I. Minutes: February 18, 2020 minutes (pp. 3-4)

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

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair:
   B. President’s Office: None
   C. Provost: None
   D. Statewide Senate: (pp. 5-10)
   E. CFA: (p. 11)
   F. ASI: (p. 12)

IV. Special Reports:

V. Business Item(s):
   A. Approval of 2020-2021 Calendar of Meetings: (p. 13)
   B. Appointment of Darin Bennett, CAFES, as substitute for Greg Schwartz for Spring Quarter 2020
   C. Appointment of Brian Osborne, CAED, as substitute for Emily White for Spring Quarter 2020
   D. Appointment of Amy Lammert, CAFES, as substitute for Michael McCullough in the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee for Spring 2020
   E. Appointment of Nury Baltierrez, SAS – Educational Opportunity Program/PCS, to fill the 2019-2021 vacancy for PCS
   F. Appointments to Academic Senate Committees for the 2020-2022 term: (pp. 14-20)
   G. Appointments to University Committees for the 2020-2021 academic year: (pp. 21-22)
   H. Appointments of Academic Senate Committee Chairs for 2020-2021: (p.23)
   I. Approval of Assigned Time for the Academic Senate Officers and Committee Chairs for 2020-2021 Academic Year: (p. 24)
   J. Review and Consider “University Faculty Personnel Policies Appendix: Administrative Memos to Appear as Consent Agenda Item: Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 25-53)
   K. Resolution on the Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Instruction for Winter and Spring Quarters 2020: Dustin Stegner (p. 54)
   L. Resolution on Suspending eLearning Addenda: Brian Self, Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (p. 55)
   M. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 7: Personnel Actions Eligibility and Criteria: Ken Brown, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs (pp. 56-64)
   N. Resolution on Revisions to University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 4: UFPP 4 Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Process: Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs (pp. 65-77)
   O. [TIME CERTAIN 4:30 p.m.] Resolution to Adopt ORCID for Improved Identification and Connection among Researchers: Keri Schwab, Academic Senate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Committee (p. 78)
P. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 8.4.5: Student Evaluation Results: Ken Brown, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs (pp. 79-84)

Q. Resolution on the Marketing of Cal Poly’s Educational Identity and Goals: Gary Laver (pp. 85-86)

R. Resolution on Posting Accessible Course Materials: John Hagen, Instruction Committee Chair (pp. 87-88)

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
I. **Minutes**: M/S/P to approve the February 4, 2020 Academic Senate Executive Committee minutes.

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

III. **Reports**:
   A. **Academic Senate Chair**: none.
   B. **President’s Office**: Jessica Darin, Chief of Staff, announced that the Year-Round Task Force is preparing a report examining what year-round operations would look like if implemented at Cal Poly. Additionally, Darin reported that progress is being made in the searches for Provost, Corporation Chair and Vice President for Development.
   C. **Provost**: none.
   D. **Statewide Senate**: Gary Laver, Statewide Senator, reported some leaders on campus, including ASI President Mark Borges and Academic Senate Chair Dustin Stegner, are working to draft Cal Poly’s response to the state’s potential ethnic studies requirement.
   E. **CFA**: none.
   F. **ASI**: Mark Borges, ASI President, reported that there will be a polling location on campus in the Recreation Center on Super Tuesday, March 3rd. Borges also announced thatSafer’s survey on sexual violence will be open until March 18th and the Campus-Community Liaison Committee has formed a subcommittee to address issues of diversity, equity and inclusion in the San Luis Obispo community in response to the CPX results.

IV. **Business Item(s)**:
   A. **Substitution of Jerusha Greenwood for Thomas Gutierrez as Academic Senate Vice Chair for spring quarter 2020**: Tom Gutierrez, Academic Senate Vice Chair, is set to go on sabbatical during spring quarter 2020, thus leaving the position vacant and requiring reassignment of the duties. M/S/P to approve Jerusha Greenwood, Experience Industry Management, to assume the duties of Academic Senate Vice Chair for spring quarter 2020. M/S/P to present this appointment to the Academic Senate for approval.
   B. **Resolution on Timely Adoption of Course Materials**: John Hagen, Instruction Committee Chair, presented a resolution asking faculty to finalize textbook, course pack and lab manual selections one quarter in advance to improve accessibility of course materials. This resolution will return at a later meeting.
   C. **Resolution on Discontinuation of M.S. of Printed Electronics and Functional Imaging Degree Program**: Colleen Twomey, Graphic Communication Chair, proposed a resolution discontinuing a dormant Master’s program in printed electronics. The faculty in this department have unanimously agreed that the program has proven unsustainable as the industry continues to rapidly grow. M/S/P to agendize this resolution.
   D. **Resolution on Class Attendance**: Ashlee Hernandez, student, introduced a resolution recognizing the unique needs of students with dependents and revising language in the Campus Administrative Policy (CAM) to be more inclusive and representative of these needs. M/S/P to agendize this resolution.
   E. **Additional Charge to Instruction Committee: Resolution on Poly Access**: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, introduced a potential new charge asking the Instruction Committee to draft a resolution on Poly Access following a report to the Executive Committee from the Ethics + Emerging Sciences Group. M/S/P to assign the charge to Instruction Committee.
F. **2021-2022 Fall Calendar.** Keith Humphrey, Vice President for Student Affairs, reported that the President’s Office has chosen to move forward with a Wednesday, September 15, start date in fall quarter 2021 because this option poses the least risk for student safety, specifically in terms of alcohol poisoning.

V. **Discussion Item(s):**
   A. **Possible Resolution on Change to University Housing Requirements.** Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, proposed the possibility of a collaborative resolution between the Academic Senate and ASI regarding changes to university housing requirements. The Executive Committee discussed the pros and cons of drafting a resolution addressing the topic and it was decided that more research has to be done before a decision can be made.

VI. **Adjournment:** 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by,

*Katie Terou*

Katie Terou
Academic Senate Student Assistant
Report from ASCSU March 19–20, 2020
Adapted from material provided by ASCSU Senators John Tarjan & Janet Millar

Note: This was the first virtual plenary meeting of the ASCSU.

1. Chair Nelson covered the following items in her report:

- Items discussed at the Campus Senate Chairs Council
  - The use of student evaluations of teaching this semester
  - Ensuring proper consultation with campus leadership
  - Student basic needs, including access to technology
  - Exposure of librarians to the virus as libraries remain open
  - Ensuring the quality of instruction
- ICAS (Leadership of the CSU, CCC and UC Senates)
  - Held Legislative Days last week—spoke with Higher Education, Budget, Finance Committee representatives, among others
  - Major topics included:
    - Transfer (want it to increase from CCC, to be more efficient)
    - Student basic needs
    - Segment budgets
    - Total attendance
    - Faculty diversity
    - CCC Ethnic Studies Bill (AB 3310)
    - Bill to expand and make permanent CCC B.A. degrees (SB 874)

2. Excerpts from Other Reports

- **Academic Affairs** discussed the following:
  - Maintaining course quality
  - Student access to counseling and advising during this crisis
  - Community College B.A. degrees
  - Temporary suspension of the Graduate Writing Requirement (GWAR) per Chancellor’s Office order
  - Campus autonomy
  - Prison education and Project Rebound
  - Campus review processes
  - Improving transfer from community colleges
  - The potential Ethnic Studies requirement, including consideration of the Chancellor’s Office proposal regarding ethnic studies in response to ASCSU’s prior resolution, as summarized below
    - “The ethnic studies, diversity and social justice requirement is a minimum 3-semester unit course as part of lower division CSU General Education Breadth. This requirement will be effective with the 2023-24 catalog year.”
ii. The ethnic studies, diversity and social justice requirement may be met with existing campus requirements and/or courses that were developed to meet local requirements."

- **Academic Preparation and Education Programs** worked on the following:
  - WestEd evaluation of EO 1110 implementation—initial results look promising
  - Quantitative reasoning proposal to increase HS requirements, including HS courses which prepare students for success at the CSU
  - Issues surrounding completion of teaching credentials during the crisis

- **Faculty Affairs** has many resolutions in front of the body and discussed the following:
  - Open access materials
  - AAUP Statement on Knowledge in Higher Education
  - Intersegmental curriculum development
  - The impact of alternative modes of delivery during the COVID crisis on workload and the evaluation of faculty

- **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** discussed the following topics:
  - Monitoring hundreds of bills currently in the legislature
  - Recommend positions on 11 bills felt to be of most relevance to the CSU
  - Monitoring Senate actions related to AB 1460—nothing to report

- **GE Advisory Committee**
  - The CSUCO is currently engaged in the annual review of CCC course outlines of record submitted for evaluation to receive CSU GE credit.
  - The potential for a formal appeals process for CCC courses denied inclusion on the approved GE course list. Such a process would probably involve an accelerated timeline for submission and review to allow for an appeals process within the same year.
  - Several other items were discussed:
    - CLEP Spanish with writing is now posted on the credit by exam list (as recommended by GEAC in November).
    - The impact (likely a large one) of the possible addition of an ethnic studies requirement to lower-division GE on the community colleges
    - Quantitative reasoning preparation: changes to the BOT item
    - AB705 (community college placement into courses and self-placement processes, guided pathways)
    - Revising EO 1100 FAQ about types of permissible campus variations
    - Discussion of how ADT/UC Pathways possible alignment may impact GE (IGETC or CSU GE is required within each ADT).

- **Ad Hoc Committee on Inclusion and Diversity** has begun meeting to review practices and procedures to ensure inclusion. In the current crisis, we need to ensure that all students, and faculty, have access to electronic resources and training to adapt to our new modalities of teaching and learning.
RESOLUTIONS

1. The ASCSU passed the following second reading items. Copies of these and other resolutions can be found at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/.

   • Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Endorsement of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement “In Defense of Knowledge and Higher Education” is self-explanatory. In Defense of Knowledge and Higher Education
   
   • Resources to Support California State University (CSU) Faculty Participation in the Course-Identification Numbering System (C-ID) Process urges adequate support for staff and faculty to accomplish the important work of implementation and maintenance of transfer model curricular (the basis for transfer into the CSU).

2. The ASCSU passed the following resolutions after waiving a second reading. Copies of these and other resolutions can be found at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/.

   • Accommodations to Faculty Due to the COVID-19 Emergency recommends that individual faculty members can determine whether student perceptions of teaching effectiveness for this semester will appear in their PAF and WPAF without penalty, that probationary faculty be granted an additional year in RTP considerations if requested, and that the appropriate administrator place a memo outlining the difficulties encountered during the affected periods that might impact teaching, service and scholarly and creative activity. It also asserts intellectual property rights for faculty, asks for sufficient resources to support alternative modes of instruction, and calls for a return to prior modes of instruction pre-crisis.

   • CSU Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) and UC Transfer Pathway (UCTP) Alignment encourages exploration of potential alignment of major transfer patterns by intersegmental discipline faculty representatives and opposes efforts to explore alignment without CSU discipline faculty member participation.

   • 2020 Legislative Advocacy Positions of the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1917</td>
<td>Budget Act of 2020</td>
<td>Ting</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 808</td>
<td>Budget Act of 2020</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community colleges: statewide baccalaureate degree pilot program</td>
<td>Hill, Hueso, and Wilk</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Extends the statewide baccalaureate degree pilot program indefinitely. Removes the requirements that the program consist of a maximum of 15 community college district programs and for a student to commence a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1460</td>
<td>CSU graduation requirement: ethnic studies</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>ASCSU opposes legislative intrusion in the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 3310</td>
<td>Community colleges: ethnic studies</td>
<td>Muratsuchi</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Requires California Community College students to take Ethnic Studies with units transferable and satisfying any CSU requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2228</td>
<td>Postsecondary education: sexual assault kits</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Requires free sexual assault kits and related medical services are available within a 5-mile radius of each campus or provided for free at the campus health center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1083</td>
<td>Mental health counselors</td>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Would require one counselor for every 1500 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1970</td>
<td>Public postsecondary education: pilot program for free tuition and fees: working group</td>
<td>Jones-Sawyer</td>
<td>Support in Concept</td>
<td>Creates a working group from DOE, UC, CSU and CCC to consider a pilot program for free tuition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1862</td>
<td>Public postsecondary education: California State University: tuition</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Support in Concept</td>
<td>Requires free tuition at a CSU, for two years, for any student that completed an ADT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2176</td>
<td>Free student transit passes: eligibility for state funding</td>
<td>Holden</td>
<td>Support in Concept</td>
<td>Requires transit agencies to offer free student transit passes to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2495</td>
<td>Public postsecondary education: undergraduate tuition and mandatory systemwide fees</td>
<td>Choi</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Fixes tuition upon entrance to the CSU for six years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Response to the CSU Chancellor’s Office Memo on Recommended Implementation of a California State University (CSU) Ethnic Studies Requirement (March 17, 2020)** was granted a waiver in order to take a position which may inform current legislative and system developments. The BOT is urged to implement an Ethnic Studies requirement that
  - Relies on campuses to operationalize the requirement and the associated learning outcomes through existing curricular processes
  - Allows the expansion of historically oppressed groups that may be included
  - Calls for a lower-division requirement that can double-count within general education
  - Encourages an upper-division reflective component
  - Expresses the expectation that the number of units in lower-division GE will not increase

3. A sample of new and carried-over items to appear on the May plenary agenda:
   a. **Affirming the Role of the CSU Board of Trustees in Adopting Rules, Regulations and Policies Governing the University** is a response to ongoing governmental attempts to circumvent the Board in mandating policy for the CSU.
   b. **Opposition to AB 1930—CSU/UC Admission Policy** asserts that the restrictions contained in this bill would hamper the Board of Trustees’ ability to set policy to meet the needs of our students.
   c. **Addition of Dedicated Contingent Faculty Senate Members** suggests an amendment of the ASCSU constitution to add 3 full-time lecturer faculty to the body.
   d. **Resolution in Support of ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID) for the California State University (CSU)** ORCID is a not-for-profit group which facilitates collaboration and research by providing accurate and self-modifiable information in an easy to access database.
   e. **Re-Affirming the Role of the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) and Campus Senates in Establishing Curriculum and Graduation Requirements** affirms the role of the ASCSU established in the Higher Education Employer Employee Relations Act and supported by the ASCSU constitution and AAUP statements on shared governance.
   f. **In Support of Lecturer Range Elevation** encourages CFA and CSU management to allow range elevation based upon service, irrespective of position on the SSI scale.

**OTHER REPORTS**

1. **Chancellor Tim White** began by thanking us all for our extraordinary efforts to maintain academic continuity during the COVID crisis. He is proud of the efforts of our faculty and other. In-person interviews of candidates for the Chancellor position have been postponed from Monday and will be held as virtual interviews at a later date. Campus and CO leaders are working tirelessly to ensure continuity and protect the health of our students and employees. Circumstances vary by region/campus, and blanket policies optimal for all campuses cannot be developed.
The Chancellor stressed that there is both a health aspect and perhaps a dire budgetary aspect to this crisis. We will be losing residency fees, the state’s budgeting process will not reflect what was proposed in January, and we anticipate losses in enrollment and hence student fee revenue next year. The drop in enrollments could be significant. We need to plan for the contingency that we will likely not get the $199m budget increase in the January Governor’s budget and potentially could face cuts to our base budget as a result of loss in state revenues.

Student evaluation of teaching should be made available to faculty but should not adversely impact RTP. There is currently no systemwide hiring freeze. That might change. Campuses may choose to slow down some hiring. Faculty members can play a very important role in encouraging students to enroll on our campuses through phone outreach. This may help to mitigate some of the expected losses in “yield” of prospective student applicants.

2. **Executive Vice Chancellor Loren Blanchard** indicated that we will likely be in virtual operations until at least the end of the academic year. CSU administration is spending much time responding to both internal and external constituencies. Groups across the country are expressing concerns about the potential financial impact the crisis will have on universities.

CSU campuses are not “closed” per se; they are just not open for instruction and some other functions. He encouraged faculty not only to provide learning via alternative modalities, but to be aware and sensitive to student circumstances and need, and to be willing to direct students to a whole host of services that are still being offered, albeit virtually. If students cannot complete courses for reasons outside of their control or classes are canceled, students will likely be given a pro-rated tuition rebate. Students may have to return to campus after graduation if they wish to participate in some type of commencement ceremonies. Diplomas will be granted and delivered regardless of commencement schedules.

