



## Meeting of the Academic Senate

Tuesday, April 18, 2017

UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00 pm

- I. **Minutes:** Approval of March 7 and March 14, 2017 minutes: (pp. 2-5).
- II. **Communication(s) and Announcement(s):** none.
- III. **Reports:**
  - A. Academic Senate Chair:
  - B. President's Office:
  - C. Provost:
  - D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
  - E. Statewide Senate:
  - F. CFA:
  - G. ASI:
- IV. **Special Report:**

[TIME CERTAIN 4:00] Update on Graduation Initiative by Cem Sunata, Registrar and Beth Merritt Miller, Assistant, Vice Provost for University Advising.
- V. **Consent Agenda:**
  - A. Courses to list on SUSCAT: (pp. 6-8).
  - B. 2017-2019 Catalog: College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences
    - Proposal submitted by the Food Science and Nutrition department for MS Agriculture, specialization in Food Science and Nutrition, changing its name to MS Agriculture, specialization in Food Science
    - Proposals submitted by the Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences department.
- VI. **Business Item(s):**
  - A. **Resolution on Proposing New Courses or Other Changes to Curricula:** Glen Thorncroft, Senator, first reading (pp. 9-10).
  - B. **Resolution on Aligning USCP Criteria to Diversity Learning Objectives with Oversight by GE Governance Board:** Bruno Giberti, Academic Programs and Planning and Denise Isom, Interim Associate Director of the Office of Diversity and Inclusivity, first reading (pp. 11-13).
  - C. [TIME CERTAIN 4:10] **Resolution on Proposed Faculty Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedures:** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, first reading (pp. 14-27).
  - D. **Resolution on Electronic WPAF and Workflow in Faculty Evaluation:** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, first reading (pp. 28-29).
  - E. **Resolution on Rescinding Resolution AS-603-03/IC,CC,GEC [Resolution on Credit/No Credit Grading (CR/NC)]:** Phil Nico, Senator, first reading (pp. 30-33).
  - F. **Resolution to Modify the Bylaws of the Academic Senate:** Gary Laver, Academic Senate Chair, first reading (pp. 34-35).
  - G. **Resolution on Retiring Obsolete Academic Senate Resolutions:** Gary Laver, Academic Senate Chair, first reading (pp. 36-37).
- VII. **Discussion Item(s):**
- VIII. **Adjournment:**

**CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**San Luis Obispo, California 93407**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING**  
**TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2017**  
**UU220, 3:10 TO 5:00 PM**

- I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the February 14, 2017 Academic Senate meeting minutes.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): None.
- III. Reports:
  - A. **Academic Senate Chair:** None.
  - B. **President's Office:** Rachel Fernflores, Senator, provided a report on behalf of Jessica Darin, President's Chief of Staff. Fernflores reported that a ribbon cutting ceremony was held for the Central Coast Cyber Forensics Lab at Camp San Luis Obispo. She announced the hiring of Josephine De Leon as the new Vice President and Chief Officer for the Office of Diversity and Inclusivity to start July 10, 2017. The President's Office is currently engaged with other areas around campus to establish a third-party exit interview process. Lastly, the President's Office is developing their Strategic Plan to include more specific goals.
  - C. **Provost:** Kathleen Enz Finken, Provost, announced the rehiring of Scott Dawson to serve as Dean for the Orfalea College of Business to start June 1, 2017. Enz Finken also announced the appointment of Jim Meagher as Interim Dean to the College of Engineering. She reported that the Writing Center on campus is being moved under Academic Programs and Planning's Office and will report to Mary Pedersen, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Planning.
  - D. **Student Affairs:** Keith Humphrey, Vice President of Student Affairs, addressed the relocation of Fremont Hall students reporting that all 274 students have been moved. He commended student Mark Borges, Fremont Hall Community Council President, for his efforts in maintaining community climate among Fremont residents. Humphrey also announced that Cal Poly's Student Affairs was named a 2017 Most Promising Place to Work in Student Affairs by *Diverse Magazine*.
  - E. **Statewide Senate:** Manzar Foroohar, Statewide Senator, announced the Chancellor's approval of \$2,500,000 for Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA), of which, Cal Poly will receive slightly more than \$139,000. Faculty may apply for these funds once the money is allocated.
  - F. **CFA:** None.
  - G. **ASI:** None.
- IV. Special Reports:
  - A. **Substance Use and Abuse Advisory Committee Update:** Genie Kim, Director of Wellbeing and Health Education, and Kathleen McMahon, Dean of Students, provided an update from the Substance Use and Abuse Advisory Committee. Data was analyzed from the online alcohol and drug education program – AlcoholEdu,

