academic Senate Instruction Committee to review the consultative process between the Academic Senate and the Registrar's Office for changes to enrollment and registration that affect how faculty conduct their courses.

VI. Adjournment: 4:56 PM

Submitted by,

Mark Borges
Academic Senate Student Assistant

805-756-1258 ~ academicsenate.calpoly.edu
Statements of Interest Received to serve on
e-Learning Addendum Revision Task Force
(select one representative from each college)

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Aydin Nazmi, Food Science and Nutrition Department (9 years at Cal Poly) Tenured
I recently launched a 100% online class, FSN 250: Food and Culture, with the support of a year-long CTLT course, the Quality Online Teaching Academy (QOTA). The academy took me from A to Z in terms of planning, developing, and launching an online course. I had ‘inherited’ an online course platform/model, but developing it from scratch was critical given my course learning objectives. Without the CTLT, it would have been very difficult and the result would have been much less impressive. As such, I believe that faculty need to have resources with which to develop courses, add online content, and generally experiment with the myriad formats available for eLearning.

Thankfully, the CTLT is growing, and the fact is that online classes are, and will continue to be, an ever-growing segment of education and college globally. Because of my interest and experience in online education, I am interested in serving on this committee.

Brian Greenwood, Experience Industry Management Department (13 years at Cal Poly) Tenure track
I was on the initial e-Learning task force that developed AS-750-02. At the time, as a probationary faculty member, I could not speak up as much as I would have liked and relented on several items that in retrospect I wished I had pushed harder. Since that time, I’ve continued to be engaged with technologically-enhanced learning by teaching an online course through another university (for 13 years), developing and receiving approval for a hybrid course (my third course approved using that medium), engaging in the Digital Commentary Grading Project, and proposing an online course after being involved with the CAFES Online Enhancement Initiative. I feel that I would bring firsthand expertise with technologically enhanced learning to the committee. I also believe strongly that Cal Poly should remove the barriers that have been placed in this realm in order to remain competitive in the 21st century. I also believe strongly that doing so will not diminish Learn by Doing and could even strengthen it.

Kevin Lin, Experience Industry Management Department (5 years at Cal Poly) Tenure track
I have extensive online teaching experience. Currently I’m teaching two hybrid courses (RPTA 317 Convention and Meeting Management and RPTA 460 Senior Project). I also participated in the CAFES Online Course Workshop in the spring and summer of 2016 and started creating online content for six modules in RPTA 317. I successfully completed several online course training programs offered by CTLT (e.g., Intro to Screencasting Course, Quality in Online Learning & Teaching Springboard Workshop, Flipped Classroom, and Camp Course Design). I also have a Certificate for Online Teaching from Penn State.

Most recently, with the support from my department chair and the CAFES dean’s office, I became a member of the Cal Poly Quality Online Teaching Academy in the summer of 2017 and completed the following tasks:
Submitted an eLearning addendum in the winter quarter of 2018 to launch more online modules for RPTA 317 to turn it into a hybrid course with 50% or more content online.

* Online Teaching Learning Community (AY 2017-18). This component provides intensive support for course design and content development through specific topics and open labs. Four, two-hour meetings per quarter; 12 total meetings (24 face-to-face hours total).

* QOLT Springboard Workshop (Fall 2017). The QOLT Rubric is the CSU-endorsed guide for preparing a quality online course. This workshop addresses the more challenging portions of the rubric so that the final course is ready for QOLT review and certification through the Chancellor’s Office. Six hours fully online.

* eLearning Addendum Workshop (Fall 2017). This workshop allows CTLT staff, who have worked with the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC), to help participants develop their proposal. Six hours fully online.

* Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning (Summer 2017). This workshop covers effective practices for online course design and assessment, as well as copyright and fair use issues. Four-week, fully online, and asynchronous (40 hours total).