The administration considered the ASCSU resolution on Ethnic Studies and feedback from campuses about it in proposing a slightly modified implementation of AS-3403. There was a wide range of opinions. The proposal represents a best attempt to find agreement on a potential recommendation to the Board of Trustees in May.
CFA RESPONSE TO COVID-19.

CFA statewide has a web page that provides faculty with updates and resources regarding the pandemic: https://www.calfac.org/pod/covid-19-and-cfa. CFA is prioritizing enforcement of Article 37 (Safety) of our Collective Bargaining Agreement during the pandemic. All faculty have the right to work remotely during the pandemic. CFA SLO believes that all Cal Poly faculty are now able to work remotely. Faculty do not need to sign telecommuting agreements in order to work remotely. Cal Poly faculty should immediately contact CFA SLO Chapter President Lewis Call (lcall@calfac.org) and Faculty Rights Chair Neal MacDougall (nmacdougall@calfac.org) if they believe that they are being required to work in unsafe conditions, if they are being denied the right to work remotely, or if they are being asked to sign a telecommuting agreement.
Academic Senate Executive Committee ASI Report for April 7, 2020:

COVID-19: ASI Student Leaders have been involved in many discussions regarding COVID-19’s implications to spring quarter. Many student issues have been resolved, but at this point, main concerns involve the following:

- Students being unable to find hours for work
- Students losing summer internships/dealing with hiring freezes
- Students being unable to break leases
- Students managing synchronous classes while living in a different time zone (i.e. a student from Hawaii taking a 7 AM class or a student from New York taking an 8 PM class)

All of these challenges have many dedicated people working to solve them, and I would like to thank those that are working to address student needs. Additionally, we do encourage faculty to attempt to reach out to their students to see if there are additional accommodations they may have, given that they may be taking their online class in a new setting.

- The ASI Board of Directors are continuing to meet virtually, and all updates to meeting times and schedules can be found on the ASI website. In addition ASI is continuing to provide various services to students virtually, including Rec Center classes, at-home ASI Events, and more.
# Academic Senate Calendar of Meetings For 2020-2021

All Executive Committee meetings are held in 01-409 from 3:00 to 5:00pm unless otherwise noted. All Academic Senate meetings are held in UU220 unless otherwise noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEETING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 11, 2020 (Friday, 1:30 to 5:30pm, UU220)</td>
<td>Academic Senate Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3</td>
<td>Executive Committee (if needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 7 – January 3, 2021</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finals Week and Quarter Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 5</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 19</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 26</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23</td>
<td>Executive Committee (if needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 15 – March 28, 2021</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finals Week and Quarter Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>Executive Committee (if needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>Academic Senate (if needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 7 – June 13, 2021</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finals Week and Quarter Break</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statements of Interest Received for  
2020-2022 Academic Senate Committee Vacancies by College  
(All appointments are for 2-years unless noted below)

**College of Architecture and Environmental Design**  
Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (2020-2022)  
Curriculum Committee (2019-2021)  

**David Watts, Landscape Architecture (12 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent**  
I have been able to serve on the ASCC for the past year and wish to continue in my appointment. It has been a great experience to partake in conversations regarding a wide range of educational issues beyond individual course proposals. I have always been engaged with curriculum since my arrival at Cal Poly and experienced an entire department curriculum change during my first year. I was able to observe the complexities and the impact it had on students and faculty first hand. I authored and oversaw the approval of our department's minor and am its administrator.

I have served as the department curriculum chair for the past three years and and have been the CAED curriculum chair for the past two years. I have recently worked with the CM department on their interdisciplinary minor and in our department getting the first graduate level courses approved. I hope to continue my work representing my department and college at the university level.

Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee (2020-2022)  
Diversity Committee (2020-2022)  
Faculty Affairs Committee (2019-2021)  
GE Governance Board (2020-2023)  
Grants Review Committee (2019-2021)  
Instruction Committee (2019-2021)  
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Committee (2020-2022)  
Sustainability Committee (2019-2021)

**College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences**  
Curriculum Committee (2020-2022)  

**Amy Lammert, Food Science Nutrition (11 years at Cal Poly)**  
1. I have been the FSN representative for the last 6 years and we have had several course modifications, program modifications, and significant program modifications in Nutrition. During this time, we have also had a Blended Masters in Food Science and stand-alone Masters in Food Science approved as well.

2. I was "traumatized" in the last cycle trying to get the nutrition program documentation through (their accrediting body, ACEND, made major requirement changes that resulted in a pretty significant modification to the program) and don't ever want to repeat that. As a result, in the beginning of this AY, I put together a shared One Drive folder with best practices and links to resources for the FSN faculty with more detailed information to help guide them through the curriculum modification process. I also shared it with all of the members of the CAFES-CC. It has been modified four times as we have moved through this cycle. I think it is actually helping my CAFES colleagues!

3. I understand that I will need to work with individual faculty from different departments within CAFES to help them move through this process throughout the duration of this role.

4. I am also the Food Science assessment coordinator for our Institute of Food Technologists approved undergraduate Food Science Program. I think having the curriculum and assessment knowledge is powerful, not only in reviewing other courses and programs but also in evaluating assessment strategies.

I look forward to hearing your response and getting involved this quarter (virtually ?) as CAFES transitions from Mike McCullough to hopefully me.
Samantha Gill, Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences and Bioresource Agricultural Engineering (22 years at Cal Poly)

I have been at Cal Poly since 1997 and I believe that the Fairness Board is a crucial committee for the university. Students need a place to address major grade disputes if they cannot be handled at the department level, they need an outlet to address these concerns in a fair manner. This is a job for the fairness board. It is also equally important that faculty have an opportunity to defend their grading. The fairness board act like a jury to hear both sides and make recommendations to the Provost. It is imperative that both sides be heard. This results in fairness for both the students and the faculty member. None of us are perfect and so a format such as that outlined in the Fairness Board description is extremely important.

As a faculty member for over 20 years, I have heard many complaints from students. I have heard many student complaints, in confidence, about the grading of other instructors. In a couple of cases, I was able to talk with the other instructor about general grading and get this situation resolved. In other cases, I was able to talk with the student and give them a better understanding of how many faculty determine and assign grades. The students who approached me all said they did so because they believe that I am fair and that I am concerned about students.

In conclusion, I am very concerned about fairness to both students and faculty. I believe that I can be an asset to the Fairness Board because of my years of experience at Cal Poly.

Juliana Huzzey, Animal Science (5.5 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent

I have completed one term (2018-2020) serving on the Fairness Board. During this time we had only a few cases for review but for each of these I found them to be very interesting and informative. Because of this work I better understand the importance of transparency, clarity and documentation in the classroom. I’ve learned better ways to communicate important course matters on my syllabi, for example, and share this information with newer faculty in our department.

My area of professional expertise is in animal behavior and animal welfare. Particularly with the latter field of study I am used to discussing and working on complex and contentious issues. I feel this experience is an advantage for working on cases that come to the fairness board which also involve complex issues. I am a compassionate person but I also value objective consideration of information (e.g. in a fairness case). I believe the combination of these skills would make me a good candidate for serving on the Fairness Board.

Thank you for your consideration. I would look forward to the opportunity to serve another term on this committee.

Grants Review Committee (2020-2022)
Instruction Committee (2020-2022)

Luis Castro, Food Science and Nutrition (5 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent

My name is Luis Castro, I am an assistant professor in the Food Science and Nutrition department, and I am very interested in continuing my service in the Academic Senate Instruction Committee for the 2020-2021 period. I am very passionate about teaching, since joining CalPoly I have attended various workshops on teaching and assessment methods which I have implemented in my classes. Recently I implemented a team based learning approach to one of my courses with great success, I have also been employing different delivery and assessment strategies to improve student learning. I wish to be more involved with policies and decision making regarding improvement of the quality of teaching on campus, grading and instruction in general. From my various activities I have become aware of the many different teaching and learning techniques, I am currently working on incorporating more virtual and interactive tools into my courses, my goal is to share what I have learned and contribute to the teaching excellence at CalPoly.
**College of Engineering**

Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee (2020-2022)
Diversity Committee (2020-2022)
Instruction Committee (2020-2022)
Sustainability Committee (2020-2022)

**David Braun, Electrical Engineering (24 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent**

The Sustainability Committee has multiple on-going projects, which I’d like to help the committee further. Specifically, I’d like to work more on the following ongoing ASCC efforts:

1. Respond to AS-787-14 by
   a. Continuing to update the lists of SUSCAT courses, and
   b. Working with the CTLT and others to encourage faculty to teach sustainability in new and existing courses.
2. Work with students to better integrate approaches to sustainability inside and outside the classroom/curriculum.
3. Respond to the 2014 CSU Sustainability Policy directives.
4. Document and collect academic data for the AASHE/STARS certification.
5. Help the campus achieve the Second Nature Climate Commitment.

Additionally, I’d like to help the committee make progress on several new initiatives:

1. Set Cal Poly’s Carbon Neutrality Date.
2. Include Sustainability in Faculty and Staff hiring procedures.

I enjoy chairing the committee and attempt to perform the responsibilities diligently. I am eager to serve on the committee and am certainly willing to serve as chair. However, if current members want to chair the committee, I would gladly defer to them.

**College of Liberal Arts**

Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (2020-2022)

**Lauren Kolodziejki, Communication Studies (6 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent**

Last year was my first on the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee. I learned a great deal and now have a much better understanding of how the university budget works and many of the long-term financial questions the university needs to address. With this new knowledge in place, I would like to continue my work on the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee. My perspective as a non-business/accounting person brings valuable insights to the conversations the committee has. Since a large focus on the committee this year has been thinking about how to increase transparency and communication around the university's finances, my background in Communication Studies has been helpful.

Budgeting and long-range planning are areas that are fundamental to the health and vibrancy of Cal Poly, and this committee serves as an important point of contact for shared governance. It is essential for faculty to have a formalized role related to the allocation of university resources and long-term visioning for Cal Poly. I believe my presence on the committee is beneficial for understanding the perspective of stakeholder who many not immediately grasp all the details of the budgeting process but have a vested interest in the fiscal stability of the institution. I am also interested in this committee's continued efforts regarding the university's strategic plan.

Curriculum Committee (2020-2022)

**Gregory Bohr, Social Sciences (17 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent**

I have served on the ASCC for 6 (?) years, and have been the Chair of the CLA Curriculum Committee for the same amount of time. I have represented the college (and my department) through multiple Catalog cycles, and participated in the various business of the ASCC in that time. I also represented the ASCC on the small committee charged with writing the new GWR resolution. I look forward to continuing to serve on the ASCC and CLA committees, particularly as we finalize the 2021-22 Catalog over the next year, and shepherd our GE recertifications through the process.

Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee (2020-2022)

Faculty Affairs Committee (2020-2022)

**Christy Chand, Theatre and Dance (8 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent**

After serving on this committee for the past two years, I am familiar with our charges and am passionate about contributing to the deliberation required when considering policy change and other recommendations. Knowing that the charge regarding revising the requirement for qualitative comments to
be included on student evaluations will be continuing into the next academic year, I would very much like to be involved in the conversations that will shape the committee's recommendations.

GE Governance Board (2020-2023)
Dustin Stegner, English (14 years at Cal Poly)
From 2018-2020, I was regularly involved in the General Education Governance Board through my role as Academic Senate Chair. Collaborating with the GEGB Chair I also helped to organize the GE area working groups, DEI working group, and pathways working group in order to respond to the requirements of Executive Order 1100(r). I am interested in serving on the governance board as it begins its multi-year program of reviewing GE courses.

Grants Review (2020-2021)
Dawn Neill, Social Sciences (12 years at Cal Poly)
I seek appointment to the Grants Review Committee. 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. I hold graduate degrees in both Anthropology (PhD) and Public Health Nutrition (MS) and have a broad array of interests related to cultural, biological, and ecological issues, especially in an interdisciplinary capacity. I have earned two research grants from the National Science Foundation (NSF) (Dissertation Improvement Grant, $12,000, 2004; Cultural Anthropology Research Grant, $220,000, 2010-2013). I have mentored colleagues and students in the research process, including assisting four undergraduate students to formulate and submit their own research proposals to NSF (2 funded in 2010; 1 funded 2011; 1 funded 2012). I have reviewed grant proposals for National Science Foundation-Cultural Anthropology and reviewed papers for Demography and Human Nature. I also recently concluded a three-year appointment to a National Science Foundation Grants Review Panel.

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. I have attended the CSU-wide student research competition and advised two Cal Poly Liberal Arts students presenting their research – both of whom received awards. Given my experience working with student researchers and writing and reviewing grants, I think I am good fit for the committee.

Instruction Committee (2020-2022)
Sara Lopus, Social Sciences (3 years at Cal Poly)
Sustainability is at the forefront of my teaching and research agendas, and if I were selected to serve on the Academic Senate Sustainability Committee, it could become a principal element of my university service as well. My academic training (BS Environmental Sciences, MS International Agricultural Development, PhD Demography) has exposed me to a broad array of sustainability-related challenges, along with solutions that I’d like to advocate for on our campus and throughout the Central Coast community (e.g. continued reduction of on-campus waste; increased provision of local, organic, and affordable dining options; student, staff, and faculty engagement with local environmental non-profits; prioritization of sustainability in campus transportation and housing policies; incorporation of sustainability into courses in all Cal Poly colleges). After attending Cal Poly’s “Infusing Sustainability Across the Curriculum” charette in 2018, I took action within my personal and departmental curricula by (1) expanding the module on population-environment interactions within my existing SOC 431World Populations course and (2) reshaping my major’s core curriculum, such that all Sociology majors are now required to take my soon-to-launch SOC 308 Environmental Sociology course. I would like to continue these efforts outside of my department by advocating for the integration of sustainability content into courses across the university, encouraging faculty to apply for SUSCAT certification, and partnering with the CTLT to create sustainability-focused workshops and learning communities. In my 2.5 years at Cal Poly, I’ve participated in seven CTLT-sponsored workshops, book circles, and/or learning communities, so it’s fair to say I’m well-versed in the quality of the pedagogical content that the CTLT provides on campus. Although I am still a junior faculty member on the Cal Poly campus, I do have some experience serving on university-level committees: I was on the General Education Taskforce from 2018-2019, and as a graduate student at UC Berkeley, I served two years on the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Work and Family.

With all the sustainability expertise on this campus, Cal Poly is well-situated to create a name for itself as a sustainability leader. As our recent STARS Gold rating reflects, we are getting there. I’m heartened to read that sustainability is playing a central role in the campus Master Plan for 2035, and I hope to play a personal role in shaping how that is done.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Committee (2020-2022)
Sustainability Committee (2020-2022)

Jason Peters, English (5 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent
I'm eager to continue representing CLA on the Sustainability Committee. I think we have done some terrific work over the past year by promoting sustainability on campus, finding ways to encourage faculty to infuse their courses with sustainability-related concepts, and expanding the SUSCAT. While the environmental and economic components of the sustainability triad are well-represented in our work, I look forward to continuing to collaborate with committee members on ways of building the social capacity of sustainability discourse on campus, such as by bringing sustainability and DEI initiatives into stronger alliance with one another.

College of Science and Math
Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (2020-2022)
Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee (2020-2022)

Lars Tomanek, Biological Sciences (15 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent
Promoting student-centered research to Cal Poly has been one of my passions since joining the faculty. For me, involving students in research is high-impact teaching. Student-centered research also motivates and engages faculty and, thus, it is an important element of Cal Poly’s vibrancy. Since serving on the Academic Senate for three years, I have expanded my involvement in university affairs beyond my department and college, and greatly enjoyed learning about the academic pursuits of other disciplines on campus. Serving on the Distinguished Scholarship Committee this last year, I appreciated hearing about different types of research and different ways faculty are engaging students in it.

By serving on the committee, I learned that it is important to hear from a broader range of voices, especially those promoting equity between genders, different disciplines and the alternative approaches used to engage students in research. I am enriched by what I learned from other committee members explaining their perspective. As a chair I try to achieve a group consensus among committee members by promoting discussions that consider equity, the different areas of scholarship on campus and the challenges that faculty from different backgrounds face, e.g., industry- versus agency-funded research. I also have a new appreciation of the need to take into account continuity in research, as the commitments and roles of faculty change over the years.

