Meeting of the Academic Senate
Tuesday, March 12, 2019
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00 pm

I. Minutes: None

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

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

IV. Special Reports:
A. [TIME CERTAIN 4:00 P.M] Cal Poly Experience Presentation to Academic Senate: Dr. Julie Garcia and Dr. Damon Williams

V. Consent Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED BY ACADEMIC SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name or Course Number, Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM 105 Early Start Program: Mathematics (1), 1 lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 230 Philosophical Classics: Knowledge and Reality (4), 4 lectures, GE C2 (existing course proposed to be offered online)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Minors: Brian Self, Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Chair, second reading (pp. 2-10).
B. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 5: Evaluation Processes: Ken Brown, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (pp. 11-18).
A. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 6: Evaluation Cycle Patterns: Ken Brown, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (pp. 19-24).
B. Resolution on Supporting Library Collections Necessary for Faculty and Student Success: Brett Bodemer, second reading (pp. 25 -31)

VII. Discussion Item(s):

VIII. Adjournment:
RESOLUTION ON MINORS

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution supersedes all prior policies regarding minors including the following resolutions: AS-73-79, AS-213-86, AS-312-89, AS-335-90, and AS-437-95. This resolution will not supersede resolution AS-775-14 on Cross-Disciplinary Studies Minors.

WHEREAS, A minor has been defined as a “coherent group of courses which stands alone and provides a student with broad knowledge of and competency in an area outside of the student’s major”; and

WHEREAS, A major and a minor may not be taken in the same degree program; and

WHEREAS, The minor consists of 24 to 30 quarter units, of which at least half must be upper division; and

WHEREAS, Numerous resolutions outline requirements for minors and a single comprehensive policy would provide clarity; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopts the attached “Academic Program Review Policies and Procedures – Policy on Minors”, and be it further

RESOLVED: That, as part of this policy, the Academic Senate revise the unit range of minors from 24-30 quarter units to 24-32 quarter units in order to accommodate more effectively 4-quarter -unit classes into minors.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Date: January 17, 2019

---

1 Where 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.
Academic Program Review Policies and Procedures – Policy on Minors

In contrast to a concentration, a minor is defined as a coherent group of courses that provides a student with broad knowledge of and competency in an area outside the student’s major. A major and a minor may not be taken in the same area of study; for example, a major in Agricultural and Environmental Horticultural Sciences concentrating in Environmental Horticultural Science cannot obtain a Landscape Horticulture Minor but can obtain a Crop Science Minor.

REQUIREMENTS

- A minor consists of 24 to 32 units. At least half of the units must be from upper-division courses (300- or 400-level), and at least half of the units must be taken at Cal Poly (in residence). An exception is allowed for students earning a minor that involves a significant international component (e.g., French, German, Spanish, or Italian Studies) who complete work toward that minor through study abroad; in these cases, at least a third of the units must be taken at Cal Poly (in residence).
- No more than one-third of the credits in a minor can be drawn from courses that are graded Credit/No Credit (CR/NC).
- A minimum overall 2.0 GPA in courses taken in the minor is required for completion of the minor.
- A minor must require that students take a minimum of 12 units outside of their specified Major and Support courses (see definitions of Major Courses and Support Courses at the end of the document). The 12 units (minimum) outside the specified Major or Support courses must be from:
  1. Free electives;
  2. A list of designated electives, such as approved electives or technical electives;
  3. General Education courses (as long as they are not specified as Major or Support Courses); and/or
  4. Additional units that do not count towards the student’s undergraduate degree requirements.

Majors in which the majority of requirements for a minor are embedded within the major and support courses shall not grant the minor to their students. The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC) will review combinations of majors and minors to identify major-minor combinations where it is possible for students to earn both the major and the minor without taking 12 units that are outside the major. If a minor is not sufficiently “outside the student’s major”, a note will be added to the catalog description of the minor indicating “Minor not open to students majoring in XXX.”
A MINOR IS COHERENT GROUP OF COURSES

A proposal for a minor program shall demonstrate that the minor is a "coherent group of courses with a defined purpose or theme." This coherence shall be shown by including a brief matrix of the Minor Program Learning Objectives (PLO) correlated with the courses in the minor. The matrix shall map Minor Program Learning Objectives to courses within the minor such that all PLOs are met by every student obtaining the minor. Similarly, the required courses should all meet, at least in part, one or more of the Minor PLOs.