I have experience with the eLearning addendum and have submitted one already. I understand the current system is not the most user-friendly one out there. I would like to contribute the development of eLearning at Cal Poly and help to streamline the process and encourage more faculty to explore this new content delivery method.

**COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN**

**ORFALEA COLLEGE OF BUSINESS**

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

**COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS**

Christian Anderson, World Languages and Cultures (6+ years at Cal Poly) Tenure Track

I spent a year training with Catherine Hillman and navigated the process myself before teaching an online GE C4 course last summer. I believe in the power of online education. I have insights and will share.

**COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS**

Samuel Frame, Statistics Department (12+ years at Cal Poly) Tenured

I have been developing hybrid classes for over a decade, and more recently I have been developing online courses supported by the university through the QLT program. During the 2017-2018 academic year, I submitted a course proposal for STAT 252 to be fully online which included an eLearning Addendum. This course was approved, is currently being offered for the first time, and will be submitted to the CSU for approval. During the 2018-2019 academic year, I have already submitted a course proposal for STAT 312 to be fully online including an eLearning Addendum. I am familiar with the eLearning Addendum we currently use, and can make positive suggestions to help improve the form and process.
Vacancies for 2018-2020 Academic Senate Committees
Information available at: https://academicsenate.calpoly.edu/content/senate_comm

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee
Grants Review Committee

Aydin Nazmi, Food Science and Nutrition Department (9 years at Cal Poly)

In service efforts, I strive to be involved in areas that complement my interests and expertise. Given my experience, the Grants Review Committee is a good fit. At Cal Poly, I have maintained a funded research portfolio totaling more than $2 million and thus have written many grants and have been invited to serve on grant review boards, for example the CA Dept of Food and Agriculture Specialty Block grants. I have mentored colleagues and students in the research process, including assisting a number of undergraduate and graduate students to formulate and submit their own research proposals. I have served on the IRB at Cal Poly, and have published widely, presented at dozens of conferences, all of which underscore my interest and experience in the field of research. My area of expertise, epidemiology, is relatively broad encompassing nutrition, public health, statistics, several disease states, sociology, and equity. As such, I am able to ‘speak’ a number of research languages, which may come in handy when reviewing a wide array of proposals.

The main duties of the Grants Review Committee are to evaluate Cal Poly Faculty research proposals (RSCA) and review student submissions for the CSU-wide research competition. I have ample experience reviewing faculty research and working with students through the undergraduate research process. Given my experience working with student researchers and writing and reviewing grants, I think I am good fit for the committee.

Instruction Committee

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
Faculty Affairs Committee (2018-2019)

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee
Instruction Committee

ORFALEA COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
GE Governance Board

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES
Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee (2018-2019)
Instruction Committee (2018-2019)
Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Committee
Sustainability Committee (2018-2019)
Instruction Committee: Academic Calendar Recommendation

Hunter Glanz <hglanz@calpoly.edu>

Tue 10/30/2018 9:46 AM

To: Gladys E. Gregory <ggregory@calpoly.edu>

2 attachments (834 KB)
2020-21_Proposed_Academic_Calendar_Chart.pdf; Summary of Feedback 2018-10-16.pdf;

Gladys,

The Instruction Committee met from 3-4pm on 10/23/2018. Members Glanz, Deif, Trudell, Waskiewicz, Harding, and Giberti were in attendance (6 of 9).

Among other things we discussed the academic calendar for the 2020-21 academic year. As a body that's supposed to represent the faculty here at Cal Poly, we eventually decided to endorse the faculty's preference that we saw in our materials and heard ourselves firsthand. Our recommendation:

Fall 2019: Option 2 (Monday start with an of Thanksgiving week off)
Winter 2019: No preference

Please let me know if you need anything else from me.