Importantly, the Distinguished Scholar Award also sends a message to the faculty-at-large and the greater public, specifically funders. For example, by recognizing research in education we embrace scholarship in our daily craft of teaching, recognizing industry-funded research promotes our engagement with industries and supporting research by the National Institute of Health and the National Science Foundation helps our students prepare for graduate programs. Finally, as a DSA recipient myself, I know that it is also an acknowledgement of the role of our students', staff's and department’s efforts to promote research. The award is therefore a celebration of our effort as an educational community to enhance our thinking about the world and the ever changing reality that our students will experience in their future. I would like to continue to chair the committee as I am enjoying the responsibility a great deal. Listing to our colleagues praising their fellow faculty through the nomination and selection process provides great satisfaction to the committee and myself. It is an honor to serve Cal Poly in this capacity.

Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee (2020-2022)

Eric Kantorowski, Chemistry and Biochemistry (17 years at Cal Poly)
Teaching is the single most important aspect of a CP faculty member's duties. To participate in assessing candidates for the DTA is an immense responsibility, which I take quite seriously. There is also personal growth in that it is valuable to observe teaching techniques and styles of a wide breadth of instructors from other departments and colleges.

Diversity Committee (2020-2022)

Marilyn Tseng, Kinesiology and Public Health (9 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent
As the current Chair of the Academic Senate Diversity Committee, I oversaw our decision-making process following the presentation of results from the CPX survey, and I am currently leading our committee’s efforts towards an action plan in light of CPX survey results and Collective Impact recommendations, and towards addressing our second charge regarding Diversity Learning Objectives. We have developed a plan and have ideas on priorities and next steps – specifically, supporting the regular collection and sharing of data to monitor the status of diversity at Cal Poly; incorporation of the Diversity Learning Objectives into more programs; and recognition of faculty efforts towards improving the climate and curriculum with respect to diversity. I would love the opportunity to continue serving on the committee to see these plans through. I currently also serve on the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee of the Department of Kinesiology and Public Health; the self-study working group on campus climate for WASC Thematic
Pathway for Reaffirmation; and the Inclusive Excelience Council. I hope that my service on these committees will continue to inform what I can contribute to the Academic Senate Diversity Committee.

GE Governance Board (2020-2023)

**John Jasbinsek, Physics (12 years at Cal Poly) - Incumbent**
I am serving as my department curriculum chair and so am heavily involved with the current GE course re-certification effort on campus. I would like another term on GEGB to aid in the process of all departments on campus accomplishing this significant task.

Grants Review Committee (2020-2022)

**Shanju Zhang, Chemistry and Biochemistry (9 years at Cal Poly)**
I am writing to apply for serving Grant Review Committee. I started my independent career as an Assistant Professor at Cal Poly in 2011 and was tenured and promoted as an Associate Professor in 2017. I have about 25 years of experience in determination of synthesis, structures and properties of polymers and nanomaterials. I have published about 70 peer-reviewed papers in high-caliber journals including Macromolecules and Advanced Materials. During the past nine years at Cal Poly, I have supervised 84 research students including 13 master’s graduates. All students are required to show their understanding about the research projects in a final journal-article-style report. To date, students have given 30 oral talks and presented 25 posters. Students have earned a 1st place award of Best Presentation and a 1st place award of Best Poster in ACS national meeting, a 1st place award of Best Poster in ACA Coatings Tech national meeting and a 1st place award of CSU research competition, as well as many Best Poster awards in regional meetings. There have been 14 papers written by Cal Poly students as lead authors that have been published by top journals such as Macromolecules. There are 38 Cal Poly students who serve as co-authors in the published papers. I, as a PI, have secured more than half a million dollars of research grants including two NSF grants and one ACS-PRF grant along with others. I have been serving proposal panels for national and international funding agencies for about 10 times, including National Science Foundation, American Chemical Society-Petroleum Research Fund, Canada Foundation for Innovation, and Poland National Science Center. I served as a panelist and reviewer to evaluate about 100 research proposals from top R1 institutions. In addition, I serve as a regular and adjudicative referee for 43 peer-reviewed journals including ACS Nano, Advanced Materials, Chemical Society of Reviews, etc. I have reviewed hundreds of research papers from different countries. I believe that I am well qualified for serving Grant Review Committee and would like to make contributions to the committee.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Committee (2020-2022)

Sustainability Committee (2020-2022)

**Jonathan Fernsler, Physics (14 years at Cal Poly) - Incumbent**
I am excited to continue work on the Senate Sustainability Committee in order to implement sustainability-related courses (SUSCAT) into the new student Schedule Builder, to craft policy to improve Cal Poly sustainability scoring in the AASHE STARS program and to further integrate sustainability into the Cal Poly curriculum.

Orfalea College of Business

Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (2020-2022)

**David Maber, Accounting (4 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent**
I have been on the committee for the past two years. For the past year I have been the chair. During the past two years, I have been actively involved with reviewing the University’s Strategic Plan and the Annual Budget Book. Both are ongoing and I believe some continuity in committee involvement and leadership is important to effective oversight and execution of the committee’s responsibilities.

Curriculum Committee (2020-2022)
Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee (2020-2022)
Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee (2019-2021)
Diversity Committee (2020-2022)
Faculty Affairs Committee (2020-2022)

**Eduardo Zambrano, Economics (11 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent**
I wish to continue serving because I am interested in seeing through the updating of the governance documents at Cal Poly, which we have been working on for several years now.

Fairness Board (2019-2021)
GE Governance Board (2020-2023)
Grants Review Committee (2020-2022)

**Javier de la Funete, Industrial Technology and Packaging (7 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent**
Initially, my interest in participating in the Grants Review Committee was two-folded. First, as a new faculty at Cal Poly, I wanted to learn more about the review process for internal grants and state faculty support grants. Secondly, I was the recipient of an internal grant (EFI award) in 2014, and I wanted to contribute to the system by offering my services at the university level.

Now, I have been a member of the Grants Review Committee for more than five years. One year as committee chair. I have been involved with reviewing internal grants and selecting student projects to represent Cal Poly at the state-wide competition and even helping Cal Poly to organize the CSU Student Research Competition on our campus.

It has been an enriching professional development experience, and it allowed me to meet people across campus in a way that I have not anticipated. Also, as a faculty transitioning from associate to full professor, I would like to use my gained experience and undertake more leadership roles by continuing to chair the committee.

In this past year, I worked hard to have a representative from each college. Besides regular committee responsibilities, I collected committee members’ feedback for Dr. Renee Reijo Pera on the Strategic Initiatives (SRSCA) and volunteered to serve as one of the Academic Senate reviewers during SRSCA proposals.

Instruction Committee (2020-2022)
Sustainability Committee (2020-2022)

Professional Consultative Services
Budget and Long-range Planning Committee (2019-2021)
Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee (2019-2021)
Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee (2019-2021)
Faculty Affairs Committee (2020-2022)
  Brett Bodemer, Library (10 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent
  I have served on this committee for several years now, and one of my major goals is to help finish the migration of the faculty personnel policies into its new incarnation, (UFPP) which may happen as early as the next academic year. However, there are other recurring issues (e.g., equity adjustments) that the committee has dealt with before and that I am in a relatively good position to give input on moving forward.

Fairness Board (2020-2022)
Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Committee (2020-2022)
Sustainability Committee (2019-2021)
Statements of Interest Received for
2020-2022 University Committee Vacancies
(All appointments are for 1-year unless noted below)


**Athletics Advisory Board:** One vacancy: (2020-2023)

**Campus Parking & Transportation Advisory Committee:** Two vacancies (2020-2022)

**Campus Safety and Risk Management Committee:** One vacancy (2020-2022)

**Conflict of Interest in Research Committee:** One vacancy (2020-2021)

**Disability Access and Inclusion Committee:** Two vacancies DACC (2020-2022) AND ARB (2020-2022)


**CAED (2020-2022)**

**CENG (2019-2021)**

**CLA (2020-2022)**

**CSM (2020-2022)**

**Jodi Christiansen, Physics – CSM – (13 years at Cal Poly)**

I am interested in building and assessing students' ability to think logically, communicate, and write. I am currently on the team that teaches the physics department upper division labs where we provide students with tools to make logical arguments related to their data, gain knowledge from the data, and communicate the results of the experiment in the context of the relevant physics. These are high level skills and students come away equipped to join a professional conversation. I am proud of our program, but would also like to build my knowledge of this issue more broadly and bring back new ideas to our program through what I learn.

Professionally I write scientific articles once every other year. Interacting with colleagues and editors has contributed to my skill as a writer. Since joining the Cal Poly faculty, I have also had the pleasure of writing educational papers (American Journal of Physics) and course materials and have been amazed at how this has helped my communication skills improve. Writing is lifelong endeavor and I am happily on the path. I feel that I am now well qualified to participate on this committee.

My goal is to align the College of Science and Math with the GWR. We have long-held department traditions intended to prepare students for the GWR. From conversations I've had on campus, some of these traditions are not well aligned with the university requirements. I would like to assess these traditions and provide feedback to my college. It may also be possible to identify the upper division courses that fulfill the GWR for our students.

**Ashley McDonald, Chemistry and Biochemistry – CSM – (9 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent**

I teach CHEM 354, which was the first CSM class to receive GWR approval in the GWR expansion phase. I am familiar with the GWR requirements, application process, and procedures. I think that by serving on the GWR Advisory Board, I can help more CSM and CENG classes through the GWR approval process and ultimately create more opportunities for our students to complete their GWR requirement through discipline-specific classes. I have served on the GWR advisory board for the last year.

**OCOB (2020-2022)**

**PCS (2020-2022)**

**Bing Anderson, Finance - OCOB - (16 years at Cal Poly) – Incumbent**
I have served on the committee for a number of years, and have chaired this committee three times. I am familiar with the workings of this committee, its history, the issues, and its charges. I hope to continue using these to serve the committee, especially the relatively newer members on the committee, my college as far as intellectual property is concerned, and our university in general.

Student Health Advisory Committee: One vacancy: (2020-2021)

**Lauren Kolodziejski, Communication Studies – CLA – (6 years at Cal Poly)**
My scholarly research focuse on rhetorical analysis of public communication of science and health. Much of my work examines navigating risk communication and public engagement with technoscientific information. With this background I can make valuable contributions to the work of the committee to serve as a means of communication between Health Services and students. Also, recent events have made me particularly interested in the work of this committee. The coronavirus outbreak highlights how important it is to have communication reaching students about relevant health related issues. I have also had a number of students needing mental health care this year but have heard students say that they cannot get the support they need. These experiences have made me increasingly interested in learning more about the health support the university provides to students as well as how health-related information is communicated. I believe our work at the University should be student-center and would welcome the opportunity to serve on this committee and learn more from the student members about their Student Health needs.

Sustainability Advisory Committee: One vacancy (2020-2022)

University Union Advisory Board: One vacancy (2020-2021)
# Candidates for 2020-2021 Committee Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chair 2019-2020</th>
<th>Chair Since</th>
<th>Possible Chair 2020-2021</th>
<th>2020-2021 Committee Member</th>
<th>College/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; Long-Range Planning Committee</td>
<td>David Maber</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>David Maber</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>OCOB/Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Brian Self</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>Brian Self</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CENG/Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory Bohr</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CLA/Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Lammert</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CAFES/Food Science Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee</td>
<td>Lars Tomanek</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>Lars Tomanek</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CSM/Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee</td>
<td>Brian Kennelly</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>Eric Kantorowski</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CSM/Chemistry and Biochemistry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Kennelly</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CLA/World Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Marilyn Tseng</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>Marilyn Tseng</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CSM/Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Ken Brown*</td>
<td>44178</td>
<td>Ken Brown</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CLA/Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Board</td>
<td>Anika Leithner</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>Anika Leithner</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CLA/Political Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Governance Board</td>
<td>Gary Laver</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 year appointment – ends 2022)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Javier de la Fuente</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>OCOB/IT&amp;P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Committee</td>
<td>John Hagen</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>John Hagen</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CSM/Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Committee</td>
<td>Keri Schwab</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>Keri Schwab</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>EIM/CAFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Committee</td>
<td>David Braun</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>David Braun</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CENG/Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCP</td>
<td>Grace Yeh</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>Grace Yeh</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Ethinc Studies Rep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Assigned Time for 2020-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate Chair</td>
<td>Tom Gutierrez</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate Vice Chair</td>
<td>Jerusha Greenwood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee</td>
<td>David Maber</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Brian Self</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED - VACANT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES - Amy Lammert</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA - Gregory Bohr</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG - A. Keen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM - J. Walker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB - VACANT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee</td>
<td>Lars Tomanek</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Marilyn Tseng</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Ken Brown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Board</td>
<td>Anika Leithner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Governance Board</td>
<td>Gary Laver</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Review Committee</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Committee</td>
<td>John Hagen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Comm</td>
<td>Keri Schwab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Committee</td>
<td>David Braun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCP Review Committee</td>
<td>Grace Yeh</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Up to 82.5 WTUs per year**

**Curriculum Committee Members**

- Catalog years=60 WTUs (10 each) -- Non-catalog years=36 WTUs (6 each)

Provided by Provost Enz Finken
Approved by Provost on 06.10.14
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 which 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.

Many policies are not established by the Academic Senate, but instead are subject to administrative action. To facilitate access to and citation of those memos FAC proposes the establishment of an appendix to UFPP containing administrative memos.

### Summary of Appendix: Administrative Memos

Administrative memos related to faculty personnel policies shall be placed into an appendix to UFPP and given a standard citation reference. The placement of additional memos shall occur by Senate action either by the consent agenda or by resolution. Editing UFPP to insert citations of these memos needs no further Academic Senate oversight.

This appendix to UFPP shall be accessible as a separate document linked to the Academic Personnel website along with UFPP and the other faculty personnel policy documents at Cal Poly.

### Impact on Existing Policy

This action consists of establishing a place to hold policy-making administrative memos and a standardized means of citing those memos. The memos have already established or modified policy. Moving them into a single document appended to UFPP and implementing a standardized means of citing them changes no policy expressed by the memo.

### Implementation

References to administrative memos need to be updated to use the new citation standard. References in UFPP can be implemented ad hoc.

### Consultation with Faculty Units about UFPP Appendix: Administrative Memos

Consultation on the creation of this appendix to UFPP was minimal. Members of FAC considered it valuable. A few informal conversations with administrators, staff, and faculty suggested it to be a non-controversial positive addition to UFPP.

What follows is the proposed text of the policies and a draft of the appendix...

Faculty Affairs Committee, Winter 2020
Written by the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Approved by the Academic Senate
Maintained by Academic Personnel

This document arose from shared governance between the Cal Poly Academic Senate and Academic Personnel. Final policy text is in effect for the academic year listed above until superseded by revisions to prevailing policy.

Draft policy not yet in effect but provided in this document for reference is marked in red typeface with titles indicating the status of the draft.
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Appendix: Administrative Memos

13.1.1. UFPP includes an appendix containing copies of various administrative memos relevant to policies in UFPP or subordinate policy documents. Administrative memos state or create policy by administrative action. Gathering them into an appendix provides a convenience of a single location for policy memos cited in UFPP or in subordinate college, library, or department policy documents.

13.1.2. UFPP Appendix: Administrative Memos shall be contained in a document separate from UFPP, and accessible on the Academic Personnel website along with UFPP.

13.1.3. Administrative memos are sorted by date and assigned descriptive names typically drawn from their subject lines. To standardize citation of administrative memos, each is assigned a reference number in the following format: AM-YYYYMMDD. Any citation of administrative memos in UFPP or subordinate policy documents should use that reference standard.

13.1.4. Administrative memos shall be placed in this appendix by Academic Senate Consent or Academic Senate Resolution cited in a list of the memos in UFPP.

13.1.5. Adding citations of administrative memos to UFPP shall be regarded as wholly editorial and therefore needs no further Academic Senate action.

13.1.6 List of administrative memos

- AM-19850222: AB85-2 Role and Definition of Professional Growth and Development
  - [Cite Senate action]
- AM-20050111: Faculty Post-Retirement Employment
  - [Cite Senate action]
- AM-20061117: Agreement for Summer Quarter Faculty Assignments
  - [Cite Senate action]
- AM-20130110: New Outside Employment Reporting Requirement for Unit 3 Employees
  - [Cite Senate action]
- AM-20130222: New Student Evaluation Requirement Effective Winter Quarter 2013
  - [Cite Senate action]
- AM-20130919: Self-Support Program Personnel Policies
  - [Cite Senate action]
- AM-20161115: Amendments to the Range Elevation Procedures 2016
  - [Cite Senate action]
- AM-20170530: Guidelines for Special Session Teaching
  - [Cite Senate action]
- AM-20171030: Settlement on Lecturer Voting
  - [Cite Senate action]
- AM-20171101: Employment of Non-Immigrants – Important updates
  - [Cite Senate action]
- AM-20180919: Lecturer Range Elevation Eligibility Guidelines
  - [Cite Senate action]
- AM-20190208: Summer Term 2019 Faculty Eligibility
  - [Cite Senate action]
ROLE AND DEFINITION OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Improving the climate for professional growth has been an issue of special concern to me ever since I came to Cal Poly in 1979. A modern university needs a faculty that is up-to-date in its field. I am, therefore, committed to doing whatever is necessary to ensure that end.