To ensure a consistent experience among students, a minor shall have a core group of courses of at least 12 units that is common for all students in the minor program. This core group helps to assure that all PLOs are met by all students. Some of these units may include a choice of one course from a short list of courses that have similar content and course learning objectives. For example, the following two requirements are consistent with the intent of this policy:

Select from the following (4 units): STAT 217, STAT 218, STAT 251.

Select from the following (4 units): ENGL 330, ENGL 331, ENGL 332, ENGL 333, ENGL 334, ENGL 335, ENGL 339

The first list includes three introductory statistics courses that contain similar content but are offered for different majors. The second list focuses on British Literature during different time periods.

Proposed programs that do not have a core of 12 units in their minor should include a written statement describing how the minor offers a consistent and coherent group of courses with a defined purpose or theme.

PROCESSES FOR OBTAINING THE MINOR

- Students who wish to enroll in a minor must contact the department offering the minor and meet with the minor advisor. The minor should be declared as soon as the student is reasonably certain that they will pursue that minor.
- A minor is officially declared by submitting a completed minor agreement form to the Office of the Registrar. Once a minor is formally declared and entered into the student's record, progress in the minor can be tracked on the Degree Progress report.
- The requirements for the minor must be completed before or at the same time as the major requirements are completed.
- The completion of the minor will be noted on the student's transcript but will not be shown on the diploma.

MULTIPLE MINORS

A student may count a maximum of 8 units between any two minors.
NEW MINORS

Because minors increase student choice and do not pertain to degree requirements, a new minor may be proposed at any time. A proposal for a new minor will undergo the standard academic review process and provide Program Learning Objectives, demonstrate student interest and need, identify resources, etc.

New electives may be added to a minor at any time, but other changes may only occur during a catalog cycle.

IMPLEMENTATION

Existing minors with fewer than 12 specified units will not be required to request an exception or to provide justification, unless they propose substantive changes to the minor. To ensure currency, all minors shall provide Minor Program Learning Objectives and their PLO-to-course mapping during the 2021-2023 catalog review cycle. The Minor PLOs will be published in the 2021-2023 catalog.
DEFINITIONS
As stated in the Cal Poly catalog, Major Courses and Support Courses are defined as:

Major Courses
- comprise the basic knowledge in the discipline and are required of all students in the major;
- have the prefix of the major program and/or college; may be from any other prefix or discipline which are required in the major field of study;
- count toward the Major GPA; include common core courses that are at least half of the required number of units in the major;
- may be augmented by a concentration, minor or adviser approved electives;
- which fulfill General Education requirements shall be listed in the major course category with a reference (as an asterisk) to the GE area;
- should include 15 units designated at the 100-200 level.

Support Courses
- are any specified courses that are not listed in the major; do not carry the prefix of the home department, with the exception of advisor/technical/professional electives;
- are optional depending on the nature of the degree program and the judgment of the program's faculty;
- which fulfill General Education requirements shall be listed in the support course category with a reference (as an asterisk) to the GE area.
Background Material

Cal Poly first addressed minors in Resolution AS-73-79, where it endorsed “the concept of optional minors” and provided a definition:

A minor is a formal aggregate of classes in a specific subject area designed to give a student documented competency in a secondary course of study. In contrast to options and concentrations it stands alone and is distinct from and outside the student’s degree major.

Additionally, it set forth that

The minor consists of 24 to 30 quarter units, of which at least half must be upper division. Twelve or more of the units in the minor must be specified courses with the remainder, if any, to be chosen from an appropriate list.

Resolution AS-213-86 tried to provide differentiation between minors and concentrations by stating “in contrast to concentrations it stands alone and is distinct from and outside the student’s degree major.”

Resolution AS-312-89 called for a study on minors at Cal Poly. This study resulted in a Resolution AS-335-90, which concluded that minors that “presented a clear central theme and justified the choice of courses in relation to that theme were the strongest. In addition interdisciplinary programs were stronger if they included a course or courses which integrated the diverse elements of the program.”