Thanks,
Hunter

Hunter S. Glanz, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Statistics
Calif Polytechnic State Univ
1 Grand Ave, Fac. Offices East
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0405

Bldg./Office: Bldq.25/Rm.111
Dept. Phone: 805-756-2792

https://outlook.office.com/owa/?path=/mail/inbox
Date: September 11, 2018
To: College Deans
Jasmin Fashami, ASI President
Beth Gallagher, Human Resources
Hunter Glanz, Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Keith Humphrey, Student Affairs
Lorlie Leetham, Cal Poly Corporation
Al Liddicoat, Academic Personnel
Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate
Cynthia Villa, Administration and Finance

Cc: President Jeffrey Armstrong, Provost Kathleen Enz Finken, Jessica Darin, Bill Britton, Alison Robinson, James Maraviglia, Mary Pedersen, Brian Tietje, Susan Olivas

From: Cem Sunata, University Registrar

Subject: 2020-2021 Academic Calendar Proposals and Consultation

In accordance with Campus Administrative Policy 211 (http://policy.calpoly.edu/cap/200/cap210.htm), the Provost or his/her designee proposes an academic calendar to the President for approval following consultation with various campus constituencies including the Academic Deans' Council, Academic Senate Executive Committee, Academic Senate Instruction Committee, ASI, Academic Personnel, Human Resources, Cal Poly Corporation, and Student Affairs.

Currently, Cal Poly is operating on an approved academic calendar extending through the end of Spring Quarter 2020. Attached are the quarter-by-quarter calendar proposals for the period from Summer Quarter 2020 through Spring Quarter 2021. For each quarter's proposal:

- Applicable Campus Administrative Policy (CAP) is cited.
- The various options and corresponding considerations are presented in a table format.
- Calendar displays with relevant months are provided for each option. Key dates are highlighted, such as final examination periods and academic holidays.

Ultimately, the calendar for the entire year will be a combination of the selected proposals for each quarter.

By copy of this letter we are requesting recipients, except for the Academic Senate Chair and the Academic Senate Instruction Committee, to seek input from their respective organizations. After receiving and assessing input, the recipients should send any comments and/or recommendations on the proposed options, to Susan Olivas, Office of the Registrar (solivas@calpoly.edu) on or before Monday, October 15, 2018.

After the collected feedback is provided to the Academic Senate Instruction Committee for review, the Academic Senate Executive Committee is requested to make their recommendation on or before Friday, November 9, 2018.

If you have any questions regarding development of the calendar, please contact Susan Olivas at ext. 6-2533.

Attachments
Campus Administrative Policy for consideration:

- Per CAP 211.1, "Summer quarter should end prior to Labor Day. Spring quarter should end prior to the second weekend in June."
- Per CAP 211.1, "The need to start the first day of instruction on a Monday shall take higher priority in planning the academic calendar than ending summer quarter prior to Labor Day and ending spring quarter prior to the second week in June."
- Per CAP 211.2, "Whenever possible, quarter breaks should include no less than five calendar days between the last day of final examinations and the beginning of the subsequent quarter."

Note: The following dates are based upon a 10-week session, the longest possible session. Actual sessions to be offered during the summer will be determined at a later date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2020 Break between Spring &amp; Summer terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>June 22, Monday</td>
<td>July 3, Friday</td>
<td>10-week session: August 28, Friday</td>
<td>Labor Day occurs on Monday, September 7. This option allows a Monday start and conclusion of the summer term by Labor Day. Instructional Days = 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summer 2020

#### 49 Possible Instructional Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2020</th>
<th>July 2020</th>
<th>August 2020</th>
<th>September 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td>12 13 14 15 16 17 18</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 29 30</td>
<td>26 27 28 29 30 31</td>
<td>23 24 25 26 27 28 29</td>
<td>27 28 29 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campus Administrative Policy for consideration:

- Per CAP 211.1, "Whenever possible, the first day of instruction each quarter shall be a Monday with a 48-day minimum per quarter (49-day minimum spring quarter) and the last day of instruction each quarter shall be a Friday."
- Per CAP 211.1, "In calendar years in which the first Monday of a quarter falls on a major religious or cultural holiday, it is recommended that instruction shall begin on Tuesday of that week."
- Per CAP 211.2, "Whenever possible, quarter breaks should include no less than five calendar days between the last day of final examinations and the beginning of the subsequent quarter."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
<th>Break between Summer &amp; Fall terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Break between Fall &amp; Winter terms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>5 calendar days</td>
<td>Fall Conference starts Sept. 10, Thursday</td>
<td>November 11, Wednesday</td>
<td>December 4, Friday</td>
<td>December 5, Saturday Common Finals Option</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>There is no major religious or cultural holiday on the first day of classes. Instructional Days = 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>9 calendar days</td>
<td>Fall Conference starts Sept. 14, Monday</td>
<td>November 11, Wednesday</td>
<td>December 4, Friday</td>
<td>December 5, Saturday Common Finals Option</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>There is no major religious or cultural holiday on the first day of classes. December 14 is designated as an Evaluation Day and December 15 is designated as a Grades Due Day to meet the minimum of 170 faculty work days in an academic year. Instructional Days = 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>9 calendar days</td>
<td>Fall Conference starts Sept. 14, Monday</td>
<td>November 11, Wednesday</td>
<td>December 4, Friday</td>
<td>December 5, Saturday Common Finals Option</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>There is no major religious or cultural holiday on the first day of classes. Instructional Days = 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2020 Option 1 (Classes start on a Thursday; no classes during Thanksgiving week)

51 Instructional Days:
## Fall 2020 Option 2 (Classes start on a Monday; no classes during Thanksgiving week)
### 49 Instructional Days:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 2020</th>
<th>October 2020</th>
<th>November 2020</th>
<th>December 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 31 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18 19</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</td>
<td>15 16 17 18 19 20 21</td>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 28 29 30</td>
<td>25 26 27 28 29 30 31</td>
<td>29 30</td>
<td>27 28 29 30 31 1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fall 2020 Option 3 (Classes start on a Monday; classes meet Monday and Tuesday of Thanksgiving week)
### 51 Instructional Days:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 2020</th>
<th>October 2020</th>
<th>November 2020</th>
<th>December 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 31 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18 19</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</td>
<td>15 16 17 18 19 20 21</td>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 28 29 30</td>
<td>25 26 27 28 29 30 31</td>
<td>29 30</td>
<td>27 28 29 30 31 1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Winter Quarter 2021

**Winter Quarter 2021**

**Campus Administrative Policy for consideration:**

- Per CAP 211.1, "Whenever possible, each academic quarter shall consist of a minimum of nine (9) offerings of calendar days' schedules." For example, there should be nine offerings of Monday classes, nine offerings of Tuesday classes, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter 2021 Break between Fall &amp; Winter terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1a or 1b</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>January 4, Monday</td>
<td>January 18, Monday</td>
<td>March 12, Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>January 18, Monday</td>
<td>February 15, Monday</td>
<td>March 13, Saturday Common Finals Option</td>
<td>Follow a Monday schedule on a Tuesday, so there are nine offerings of Monday classes during the term. Options are: 1a) Tuesday, January 19, after Martin Luther King Jr. holiday on January 18 1b) Tuesday, February 16, after President’s Day holiday on February 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Considerations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can affect part-time instructors with other jobs off-campus (e.g. at Cuesta) and students’ jobs off-campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Occurrence later in term may affect mid-term schedules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22 is designated as an Evaluation Day to meet the minimum of 170 faculty work days in an academic year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Days = 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Winter 2021 option 1a or 1b**

48 instructional days

**January 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**February 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**March 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring Quarter 2021