To do so, we have already taken several steps. The first of these has been to define the role of research. Previously, research had been viewed by many as a questionable activity, unrelated, perhaps even inimical, to the aims of the institution. In the fall of 1981, I issued Administrative Bulletin 81-2 with the intention of dispelling that notion. That bulletin identified research as an important and valid form of professional development, appropriate to the purpose of the institution. It also asserted that professional development is essential to maintaining a viable educational program, and is second in importance only to instruction.

The Academic Senate saw the need for a fuller statement on professional growth and development to provide a context for the role of research. In the Fall of 1981, it appointed an ad hoc committee to draft a policy on professional development. That committee met during academic year 1981-82, drafted a statement, and forwarded its recommendations to the Senate in May of 1982. The Senate approved the report in February of 1983 and forwarded it to me with a recommendation for adoption. An Administrative Bulletin was drafted based on that report and shared with other members of the academic community in the Fall of 1983. Further suggestions for improvement were received, evaluated, and, as appropriate, used to refine this version of the bulletin, which is attached.

Parallel with these developments, the Academic Planning Committee was seeking to define more clearly Cal Poly's overall mission. A final statement, originated by this Committee, was issued in September of 1983 after much consultation. Once again, the importance of intellectual and professional growth to the campus was asserted, as follows:

Cal Poly is committed to establishing and maintaining an environment that fosters the complete growth of the individual--student and faculty member alike. Commitment to inquiry and the search for truth is a foundation for intellectual and personal growth. Cal Poly strives to instill among its students intellectual maturity, an appreciation of learning, and a dynamic professionalism. To foster professional development among faculty, it strives to stimulate faculty members to challenge themselves—to develop professionally through organizations, creative activity, consultation, professional leaves in business and industry, or applied or basic research.

Supporting a strong program of professional growth is a costly enterprise, and financial support for faculty development is scarce. The University is aware of the history of deficiency in this vital area and recognizes its responsibility to continue to take action to help alleviate these resource constraints. Clearly it is in the State's best interest to protect its investment in students by insuring the continued development of its teachers.

But the State has not always recognized these responsibilities and their potential benefits. In recent years it has turned down requests for augmented funding with distressing regularity. Consequently, problems that were once nuisances have accumulated and been compounded until quick remedies are no longer possible.

Fortunately, that era seems to be turning around in California as in other states. Although attempts to reduce the teaching load have failed, Cal Poly's FTE faculty allocations have been augmented recently, giving us a student/faculty ratio considerably lower than it was four years ago, making some assigned time appointments possible. Faculty allocations should continue to grow, at least into the near future,
with no accompanying growth in student numbers.

Our teaching laboratories are not ideally suited for some advanced forms of professional development, but the outlook for funds to replace equipment and purchase new equipment is considerably improved. In addition, plans are being considered for conversion of facilities being replaced by new construction to space which could be made available for faculty development and research efforts. Private faculty offices are also being added as each new building is completed. Approved capital improvement projects could add 150 private offices to the campus by the fall of 1987.

Our technical and clerical support staff is still not adequately funded to assure the most productive use of faculty time, and travel to attend professional meetings has never been sufficient to meet realistic needs.

However, a recent program change proposal increased state support for technical staff in some disciplines and the Governor's budget this year formally recognizes faculty professional development in a program change proposal although the funding level is still quite small. The annual giving program along with other private support programs established by the Development Office continue to improve each year to help ameliorate our shortage of resources for faculty professional development.

These changes are happening now, and further initiatives are underway, undertaken at many different levels by various constituencies. I have personally informed key legislators, the Department of Finance, the Governor's Office and, of course, the Chancellor of our need for help, and of the State's responsibility to remedy these problems. In addition, I am redoubling our efforts to gain private support. With the appointment of the new Vice President, University Relations, we have made another major commitment to finding support from the private sector.

In the meantime, this Administrative Bulletin is intended to define professional development, to assert its importance, describe various avenues of professional development, and outline its role in faculty personnel actions.

Clearly, if we were provided adequate funding for professional development, we could do much. Even though we are not, we cannot choose to do nothing at all. As an institution of higher education, we have an obligation to ourselves, our colleagues, our profession, and our students to do the best we can with what we have. Within that context, this bulletin defines the unique role professional development plays on our campus. I encourage each of you to do your best to preserve and enhance the vitality of teaching at Cal Poly.

Warren J. Baker

Note: This Administrative Bulletin should be filed in the Appendix of the Campus Administrative Manual and an entry made in the CAM Index and the title added to the Administrative Bulletin’s title page.
ROLE AND DEFINITION OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

The vitality of Cal Poly as a university depends on an intellectually active and professionally vigorous faculty. Those who continue to grow professionally also continue to grow as teachers. Indeed, scholarship, professionalism, and teaching are so interdependent that scholarship can become enervated without the stimulation of a professional commitment, and teaching can become irrelevant without the revitalization of scholarship or the touchstone of the marketplace.

As a special institution of higher learning, Cal Poly can profit from a wide range of professional development modes. This Administrative Bulletin is intended to guide faculty into those directions of professional growth most useful to Cal Poly and to define the role professional growth and development plays in the instructional program of the University.

Definition of Professional Development

Professional development is defined as the generation of knowledge or the acquisition of experience, skill, and information that enables one to perform at a higher level of proficiency in his or her profession.

Role of Professional Development

Excellence in teaching is the primary purpose of the University. Professional growth and development is essential to meeting this goal.

Avenues of Professional Development

The instructional programs at Cal Poly range from the basic to the applied. In turn, any of a number of professional development activities can fit Cal Poly’s spectrum of disciplines and professions.

The campus has a faculty of diverse interests as well, whose professional pursuits cannot be neatly categorized. Typical activities can be listed, however. They fall into two major modes: generation of knowledge concerning teaching or the discipline; and acquisition of further knowledge in, or professional contributions to, one’s own or related fields.

1. The generation of knowledge concerning teaching or the discipline

   A. Contributions to the teaching profession. Examples of this type of professional development include studies of pedagogic technique, papers on pedagogy presented at professional meetings or submitted to professional journals; presentations on pedagogy given in invited talks, seminars, and workshops; development and marketing of audio-visual aids; and development and publication of textbooks or manuals.

   B. Contributions to the general body of knowledge in an academic discipline. Generation of knowledge in a discipline may involve basic and applied research or creative productions. The various forms of research have already been defined in AB 81-2, “Role of Research.” In the visual, performing, or literary arts, creative contributions in the discipline involve the production of art works and techniques that become part of the general body of literature of an artistic discipline. Contributions to knowledge may also include creative works protected by copyright or patents.
Dissemination of new knowledge occurs through papers presented at meetings or published by professional journals, and through contributions to colloquia or seminars. Dissemination of works of art and new modes of artistic expression occurs through publication, gallery shows, public performances, and presentations at meetings seminars.

2. The acquisition of further knowledge in one’s field or a related field.

Examples include service to or study in a different but related academic discipline; classes, seminars or conferences attended to enrich or update professional knowledge or skills; international development and education appointments; professional experience in industry or government; challenging consultancies; internships or residencies at appropriate institutions or organizations; participation in national and international professional programs; projects undertaken to improve teaching skills; the completion of advanced degrees, professional licenses, or additional advanced studies; participation in appropriate institutes, seminars, and workshops; active participation in professional organizations; and service on advisory boards or committees in relevant fields.

The above examples, although not exhaustive, suggest the variety of professional development activities in which faculty could engage.

Appraisal of Professional Development

Each discipline or department at Cal Poly must decide on the combination of professional development activities best suited to its individual character. It is the responsibility of each academic department to ensure that the professional activities of individual faculty members are an asset to the university and are supportive of its educational mission. This responsibility should be carried out in a manner consistent with established departmental criteria.

The direction of research, scholarship—indeed, of any professional development activity—is often uncertain and can take unexpected turns. Recognizing that specificity is often not possible, it is helpful nonetheless to have a plan for guidance. It is important, therefore, that each faculty member carefully consider and document general plans for professional development, and modify these plans as necessary.

Departments can help orient new faculty by clarifying what modes of professional development are most consistent with departmental goals, and by endorsing general plans. The faculty member’s immediate colleagues are usually the people best suited to evaluate the quality of the work done. The department head, in consultation with the tenured and senior faculty, is responsible for informing individual department members about how well their professional activities are meeting these criteria, both in plan and performance.

Because of the crucial relationship between teaching and professional development, it is campus policy that evidence of professional development is and continues to be an important requirement for all faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. Cal Poly’s health as a university depends on the vitality of its faculty. Teaching can continue to be invigorating only if it is energized by regular involvement in the recreative activities of professional development. This bulletin is intended to clarify and assert the importance of encouraging and nurturing this most vital element in Cal Poly’s continued success.

Resources for Professional Development

In order to create an atmosphere in which faculty can strive for excellence both in the classroom and professionally, a university must provide an academic environment that encourages pride in one’s work, and an opportunity to do that work well. The university must strive to provide faculty sufficient time and resources to pursue both professional growth and teaching excellence, so that these two types of endeavors may be mutually supportive rather than competitive.
The present teaching load is such that faculty often compromise the quality of their teaching because of inadequate time to develop new approaches and new material. Finding time for professional development is extremely difficult and can further compromise and limit improvements in quality. Efforts should be made to bring the teaching load into line with the expectations for continual improvement and professional development.

Facilities need to be improved and expanded for basic teaching activities. Furthermore, the current facilities utilization formulas do not recognize the need for facilities to support the teaching effort through faculty development. Adequate recognition must be given to provide facilities for both teaching and professional development.

The working environment should be sufficiently attractive to acquire and retain faculty dedicated to teaching excellence fostered by continual professional development activities. This means that adequate support should be sought for salaries, sabbaticals, professional travel, publication, private offices, library and computing facilities, and technical, clerical, and student assistant help.

Professional growth and development is extremely important for the competence of our faculty and for the vitality of our academic programs. Both the faculty and the university must cooperate in this effort of mutual benefit. The faculty bear the responsibility of engaging in appropriate professional activities, and the university bears the responsibility of providing appropriate time and resources for these activities.
This is a reminder of post-retirement employment limitations for faculty employees. Government Code provisions permit former California State University (CSU) academic employees who retire and receive retirement benefits from the California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS) to accept limited CSU employment without jeopardizing retirement benefits or requiring reinstatement from retirement.

Government Code 21227 allows a retiree to accept a faculty assignment where such post-retirement employment does not exceed, in any fiscal year, 960 hours or 50 percent of the hours the member was employed during the last fiscal year prior to retirement. Recently, CalPERS advised the CSU that the retiree is required to select the option that provides the lesser employment. Every academic workday of a specific academic term (prorated by time base) counts toward the 960 hour or 50 percent limitation, regardless of the actual days teaching or whether the faculty member is working full or part-time during the term.

The Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) article in the CSU-CFA collective bargaining agreement is more restrictive and limits FERP employment to 90 days (720 hour equivalent) or 50 percent of the employee’s regular time base in the year preceding retirement. The campus academic calendar identifies workdays. Every academic workday in a term (academic quarter) counts toward the FERP 90 day or 50 percent methodology maximum, regardless of actual days spent teaching.

FERP participants are not eligible for other CSU appointments except for appointments in CSU extension (Continuing Education) during the period of employment in FERP. For example, a FERP participant may not be appointed as a lecturer and may not be appointed to additional employment through the Foundation. The only exception allows a FERP participant assigned to work full-time for one academic quarter to also accept CSU extension (Continuing Education) on days that do not coincide with the period of FERP employment as long as the total of FERP plus CSU extension does not exceed 90 days in a fiscal year.

If post-retirement employment limits are exceeded, the CalPERS’ retiree and Cal Poly are subject to penalties to include repaying the employee and employer contributions that would have been paid during any period of “unlawful” employment, plus interest and administrative expenses incurred by CalPERS in responding to this situation.
AM-20061117: Agreement for Summer Quarter Faculty Assignments
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1. Offers of summer employment shall be based on the curricular needs of the department.

2. The composition of summer quarter appointment offers for extra pay within the University (and preferably within each college and department) may consist of:
   a. At least 60% of summer appointment offers (headcount) shall consist of tenured and probationary faculty, as follows:
      i. Three-quarters of summer appointment offers (headcount) shall consist of tenured and probationary faculty based on priority lists and ranking procedures (item 8, below).
      ii. One-quarter of summer appointment offers (headcount) may consist of a combination of new first year tenure track faculty and additional probationary faculty. (Offers of summer employment may be extended to any new first year tenure track faculty member either during the summer preceding the tenure track assignment, or the summer quarter immediately following their 1st academic year.)
   b. Up to 40% of summer appointment offers (headcount) may consist of lecturer appointments. It is possible that more than 40% (headcount) of the appointments for Summer Quarter may result in lecturer appointments if tenured and probationary faculty decline offers extended to them.

3. Appointment of probationary or tenured faculty during Summer Quarter will be based on a 12 WTU teaching assignment and 3 WTU for instructionally related responsibilities (see item 7 below), or pro-rata amount for part-time assignments. (For example, the assignment of a probationary or tenured faculty member teaching 4 units over five weeks or eight weeks would be paid 4/12 for the quarter to include instructionally related responsibilities.)

4. Probationary and tenured faculty teaching part-time may either:
   a. be compensated on a pro-rata basis of 12 WTU, or
   b. "bank" the summer units on a pro-rata basis of 12 WTU to reduce a future teaching assignment during a quarter in the immediately subsequent academic year. The quarter for which the teaching assignment will be reduced will be jointly determined by the faculty member and department head/chair before the summer letter of appointment is extended.

5. Probationary or tenured faculty "banking" Summer Quarter by teaching full-time will not be assigned to teach for extra pay during the vacation quarter (except for emergencies or extraordinary circumstances).

6. Summer Quarter appointments of lecturers will be based on a 15 unit teaching load. Lecturers will be paid for all work assigned. Lecturers assigned instructionally related responsibilities shall be paid accordingly.

7. Instructionally related responsibilities include research, scholarship, creative activity, and/or service to the University, profession and/or the community.

8. After determining the curricular needs for Summer Quarter, consideration of probationary and tenured faculty eligible and qualified to teach the courses shall then include a rank ordered list of
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faculty with priority being given to those eligible faculty members who have taught during
summer quarter less recently.

a. The Academic Personnel office will develop a list, by department, reporting past history
of summer quarter assignments for those faculty who have taught for extra pay; banked a
summer quarter full time; or repaid an "advance quarter off" by teaching a summer
quarter.
b. Faculty will advise their department head/chair (by a deadline established by the
department) whether the assignment will be for extra pay or for banking in the event they
are appointed to teach Summer Quarter.
c. Tie-breaking procedures, when faculty are equally eligible and qualified, will be
determined by the respective department/equivalent unit.

9. Summer quarter assignments not affecting eligibility are:

a. Banking a part-time summer teaching assignment to reduce the teaching assignment in
the immediate subsequent academic year, but will impact department priority;
b. Non-teaching assignments reimbursed by grants, fellowships, non-State funding, etc.;
c. Instructional administrative assignments such as coordinators, department heads/chairs,
production/farm managers, etc.; and/or
d. Assigned time for professional development or course/curriculum development.

10. Unless otherwise agreed to by the parties, this agreement shall remain in effect through at least the
ending date of the successor contract currently being negotiated between the CSU and CFA.

11. The intent of the Parties is to maintain the level of compensation provided in this agreement,
unless the collective bargaining agreement provides a higher level of compensation or benefits.

12. For terms and conditions of employment not specifically addressed by this agreement, it is the
intent of the parties to maintain the status quo with regard to summer employment. However, in
the event of a conflict regarding this agreement or past practice, the state-wide MOU (excluding
Article 21- Summer Session) will control for summer employment.