Cal Poly's residential life, and the National College Health Assessment II. They also discussed a partnership with the Job Foundation's Campus Matters Program. The report can be found at <http://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/SUAAC.pdf>

- B. **Annual Program Review Update:** Bruno Giberti, Faculty Associate for Academic Programs and Planning, gave a presentation on Program Review. The report can be found at [http://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/Program\\_Review\\_Report\\_03.07.17.pdf](http://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/Program_Review_Report_03.07.17.pdf)

V. Business Items:

- A. **Election of Officers for 2017-2018:** Dustin Stegner, English Department, was elected by acclamation as the 2017-2018 Academic Senate Chair and Kris Jankovitz, Kinesiology Department, was elected by acclamation as the 2017-2018 Academic Senate Vice-Chair.
- B. **Resolution on Academic Standards for Masters Degree:** Richard Savage, Dean of Graduate Education, presented on a resolution proposing that the number of units designed for graduate study be raised from 50% to 60% of the units required for the degree. The resolution will return as a second reading.
- C. **Resolution on Request for Outside Review:** Paul Choboter, Senator, presented a resolution requesting that the Cal Poly administration develop a protocol for conducting exit interviews. The resolution also requests that the results from these reviews be shared with the Academic Senate and unions representing staff, and that recruitment and retention strategies be developed in response to the reviews. The resolution will return as a second reading.

VI. Discussion Item(s): None.

VII. Adjournment: 5:03 p.m.

Submitted by,

*Mark Borges*

Mark Borges

Academic Senate Student Assistant

**CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**San Luis Obispo, California 93407**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING**  
**TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2017**  
**UU220, 3:10 TO 5:00 PM**

- I. Minutes: None.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): None.
- III. Reports:
- A. **Academic Senate Chair:** Gary Laver, Academic Senate Chair, announced the passing away of past Cal Poly Vice President of Academic Affairs, David Conn.
  - B. **President's Office:** None.
  - C. **Provost:** None.
  - D. **Student Affairs:** None.
  - E. **Statewide Senate:** None.
  - F. **CFA:** None.
  - G. **ASI:** None.
- IV. Special Reports:
- A. **Electronic WPAF and Workflow in Faculty Evaluation:** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, and Al Liddicoat, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, reported that Cal Poly has been investigating for a new electronic workflow software for the RPT process. The presentation can be found at: [http://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/Interfolio\\_AS\\_Presentation.pdf](http://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/Interfolio_AS_Presentation.pdf)
  - B. **Optimizing IT:** Bill Britton, Interim CIO/Cybersecurity Center Director, provided an update of IT's current agenda of work. He reported that Cal Poly will be moving toward a cloud-based structure for data storage and the Data Center will be receiving infrastructure updates.
- V. **Consent Agenda:**
- A. The following items were approved by consent:
    - ANT 345 Human Behavioral Ecology, COMS 316 Intercultural Communication, COMS 386 Communication, Media, and Politics, KINE 250 Health Living, PHIL 231 Philosophical Classics: Ethics and Political Philosophy, PSY 201 General Psychology, and TH 210 Introduction to Theatre
  - B. The following proposals were approved by consent:
    - Proposal for BS Dairy Science, Proposals for AERO 464 and AERO 526, and Proposals for KINE 298, KINE 434, and KINE 453
- VI. Business Items:
- A. **Resolution on Academic Standards for Masters Degree:** M/S/P to move the resolution to second reading. Richard Savage, Dean of Graduate Education, presented on a resolution proposing that the number of units designed for graduate study be raised from 50% to 60% of the units required for the degree. M/S/P to approve the resolution.



