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Meeting of the Academic Senate  
Tuesday, April 21, 2020

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve of the March 10th, 2020 Academic Senate minutes.

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

III. Reports: All reports were submitted in writing at the request of the Senate Chair. The reports can be found at: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/sa042120.pdf

IV. Consent Agenda

A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSC 121 Computing for All I (4), 3 lectures, 1 activity</td>
<td>Reviewed and recommended for approval 3/5/20.</td>
<td>On 4/21/20 consent agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 122 Computing for All II (4), 3 lectures, 1 activity</td>
<td>Reviewed and recommended for approval 3/5/20.</td>
<td>On 4/21/20 consent agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. University Faculty Personnel Policies Appendix: Administrative Memos

V. Special Reports:

A. Cal Poly Athletics Written Summary: Don Oberhelman, Director of Athletics, submitted a written to the Academic Senate and can be found at: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/sa042120.pdf

VI. Business Items:

A. Resolution on Suspending eLearning Addenda: Brian Self, Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, presented a resolution that would suspend the normal approval processes for courses being taught online. Given the circumstances of the global pandemic, faculty who wish to teach their courses online in Fall 2020, would be able to do so. This resolution will return in first reading status at the next Academic Senate Meeting.

B. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 7: Personnel Actions Eligibility and Criteria: Ken Brown, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs, proposed the revised Personnel Policies subchapter regarding personnel actions eligibility and criteria to the Senate. M/S to move the Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 7: Personnel Actions Eligibility and Criteria to second reading. 27 against, 4 abstentions. This resolution will return in first reading status at the next Academic Senate Meeting.

C. Resolution to Adopt ORCID for Improved Identification and Connection among Researchers: Keri Schwab, Academic Senate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Committee, presented a resolution to adopt the ORCHID software at the University. ORCHID is a digital identifier that is able to distinguish scholarly works from others. M/S/P to move the Resolution to Adopt ORCID for Improved Identification and Connection among Researchers to second reading. M/S/P to approve the Resolution to Adopt ORCID for Improved Identification and Connection among Researchers. 3 against, 2 abstentions.

D. Resolution on Revisions to University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 4: UFPP 4 Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Process: Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs, presented the resolution that would revise the University Faculty Personnel Policies Chapter 4 to make rankings done for faculty up for promotion optional to the department.
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This resolution will return in first reading status at the next Academic Senate meeting.

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

VIII. **Adjournment:** 4:31 pm

Submitted by,

Francesca Tiesi
Academic Senate Student Assistant
The Cal Poly Now app (What’s Up Now guide) has over 400 virtual engagement opportunities for students to remain connected with out-of-class activities at Cal Poly. If you encounter students who need connection, please refer them there.

Details will be released soon for students who left belongings in the residence halls or apartments before spring break on how to retrieve them, have them shipped, have them stored in SLO, or have them donated.

Happy Mother’s Day (in advance) to all the mothers on Senate!
CFA Report to the Academic Senate Committee May 5, 2020

SUMMER 2020. Our local Summer Quarter agreement remains in effect. A full-time Summer teaching assignment will consist of 12 WTU for tenured and tenure-track faculty, and 15 WTU for lecturers. Across the University (and preferably within each college and department), 60% of Summer teaching offers (by headcount) should be made to tenured and tenure-track faculty. Up to 40% of Summer teaching offers may be made to lecturers. However, if some tenured or tenure-track faculty decline offers of Summer teaching, then lecturer appointments may make up more than 40% of Summer teaching assignments. Department heads and chairs will have received a list of faculty who are eligible to teach in Summer from Academic Personnel. If a department wants to offer a particular class and no eligible faculty are available to teach that class, the department chair or head may request an eligibility waiver from their Dean’s Office.

CSU COVID-19 PAID ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE. The CSU has authorized paid administrative leave for employees who are unable to work due to COVID-19. An employee may use up to 256 hours of paid administrative leave. This leave can be combined with other types of leave such as sick leave. Faculty who wish to apply for paid administrative leave should notify their department chair/head and Academic Personnel.
ASI President Report for May 5, 2020 Academic Senate:

- **ASI Election Results**: I am pleased to congratulate the following student leaders for their election to their respective positions. A more comprehensive list of the election results can be found [here](#).
  - **ASI President**
    - Shayna Lynch, Political Science
  - **ASI Board of Directors**
    - **College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences — 4 seats**
      - Hayley Fernandes
      - Armando Nevarez
      - Sujhey Rosas
      - Samantha Santos
    - **College of Architecture and Environmental Design — 3 seats**
      - Alexander Ameri
      - Diana Fierro Gonzalez
      - Mitchell Wexler
    - **College of Engineering — 5 seats**
      - Ricky Chavez
      - Alan Faz
      - Suha Hussain
      - Tess Loarie
      - Jordan Perlas
    - **College of Liberal Arts — 4 seats**
      - Neila Consuelo Patino
      - Jordy Roth
      - Parker Swanson
      - Amanda Tejeda
    - **College of Science and Mathematics — 4 seats**
      - Michelle Deyski
      - Perla Estrada
      - McKenna Grant
      - Sam Park
    - **Orfalea College of Business — 4 seats**
      - Katia Espinoza
      - Marissa Hijji
      - Melody Lee
      - Tom Lee
  - **CSSA** – The California State Student Association convened on April 18. A brief summary of actions taken are as follows:
    - The Board passed a stance of support for [AB 2023 – Educational Equity: Student Records: Name and Gender Changes](#).
    - The Board passed three resolutions: [CSSA Resolution Regarding Access to Menstrual Hygiene Products in the CSU](#), [CSSA Resolution for Mandatory Anti-Bias Trainings in Union Contracts](#), and [CSSA Resolution Regarding Students Left Out of the Federal Stimulus Package of 2020](#).
  - **DACA ASI Action Plan** – The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program is currently pending whether or not it will remain as a resource for our undocumented community by action
of the U.S. Supreme Court. The ASI Leadership Team has created an Action Plan to best support undocumented students at this time utilizing resources provided by the Central Coast Coalition for Undocumented Student Success and the Cal Poly UndocuAlly Working Group. If you have question on our current plan, or want to see how you can help, reach out to myself.

- **CARES Act Funds** – Through the CARES Act, Cal Poly has received approximately $14,095,976, of which $7,047,988 must be used for emergency financial aid grants to students (list of all university’s allocation amounts can be found [here](#)). An FAQ for these funds can be found [here](#). Myself and students on the ASI Board of Directors are seeking ways in which students can help decide how this money will be spent in the coming weeks.
Protecting Cal Poly’s Work, Finances, and Communications

The Information Security Office (ISO) receives approximately 300 reports of malicious or phishing emails each day. The campus receives an average of five impersonation emails per week, each purporting to be from a Dean, Department Chair, or Director asking, “Are you available?” Faculty and staff who get tricked into responding find themselves on the losing end of a gift card scam. In a recent instance, a faculty member lost $5,000 while corresponding through their personal Gmail account with a malicious actor posing as a Department Chair.

Minimizing the Number of Scam Emails

Currently, 20% of our faculty have configured their Cal Poly email to automatically forward to a personal account. When phishing emails are reported to the ISO, the team quickly assesses the risk and blocks suspicious or malicious senders. However, the blocks put in place by the security team only work on Cal Poly email systems. Once an email is forwarded to a non-Cal Poly email account, all security protections put in place are lost.

Recommendations for improving security efforts are:

1. Discontinue email forward for Cal Poly faculty and staff. We cannot help when the problem is no longer in the Cal Poly email system.

2. Remove email addresses from department directories on websites. These directories are a treasure trove of valuable data for malicious actors to plan out a coordinated and targeted attack against a college or department.

Minimizing the Impact of a Successful Scam

Recently, multi-factor authentication (MFA) was implemented to verify users’ identities when they’re logging on to Virtual Computer Labs, a service that was launched to enable distance learning. Information is safer because thieves would need to steal both a person’s password and phone (or a second authentication factor) to gain access.

California State University is advocating for and funding full MFA implementation by July 2021. Information Technology Services (ITS) is planning for a broader rollout to other critical services (including email and My Cal Poly Portal) to further protect data.

Questions or concerns regarding any of the information above can be directed to Cal Poly’s Information Security Officer, Doug Lomsdalen, via email at dlomsdal@calpoly.edu.
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

---

1 (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies. This process specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda. Using the new process, FAC 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:
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; therefore be it

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
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.

Faculty Affairs Committee, Winter 2020
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 15.4445). 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 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 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. 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 ON SUSPENDING eLEARNING ADDENDUMS

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution temporarily supersedes AS-750-12.