SIGNATURES:

RICHARD SAENZ (Date)  WARREN J. BAKER (Date)
CFA Chapter President SLO  President
California Polytechnic State University

March 5, 2020
State of California
Memorandum

To: Philip Bailey, Dave Christy, Douglas Epperson, Debra Larson, Christine Theodoropoulos, David Wehner, Mike Miller, Preston Allen, and Don Oberheim

From: Albert A. Liddicoat
Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

Date: January 10, 2013

Subject: New Outside Employment Reporting Requirement for Unit 3 Employees

On September 18, 2012 the CSU Board of Trustees ratified the successor CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement for immediate implementation. The Collective Bargaining Agreement includes a new requirement for full-time faculty unit employees to report outside employment that is expected to exceed 110 hours in an academic quarter for academic year faculty, or outside employment (non-Cal Poly employment) that exceeds 120 hours per three-month period for faculty holding 12-month appointments. A fillable version of the required Outside Employment Disclosure Form is available on the Academic Personnel website at the following URL:

http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/forms

The reporting of outside employment will be implemented campus wide at the start of the Winter quarter 2013. Academic Personnel will notify all full-time faculty at the beginning of each academic term and reporting period of their requirement to report outside employment. Full-time faculty members that meet the reporting requirement must submit the completed Outside Employment Disclosure Form within thirty days of the commencement of the term or three-month period. They will be instructed to submit the form directly to their dean or appointing authority for inclusion in their Personnel Action File. Please provide a copy of any forms you receive to Academic Personnel before filing. Feel free to contact Al Liddicoat, aliddicoat@calpoly.edu if you have any questions regarding the implementation of the new outside employment reporting requirement.

Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 35 Outside Employment

35.3 In addition to the requirements of 35.2 above, all full-time faculty unit members shall be required to provide a written statement to the appropriate administrator of all outside employment, where such outside employment is expected to amount to more than

i. 160 hours per semester for faculty holding academic year or ten (10) month appointments at a semester campus.

ii. 110 hours per quarter for faculty holding academic year or ten (10) month appointments at a quarter campus.

iii. 120 hours per 3 month period for faculty holding twelve (12) month appointments.

Written statements shall be submitted using the form at Appendix H and shall be provided to the appropriate administrator within 30 days of the commencement of the semester, quarter, or three (3) month period during which the outside employment is to be undertaken. For faculty holding twelve (12) month appointments the quarter dates for the purposes of reporting shall be July 1; October 1; January 1; and April 1.
State of California
Memorandum

To: Philip Bailey, Dave Christy, Douglas Epperson, Debra Larson, Christine Theodoropoulos, David Wehner
From: Kathleen Enz Finken, Provost

Date: February 22, 2013
Copies: Jeffrey Armstrong

Department Heads/Chairs
All Faculty Employees
College Analysts
Al Liddicoat
Glen Thorncroft
Steve Rein
Dustin Stegner
Kenneth Brown
Academic Personnel Staff

Subject: New Student Evaluation Requirement Effective Winter Quarter 2013

Provision 15.15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement states that student evaluations shall be required for all classes taught by each faculty unit employee, unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after considerations of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s). The new requirement for faculty to evaluate all classes taught will take effect Winter Quarter 2013, as communicated in the memo dated 10/19/12 from Al Liddicoat, AVP Academic Personnel (available at http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policiesprocedures).

After consulting with the Academic Senate Instructional Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee, President Armstrong and I have reviewed and endorse the following exceptions for conducting student evaluations in low enrollment courses (individual senior project, independent study), capstone, and cooperative education courses:

1. Courses with low enrollment (less than five students) shall not be evaluated. Typical of these courses would be:
   - Individual senior projects
   - Independent study

2. Cooperative Education courses that do not include direct instruction shall not be evaluated using the student evaluation process. Academic Departments or the Career Services Office may use a survey to evaluate the students’ co-op experience, but this is not part of the student evaluation process.

3. Capstone senior project courses, which usually have larger enrollment, shall be evaluated if there are more than 5 students enrolled.

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

As a reminder, all student evaluations are to be conducted utilizing the questions and format that have been vetted and approved by your college. All other requirements and processes outlined in the Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty (available at http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policies/rpt) remain applicable.
As a follow-up to discussions about self-support program policies in the Deans’ Retreats over the summer, I am pleased to approve the attached International, Graduate and Extended Education Self-Support Program Personnel Policies document.

This document is intended to define and promote policies that will lend structure, clarity, consistency and transparency to the processes governing faculty appointment, assignment and pay for Cal Poly’s self-support programs offered through the auspices of the International, Graduate and Extended Education office. The applicable self-support classifications covered by these policies include:

- 2322 = Instructional Faculty – Special Programs (for credit)
- 2323 = Instructional Faculty – Extension (for credit)

Applicable programs include Off-Campus and International Programs, Self-support Graduate and Certificate Programs, and all other Special Session Programs for academic credit. Self-support Summer Term policies are covered separately and will be updated later in the academic year.

These policies are posted on the Academic Personnel website at [http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policiesprocedures](http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policiesprocedures). I would appreciate your assistance in advising your faculty of the new policies.
International, Graduate and Extended Education

Self-Support Program Personnel Policies

September 16, 2013

This document is intended to define and promote policies that will lend structure, clarity, consistency and transparency to the processes governing faculty appointment, assignment and pay for Cal Poly’s self-support programs offered through the auspices of International, Graduate and Extended Education office. These programs include Off-Campus and International Programs, Self-support Graduate and Certificate Programs, and all other Special Session Programs for academic credit. Self-support Summer Term policies are documented separately (available at http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/summer.)

The applicable self-support jobcodes and classifications covered by these policies include (source: CSU Salary Schedule; Unit 3 Faculty CBA):

2322 = Instructional Faculty – Special Programs (for credit)
2323 = Instructional Faculty – Extension (for credit)

1. Recruitment and Appointment/Assignment Authority
   a. 2322: Current faculty unit employees will be assigned by academic departments for all programs for academic credit (special session, off-campus programs, self-support graduate programs, and international programs). A Self-Support Program Appointment and Acceptance Agreement will be issued by the Vice Provost for International, Graduate, and Extended Education (IG&EE), and will be reviewed by the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel before being sent to the faculty employee.
   b. 2323: Current faculty unit employees will be assigned and appointed by the Vice Provost for International, Graduate, and Extended Education.
   c. If there is a need to hire non-faculty to teach self-support courses for academic credit (2322), applicable academic recruitment policies must be followed by the academic department or college in which the program resides to solicit applications and interest, normally using the part-time pool recruitment process.

2. Appointments to 2322 and 2323 jobcodes
   a. Article 40.13: The official notification to a faculty unit employee of an appointment in the classifications noted in provisions 40.1 and 40.2 shall include the beginning and ending dates of appointment, number of WTUs, salary, the requirement to meet the first class, and other conditions of appointment. The faculty unit employee’s appointment may require participation in the student evaluation process.
   b. Additional compensation for current faculty teaching Self-Support program courses during the regular academic year will be compensated at a rate of 1/45th of the faculty member’s annual base salary per WTU.
c. Appointments of non-faculty for Self-Support programs during academic year will be compensated at the published rate in the CSU salary schedule (see attachment) for the appropriate jobcode, based on the entry level rank (3=Assistant Professor equivalent). Higher rank placement may be used if such placement is in accordance with applicable department and college personnel policies and is recommended by the appropriate department head/chair and college dean (see 1.c above).

d. Article 40.12: An appointment to the classifications noted in provisions 40.1 and 40.2 is a temporary appointment for a specific period of time. Appointments are for instructional course WTUs only and are exempt appointments. No entitlements or fringe benefits of any type are earned in 2322 and 2323 jobcodes (these positions are paid in one lump sum at the conclusion of the assignment and therefore do not qualify for benefits).

e. Article 40.15: Faculty who develop the courses that are offered through Extension in classification code 2322, Instructional Faculty, Special Programs - For Credit shall have the right of first preference to teach those courses.

f. Article 40.21: When employing faculty to teach Extension courses that have been previously offered on that campus through the regular state-supported (General Fund) curriculum during the last academic year, first hiring preference shall be given to qualified three-year appointed faculty who have not received work sufficient to fulfill the time base entitlement of their three-year appointment in the most recent academic year, or in the case of a midyear extension course, in the current academic year. Qualified as used herein shall mean that the faculty member has taught the offered course, or a substantially similar course, on the offering campus.

g. Jobcodes 2322 and 2323 may not be used for assignments of current Cal Poly faculty during Summer Term in lieu of jobcode 2357, except by advance approval of the Vice Provost for International, Graduate, and Extended Education and Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. Requests for exceptions must clearly indicate how an exception will benefit the University and its students, and cannot be granted for courses that would qualify as self-support summer courses. Exceptions will not be approved for reasons that solely benefit the instructor. Cal-Poly Led Programs and other off-campus and self-support graduate and certificate programs offered during summer may continue to use jobcodes 2322 and 2323 for these appointments.

3. FERPs may not receive any additional employment for additional compensation for the duration of their FERP employment. This includes any additional employment for additional pay regardless of funding source, such as Special Consultant appointments, Extended Education or Cal Poly Corporation.

a. FERPs will generally not be permitted to teach for self-support programs on a reimbursed basis for the duration of their FERP appointment, unless an exception is granted by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs under the established exception criteria.

b. Any exceptions will be recommended by the Vice Provost for International, Graduate, and Extended Education on the basis of demonstrated programmatic need for the expertise of the FERP and unavailability of other faculty member(s) with the needed expertise. A FERP requesting an exception to teach for self-support programs within their college or
Memorandum of Understanding: Amendments to the Range Elevation Procedures 2016

In order to address issues associated with lack of opportunities for range elevation in the absence of negotiated Service Salary Increases (SSIs), the following program shall be available to eligible lecturers and temporary librarian faculty unit employees.

Lecturers and temporary librarian faculty unit employees who meet range elevation criteria as currently defined by Article 12.17, or become eligible while this agreement is in effect, shall continue to be eligible to apply for range elevation under provisions 12.16 through 12.20 and campus policies.

Lecturers and temporary librarian faculty unit employees who have served at least five years in the current range and have reached the Service Salary Increase (SSI) maximum shall be considered eligible for range elevation regardless of whether they have received prior Faculty Merit Increases (FMIs).

For those lecturers and temporary librarian faculty unit employees who have not exhausted SSI eligibility by the beginning of the 2017/18 academic year, the following provisions shall apply.

Determinations of eligibility:

- Full-time adjusted service (FTAS) shall be established as of the beginning of the 2017/18 academic year. For each academic or fiscal year, FTAS is defined as the average FTE over the academic or fiscal year, divided by 0.8, up to a maximum of 1.0 for the year.
- Range elevation shall be accompanied by a salary increase of at least 5% or whatever percentage increase is required to reach at least the minimum of the next range, whichever is greater.
- Lecturers and temporary librarian faculty unit employees with at least 6 years FTAS in the current range as of the start of the Fall 2017 term shall be eligible to apply for range elevation according to the following schedule:
  - In 2017/18, individuals with 12 or more years FTAS shall be eligible to apply.
  - In 2018/19, individuals with 9 or more years FTAS shall be eligible to apply.
  - In 2019/20, individuals with 6 or more years FTAS shall be eligible to apply.

Review process:

- Campus criteria, timelines, and review processes for range elevation established at each campus pursuant to Article 12.16 shall continue to be used for range elevation under these modified criteria.

Effective date for increases:

Range elevation, as well as applicable salary increases, shall take effect at the beginning of the first appointment in the academic year following review.

These provisions will remain in effect until June 30, 2020 unless superseded by an agreement between the parties.
Memorandum of Understanding: Amendments to the Range Elevation Procedures 2016

Additional Terms

The parties agree that this issue shall continue to be the subject of bargaining in successor contract negotiations, and that this Memorandum of Understanding does not impact, limit, or otherwise constrain the ability of either party to make proposals on any issue subject to this Memorandum of Understanding.

For any year in which this agreement is in effect and for any faculty member eligible under the terms of this agreement, the CSU agrees to the following: At least thirty (30) days prior to the commencement of the annual campus Range Elevation process, the campus shall notify lecturers of their eligibility. In that notification the campus shall inform the lecturers that receipt of a previous TMI will not affect their eligibility for Range Elevation, and that Range Elevation is accompanied by a salary increase of at least 5% or whatever percentage increase is required to reach at least the minimum of the next range, whichever is greater.

For CFA

Kathy Sheffield
Director of Representation
11/9/2016

For CSU

J.A. Swerbrick
Associate Vice Chancellor
11/15/2016
AM-20170530: Guidelines for Special Session Teaching Assignments

This memo provides the guidelines to determine reasonable maximum work assignments for teaching assignments administered through Extended Education.

General guidelines for faculty with full-time AY assignments:

1. During the fall, winter or spring academic terms, faculty working full-time in a state assignment can teach up to four (4) WTU per term for Extended Ed for added compensation.
2. During summer term, AY faculty can teach up to full-time (12) WTU for tenure/tenure-track and 15 WTU for Lecturers) for additional compensation.
3. During the five week summer term, faculty will be limited to eight (8) WTU since the contact hours and teaching responsibilities are compressed by 50% and therefore this is in line with full-time effort. Faculty may teach in different five week summer terms as long as they do not exceed (8) WTU in one term or (15) WTU for the entire summer term.
4. Intersession 2-2.5 week instruction is less than 1/4 of the nominal quarter so faculty will be limited to four (4) WTU.

Exceptions may be considered but they require an advance review with the AVP for Academic Personnel, who in turn will consult with me for approval prior to processing such an appointment. Faculty requesting such an exception must submit a memo to Academic Personnel that includes the justification for the teaching assignment and approval from the college dean no later than six weeks prior to the first day of classes for the assignment.

Any questions related to Extended Education teaching assignments for additional compensation should be directed to Brian Tietje, Vice Provost International, Graduate and Extended Education or Al Liddicoat, AVP Academic Personnel.
AM-20171030: Settlement on Lecturer Voting

From: Academic Personnel academicpersonnel@calpoly.edu
Subject: Settlement on Lecturer Voting
Date: October 30, 2017 at 4:41 PM
To: Academic Personnel academicpersonnel@calpoly.edu
Cc: it-policy@calpoly.edu

Dear Faculty Unit Employees:

CFA filed a grievance regarding the rights of lecturers to vote in recommendations for department chairs. This is to let you know that a no-fault grievance settlement was obtained regarding this grievance. The relevant language from the final signed settlement agreement is now effective and is copied below:

All 12.12 (3 year) lecturers, including counselors and librarians, with an appointment in the academic quarter of the vote will be eligible to participate in the vote to recommend a department chair, per Provision 20.30 of the November 12, 2014 – June 30, 2017 Collective Bargaining Agreement (and extended to June 30, 2018) (“CBA”), with a full vote in their department voting process. Nothing in the balloting process will differentiate the three-year lecturers’ vote from tenured and tenure-track faculty votes for department chair recommendations.

All other lecturers will be granted a full advisory vote. These advisory votes will be differentiated and summarized separately from the votes of the 12.12 (3 year) lecturers, tenured faculty, and tenure-track faculty.

The above voting terms represent a minimum; departments may modify their department chair selection policies through the joint governance process.

Lecturers shall be notified regarding the department voting process in the same manner as all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Lecturers eligible to cast a vote or an advisory vote shall be afforded the same opportunity as tenured and tenure-track faculty to attend regularly scheduled department meetings when department chair balloting is scheduled.

In the event the department conducts a search for a department chair that is not from the department, a different process will be used in place of the process delineated in Paragraphs 3 through 6 of this Agreement. In this case, the chair of the search committee shall solicit feedback from all lecturers employed during the quarter of the vote; these lecturers will be granted a full advisory vote, which will be presented to the faculty search committee. External department chair searches will follow the Cal Poly recruitment process for tenured and tenure-track faculty. Per the CBA, only tenured and tenure-track faculty with the permission of the dean, may serve on the search committee for external faculty recruitments. An external search may or may not include internal candidate applications, but all candidates who apply must go through the same selection process.