Campus Administrative Policy for consideration:
- Per CAP 211.1, "Whenever possible, the first day of instruction each quarter shall be a Monday with a 48-day minimum per quarter (49-day minimum spring quarter) and the last day of instruction each quarter shall be a Friday. In calendar years in which the first Monday of the quarter falls on Cesar Chavez Day, instruction shall begin on Tuesday of that week."
- Per CAP 211.1, "Summer quarter should end prior to Labor Day. Spring quarter should end prior to the second weekend in June."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2021</th>
<th>Break between Winter &amp; Spring terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>March 29, Monday</td>
<td>March 31, Wednesday</td>
<td>June 4, Friday</td>
<td>June 5, Saturday Common Finals Option June 7 - 11, Monday-Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAP 211.1 states there should be a minimum of 49 instructional days in the spring quarter, but because Cesar Chavez Day falls on Wednesday, March 31, and classes start on the preceding Monday, it's not possible to have 49 instructional days and end the term prior to the second weekend in June, also in CAP 211.1. Although there would not be 49 instructional days for the Spring term, total instructional days for the academic year will total 145-147 and be in compliance with CAP 211.1.

Instructional Days = 48

Spring 2021: 48 Instructional Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 2021</th>
<th>April 2021</th>
<th>May 2021</th>
<th>June 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 16 17 18 19 20 21</td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22</td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22</td>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 31</td>
<td>30 31</td>
<td>30 31</td>
<td>27 28 29 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Academic Holiday - ; First Day of Classes - ; Common Finals Option - ; Final Examination Period - ; Commencement Day(s) -
### SUMMARY OF CALENDAR DAYS

**Academic Year (F-W-Sp)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUMMER 2020</th>
<th>FALL 2020</th>
<th>WINTER 2021</th>
<th>SPRING 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*<em>Beginning Year/Term</em></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MWF Days</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29/30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TR Days</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Instructional Days</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49/51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Exams</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Day</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grades Due Day</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commencement</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Academic Work Days</strong></td>
<td>49†</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total Academic Year Instructional Days (F-W-Sp) = 145 or 147
* Total Academic Year Work Days (F-W-Sp) = 170

Per CAP 211.1: The typical academic year shall consist of 147 instructional days. From year-to-year a variation of plus or minus two days is permissible. There shall be a minimum of 170 academic workdays in the academic year. There shall be a maximum of 180 academic work days in the academic year.

* Fall Conference
† Final exam periods for summer term are determined by the number and length of sessions offered.
‡ Spring commencement occurs over the course of 2 days with departments participating in 1 of those days.
Adopted:

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

AS-__-18

RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED ORGANIZATION OF A NEW UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES DOCUMENT

Impact on Existing Policy: NONE

WHEREAS, Cal Poly's university-level personnel policies document, the University Faculty Personnel Actions, is limited in scope and out of date; and

WHEREAS, All faculty units of Cal Poly would benefit from a more comprehensive and adaptable faculty personnel policies document; and

WHEREAS, AS-829-17 established a procedure for updating personnel policies in coherent and focused elements; and

WHEREAS, Academic Personnel maintains a centralized repository of all faculty personnel policy documents; therefore be it

RESOLVED: University-level faculty personnel policies be contained in a single document called "University Faculty Personnel Policies" (UFPP) to be housed and accessible to the campus on the Academic Personnel website; and be it further

RESOLVED: UFPP be organized according to the chapter structure in the attached report "Proposed Organization of a New University Faculty Personnel Policies Document;" and be it further

RESOLVED: 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 be it further

RESOLVED: By the end of Spring 2019 Colleges and other faculty units reorganize their faculty personnel policy documents to conform their documents to the chapter structure of UFPP.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: October 26, 2018

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

Faculty Affairs Committee
Fall 2018

The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC is delegated the responsibility to develop faculty personnel policies and criteria through a joint governance process. The establishment of university-level academic policies through the Academic Senate is in the form of proposing and passing resolutions. When considering substantial changes to faculty policy, the FAC will request the assistance of the deans and college faculty to provide input to draft proposals prior to submission to the Senate for consideration and formal approval.