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 and summer quarters of 2020 will be taught entirely virtually; and

WHEREAS, Faculty, particularly those 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 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

(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.
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA
AS-___-20

RESOLUTION ON ONLINE TEACHING & LEARNING

WHEREAS, A previous resolution related to online teaching and learning, AS-750-12: Resolution on eLearning Policy, is seven years old, and;

WHEREAS, Online education and technology-mediated instruction is rapidly evolving in all its forms, sparking the need to periodically reevaluate campus policies and procedures.

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Task Force on Online Teaching & Learning and the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee have endorsed the attached policy entitled “Online Teaching & Learning Policy at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo;” therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt the following Online Teaching & Learning Policy at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo document.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Online Teaching and Learning Task Force
Date: April 28, 2020
Online Teaching & Learning Policy

at

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Preamble

This policy is an update of the prior “eLearning Policy at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo” adopted through AS-750-12: Resolution on eLearning Policy on May 29, 2012. For policy items that the task force deemed current, those policies have remained intact and are included below with only minor updates.

Over the course of the last two decades, online education internationally, nationally, and in California has expanded rapidly with institutions of higher education investing time, energy, and resources into developing comprehensive offerings for students at the course and degree level. With advances in technology coupled with growing need for flexibility in higher education, both hybrid and fully online courses have become more prevalent at Cal Poly. With that prevalence has come the need to update and simplify the curriculum approval process, remove the e-Learning Addendum, and more fully integrate the review of online modalities into the regular process of curricular review.

The Online Teaching & Learning Task Force was convened to address the concerns that have been brought by faculty from across the university, with the hope that this resolution will serve to streamline the process while at the same time ensuring accountability and rigor in the offering of online education.

Modality Designations

One of the first targeted areas was to establish clear definitions related to modalities (i.e., methods of delivery) for online teaching and learning instruction. This is not to be confused with
modes of delivery, as Cal Poly officially has six recognized modes of delivery to include: lecture, lab, activity, discussion, seminar, and supervision.

With our standing as one of 23 universities in the California State University (CSU), and considering the CSU’s stated commitment to online education through the CSU Fully Online Course Match program, it is natural to look to others in the system and the CSU Academic Senate to aid in that goal of defining the associated modalities involved with online instruction. The CSU Academic Senate approved AS-3169-14/AA (Rev): Designation and Compilation of Course Modalities on May 16, 2014. Therefore, we adopt the following CSU course modality (i.e., methods of delivery) definitions with the additional caveat that updates to these definitions be adopted in step with the CSU Academic Senate:

A. **Face-to-Face Course, Traditional (FT)** - Instruction is conducted in real time, with student(s) and faculty present in the same location. May use a course management system or web pages to post the syllabus and assignments. Scheduled in-person face-to-face class sessions are not normally replaced with online activities. A course in which less than twenty-five percent (25%) may be taught in an online fashion.

B. **Face-to-Face Course, Online (FO)** - Instruction is conducted via the Internet. Some instruction occurs in real time, with student(s) and faculty in different physical locations. May use web-conferencing software to hold class meetings. A course in which 100% of the course activities take place online.

C. **Local Course, Online (LO)** - Instruction occurs over the Internet (asynchronously). Scheduled face-to-face meetings may be required for orientation, exams, and student evaluation. A course in which such in-person face-to-face meetings do not exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the course activities.

D. **Remote Course, Online (RO)** - Instruction is conducted over the Internet asynchronously, with students and instructors working at separate times and in different physical locations. A course in which 100% of the course activities take place online.

E. **Hybrid Course (HY)** - Instruction using a blend of traditional and online methods. Typically, these courses are a mixture of online and face-to-face sessions; such sessions
may or may not occur in real time. A course in which at least 25% of the course activities take place online, and which does not meet the definition of an FO, LO or RO course.

F. *Flexible Course (FL)* - Course allows for more than one modality; students choose the modality (or modalities) suiting their needs from instructor-identified options.

New course proposals/modifications shall specify the mode and modality, which establishes the expected contact hours or their equivalent (see “Credit Hour Policy” below).

**Credit Hours**

In compliance with federal and WSCUC requirements as well as CSU Coded Memo AA-2011-14, Cal Poly has a credit hour policy requiring the following:

1. One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit; or

2. At least an equivalent amount of work for other academic activities as established by the institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

In practice, this means that, for each unit of credit, a FT course in lecture/seminar mode must engage the student for one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week, for a total of 30 hours each quarter. For each unit of credit, a FT course in activity mode requires two hours of instruction and one hour of out-of-class work, while a FT course in laboratory mode requires three hours of instruction and no out-of-class work.