- B. **Resolution to Establish Exit Interview Protocol and a Request for Outside Review:** M/S/P to move the resolution to second reading. Paul Choboter, Senator, presented a resolution requesting that the Cal Poly administration develop a protocol for conducting exit interviews. The resolution also requests that the results from these reviews be shared with the Academic Senate and unions representing staff, and that recruitment and retention strategies be developed in response to the reviews. The resolution's name changed to "Resolution to Establish Exit Interview Protocol and a Request for Outside Review." M/S/P to approve the resolution.
- C. **Resolution on In-Residence Requirement for Last 40 Units:** M/S/P to move the resolution to second reading. Gary Laver, Academic Senate Chair, reported on a resolution that would raise the cap for off-campus transfer credit from 10 to 12 units of the last 40 units to correspond to a set of three 4-unit courses. M/S/P to approve the resolution.
- D. **Resolution on Proposed Faculty Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedures:** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, presented a resolution that would establish a Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedure for review of the University Faculty Personnel Actions document (UFPA). This resolution will return as a first reading.

VII. Discussion Item(s): None.

VIII. Adjournment: 5:01 p.m.

Submitted by,

*Mark Borges*

Mark Borges  
Academic Senate Student Assistant

## SUSCAT Course Summary for Academic Senate Consent Agenda

Note: The *Resolution on Approving Assessment Process for Courses Meeting Sustainability Learning Objectives (AS-792-15)* directs the Academic Senate Sustainability Committee (ASSC) to identify which courses to list on the Cal Poly Sustainability Catalog (SUSCAT) following the approved assessment process. The resolution also directs the ASSC to place SUSCAT course recommendations on the Academic Senate's Consent agenda. The first assessment phase during 2015 covered General Education courses (GE courses), and those GE courses now appear on <http://suscat.calpoly.edu/catalog/courses/>. The second assessment phase during 2015-2016 covered non-GE courses from CENG, CLA, COB, and COSAM. The third assessment phase during 2016 covered non-GE courses from CAED. This memo lists only additional sustainability courses recommended for SUSCAT through February 2017. It also lists courses reviewed through February 2017 that include sustainability but do not yet meet the Academic Senate assessment criteria.

Date: March 1, 2017

### Winter 2017 Review – Sustainability Courses

COURSES TO LIST ON SUSCAT		
Course Number	Title	GE Area
CAFES		
ERSC 325	Climate and Humanity	
ERSC 333	Human Impact on the Earth	
NR 141	Introduction to Forest Ecosystem Management	
NR 142	Environmental Management	
NR 311	Environmental Measurements and Interpretation	
NR 326	Natural Resources Economics and Valuation	
NR 365	Silviculture and Vegetation Management	
NR 465	Ecosystem Management	
RPTA 313	Sustainability in Recreation, Parks, and Tourism	
RPTA 314	Sustainable Travel and Tourism Planning	

### Winter 2017 Review – Courses that Include Sustainability

COURSES ON DECK FOR SUSCAT		
Course Number	Title	GE Area
CAED		
ARCH 101	Survey of Architectural Education and Practice	
ARCH 242	Architectural Practice 2.2	
ARCH 351	Architectural Design 3.1	
ARCH 241	Architectural Practice 2.1	
ARCH 252	Architectural Design 2.2	
ARCE 106	Introduction to Building Systems	
ARCH 251	Architectural Design 2.1	