In Spring 2017 FAC proposed and the Academic Senate passed a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies. This new 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 update sections of the new UFPP on an as-needed basis. The consent agenda procedure will allow the University to quickly adopt changes that are driven by updates to state law, the Collective Bargaining Agreement, or CSU Policy changes that must be incorporated into our policies.

The guiding principles in revising the UFPA into the new UFPP include clarifying existing policies that are common across the university. Also, faculty evaluation procedures are standardized at the university level. For criteria the university-level policies 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. Colleges and departments would consult the UFPP and cite its provisions in their policy and procedure documents. The college and department personnel policy documents should not duplicate the policies specified in the UFPP and Collective Bargaining Agreement, since the UFPP will be the definitive source for all common policies.

The process for replacing the UFPA with the UFPP will start with the establishment of the general structure of the UFPP in the form of its main chapter divisions, each containing thematically unified selections of policy. Once the structure of the document has been approved by the Academic Senate and the President, FAC will propose to the Senate entire chapters of the document, each covered by its own Senate resolution. In this manner, the Senate will consider thematically unified portions of personnel policy. Once a chapter is approved by the Senate and President, FAC may propose subsequent revisions to the chapters or portions of chapters as needed. Those revisions would move through the Senate using the procedure described above, including the possibility of a consent agenda at the discretion of the Academic Senate Executive Committee.
General Outline of the UFPP

The Faculty Affairs Committee proposes the following general outline of a new University Faculty Personnel Policies document (UFPP):

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 that the Senate establish UFPP as the university-level faculty personnel policies document with this organization of chapters. If the Senate approves of this organization of UFPP, FAC would commence with the project of replacing the existing university-level faculty personnel policies by chapter or sub-chapter according to the Senate personnel policy procedures outlined above.

FAC is further proposing that colleges revise their policies documents to adopt the same chapter titles and numbers as UFPP. All faculty personnel policy documents would then conform to a common structure, which facilitates communication about such policies across campus. Colleges would work with Academic Personnel to conform their personnel policy documents to this common form. Once a college has revised its personnel policies document, its departments would then revise their documents into this common form.

Description of the Chapters of the UFPP

1. Preface
   The prefatory materials in the document include a general account of the hierarchy of policy in the CSU, the formal statement of the Senate personnel policy revision process, and a general statement of Cal Poly’s commitment to the teacher-scholar model. Colleges and departments can put in this section their mission/vision statements, as well as any guiding principles that inform their understanding and implementation of the teacher/scholar model, along with any policies or procedures for revising their policy documents.

2. Faculty Appointments
   This chapter provides university-wide hiring policies for all faculty appointments. Policies in this chapter refer to but do not include the more detailed hiring procedures maintained by Academic Personnel. Colleges and departments in their
hiring policies would augment these university-wide policies with their own specific criteria and requirements for faculty appointments.

3. Personnel Files
   This chapter defines the requirements and policies for the Personnel Action File (PAF) and Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). It provides a set of general requirements for these documents that colleges and departments may augment to address the discipline specific needs.

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

5. Evaluation 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. This chapter defines all the evaluation sequences allowed for any sort of faculty evaluation currently used by all the colleges. 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, counsellors, and coaches. Exceptions to the normal sequence of evaluation levels are also covered.

6. Evaluation Cycle Patterns
   Evaluation 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 pattern, as does the sequence of lecturer evaluations that lead towards a three-year contract or range elevation. This chapter defines all evaluation patterns and allows colleges to choose the patterns that best serve their needs and expectations.

7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria
   This chapter covers the eligibility for personnel actions (including retention, promotion, tenure, range elevation) and the general principles according to which the colleges and departments would specify the criteria for warranting the personnel action. Colleges and departments would expand greatly on these policies with their own criteria mindful of how the diversity of disciplines within the college manifest the teacher/scholar model.
8. Evaluation of Teaching and Professional Services
   This chapter includes general requirements and guiding principles for how the evaluation of teaching, as well as professional services for non-instructional 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 and apply its principles in concrete guidance and expectations for how teaching would be evaluated. Non-instructional faculty units would do likewise for the evaluation of the relevant professional services.