In courses with modalities that include online instruction (FO, LO, RO, HY, & FL), direct faculty instruction takes the place of classroom time, and a credit hour may be measured by an equivalent amount of direct instruction (e.g., text-based learning modules, asynchronous screencast lectures, lecture transcripts, recorded podcasts, assigned videos, faculty-mediated asynchronous or synchronous discussions, quizzes/exams, etc.). The equivalent for out-of-class work is very similar to that provided in the FT modality (e.g., assigned reading, homework
problems, non-faculty mediated discussion board posts, individual/group projects, papers, service-learning, etc.). Proposals for online courses should address these credit-hour requirements, assuring that the courses in their proposed modes and modalities will entail the equivalent hours of instruction or out-of-class work.

**Faculty Responsibility for Curricular and Quality Control**

Cal Poly faculty have the collective and exclusive responsibility for determining the pedagogies, instructional methods, and best practices most appropriate for their instructional modules, courses, and academic programs (pursuant to administrative assurance of resources).

At the department and program level, faculty with expertise in their respective disciplines are empowered to make decisions regarding the curriculum and present such decisions to the college and university levels for further review and approval. These decisions include those regarding the appropriate mode and modality for instruction.

For each of the listed modalities defined previously, a corresponding code will be developed in the Cal Poly online curriculum system in conjunction with the Registrar’s Office and with the intention that the modality be populated accordingly to inform students in advance of the modality being offered.

For approval of all new courses moving forward, these modalities will be integrated into the approval process with accompanying questions being required irrespective of the modality that is chosen.

In lieu of an eLearning Addendum (see Removal of eLearning Addendum below), the following standardized questions should be included under the current Course Delivery and Resources section in all new course proposals and course modifications (note that course learning objectives [CLOs] are required for all new course proposals, and course modifications will include a question addressing whether will continue to be an integral element included:

1. What is the primary modality in which the course is intended to be taught?
2. Indicate other modalities in which the course is intended to be taught.

*Note. All modalities that are defined above will be populated and defined here.*

*These questions will replace the current two questions that are nearly identical in wording but with options for In-Person, Hybrid, Online, and Other.*

To maintain accreditation standards and quality curricular control, please answer the following questions about direct instruction and out-of-class work (or its equivalent for online): *Note. Hours estimate should be on a weekly basis*

1. Hours of face-to-face instruction (*may include instruction through web-conferencing software such as Zoom, Skype, Microsoft Teams, or its equivalent*):

2. Briefly describe planned methods of direct instruction face-to-face (*e.g., lecture, discussion, small group problem-solving, videos, demonstrations, etc.*):

3. Hours of direct instruction online:

4. Briefly describe planned methods of direct instruction online (*e.g., text-based learning modules, asynchronous screencast lectures, lecture transcripts, recorded podcasts, assigned videos, faculty-mediated asynchronous or synchronous discussions, quizzes/exams, etc.*):

5. Hours of out-of-class work or its equivalent for online:

6. Briefly describe planned methods for engaging students in out-of-class work or its equivalent for online (*e.g., assigned reading, homework problems, non-faculty mediated discussion board posts, individual/group projects, papers, service-learning, etc.*):

In addition, course proposal and course modification forms should include the following for all modalities:

1. Include the course learning objectives (CLOs) and assessment methods designed to measure attainment of CLOs.

2. Please include a list of measures that will be employed to ensure academic integrity in the assessment of students’ attainment of the CLOs.
3. Indicate the names of faculty members who will initially teach the course, and if one (or more) of the online modalities (FO, RO, LO, HY, & FL) are being proposed, please briefly provide their prior online experience and/or training.

It should be noted that courses and their accompanying modes and modalities are approved at the university level, not the faculty who propose and/or teach the courses. Departments should carefully consider those who are assigned to teach any course but particularly those within the online modalities due to the specialized skills required.

Faculty who are assigned to teach and/or develop courses with online modalities (FO, RO, LO, HY, & FL) are strongly encouraged to either have prior online pedagogical experience and/or engage in appropriate training.

There are various offerings of online education training and certification, and opportunities for engagement change rapidly. Rather than endorse any one set of criteria or standard, we recommend that faculty consult with Cal Poly’s Center for Teaching, Learning & Technology (CTLT) and the California State University’s (CSU) Quality Assurance Program (including the associated “Core 24” objectives) for the latest in professional development related to online education (applies to both initial and ongoing development of online modalities).