The CBA has since been extended to June 30, 2020.
AM-20171101: Employment of Non-Immigrants – Important updates

State of California Memorandum

To: Scott Dawson, Doug Epperson, Keith Humphrey, Jim Meagher, Don Oberhelman, Christine Theodoropoulos, Andy Thulin, Dean Wendt

Date: November 1, 2017

File No.: O/AA/ Visa-Work Authorization

From: Albert A. Liddicoat
Vice Provost, Academic Affairs and Personnel

Copies: Kathleen Erz Finken
Mary Pedersen
Department Heads/Chairs
College Analysts
Adriana Popescu
Geneva Reynaga-Abiko
Nick Pettit
Kacey Chun
Chris Kitts
Amy Velasco
Jodi Block
Marc Benadiba
Jennifer Hiatt
Staff: AP, CPIC

Subject: Employment of Non-Immigrants – Important updates

Both the Academic Personnel Office and the International Center work closely with departments and the college dean’s offices to invite international faculty, staff and students to campus for temporary paid and volunteer activities. These offices follow complex U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) and U.S. Department of State federal visa regulations to determine which visa type and category is most appropriate for each individual’s proposed activity and assist with the required visa application documents.

State of California regulations and Worker’s Compensation regulations also mandate that all employees be legally able to work in the U.S. and provide proof of employment authorization before beginning employment.

Below are some important guidelines and the processes to follow when inviting or hiring an international applicant. Please review carefully, as several important changes are being communicated with this update.
Academic Personnel Office - Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty and Temporary Lecturer Classifications

- Consult with the Academic Personnel office prior to offering a faculty position to an international applicant. Academic Personnel will determine if the individual has employment authorization or needs to be sponsored for an H-1B specialty occupation category visa. Sufficient lead time must be allowed for the H-1B application processing prior to the appointment start date, since USCIS processing time can be highly variable before employment authorization is received.

- The college or department is responsible for the H-1B filing fees except for any H-4 filing fees related to the employee’s dependents. Review the H-1B visa process and fees online.

- International applicants for tenure track or other permanent positions may also inquire about employer assistance with applications for U.S. Permanent Residency. The CSU does not allow any attorney fees and/or any filing fees associated with a petition for employer-based permanent residency (“green card”) to be paid by the campus employing the petitioner, either by direct payment or as a reimbursement, from any funding source, including non-state or non-general funds. It is important to clearly communicate that the applicant is responsible for retaining an immigration attorney and is responsible for all required fees if interested in pursuing permanent residency at the time a preliminary verbal offer is extended in order to avoid any expectations to the contrary. This policy will also be communicated in the official offer letter on an as-needed basis.

- The department employing the international applicant should also be aware that not all types of positions will satisfy the eligibility criteria for employment-based permanent resident status. It is often not an option for employees in non-instructional classifications such as librarians, counselors, coaches, and the majority of staff and management positions to attain permanent resident status based on their Cal Poly employment.

- The college sends the offer letter and the applicant’s file to Academic Personnel for approval.

- If an H-1B visa petition is needed, the Academic Personnel office will be able to initiate processing of immigration forms and documentation required once the applicant accepts the written offer.

- If the required degree listed in the advertisement has not been conferred prior to the anticipated date of employment, the employee cannot begin working for Cal Poly, even in another capacity (such as a lecturer). When the highest degree earned was received from any international institution, the prospective faculty member is responsible for ordering and paying for their degree to be evaluated (and translated into English if provided in another language) by Academic Credential Evaluation Institute, Inc. (ACEI). This applies to any highest degree transcript from an international institution, even if obtained in English (such as from Canada). No other form of degree evaluation will be accepted. For verifying degrees from international universities that do not provide transcripts,
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the employee should order ACEI's Comprehensive Report including grades whenever possible. Translation services are also offered if needed.

- Once the H-1B visa petition is approved by USCIS, send the new employee to Payroll Services to verify that all employment authorization documents are in place before starting work. The employee is required to bring an original Social Security Card to Payroll in order to receive pay. If needed, please refer the new employee to the Social Security Administration office.

- Notify the Academic Personnel Office whenever a non-immigrant employee terminates employment and/or leaves Cal Poly.

Faculty Working on Grants/Sponsored Projects, Contracts, or Sports Camps

- The Cal Poly Corporation cannot employ or compensate H-1B workers for grants, contracts, camps or any other additional employment funded through external funding. However, the employing department can provide the additional compensation funded by external sources directly to the H-1B worker through an additional appointment classification (such as Special Consultant) and request reimbursement from the grant, contract, or other program administered by the Corporation.

- All sources of employment and compensation taken together cannot exceed 125% FTE, regardless of the classification used to compensate or source of compensation. Departments who employ non-immigrant faculty on visas will use the Special Consultant classification (job code 4660) for the purpose of compensating these faculty for work on grants and contracts, and any other additional employment. It should be noted that since the Special Consultant is an exempt classification, faculty employed as Special Consultants must be compensated for the work in full day increments. During the academic term, faculty employed as Special Consultants are permitted to work up to a maximum of fourteen days per academic term to stay within the 25% additional compensation provisions. During academic holidays and breaks, Special Consultant assignments may be performed on a full-time basis.

- The procedures and forms for processing Special Consultant appointments for faculty on visas are available on the Academic Personnel website.

International Center - Inviting Visiting Instructors, Researchers and Student Interns

- Visit the International Scholars website for links to all forms and sample letters.

- At least five months prior to the start date, the academic department completes the International Visitor Form and sends it to the International Center to determine the appropriate visa type.

- If a J-1 visa is deemed appropriate, the academic department assigns a faculty mentor or student intern supervisor and asks that person to complete and return the Mentor Agreement or J-1 Student Intern Supervisor Form.
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- The International Center will work with the Dean’s office to provide information for the invitation letter.
- The invitation letters for all paid appointments will be sent to Academic Personnel for approval.
- The International Center sends the DS-2019 visa document to the Dean’s office to send via international courier to the visitor along with the invitation letter. If the visitor is a volunteer, the Dean’s office will also include a Volunteer Information (V-1) Form.
- Upon arrival, the visitor will check in with the International Center and then apply for a Social Security card if he or she is to be paid.

Contact Information

Academic Personnel
Nicole Hadley
756-2841

International Center
Judy Mitchell
756-5837
AM-20180919: Lecturer Range Elevation Eligibility Guidelines

Lecturer Range Elevation Eligibility Guidelines
(Updated for 2018-19 Academic Year)

The agreement reached between the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA – Unit 3), ratified by the CSU Board of Trustees on May 24, 2016, included a provision that the parties meet to review and make recommendations regarding lecturer range elevation eligibility. The parties subsequently reached an agreement modifying range elevation eligibility that was memorialized in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated November 15, 2016.

The agreement affects lecturers who have served at least five years in their current range who have reached the SSI maximum salary or otherwise have no more SSI eligibility in their range, and lecturers who have not reached the SSI maximum salary, but who have reached qualifying levels of service in their current range as of the beginning of the 2017-18 academic year.

Individuals with six or more years of Full-Time Adjusted Service (FTAS) in their current range as of the beginning of the 2017-18 academic year shall be eligible for range elevation according to the following schedule:

- In 2017-18, individuals with 12 or more years of FTAS shall be eligible to apply.
- In 2018-19, individuals with 9 or more years of FTAS shall be eligible to apply.
- In 2019-20, individuals with 6 or more years of FTAS shall be eligible to apply.

For each academic or fiscal year, FTAS is defined as the average time base (FTE) worked over the year, divided by 0.8, and up to a maximum of 1.0 for that year. Average FTE can either be determined from the FTE assigned each term, or by adding up the number of WTUs assigned over the academic year and dividing by or 36.

Once Academic Personnel determines which lecturers are eligible to apply for range elevation, a memo will be sent to each college dean.

Range elevation is not automatic and is based on the written request and documentation provided by the temporary faculty member that demonstrates he/she has satisfied fully the approved criteria for range elevation established by the college. At each level of review, the candidate is to be provided a copy of the written recommendation and allowed ten days to submit a written statement/rebuttal and/or request a meeting to discuss the recommendation with the evaluator(s) before it is sent to the next level of review. A faculty peer review committee composed of elected tenured faculty members of the department is responsible to provide a written recommendation using the Lecturer Evaluation Form AP109-L. The PRC should include reasons for the recommendation based on the college’s approved range elevation criteria, and after reviewing the Working Personnel Action File and the permanent Personnel Action File of the candidate. The department chair/head is responsible for submitting a separate evaluation and recommendation using the Lecturer Evaluation Form AP109-L, and the dean has been delegated responsibility by the President to make range elevation decisions. Approved range elevation decisions shall be accompanied by at least a 5% increase in salary effective at the beginning of Fall Quarter 2019.

Pursuant to the collective bargaining agreement, range elevation evaluations of lecturers shall be appropriate to the work assignment of the lecturer and shall conform to the approved criteria established by the college. Criteria approved by the Academic Senate that is within the scope of the individual lecturer’s assignment should be used in range elevation recommendations and decisions.

March 5, 2020
While teaching comprises the work assignment of most lecturers, consideration shall also be given to other assigned duties beyond teaching when applicable. Article 20.1c of the faculty contract defines instructional responsibilities as:

The performance of instructional responsibilities extends beyond duties in the classroom and includes such activities as: preparation for class, evaluation of student performance, syllabus preparation and revision, and review of current literature and research in the subject area, including instructional methodology. Research, scholarship and creative activity in the faculty member’s field of expertise are essential to effective teaching. Mentoring students and colleagues is another responsibility that faculty members are frequently expected to perform. Just as faculty members may teach online, they may perform other duties online, pursuant to campus policies.

Lecturers eligible to apply for range elevation during the 2018-19 academic year must be notified of the deadlines for submitting their Working Personnel Action File and provided with college criteria by which they will be evaluated before the end of Fall Quarter. Lecturer range elevation information is available at [https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/rep](https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/rep).

The following is the timetable for 2018-19 Lecturer Range Elevation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Dec 15 (Sat)</td>
<td>Candidates advised of eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 9 (Wed)</td>
<td>Candidates notify Dean whether they intend to apply for range elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 15 (Tu)</td>
<td>Close PAF and Candidate submits Working Personnel Action File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 8 (Fri)</td>
<td>Peer Review Committee Evaluation to Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 19 (Tu)</td>
<td>Peer Review Committee Evaluation to Department Head/Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 15 (Fri)</td>
<td>Department Head/Chair Evaluation to Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 25 (Mo)</td>
<td>Department Head/Chair Evaluation to Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3 (Fri)</td>
<td>Dean Decision to Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colleges should forward to Academic Personnel a summary of range elevation decisions, along with copies of all range elevation applications (whether recommended or not), recommendations at each level, and notification letters by June 28, 2019. For questions regarding range elevation eligibility please contact Chris Blackburn (cblackbu@calpoly.edu). For questions regarding range elevation evaluation procedure please contact Lindsay Howell (lmhowell@calpoly.edu).

The Lecturer Evaluation Form AP109-L referenced in this memo is available at [https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/forms](https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/forms).

Lecturer range elevation appeal information can be found at [https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/rep](https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/rep).
AM-20190208: Summer Term 2019 Faculty Eligibility

State of California
Memorandum

To: Andy Thulin, Christine Theodoropoulos, Scott Dawson,
Amy Fleischner, Kathryn Rummell, Dean Wendt

From: Albert A. Liddicoat
Vice Provost, Academic Affairs and Personnel

Date: February 8, 2019

Copies: Kathleen Enz Finken
Brian Tietje
Sandra Harris
Cheri Baumgarten
Dustin Stegner
Lewis Call
Jennifer Hiatt
Academic Personnel Staff
College HR Analyst/Partners
Dept. Heads/Chairs

Subject: Summer Term 2019 Faculty Eligibility

As with the past nine Summer Terms, the University is planning to offer Summer Term 2019 through Extended Education as a self-supported program. The prior practices will continue with respect to determining summer term eligibility and workload.

1. During the summer term, AY faculty can teach up to full-time (12 WTU for tenure/tenure-track and 15 WTU for lecturers) for additional compensation.

2. During the five week summer term, faculty will be limited to eight (8) WTU since the contact hours and teaching responsibilities are compressed by 50% and, therefore, this is in line with full-time effort. Faculty may teach in different five week summer terms as long as they do not exceed eight (8) WTU in one term or fifteen (15) WTU for the entire summer.

Course offerings shall continue to be based on the needs of the students with the proviso that all costs at the college level are to be covered by revenues procured through student enrollment fees. Please note that due to the self-support nature of the summer program, the University cannot ensure summer term teaching assignments.

Eligibility lists report only faculty who have either ZERO or PARTIAL eligibility (in WTUs) to teach during Summer Term 2019, along with a brief explanation for the ineligibility or partial eligibility. Academic-year faculty with no other summer assignments who do not appear on the list are eligible for a full-time teaching assignment (jobcode 2357) during Summer 2019. A continuing faculty member who taught full-time FWS 2017-18 and FWS 2018-19, and taught Summer 2018 (regardless of time-base) will be listed as not eligible on the list due to having exceeded the 7 consecutive quarter rule. Teaching assignments in Special Session programs held during the period between Spring and Fall terms (jobcode 2322) are not subject to the Summer Term eligibility process, and will have no impact on ability to teach during Summer Term. The Quarter Plus Program, off-campus programs, and international programs are all examples of Special Session programs that are run during this period. Non-teaching assignments (jobcode 2368) during a previous Summer Term will likewise not impact Summer Term teaching eligibility. Faculty in 12-month assignments are excluded from the eligibility process since summer is part of their normal teaching pattern.

Eligibility to teach during Summer Term 2019 is determined based on the following parameters:

1. Faculty may not teach more than the equivalent of seven consecutive quarters, regardless of time-base —rule applies to tenure-track faculty and full-time lecturers; and

2. Faculty may teach no more than the equivalent of ten (10) FTE quarters in a triad (12-quarter period) — rule applies only to tenure-track faculty.
Exceptions to the above limitations may be granted if it is determined that the assignment of the faculty member is essential to the offering of required instruction and no other qualified eligible faculty members are available to teach. As in previous Summer Terms, requests and justifications for exceptions to the triad regulations will be documented directly on the AP101-S form. The signatures of the department chair/head and dean on the AP101-S will indicate their recommendation that such a waiver be granted. Final approval for any appointments involving requests for exceptions will rest with the AVP Academic Personnel.

3. Eligible tenured and probationary faculty will have priority for Summer Term assignments over lecturers for at least 60% (headcount) of Summer Term offers, assuming they are qualified to teach the courses offered. The respective department chair/head will determine tie-breaking procedures when faculty are equally eligible and qualified.

4. One-quarter of Summer Term appointments may consist of probationary faculty, including faculty hired to begin in Fall Quarter 2019.

5. Summer Term appointments of tenured and tenure-track faculty members carry the obligation to fulfill normal instructionally related responsibilities including research, scholarship, creative activity, and service to the University, profession and to the community.

Please note that due to the self-support Summer Term program and the unpredictable nature of Summer Term assignments, faculty may not request an Advance Quarter Off with pay.

Please review the accuracy of the enclosed lists with your departments and bring any questions or corrections to the attention of Chris Blackburn (756-5281) or Elena Morelos (756-6575) as early as possible. Summer Term appointment procedural instructions and FAQs will be distributed and posted in early Spring Quarter 2019.

If you have any questions regarding an individual case in terms of eligibility please contact Chris Blackburn by email or at 756-5281. Any questions regarding Special Session instruction (including QuarterPlus) should be directed to Cheri Baumgarten in the International, Graduate, and Extended Education office.