9. Evaluation of Professional Development
   This chapter includes general requirements for how evaluation of professional development should be conducted by evaluating bodies. The function of the professional development plan is the central concern of this chapter, both as constructed by the candidate and as assessed by evaluating bodies so as to guide the candidate towards the next personnel action.

10. Evaluation of Service
    This chapter includes general requirements for how the evaluation of service should be conducted by evaluating bodies. Colleges and departments should augment the university expectations to establish expectations about service appropriate to various faculty assignments and ranks.

11. Governance
    This chapter sets university level expectations for the definition of academic program governance at the college and department levels. This chapter will include definitions of department leadership as “chairs” or “heads” and university level requirements for defining any changes between those models of department leadership. This chapter also includes university-level policies concerning departmental recommendations to deans for the appointment of department chairs. Colleges and departments would provide more specific policies and procedures in accord with university-level policies. Colleges and departments would also include in their documents any further policies about their governance, including committees within the college and department.

12. Workload
    This chapter includes policies covering various aspects of faculty workload, including office hours, assigned time, and policies pertaining to FERP or PRTB workload.

13. Appendices
    This chapter is reserved for supplemental materials related to faculty personnel policies. One appendix will be the current version of the University Faculty Personnel Actions document, portions of which remain in effect until superseded by sections of the UFPP. Colleges and departments may include any number of supplementary documents as appendices, such as summary worksheets, schedules, checklists.
Consultation with Faculty Units about UFPP

The need for consultation with faculty units for such a universal body of policy is obvious. In establishing Senate procedures for personnel policies FAC proposed a uniform set of expectations about such consultation requiring that any affected units be appropriately informed about the proposed change and be able to offer feedback on the proposal. FAC is then obliged by these procedures to include the nature of this feedback to the Senate with the proposal.

Over the course of several weeks in Spring and Summer 2018, Ken Brown (chair of FAC) and Al Liddicoat, Vice Provost of Academic Personnel, visited with every college council to discuss this proposed overhaul of the university personnel policies document. They explained how the old UFPA would be superseded by the new UFPP document. They laid out the new Senate procedure that would be used to create and then revise UFPP. The presentation included an earlier draft of this very report. They received feedback on the spot at those meetings from department chairs and heads, Associate Deans, and the Deans. Ken left the colleges with a feedback form (attached at the end of this report) for the college to compile feedback and send it back to FAC by the beginning of October. This timeframe for feedback allowed the college leadership to bring the topic to their departments at the beginning of Fall. They also noted that the scope of this feedback should be limited to the overall structure of UFPP, its proposed chapter breakdown, and the overall project of revising these policies, noting that the proposed text of each chapter would follow as individual items for its own comparable and suitable level of consultative feedback. (The nature of the proposed changes to university policy affects the non-instructional units far less than to the colleges, and FAC has been made aware of recent changes to policy documents from, for instance, the Library.)

From this useful feedback, FAC has made some notable changes to the proposed structure of the document. College councils will again be informed of this proposal when it is put on the Senate agenda so further feedback can be directed through their Senators.

Changes to Existing Policy

This proposed change includes no policy, but instead establishes the structure of a policy document. The changes to the policy language will come when FAC proposes chapters that fill out this policy document.

Implementation

At this stage of establishing the structure of UFPP there is no implementation of policy, since this proposal includes no policy, but only the chapter structure of the subsequent policy document. Implementation in this case amounts to the project of the colleges, and in turn of departments, to conform the structure of their personnel policy documents to the uniform structure of policy documents set by the UFPP. This implementation should conform with the timeframe set in the resolution to which this report is attached.
Feedback for Faculty Affairs Committee

College:

Main contact for further information about this feedback:
   Name:
   Position:
   Email:

The FAC is considering having colleges and departments structure their personnel policy documents with the same chapter divisions of the proposed UFPPP.¹ Note that a department policy and procedure document could defer to its college’s policies and procedures on any topic. Please indicate whether and how this change in the organization of faculty personnel policy and procedure documents would affect your college and departments.