The resolution also called for minors to be included in Program Review, and that “a proposal for a minor program be required to include a brief matrix of competencies provided by the minor correlated with the courses in the minor which will fulfill those competencies.” Finally, it made minor changes to the definition of a minor:

A minor is a group of courses outside the major with a defined purpose or theme which gives documented competency in a secondary course of study.

Resolution AS-437-95 changed the policy that “A major and a minor may not be taken in the same discipline. Units taken for completion of the minor may not be counted to satisfy requirements for courses in the "major" column of the student's curriculum sheet” to simply say that “A major and a minor may not be taken in the same degree program.”

Finally, Resolution AS-775-14 established Cross-Disciplinary minors and had a provision that “the CDSM curriculum shall require at least 12 units of coursework that cannot be covered by the requirements of the student's major.”

Between 1995 and 2014, CAM was migrated to the Academic Plans and Programs site (https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/academicpolicies/Policies-Undergrad/Minors). Several of the provisions were not copied over, but no Academic Senate resolutions ever officially retired or replaced the previous ones. The policies on the website as of October 9, 2018 are provided below.
**Minors**

**Definition:** A minor is defined as a coherent group of courses which stands alone and provides a student with broad knowledge of and competency in an area outside the student’s major.

**Majors/Minors**

- A major and a minor may not be taken in the same degree program (e.g., a student majoring in history may not complete a minor in history, whereas a student majoring in crop science may complete a minor in plant protection).
- The minor will be completed along with the requirements for the bachelor's degree. Courses in the minor may be used to satisfy major, support, and general education requirements.

**Requirements**

- Students who wish to complete a minor are to contact the department offering the academic minor as early as possible in the program and fill out the appropriate agreement form.
- A minor consists of 24 to 30 units. At least half of the units must be from upper-division courses (300- or 400-level). For French, German, and Spanish language minors studying abroad, the residence requirement is reduced from 12 units (1/2 of the 24 required for these minors) to 8 units, 1/3 of the total.
- Not more than one-third of the courses in a minor can be graded Credit/No Credit (CR/NC), except for courses which have mandatory CR/NC grading.
- A minimum overall 2.0 GPA is required for completion of the minor. Prior to 3/29/2017, French, German and Spanish language minors must have a minimum overall 2.75 GPA.

**Minors/Graduation**

- The minor should be declared as soon as the student is reasonably certain that he/she will pursue that minor. Check with the minor advisor to complete the minor form, which should then be submitted to the Office of the Registrar. Once it is formally declared and entered into the student’s record, progress in the minor can be tracked on the Degree Progress report.
- The completion of the minor will be noted on the student’s transcript but will not be shown on the diploma. In no case will a diploma be awarded for the minor.
Resolution on Minors Survey

Your college or organization: _____________

All questions had choices of:

☐ Strongly support   ☐ Support   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Oppose   ☐ Strongly Oppose

and allowed for further comment.

1. The current definition of a minor:

“A minor is defined as a coherent group of courses which stands alone and provides a student with broad knowledge of and competency in and area outside of the students major.” (Academic Policies, Minors)

2. The current wording in the policy is that

“At least 12 units must be outside of the specified Major and Support classes.”

3. The current wording in the policy (from the definition that has been used historically) is that

“A minor should be a coherent group of courses”

4. The current wording has a number of ways to exhibit that the minor has coherence, or focus. Please indicate your support for each of these (put large X through them if you don’t think a minor should be focused or coherent).

Having a set of 12 core units (okay if there are groupings with similar CLOs; see policy)

Make this required

☐ Strongly support   ☐ Support   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Oppose   ☐ Strongly Oppose

Have 12 core units as an option (see next statement)

☐ Strongly support   ☐ Support   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Oppose   ☐ Strongly Oppose

Request explanation of coherency if the minor doesn’t have the 12 core units

☐ Strongly support   ☐ Support   ☐ Neutral   ☐ Oppose   ☐ Strongly Oppose

5. A minor should have Program Learning Objectives

6. A minor should map its courses to its PLOs

7. List if any of the listed provisions would make you vote against the resolution

8. Any further comments or feedback?
## Resolution on Minors Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey #</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>1 Support for Current Definition of a Minor</th>
<th>2 Support for Current Wording in Policy</th>
<th>3 Support for Historical Wording in the Policy</th>
<th>4 Support for Having a Set of 12 Core Units</th>
<th>5 Support for PLO</th>
<th>6 Support to Map Courses to PLOs</th>
<th>7 Vote Against the Resolution</th>
<th>8 Other Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. i

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: February 26, 2019

i (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...
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 PERMISSIBLE 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 PERMISSIBLE 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 PERMISSIBLE for review of probationary faculty who are not subject to performance review.