ARCH 352	Architectural Design 3.2	
ARCH 353	Architectural Design 3.3	
CRP 212	Introduction to Urban Planning	
CRP 342	Environmental Planning Methods	
CRP 404	Environmental Law	
CRP 410	Community Planning Laboratory I	
CRP 411	Community Planning Lab II	
CRP 442	Housing and Planning	
CRP 458	Local Hazard Mitigation Planning and Design	
CRP 518	Policy Development	
EDES 123	Principles of Environmental Design	
LA 330	Cultural Landscapes: People, Places and Ethical Decisions	
CAFES		
ASCI 112	Principles of Animal Science	
FSN 250	Food and Nutrition: Customs and Culture	
NR 306	Natural Resource Ecology and Habitat Management	
NR 416	Environmental Impact Analysis and Management	
NR 425	Applied Resource Analysis and Assessment	
NR 312	Technology of Wildland Fire Management	
RPTA 302	Environmental and Wilderness Education	
CENG		
CE 321	Fundamentals of Transportation Engineering	
CE 336	Water Resources Engineering	
ENVE 450	Industrial Pollution Prevention	
ENVE 467	Senior Project Design Laboratory II	
MATE 110	Introduction to Materials Engineering Design I	
MATE 130	Introduction to Materials Engineering Design III	
ME 428	Senior Design Project I	
ME 450	Solar Thermal Power Systems	
BMED 213	Bioengineering Fundamentals	
CE 424	Public Transportation	
EE 413	Advanced Electronic Design	
ENVE 325	Air Quality Engineering	
ENVE 331	Introduction to Environmental Engineering	
ENVE 436	Introduction to Solid and Hazardous Waste Management	
MATE 120	Introduction to Materials Engineering Design II	
ME 415	Energy Conversion	
SIE 510	Introduction to Systems	
CE 523	Transportation Systems Planning	
MATE 359	Living in a Material World	
EE 520	Solar-Photovoltaic Systems Design	
CLA		
GEOG 250	Physical Geography	
GEOG 414	Global and Regional Climatology	
PHIL 420	Philosophy of Biology	

ANT 345	Human Behavioral Ecology	
HIST 359	Living in a Material World	
HIST 438	History of American Agriculture	
ANT 402	Nutritional Anthropology	
COMS 395	Science Communication	
GEOG 150	Introduction to Cultural Geography	
PSY 360	Applied Social Psychology	
COB		
IT 341	Packaging Polymers and Processing	

### Winter 2017 Review

COURSES TO REMOVE FROM SUSCAT		
Course Number	Title	GE Area

Cal Poly submitted its STARS certification application to AASHE during February 2017. The application identified sustainability courses according to the STARS criteria for sustainability courses and courses that include sustainability.[1] AASHE/STARS describes the sustainability courses as “courses for which the primary and explicit focus is on sustainability and/or understanding or solving one or more major sustainability challenge.” Cal Poly interpreted this description as applying to those courses listed in Cal Poly’s Sustainability Catalog (SUSCAT).[2] Cal Poly identified courses for SUSCAT following the assessment procedure approved by the Academic Senate.[3] Summarized briefly, the procedure scores each course according to a rubric. Courses scoring 6-12 points on the rubric that also devote at least 20% of the course to sustainability get recommended as SUSCAT sustainability courses. The new courses proposed for listing appear in the first table above titled “Winter 2017 Review – Sustainability Courses.”

AASHE/STARS also recognizes courses that include sustainability. This category covers “courses that are focused on a topic other than sustainability, but incorporate a unit or module on sustainability or a sustainability challenge, include one or more sustainability-focused activities, or integrate sustainability issues throughout the course.”[1] While reviewing courses for SUSCAT, it became clear that Cal Poly offers courses that don’t teach sustainability learning objectives sufficiently to appear as a SUSCAT sustainability course, but do teach elements of sustainability appropriate for the AASHE/STARS category covering courses that include sustainability. Those courses appear in the second table above titled “Winter 2017 Review – Courses that Include Sustainability.” The ASSC plans to post this list online at a new URL titled “Other Courses that Include Sustainability” and located under <http://suscat.calpoly.edu/>.

[1] [http://www.aashe.org/files/documents/STARS/2.0/STARS\\_2.1\\_credit\\_AC01\\_Academic\\_Courses.pdf](http://www.aashe.org/files/documents/STARS/2.0/STARS_2.1_credit_AC01_Academic_Courses.pdf)

[2] <http://suscat.calpoly.edu/catalog/courses/>

[3] *Resolution on Approving Assessment Process for Courses Meeting Sustainability Learning Objectives (AS-792-15)*, May 21, 2015, [http://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/Resolutions/2014-2015/AS-792-15\\_rev.pdf](http://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/Resolutions/2014-2015/AS-792-15_rev.pdf)