Please identify and describe any other topics addressed in your college or department level personnel policies and procedures documents that seem not to fit into any of the proposed chapters for the new UFPPP listed and described above.

Please offer any questions or feedback about the proposed organizational structure of the new UFPPP.

When the Faculty Affairs Committee solicits feedback from colleges about drafts of the chapters of the proposed UFPPP, information about the proposed new policies would be sent to the Dean to be distributed to Associate Deans, Analysts in the Dean’s office, Department Chairs/Heads, and any faculty committee tasked with considering matters of personnel policy in the college. Are there other methods that should be used to solicit feedback from your college?

The project of replacing the old UFPA with the new UFPPP is more about the clarification of existing policy and involves little change to existing policy. Any revision to a policy document raises reasonable questions about the status of those policies. Please offer any general feedback or concerns in your college or departments about university level personnel policies and their relationship to your college and department level policies.

Please email this document with any feedback from your college to the Faculty Affairs Committee chair, Ken Brown (dbrown07@calpoly.edu) by October 1, 2018.

¹ When this feedback document was circulated to the colleges, the FAC was proposing a document called University Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures. Based on feedback from the colleges, FAC dropped the reference in the title to procedures.
RESOLUTION ON USE OF CAMPUS FOR VISITING SPEAKERS TO PROTECT CORE OPERATIONS AND PROVIDE TRANSPARENCY

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

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

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

The previous year, in January of 2017, the Cal Poly Republicans invited Milo Yiannopoulos to campus. The University (with funds from the CSU), spent more than $55,000 and the city of San Luis Obispo spent more than $9,000² on security due to concerns over protesters and counter-protesters. Furthermore, Yiannopoulos was using the campus tours as a book promotion vehicle, in essence making his own profit from taxpayers' money. The Office of University, Diversity and Inclusivity (OUDI) and the College of Liberal Arts created a counter-event - UNITE Cal Poly with speaker W. Kamau Bell - which successfully diverted attention from Yiannopoulos, but also cost the university additional money. In September of 2017, Milo Yiannopoulos’ visit to the University of California at Berkeley ended up costing approximately $800,000 for security, including police officers from eight law enforcement agencies and campuses across the state.³ UC Berkeley ended up spending nearly 4 million dollars for its “free speech week” in 2017.⁴ Furthermore the University ended up incurring unreported damage costs when counter-protestors destroyed university property.

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

1 WHEREAS, A core operation on campus is in-class instruction; and
2 WHEREAS, Cal Poly, as a public university faces financial constraints; and
3 WHEREAS, The revised CAP calls for policies pertaining to guest speakers’ use of campus to be evaluated on a “content and viewpoint neutral basis”; and
4 WHEREAS, The revised CAP sets forth “reasonable time, place and manner” regulations regarding the use of University property; and

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

and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Date: August 5, 2018
RESOLUTION TO MODIFY SECTION V. MEETINGS OF THE BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

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

1 WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Academic Senate indicate that attachments are not amendable; therefore be it

4 RESOLVED: That the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be modified as shown below:

SECTION V. MEETINGS

D. FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

Second reading: the motion to adopt a resolution must be moved and seconded before debate ensues. It then belongs to the body and may be amended. Documents attached to a resolution are not amendable, and cannot be removed or added to a resolution. Voting on substantive resolutions shall take place only after a second reading of the resolution at a meeting subsequent to the meeting at which it was first introduced, except that the Academic Senate, by two-thirds vote of the senators present, may waive this requirement. After the motion has been moved and seconded, amendments may be presented for action by the Senate.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 24, 2018

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