This information is available at http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/summer.
WHEREAS, the transition at the conclusion of Winter Quarter 2020 occurred during the student evaluation period and may have affected student evaluation scores, written responses, and response rates; and

WHEREAS, the delivery of all finals online in Winter Quarter altered the instrument of final assessment for the majority of courses and may have affected grade distribution, which could either be anomalously high or low given this change in modality; and

WHEREAS, the shift of all courses to virtual delivery in Spring Quarter, while undertaken for health concerns surrounding the spread of COVID-19, mandates that many faculty offer their courses in a new modality, and that this transition may affect student evaluation scores, response rates, and grade distributions for courses; and

WHEREAS, several other California State University Campuses, including Cal State Los Angeles, Cal State Fullerton, and San José State University, have passed resolutions allowing faculty the option to exclude student evaluations from faculty members’ Personnel Action File (PAF) and Working Personnel Action Files (WPAF); therefore, be it

RESOLVED that all faculty members will have the option to exclude either or both of Winter and Spring Quarter 2020 student evaluations and grade distribution information from their PAF and WPAF; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee work with Academic Personnel and the California Faculty Association to create a memorandum that will be placed in each faculty member’s PAF and WPAF explaining the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on instructional delivery in Winter and Spring 2020.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: April 7, 2020
RESOLUTION ON SUSPENDING eLEARNING ADDENDUMS

WHEREAS, AS-750-12 “Resolution on eLearning Policy” states that “An eLearning Addendum to either the New Course Proposal or Course Modification form must be submitted for curricular review for any new or existing courses in which a total of more than 50% of traditional face-to-face instruction time is being replaced with eLearning technologies”; and

WHEREAS, As a result of COVID-19 the decision was made that “Spring quarter [2020] will be taught entirely virtually for the whole quarter”; and

WHEREAS, Faculty in high-risk groups may wish to continue to teach virtually as long as they feel there is a threat of being exposed to the virus; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate suspend the requirement for an eLearning addendum for faculty who wish to teach courses virtually in Summer Quarter 2020 and in Fall Quarter 2020; and furthermore let it be

RESOLVED: That any course offered virtually from Spring 2020 to Fall 2020 would need to be approved through the regular curricular review process before being offered again virtually after the Fall 2020 term unless this resolution is extended by the Academic Senate.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Date: April 7, 2020
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”

WHEREAS, The addition of policies on personnel action eligibility and criteria are the last policies to be moved from the old University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) to 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 7: Personnel Actions Eligibility and Criteria” be established as Chapter 7: Personnel Actions Eligibility and Criteria of UFPP, and be it further

RESOLVED: UFPA (2013) be removed from the UFPP Appendix
RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents by the end of Spring 2020 to have chapter 7 of their documents cover personnel actions eligibility and criteria as per chapter 7 of UFPP.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: April 7, 2020

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.
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 has replaced the prior University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) document piece by piece in constructing a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document. FAC will 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

In replacing UFPA with UFPP FAC has proposed 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.

FAC has consulted with the colleges, the library, and Counseling Services about this chapter. The proposed draft reflects significant revision to earlier drafts based on feedback from colleges (especially CENG), the library, and counseling services.

Faculty Affairs Committee, Winter 2020
Summary of CHAPTER 7: Personnel Actions Eligibility and Criteria

This chapter compiles existing policies concerning eligibility and criteria for personnel actions such as retention, tenure, promotion, and lecturer range elevation.

Impact on Existing Policy

This chapter establishes no new policy, but restates existing policy. The policies on personnel actions for probationary and tenured faculty are drawn from University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA). The policies on lecturer range elevation are drawn from an administrative memo on lecturer range elevation from 2016, and from AS-538-00/FAC which required colleges and faculty units to draft lecturer range elevation policies.

Implementation

*The establishment of UFPP by the Academic Senate obliges 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. Colleges and the Library need to place any of their policies on faculty personnel actions into chapter 7 of their personnel policy documents by Spring 2020. They have known of this requirement since last academic year.

As these policies are currently in effect, and have been in effect at least since 2009 when UFPA was enacted, there is no implementation of policy by the Senate action of approving the inclusion of this chapter into UFPP. For AY 2019-2020 these policies reside in UFPP in an appendix containing UFPA. With the inclusion of the policies on personnel action eligibility and criteria in UFPP for AY 2020-2021, UFPA will be rendered obsolete and thus needs to be deleted from UFPA.

What follows is the proposed text of the chapter...
7. Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria

7.1. Summary

7.1.1. This chapter covers the eligibility for faculty personnel actions, which consist of retention, promotion, tenure for tenure-track faculty, and range elevation for lecturer faculty. This chapter includes general principles according to which the colleges, library, and departments would specify the criteria warranting personnel actions. These criteria also guide the processes of periodic evaluations, including cumulative evaluations of lecturers for reappointment. 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. The library and other non-instructional faculty units would expand on these policies with their own criteria appropriate to the professional responsibilities of their faculty.

7.1.2. [CITATION OF FOUNDATIONAL SENATE ACTION].

7.2. Retention, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track Faculty

7.2.1. The quality of faculty performance is the most important element to consider in evaluating individual achievement. The degree of evidence will vary in accordance with the academic position being sought by the applicant.

7.2.2. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of instructional faculty are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following areas:

- Teaching performance
- Professional development
- Service
- Other factors of consideration

7.2.2.1. Teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion for the evaluation of tenure-line instructional faculty, however it alone is not sufficient for retention, promotion, and tenure.

7.2.2.2. The granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than retention, and promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor.

7.2.3. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of library and non-instructional faculty are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following areas:

- Professional performance
- Professional development
- Service
- Other factors of consideration

7.2.3.1. Professional performance is the primary and essential criterion for the evaluation of tenure-line librarian and non-instructional faculty, however it alone is not sufficient for retention, promotion, and tenure.

7.2.3.2. The granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than retention, and promotion to Librarian requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Librarian.

7.2.4. Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty may also include criteria set by colleges. Departments may also have additional criteria established in their approved personnel policy documents.

7.2.5. Teaching Performance of Instructional Faculty
7.2.5.1. In formulating recommendations for the retention, promotion, and tenure of teaching faculty, evaluators will place primary emphasis on success in instruction.

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

7.2.5.3. In their personnel policy documents colleges shall specify how these factors enter into the evaluation of teaching. Colleges and departments may include additional factors in their personnel policies.

7.2.5.4. Evaluators shall consider results of the formal student evaluation in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance.

7.2.6. Professional Performance of Librarians and Non-instructional Faculty

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

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

7.2.6.3. In their personnel policy documents the library shall specify how these factors enter into the evaluation of professional performance. The library may include additional factors in its personnel policies.

7.2.6.4. Evaluation of non-instructional faculty shall consider professional performance appropriate to the position of the faculty under evaluation.

7.2.7. Professional Growth and Scholarly Achievement

7.2.7.1. In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on the professional growth and scholarly achievement of the applicant.

7.2.7.2. Evaluators shall consider such factors as the applicant’s educational background and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies, publications, presentation of papers at professional and scholarly meetings, external validation, and peer review of scholarly and creative activities.

7.2.7.3. In their personnel policy documents colleges and the library shall specify how these factors enter into the evaluation of professional growth and scholarly achievement. Colleges and departments, and the library may include additional factors in their personnel policies.

7.2.8. Service

7.2.8.1. In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on the service the applicant performs in relation to the university and the community.

7.2.8.2. Evaluators shall consider such factors as the applicant’s participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; co-curricular activities; membership of department, college, the Academic Senate and its committees, and University
committees; individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and, service in community affairs directly related to the applicant’s teaching and/or research areas as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

7.2.8.3. In their personnel policy documents colleges and the library shall specify how these factors enter into the evaluation of service. Colleges and departments, and the library may include additional factors in their personnel policies.

7.2.9. Other factors of consideration

7.2.9.1. In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on collegiality (working collaboratively and productively with colleagues and participation in traditional academic functions); initiative; cooperativeness; and dependability.

7.2.9.2. In their personnel policy documents colleges and the library shall specify how these factors enter into the evaluation of other factors of consideration. Colleges and departments, and the library may include additional factors in their personnel policies.

7.3. Retention Eligibility

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

7.3.2. It is the responsibility of applicants to provide sufficient evidence that they have fulfilled the criteria for retention.

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

7.3.4. Evaluation of probationary faculty involves a comprehensive assessment of performance during the entire probationary period with retention seen as leading to tenure.

7.3.5. Faculty who have not demonstrated the potential to achieve tenure should not be retained.

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

7.4. Promotion Eligibility

7.4.1. Promotion eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 14 of the CBA.

7.4.2. Promotion in rank is not automatic and is granted only in recognition of teaching competency or effectiveness as a librarian, professional growth and scholarly achievement, and meritorious service during the period in rank. The application of criteria will be more rigorous for promotion to Professor or Librarian than to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian.

7.4.3. Applicants for promotion to the academic rank of Professor or Librarian must be tenured or concurrently be granted tenure.

7.4.4. An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered normal if the applicant is eligible and both of the following conditions hold:
   • The applicant is tenured or the applicant is also eligible for and applying for normal tenure.
   • The applicant has completed at least the equivalent of four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

7.4.5. An application for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Librarian is considered “early” if one of the following conditions holds:
• The applicant is a probationary faculty employee who is not in their sixth probationary year and is not eligible for normal tenure.
• The applicant is a tenured faculty employee and has not satisfied the equivalent service requirements of at least four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

7.4.6. Early promotion will be granted only in exceptional cases. The circumstances and record of performance which make the case exceptional shall be fully documented by the applicant and validated by evaluators.

7.4.7. The fact that an applicant has reached the maximum salary in their academic rank or meets the performance criteria for promotion does not in itself constitute an exceptional case for early promotion.

7.5. **Tenure Eligibility**

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

7.5.2. Applicants for appointment with tenure shall normally be tenured professors or tenured librarians at other universities. Exceptions to this provision must be carefully documented. The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in a management position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by tenured faculty in the appropriate department. Possession of the doctorate or other designated terminal degree from an accredited institution is required for tenure.

7.5.3. Normal tenure is for applicants who have accrued credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

7.5.4. Early tenure is for applicants who have not yet achieved credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

7.6. **Tenure Criteria**

7.6.1. Tenure represents the University’s long-term commitment to a faculty employee and is only granted when there is strong evidence that the individual who, by reason of their excellent performance and promise of long-range contribution as a teacher-scholar to the educational purpose of the institution, is deemed worthy of this important commitment. Tenure means the right of a faculty employee to continue at Cal Poly unless voluntarily terminated, terminated for cause, or laid off by factors governed by CBA 38.

7.6.2. Tenure decisions are considered more critical to the University than promotion decisions.

7.6.3. An applicant who does not have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor should not be granted tenure.

7.6.4. Retention is not a guarantee of tenure.

7.6.5. Tenure is not a guarantee of promotion.

7.6.6. Early promotion is not a guarantee of tenure.

7.6.7. An applicant for tenure must at least fully meet the requirements of their assignment and be making a valuable contribution to the university according to department, college or library criteria for tenure in each of the following performance areas:

• For instructional faculty: teaching, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.
• For librarian faculty: professional performance, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.
7.6.8. An applicant for early tenure must meet department, college, or library criteria for normal tenure and provide evidence of exceptional performance in each of the following performance areas:
- For instructional faculty: teaching, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.
- For librarian faculty: professional performance, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.

7.6.9. An applicant for early tenure should, at a minimum, receive a favorable majority vote from the department peer review committee.

7.7. Lecturer Range Elevation Eligibility and Criteria
7.7.1. Policies for lecturer range elevation are governed by CBA 12, and the memo “Amendments to the Range Elevation Procedures 2016.” Cal Poly requirements about colleges and faculty units establishing their own lecturer range elevation criteria were established by AS-538-00/FAC, which is superseded by UFPP.

7.7.2. Colleges and faculty units shall establish range elevation criteria for temporary lecturer faculty. Faculty, including temporary lecturer faculty, shall formulate such policies.

7.7.3. The university shall notify lecturer faculty in a timely manner of their eligibility to be considered for range elevation.

7.7.4. Temporary lecturer faculty members shall submit requests to be elevated to a higher range according to the university timeline accompanying the notification of eligibility. Faculty members shall document the reasons for which they believe that they should be elevated in the materials submitted in their WPAF according to their college or faculty unit criteria for lecturer range elevation.

7.8. Counseling Faculty Eligibility and Criteria
7.8.1. Eligibility and criteria for counseling faculty with classification of Student Services Professional-Academic Related (SSPAR) shall be modeled after eligibility and criteria for lecturer faculty, and stated in their faculty unit policy document.
RESOLUTION ON REVISIONS TO UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
CHAPTER 4: UFPP 4 RESPONSIBILITIES IN FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESSES

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution revises academic personnel policies contained in University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) 4, which was established by AS-867-19 and revised by Academic Senate Consent 12/3/2019. This resolution supersedes those prior Academic Senate actions.¹

WHEREAS, AS-687-09 established University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) as Cal Poly’s governing document concern faculty evaluation; and

WHEREAS, UFPA V.B requires that “department PRCs, department chairs, college or library PRCs, and deans shall submit a ranking of those promotion applicants who were positively recommended at their respective level;” and

WHEREAS, Policies on responsibilities in faculty evaluation from UFPA are now contained in University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) chapter 4; and

WHEREAS, Consultation with colleges and the library reveals that the composition of department peer review committees for promotion varies enough across the colleges and the library such that a university requirement to rank order candidates for promotion may often be impracticable; and

WHEREAS, Department, college, and library peer evaluation committees, and department chair/head evaluations already provide detailed justifications of their positive recommendations for promotion; and

RESOLVED: The policy included in the report “Proposed Revision of University Faculty Personnel Policies CHAPTER 4: UFPP 4 Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes” replace the policies currently in UFPP 4, and be it further
RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library examine their personnel policies in light of these revisions to UFPP chapter 4, and if necessary, revise chapter 4 of their personnel policy documents by the beginning of Fall 2020 to comply with UFPP.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee  
Date: April 7, 2020

(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which 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. FAC has used this process to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document and is now employing the same process to create and revise personnel policies to UFPP on an as-needed basis.

In creating UFPP FAC has adopted a guiding principle that, as far as possible, the migration of existing personnel policies from the former governing personnel policies document, University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), into UFPP shall not change those policies as they are in UFPA, but instead just reformulate them into the new style and structure of UFPP. Once the policies previously in UFPA are in place in UFPP, FAC may then visit them for subsequent revision in the form of presenting to the Academic Senate revisions to chapters and sections of UFPP. FAC may also propose wholly new policies to be included in UFPP.

This report explains and justifies a focused set of revisions to personnel policies in UFPP 4: Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes.

When the Academic Senate created UFPP in AY 2018-2019 a few policies in UFPA were omitted. To cover any such omissions, UFPA remained in UFPP as an appendix so that policies in UFPA but not yet migrated into UFPP would still remain in effect for AY 2019-2020. In Fall 2019 the Senate added several such omitted policies to UFPP by means of the personnel policies consent agenda. One of those policies required department levels of faculty evaluation for promotion to rank the candidates they positively recommended for promotion. In Winter 2020 the FAC chair circulated of a draft of UFPP for AY 2020-2021 to the colleges and the library containing all revisions thus far approved by the Senate. Highlighting the policies requiring department level reviews to rank candidates for promotion led to some follow-up consultation on those topics. The issues with requiring rankings of promotion candidates from department peer review committees (DPRC) and department chair/head reviews that arose from that consultation included the following:

- Large departments may have a core of DPRC membership common across all cases of promotion in the department, but for small departments reviewing more than one candidate for promotion there may be few or even no faculty in common across DPRCs.
- Department chair/head level of review must be skipped when the candidate for promotion is going up for a rank higher than that of the chair, when the chair is not tenured, or when there is some conflict of interest that excludes the chair from conducting an evaluation.

Turning the requirement of a ranking from department level review into an allowance for such a ranking accommodates for these factors and allows for the exercise of discretion from the DPRC or chair/head about when rankings are or are not meaningful.
These issues don’t affect the College/library peer review committees (CPRC) level of review. The main relevant differences about CPRC composition and responsibilities that warrant its ranking of promotion candidates are the following:

- The CPRC must address every promotion case in the college/library.
- CPRC composition escapes the cases of conflict of interest affecting department level reviews.
- CPRC review is the last faculty level of review prior to administrative reviews.

The CPRC ranking serves as the faculty recommendation concerning the subsequent administrative decisions of whether to grant promotion and also of how much of a salary increase should accompany the promotion. FAC thought this ranking should remain required, and that issues about how these CPRC rankings be conducted should be addressed at the college level rather than constrain the exercise of discretion about those rankings with university policy.

### Summary of revisions to UFPP 4 Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA 15.44) allows peer evaluators to rank order candidates positively recommended for promotion and to send that recommendation to the administrative levels of review. The Cal Poly Academic Senate formalized this allowance into a requirement in UFPA section V.B established in 2009 by AS-687-09:

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

The establishment of UFPP in AY 2018-2019 as the successor to UFPA involved moving policies from UFPA into UFPP. However, in the establishment of UFPP chapter 4 by AS-867-19 only the requirement that a college peer review committee (CPRC) rank order its positive recommendations for promotion migrated from UFPA to UFPP. Policies requiring the same of the other levels of review listed in UFPA V.B entered UFPP 4 by Academic Senate Consent 12/3/2019. It is those additions that FAC recommends be revised.

The proposed new policies allow for such rankings from department peer review committee (DPRC) and chair/head levels of evaluation, but the university no longer requires every DPRC or department chairs/heads to do so. We have preserved the requirement that college peer review committees rank order candidates for promotion for the higher administrative levels of review (e.g. deans), and that administrative reviews (e.g. deans) rank order candidates in their recommendations to the provost.