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

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

5.2.2.7. Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE 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
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
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.
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.
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.¹

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

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

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

RESOLVED: The policy document contained at the end of the attached report “Proposed Chapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: CHAPTER 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: February 26, 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,
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
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.
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 Academic 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: February 26, 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.
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))¹, 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.² 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).³ The report listed as a specific action item the channeling of new funds towards the Robert E. Kennedy Library specifically for collections.⁴

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)
Approved Unanimously – January 17-18, 2019
HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY  
University Senate  

Sense of the Senate Resolution on CSU Electronic Core Collection Funding  

08-18/19-EX – February 12, 2019  

RESOLVED: That the University Senate of Humboldt State University strongly supports centralized funding of an Electronic Core Collection (ECC) of library information resources for all CSU campuses, and be it further  

RESOLVED: That the University Senate recognizes that centralized funding benefits every CSU campus but has become particularly valuable for smaller campuses with smaller library budgets because the ECC provides direct access to general and disciplinary resources that would be difficult to fund and sustain locally; and be it further  

RESOLVED: That the University Senate recognizes that centralized acquisitions of electronic resources allows the CSU system to leverage its purchasing power to negotiate costs that may be unachievable at the individual campus; and be it further  

RESOLVED: That the University Senate strongly supports increasing base ECC funding: 1) to address resource cost inflation and prevent a reduction in the number of ECC resources currently being offered, and 2) to allow expansion of the ECC so that all CSU students and faculty, regardless of campus affiliation, have access to a strong core of disciplinary and general resources to meet their scholarly needs; and be it further  

RESOLVED: That the resolution be shared with the Chancellor; the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Technology Services; the CSU Academic Affairs Council; The CSU Council of Library Directors (COLD); the HSU Sponsored Programs Foundation Board of Directors; and the committees charged with oversight and management of the ECC (SDLC and EAR).  

RATIONALE:  
A resolution in support of increased ECC funding passed the CSU Academic Senate unanimously on January 17-18 (AS-3351-18/FGA/AA (Rev)). As noted in that resolution:  
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.  
This resolution affirms the need for increased funding and brings attention to the special importance of central funding and support for the CSU libraries with smaller library budgets.
Centralized management of the ECC and its funds makes it possible to leverage the CSU’s purchasing power to achieve economies of scale in the acquisition of resources, ensuring that campuses are supported in the most cost-effective way. A sizable augmentation of the ECC budget (as recommended in the ASCSU resolution) will allow a significant expansion of the resources available to all campuses.

The ECC is currently composed of the following resources:

Resources in the Electronic Core Collection
- ABI Inform (ProQuest)
- Academic Search Premier (EBSCO)
- Academic Complete eBooks (ProQuest)
- American Chemical Society Journal Archives
- American Council of Learned Societies
- America History and Life (EBSCO)
- Biological Abstracts (Thomson)
- CINAHL (EBSCO)
- Communication and Mass Media Complete (EBSCO)
- CQ Researcher
- Digital Dissertations Package A (ProQuest)
- Ethnic NewsWatch
- GenderWatch
- Global Newsstream (ProQuest)
- Grove’s Music
- JSTOR Arts and Sciences (12 collections)
- Life Sciences Collection (JSTOR)
- MathSciNet
- Mergent Online
- Modern Language Association (EBSCO and ProQuest)
- NetLibrary (EBSCO)
- Oxford English Dictionary
- Project Muse Standard Collection
- PsycARTICLES (EBSCO and ProQuest)
- PsycINFO (EBSCO and ProQuest)
- Safari Tech Books (ProQuest)
- Sociological Abstracts (ProQuest)
- SpringerLink Online Historical Backfiles
- SCOAP3
- Westlaw: Campus Research – News and Life
- Wiley Interscience Backfile
- Wiley-Blackwell Backfile