Adopted:

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

AS-\_\_-17

RESOLUTION ON PROPOSING NEW COURSES OR OTHER  
CHANGES TO CURRICULA

- 1 WHEREAS, The development of curriculum and instruction is the responsibility of the faculty, a
- 2 fundamental principle supported by AAUP (*Statement on Government of Colleges and*
- 3 *Universities*)<sup>1</sup> and the Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU) (*Collegiality in the*
- 4 *California State University System*, 1985)<sup>2</sup> to name a few; and
- 5
- 6 WHEREAS, At times it has been necessary to reassert this principle, for example by the ASCSU
- 7 (*Reasserting Faculty Control of Curricula Regardless of Delivery Mode*, AS-3081-
- 8 12/FA/AA)<sup>3</sup>, and by the Cal Poly Academic Senate (*Resolution on Shared*
- 9 *Governance*, AS-748-12)<sup>4</sup>; and
- 10
- 11 WHEREAS, Current campus procedures establish the workflow for proposing new curricula: the
- 12 Office of the Registrar states that "Proposals for new courses are developed by faculty
- 13 and submitted for approval through the Curriculum Management system,"
- 14 (<http://registrar.calpoly.edu/course-policies-guidelines#Propose%20a%20New%20>),
- 15 and Academic Senate Bylaws (VIII.I.2b) state that "[t]he Curriculum Committee
- 16 evaluates curriculum proposals from departments and colleges;" and
- 17
- 18 WHEREAS, On this campus, the policy that only faculty may propose new courses or other changes
- 19 to existing curricula has been articulated for some time, but it does not appear in
- 20 Senate documentation; therefore be it
- 21
- 22 RESOLVED: That the faculty reassert and reaffirm that the development of curriculum and
- 23 instruction are the purview of the faculty; and be it further
- 24
- 25 RESOLVED: That only current faculty may propose new courses or other changes to curricula, and
- 26 that they do so through the curriculum committee of the appropriate academic
- 27 department or associated college.

Proposed by: Glen Thorncroft, Senator, CENG  
Paul Rinzler, Senator, CLA  
Lauren Garner, Senator, CAFES

Date: December 5, 2016

Footnotes:

<sup>1</sup> "When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction." *AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*

<sup>2</sup> "Because the university's curriculum is of central concern to the faculty and because faculty have the primary responsibility in curricular decisions, it follows that faculty should have the major voice in academic policy decisions which closely affect the curriculum, access to the curriculum, or the quality of the curriculum." *Collegiality in the California State University System, Academic Senate of the CSU (1985)*

<sup>3</sup> "RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reassert that the quality of the curriculum for academic credit, including technology-mediated courses and online courses, remain the purview of the faculty individually and collectively..." *Reasserting Faculty Control of Curricula Regardless of Delivery Mode, CSU Academic Senate, AS-3081-12/FA/AA*

<sup>4</sup> "RESOLVED: That the faculty affirm its primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and student educational processes..." *Resolution on Shared Governance, Cal Poly Academic Senate Resolution AS-748-12*



Adopted:

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

**AS-\_\_-17**

**RESOLUTION ON ALIGNING USCP CRITERIA TO DIVERSITY LEARNING OBJECTIVES  
WITH OVERSIGHT BY GE GOVERNANCE BOARD**

**Background Statement**

AS-395-92 Resolution Relating to a Cultural Pluralism Requirement determined that, beginning with the 1994-96 catalog, Cal Poly undergraduates must fulfill a cultural pluralism baccalaureate requirement consisting of a single course satisfying defined criteria.

In a related action, AS-396-92/CC Resolution on the Formation of a Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee established a subcommittee for the initial review of USCP courses. This subcommittee consisted of seven voting members representing the colleges and professional staff, as well three ex officio members representing Ethnic Studies, the Curriculum Committee, and what was then called the General Education and Breadth Committee. AS-433-95/CC added ex officio members representing ASI and Women's Studies.

AS-651-06 Resolution on Cal Poly Learning Objectives established the University Learning Objectives as a broadly shared set of performance expectations for all students who complete an undergraduate or graduate program at Cal Poly.