### Impact on Existing Policy

The proposed policy changes a university requirement into an allowance. Colleges or the library with their own currently formalized requirement in their personnel policies document that peer evaluators rank order candidates for promotion may do nothing and continue with that practice. To change their practices from their current state, a college or the library would need to change their policies.
accordingly. If a college elected to require such a ranking from its department level evaluations, the college would have to include such a policy in chapter 4 of its personnel policies document.

### Implementation

This policy would go into effect the next academic year. Any changes in college, department, or library personnel policies would need to be completed and approved by the provost by the beginning of the Fall term of the academic year in which those policies would be in effect.

What follows are two versions of the revised text of UFPP chapter 4, first in its final form, and secondly with relocated text in green, and revisions marked in red underlining for added text and red strikeout for deleted text. ...
4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes

4.1. Summary

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

4.1.2. Chapter 4 was established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-867-19. Portions were revised by Academic Senate Consent 12/3/2019.

4.2. Candidates

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3. Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC)

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3.7. DPRC evaluation recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee (CBA 15.45). The DPRC shall vote for or against the proposed action (retention, promotion and/or tenure), or, under very rare circumstances, abstain. Abstentions require written explanation. In cases of split votes, the report should reflect the relevant perspectives on the committee and the rationale for the majority decision. In rare instances when agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report, the minority committee member(s) may submit a signed minority report.

4.3.8. The DPRC may submit to the subsequent levels of evaluation a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44).

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

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

4.4. Department Chair/Head

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

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

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

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

4.4.5. The department chairs/heads may submit to the subsequent levels of evaluation a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44).

4.5. College Peer Review Committee (CPRC)

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

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

4.5.3. Based on the review of the PAF, WPAF, and prior levels of evaluation, the CPRC shall vote for or against the proposed retention, promotion, and/or tenure, or, under rare circumstances, abstain. Abstentions require written explanation. A simple majority of the voting members constitutes the recommendation of the CPRC.

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

4.5.5. The CPRC report shall be provided to the candidate at least 10 days before sending the evaluation to the dean (CBA 15.5). Candidates may request a meeting and/or submit a rebuttal to the CPRC report within the 10-day rebuttal period. The CPRC shall review rebuttal material with the option of revising the recommended action or correcting errors in the original report; no other written response, other than acknowledgment of receipt of the rebuttal, shall be provided to the candidate.
4.5.6. The CPRC shall submit to the subsequent levels of evaluation a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44). Further specification of the nature of the ranking shall be determined by the college or library in their personnel policies documents.

4.6. Administrative Evaluators

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

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

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

4.6.4. Administrative evaluators shall submit to the Provost a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44).

4.7. Provost

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

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

4.7.3. The Provost’s letter to the candidate constitutes the final decision on retention, promotion and/or tenure.
4. Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes

4.1. Summary

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

4.1.2. Chapter 4 was established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-867-19. Portions were revised by Academic Senate Consent 12/3/2019.

4.2. Candidates

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3. Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3.8. The DPRC shall may submit to the subsequent levels of evaluation a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44).

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

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

4.4. Department Chair/Head

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

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

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

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

4.4.5. The department chairs/heads shall submit to the subsequent levels of evaluation a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44).

4.5. College Peer Review Committee (CPRC)

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

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

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

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

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

4.5.5.4.5.6. The CPRC shall submit to the subsequent levels of evaluation a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44). Further specification of the nature of the ranking shall be determined by the college or library in their personnel policies documents.

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

4.6. **Administrative Evaluators**

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

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

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

4.6.4. Administrative evaluators shall submit to the Provost a ranking of those promotion applicants whom they positively recommended (CBA 15.44).

4.7. **Provost**

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

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

4.7.3. The Provost’s letter to the candidate constitutes the final decision on retention, promotion and/or tenure.
RESOLUTION TO ADOPT ORCID FOR IMPROVED IDENTIFICATION AND CONNECTION AMONG RESEARCHERS

Impact on Existing Policy: i

1. WHEREAS, ORCID provides faculty and researchers a persistent digital identifier (an ORCID ID) that a faculty member owns and controls and helps distinguish that member from other researchers; and, faculty can connect their ID with professional information, such as their affiliations, grants, publications, and peer reviews; and, faculty can use their ID to be recognized and located by other researchers, publishers, and funding agencies; and

2. WHEREAS Cal Poly does not have an Institutional ORCID account, or policy regarding adoption or use of such an account; and

3. WHEREAS, The RSCA committee reviewed the ORCID summary sheet, surveyed fellow faculty members, and discussed the ORCID institutional membership as a committee; and

4. WHEREAS, The RSCA committee recognizes the benefits of ORCID for grants, publications, research, and identifying collaborators for research; therefore, be it

5. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate supports Cal Poly’s adoption of a university-wide ORCID account; and be it further

6. RESOLVED: That Academic Senate encourages faculty to enroll and use ORCID, but maintains that its use will not be mandatory and it will not be used in the RPT process.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Committee
Date: April 7, 2020

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.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
SUBCHAPTER 8.4.5: STUDENT EVALUATION RESULTS

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution establishes new policy. Its impact on existing practice is described in the attached report.

WHEREAS, Student evaluation data are collected and used for the purpose of providing student feedback as part of the evidence considered in the evaluation of teaching in periodic and performance evaluations of instructional faculty; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has no policies on the disposition of student evaluation data beyond their practical use in the evaluation of teaching performance as part of periodic and performance evaluations of instructional faculty; and

WHEREAS, Colleges and departments have established their own varied practices of removing out of date student evaluation data from faculty Personnel Action Files (PAF); and

WHEREAS, University policy on document storage and disposition of student evaluation results would eliminate variation across campus about how student evaluation results are maintained in the PAF; and

WHEREAS, Electronic storage of student evaluation data has changed the practices of document disposition without any consideration by the Academic Senate about the value of standardizing longstanding practice of disposition of student evaluation results from the PAF; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy document contained at the end of the attached report “Proposed University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 8.4.5: Student Evaluation Results” be established as university policy, and be it further
RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents prior to Fall 2020 to conform with subchapter 8.4.5 of UFPP.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: April 7, 2020

(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which 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. FAC has used this process to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document and is now employing the same process to create and revise personnel policies to UFPP on an as-needed basis.

In creating UFPP FAC has adopted a guiding principle that, as far as possible, the migration of existing personnel policies from the former governing personnel policies document, University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), into UFPP shall not change those policies as they are in UFPA, but instead just reformulate them into the new style and structure of UFPP. Once the policies previously in UFPA are in place in UFPP, FAC may then visit them for subsequent revision in the form of presenting to the Academic Senate revisions to chapters and sections of UFPP. FAC may also propose wholly new policies to be included in UFPP.

This report explains and justifies a proposed new personnel policy. The proposed new policies are addenda to the policies already in UFPP 8.4.5.

FAC engaged in consultation with the colleges about the proposed policy, presenting two options for the proposed policy. The policy presented here arose from the one option universally preferred by those who provided feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Subchapter 8.4.5 Student Evaluation Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per article 15.15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), results of student evaluations are stored as an electronic extension of a faculty member’s Personnel Action File (PAF). Student evaluation reports comprise part of the body of evidence relevant to the evaluation teaching performance in faculty evaluation processes. Results of student evaluations contribute to the assessment of the faculty member’s teaching performance as recorded in the AP109 form used by the Department Peer Review Committee and Department Chairs/Heads. These AP109 forms remain in the PAF forming a history of faculty evaluation, including the evaluation of teaching performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed policy defines student evaluation results as the reports generated for each course evaluated, including a complete accounting of the quantitative responses and all the student comments from a given class section of a course. Filing and storage of student evaluation results amounts to filing and storage of these reports. The remaining policy text addresses the disposition of those reports beyond the period of their utility. Some background about the utility of these reports of student evaluation results is in order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the validation of the quality of teaching inherent in the granting of tenure and post-tenure promotion, and in issuance and renewal of lecturer faculty contracts, the continued evaluation of teaching beyond these personnel actions is in reference to the summary assessment of teaching covered in the evaluation reports that recommended those personnel actions. The evidence of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Affairs Committee, Winter 2020
teaching under consideration in a subsequent post-tenure evaluation is assessed in reference to prior assessments of teaching performance in the reports issued from prior evaluations, but the evidence in support of those prior summary assessments is not something to revisit in subsequent evaluations.

When student evaluations were conducted with paper forms, student evaluation records consisted of summary reports of the quantitative results and the original paper forms containing each student’s comments collected in the student evaluation process. Both those summary reports and the original paper forms with student comments were, by the CBA, considered to be part of the PAF. The summary reports were standardly filed in the PAF secured in the dean’s office, while the original paper forms were typically stored in department offices, officially by the CBA as an extension of the PAF.

The storage of the original student evaluation forms provided practical limitations on how long those paper documents would remain available as an extension of a PAF. To make room for storage of recent student evaluation forms, ones no longer relevant to the active cycles of faculty evaluation would routinely be returned to the faculty member, and thus be purged from the PAF. In the absence of any policy on the disposition of student evaluation documents the purging of original student evaluation data including student comments varied across campus. Yet, the practice, in some form or other, of purging the data from the PAF was widespread.

The use of electronic storage of student evaluation data, and especially the electronic collection of such data across campus since Fall 2016, has allowed student evaluations to remain in an electronic extension of a faculty member’s PAF virtually in perpetuity, and therefore beyond the period of their utility in evaluating faculty teaching quality. The absence of university policy governing the disposition of such data coupled with the elimination of any storage based need to purge outdated student evaluation data, in effect, creates a change away from accepted practice, and amounts to the construction of new policy by mere omission of prior policy, and without any action by the Academic Senate.

FAC therefore recommends that university policy establish that student evaluation reports be retained for the period of their utility in faculty evaluation, and then removed from the PAF as they lose that utility.

This recommendation is limited to the official reports of student evaluation results including the entire body of student evaluation data and the comments from students for a given class taught by that faculty member. Colleges and departments may summarize student evaluation results and record those summaries in other documents (e.g. comprehensive records of teaching assignments) that remain in the PAF independent of any provision of the proposed policy options under consideration.

This proposed policy requires a faculty member’s PAF to be purged of student evaluation reports after six academic years. That period of time covers the normal probationary period for tenure-track faculty, overlaps with the standard period of post-tenure evaluation, covers the standard period of evaluation prior to the establishment of a three-year contract for lecturer faculty, and overlaps the period of two successive three-year contracts.

In certain cases there may be some utility in retaining student evaluation data for longer periods. The CBA allows faculty to place items in their own PAF, and allows administrators to place items in a faculty
member’s PAF. The decision of a faculty member, or of a department chair/head or dean, to retain student evaluation results for a longer period is therefore allowed. But, the default in the absence of a positive action to retain the data would be to purge it after six academic years.

### Impact on Existing Policy

The proposed policy governs how Deans serve as the custodians of a faculty member’s PAF. The policy conforms with existing CSU policies about document retention and disposition. Student evaluation reports are documents with legal standing as elements of personnel files. CSU policies about document disposition of legal files as well as the secure deletion of data would prevail in the execution of the provisions of this policy.

The proposed policy conforms with the Collective Bargaining Agreement which specifies that results of student evaluations be placed in the PAF, and that this placement may be in the form of electronic storage. The CBA is silent about how long such results must remain in the PAF. The CBA allows for filing and removal of items from the PAF both from the faculty member and administrators.

In framing our ideas about how to draft the new policy, FAC considered similar policies that have been in place for a while at SDSU.

### Implementation

This policy would go into effect the next academic year. Its implementation requires the purge of obsolete student evaluations from the PAFs of all those faculty who have met the conditions for the purge of those documents. The exact process and timing of document disposal amounts to an administrative task. It should happen in summer so the student evaluation data are fixed for the upcoming academic year. Further clarification of the administrative side of implementing this policy may warrant additions or revisions to this subchapter down the line.

What follows is the text of UFPP subchapter 8.4.5.1 and 8.4.5.2, which remain as they are, followed by new policy starting at 8.4.5.3. ...
8.4.5. **Student Evaluation Results**

8.4.5.1. Placement of student evaluation results in Personnel Action Files is governed by CBA 11.1, 15.15, 15.17.

8.4.5.2. Results of student evaluations shall be stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the Personnel Action File. The dean is the custodian of the PAF and will provide secure access to this information.

8.4.5.3. Results of student evaluations consist of reports generated for each course evaluated, including a complete accounting of the quantitative responses and all the student comments from a given class section of a course. Policies about filing, storage, and disposition of student evaluation results concern only these reports of student evaluation results.

8.4.5.4. Colleges and departments may summarize or extract selected quantitative student evaluation data into other reports about the teaching history of a faculty member that the college or department may require to be included in the PAF. Any extraction of student evaluation data into other reports for the PAF must be defined in the college or department personnel policies.

8.4.5.5. Results of student evaluations shall only be retained in the PAF for the prior six complete academic years.

8.4.5.6. Results of student evaluations may be maintained in the PAF for longer periods on request of the faculty member, the department chair/head, or the dean.

8.4.5.7. Absent a request to retain them, results of student evaluations from classes taught earlier than the prior six complete academic years shall be removed from the PAF, following standard CSU procedures for legal document disposition. The removal of results of student evaluations from the PAF shall normally occur in summer.
WHEREAS, The voice of the faculty is integral to framing Cal Poly’s educational identity and goals; and

WHEREAS, The WASC Commission Action Letter from 2010 asked that Cal Poly “identify more clearly the aspirational goals of the institution, and the role of faculty in helping to shape possible changes in the institution’s identity”; and

WHEREAS, The Report of the WASC Visiting Team: Capacity and Preparatory Review from the last full accreditation review by WASC in 2010 cited the “need for a measurable definition of the signature pedagogy of Cal Poly, that of Learn-by-Doing”; and

WHEREAS, The Report of the WASC Visiting Team in 2012, “recommended that additional attention be given to clearly: a) defining what is meant by the term “comprehensive polytechnic university””; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s faculty have spoken through Academic Senate resolutions on the definition of Learn by Doing (AS-727-11) and the adoption and definition of Cal Poly’s identity as a comprehensive polytechnic (AS-650-06); and

WHEREAS, In our WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report (December 2009), Cal Poly recognized the combination of our Learn by Doing pedagogy, our adoption of the teacher-scholar model, our intention to provide “a meaningful reply to the fractured nature of higher education,” and our commitment to the “development of vigorous programs in the arts, science, and humanities” in reaffirming our identity as a comprehensive polytechnic university”; and

WHEREAS, One foundation of President Armstrong’s Vision 2022 affirms Cal Poly as a “comprehensive polytechnic university”; and

WHEREAS, Recently developed Cal Poly marketing/branding policies and documents, though since corrected after feedback from the Academic Senate, originally contained a description of Cal Poly as a “holistic polytechnic” and a definition of Learn by Doing that differed from and ignored previously adopted definitions of these concepts; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly’s marketing/branding policies and materials include references to and definitions of Cal Poly’s educational identity and goals based only on those documents which have received both faculty endorsement via the Academic Senate and approval by the President; and be it further
RESOLVED: That Cal Poly’s Academic Senate be consulted through all stages of future efforts to modify marketing/branding policies and materials intended to promote Cal Poly’s educational identity.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: April 7, 2020
RESOLUTION ON POSTING ACCESSIBLE COURSE MATERIALS

Impact on Existing Policy: NONE

WHEREAS, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities act of 1990 require that universities make courses accessible to all students; and

WHEREAS, California State University Executive Orders 926 (2005) and 1111 (2018) call for all courses to be accessible to all students; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion encompasses providing equitable access to education to all students regardless of disability status; and

WHEREAS, Accessible course materials are an important component of education and student success at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, Continual measurement and remediation are necessary for continual improvement in accessibility; and

WHEREAS, The Canvas LMS is itself accessible, and it will include a tool, Ally, for evaluating the accessibility of posted course materials and suggesting possible steps for remediation; and

WHEREAS, The accessibility of web pages within Cal Poly Drupal can also be determined by the site administrators, facilitating remediation

WHEREAS, Some faculty may need help moving course materials to the LMS; therefore be it

RESOLVED: Faculty are strongly encouraged to post course materials within the LMS, and be it further
RESOLVED: Faculty are strongly encouraged to post any course materials not posted within the LMS on a Cal Poly Drupal site, and be it further
RESOLVED: The CTLT will provide training and support for faculty moving teaching materials into the LMS.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: April 7, 2020