Cal Poly’s Center for Teaching, Learning & Technology is currently located at:
https://ctlt.calpoly.edu/

California State University’s (CSU) Quality Assurance Program is currently located at:
http://courseredesign.csuprojects.org/wp/qualityassurance/

**Removal of eLearning Addendum**

Previously, course modifications that involved a change in the modality beyond the 51% threshold of contact time (i.e., face-to-face) required an additional eLearning Addendum. That is no longer the requirement per this resolution. However, it should still be noted that any change in the modality (defined previously above) of an existing course from the modalities listed in the original course proposal must involve a course modification.
Accessibility

For all courses, irrespective of modality, course materials must be accessible and comply with state and federal laws and guidelines. Instructors offering courses in online modalities are required to make sure all course materials are accessible. This includes (but is not limited to) using videos with closed captions, documents created with accessibility features such as Word Styles and PDF tags, and accessible Canvas content.

Additionally, instructors are encouraged to utilize SensusAccess, a free software tool available to Cal Poly students, staff and instructors, that can provide alternative formats of electronic materials, such as converting a PDF file to MP3 format. Cal Poly will soon be integrating Blackboard ALLY into the Canvas LMS. ALLY will identify inaccessible course content within the LMS and provide guidance to fix issues. ALLY provides alternative formats of course materials, similar to SensusAccess, and includes translations to other languages as well.

As technology and standards evolve, instructors utilizing technology-mediated instruction in any capacity are highly encouraged to maintain currency in accessibility standards and utilize the appropriate means/methods to ensure equitable access for all students.

For more information, see the California State University Board of Trustees Policy on Disability Support and Accommodations; Executive Order (EO) 1111 that is currently located at: https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/6590867/latest/

University Resource Responsibilities

Information Technology Services (ITS), Robert E. Kennedy Library, CTLT, and other university agencies may be called upon to provide necessary resources and services for the successful implementation of online education courses and programs.

These resources and services include:

1. **Student Training.** Where applicable, the University will provide training in online education technology and use to students through web-based resources and virtual instruction.
2. **Faculty Training.** Where applicable, the University will provide training in the use of online education technologies and pedagogy to faculty through face-to-face workshops (if feasible), web-based resources, and virtual instruction.

3. **Technical Support.** Where applicable, the University will provide help desk services, account maintenance, software and hardware assistance, etc., as needed to support online education courses and programs.

4. **Testing Services.** Where applicable, the University will provide access to appropriate test proctoring services either via a physical location and/or virtual means aligned with best practices as defined by the California State University’s (CSU) Quality Assurance Program. These testing services should include adequate safeguards designed to aid faculty in ensuring academic integrity for online education courses and programs.

5. **Information and Facility Services.** The University will provide adequate access to library resources, laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to online education courses and programs.

6. **Student Services.** The University will provide adequate access to the range of student services appropriate to support online education courses and programs, including admissions, financial aid, academic advising, and placement and counseling.

7. **Student Evaluations.** The University should collaborate with faculty to develop and deploy student evaluation tools for online education courses that are consistent with the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

**Assessment of Online Education Courses and Programs**

Criteria for assessing the quality and efficacy of online education-based instruction shall be developed by the academic units from which the instruction originates. Online education courses, sections, and programs shall be held to the same standards as traditional classroom instruction when reviewed by department, college, and university program review committees.
Program review committees shall evaluate the educational effectiveness of online education courses (including assessments of student-based learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction), and when appropriate, determine comparability to courses taught only in a face-to-face traditional classroom modality. This process shall also be used to assure the conformity of online education courses and programs to prevailing online education quality standards, and as standards evolve, the appropriate standards for quality online teaching and learning should be utilized for assessment. Ultimately, online education courses and programs shall be consistent with the educational missions and strategic plans of the department, college, and university.

**Contracting and the Use of Outside Resources**

The University shall not agree in a contract with any private or public entity to deliver or receive online education courses or programs for academic credit without the prior approval of the relevant department and college. In addition, all such contracts must be in compliance with the relevant University policies and guidelines. The impetus for such a contract shall originate with the Cal Poly faculty, who would decide whether there is an instructional need and how best to fill it. As part of its review of online education-based courses within the scope of this policy document, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee in conjunction with ITS shall determine the suitability of hosting course materials on non-university facilities.

**Intellectual Property Rights**

Faculty with questions about intellectual property rights related to online modalities should consult the latest Intellectual Property Policy at Cal Poly that is currently located at: https://research.calpoly.edu/policyIP
Admissions

Admissions criteria for online education-based courses shall be the same as for traditional face-to-face courses. Agencies providing funding for online education courses or programs shall not acquire any privileges regarding the admission standards, academic continuation standards, or degree requirements for students or faculty.

Course Descriptions and Advertising Guidelines

Faculty and students have a right to know the modalities and technological requirements of each course, program, and degree offered by the University. This information will be communicated to students in all relevant communications. Publicized descriptions of online education courses shall note the modality according to the definitions listed above.

Impact on Faculty Personnel Decisions

Faculty personnel decisions (hiring, retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review) should value and reward course and curriculum development and professional development activities that result in improved instruction. However, no ranking of instructional methodologies or modalities is to be used as a basis for personnel decisions. The role and value of online education should be made explicit in the personnel policies of departments and colleges.

Online Education Course and Program Funding

Funding sources for the development of online education courses and programs shall be explicitly stated in all online education-based course and program proposals. Funding sources may include any combination of grants, self-support, private contributions, and state support. The originating department shall develop the funding source proposal through traditional means and shall make a recommendation to the Academic Senate as to the suitability and viability of the proposed funding source. If applicable, such proposals shall include funding for the services of an instructional designer.
Use of Online Education Technologies is Optional

Nothing in this policy shall imply that online education is a preferred or required method of instruction. Implementation of this policy must comply with existing campus policies and collective bargaining agreements where applicable (e.g., workload and faculty rights). It should also be explicitly noted that faculty may not be required to teach more students in an online modality than they would be assigned to teach in a face-to-face modality.

Furthermore, this policy is only applicable to new courses and course modifications with a modality change and is not meant to restrict or rigidly control the general use of online education technology in the classroom.

Applicability of this Policy

This policy shall apply to all new and existing credit-bearing courses and programs offered by Cal Poly.
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. ¹

1 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

2 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

3 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

4 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

5 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

6 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 28, 2020

---

1 (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies 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.

### Summary of Subchapter 8.4.5 Student Evaluation Results

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.

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.

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
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
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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.
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 the university to sustain continuous 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

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
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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 university will provide training and support for faculty moving teaching materials into the LMS.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: April 28, 2020
Summary
The purpose of this resolution is to ensure that the university can collect data on the overall accessibility of course materials at Cal Poly. Achieving a universally high level of accessibility is a worthy long-term goal, but one that cannot be achieved with a single resolution. This resolution is only a small step towards that goal. However, it will accomplish two things, one of which requires immediate action. First, it will facilitate measurement of our progress. Second, by demonstrating our commitment to accessibility, it may shield the university from legal action as detailed below.

Background
Many of our students have disabilities; course materials can be designed in such a way that they don’t put unnecessary barriers between those students and their learning. Two examples may be helpful.
- A properly designed table can be parsed by a screenreader for student who is blind.
- Captions can make videos accessible for a student who is deaf.
Providing equitable access to learning is consistent with Cal Poly’s shared values. It is also required by law and by the policy of the California State University system.

Law
The most relevant laws are Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Universities that aren’t complying with these laws have been targeted for lawsuits by student plaintiffs. A sampling of these cases can be found here.

CSU Policy
The CSU Chancellor issued Executive Orders 926 (2005) and 1111 (2018), which established CSU policy for compliance with disability law. The Accessible Technology Initiative has more detailed information about implementation at the CSU system level. The Cal Poly ATI website has information specific to our campus.

Canvas Ally Tool
The Ally tool within the Canvas LMS will allow instructors to gauge the accessibility of the items that they have posted on their courses. It will also allow the university to see the overall level of accessibility of course materials posted at Cal Poly. Collecting this data will allow the university to gauge the effectiveness of its efforts to improve the overall accessibility of posted course materials at Cal Poly. However, this data will be meaningful only if most faculty post their course materials on the LMS.

Faculty Workload
Converting all of one’s teaching materials from inaccessible to accessible could be for many faculty members an arduous task, a task that should not fall to individual faculty members as an unfunded mandate. This resolution does ask that of them. Instead, it is a request to post materials on the LMS, with aid supplied by the university, so that the Cal Poly can measure progress towards accessibility of the university as whole.