AS-663-08 Resolution on Diversity Learning Objectives established the four DLOs as an addendum to the ULOs. ULO 6 states that all Cal Poly graduates should be able to "make reasoned decisions based on an understanding of ethics, a respect for diversity, and an awareness of issues related to sustainability."

AS-671-08 Resolution on Changes to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate changed the membership of the USCP Subcommittee to consist of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee chair, as well as the chairs of Ethnic Studies and Women's Studies. This was intended to simplify the formation of the subcommittee and expedite its business.

AS-676-09 Resolution on United States Cultural Pluralism Requirement revised the USCP criteria to make them simpler, broader, and more reflective of more recent statements: the DLOs and the Cal Poly Statement on Diversity.

The ULO project on Diversity Learning was conducted from 2008 to 2011. The project involved the design and analysis of separate surveys for the first three of the four DLOs, the use of focus groups to assess the fourth, and an analysis of the influence of service learning and the USCP requirement on diversity learning. Each of the three surveys provided evidence of value added, with seniors and juniors scoring higher than freshmen, but neither service learning nor satisfaction of the USCP requirement were found to have had substantial influence on students' diversity learning, at least as defined by the DLOs. In 2012, Cal Poly described these results in its WASC Education Effectiveness Review Report, which made the following recommendation: "Align the USCP requirement with the DLOs and review USCP courses to see whether they address the DLOs."

- 1 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate determined that, beginning with the 1994-96 catalog, Cal Poly  
2 undergraduates must fulfill a US cultural pluralism (USCP) requirement consisting  
3 of a single course satisfying defined criteria (1992); and  
4
- 5 WHEREAS, The revised criteria (2009) do not fully align with the Diversity Learning Objectives  
6 (2008); and  
7
- 8 WHEREAS, The ULO Project on Diversity Learning (2008-2011) found that satisfaction of the  
9 USCP requirement did not have a substantial influence on students' diversity  
10 learning as defined by the DLOs; and  
11
- 12 WHEREAS, The DLOs have not been revised since their passage in 2008, and were written as an  
13 extension to the University Learning Objectives; and  
14
- 15 WHEREAS, ~~83~~72% of USCP-designated courses in the Cal Poly catalog are also GE-designated  
16 courses; and  
17
- 18 WHEREAS, In AY 2015-16, 2383 students took a course that satisfied the USCP and a GE  
19 requirement, which was equivalent to 91% of the total number of students taking a  
20 USCP courses; therefore be it  
21
- 22 RESOLVED: That the USCP and DLO policies be revised as shown ~~to incorporate the DLOs, as~~  
23 ~~shown~~ in the attachment, and be it further  
24
- 25 RESOLVED: That the revised policy will become effective immediately for all existing USCP  
26 courses, newly proposed courses and course revisions, and be it further  
27
- 28 RESOLVED: That existing USCP courses retain their designation and be subject to future review  
29 in accordance with the revised criteria, and be it further  
30
- 31 RESOLVED: That the USCP Subcommittee be renamed the USCP Review Committee, comprising  
32 the Chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, the Chair of Ethnic Studies,  
33 the Chair of the General Education Governance Board (GEGB), the Chair of Women's  
34 & Gender Studies, the Vice President and Chief Officer for Diversity and Inclusion,  
35 and the CTLT Inclusive Excellence Specialists, or their designees, and be it further  
36
- 37 RESOLVED: That the oversight of USCP courses, including the review of new course proposals  
38 and modifications, be added to the responsibilities of the GEGB, and be it further  
39
- 40 RESOLVED: That the USCP Review Committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the GEGB,  
41 which will decide on new USCP course proposals and modifications, and be it  
42 further  
43
- 44 RESOLVED: That the USCP Review Committee will work with the GEGB ~~curriculum~~ to design and  
45 implement a plan for the curricular review of all existing courses with a USCP  
46 designation.

Proposed by: USCP Task Force  
Date: January 26, 2017  
Revised: February 16, 2017

## USCP Criteria

United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) courses must focus on all of the following:

1. One or more diverse groups, as defined in the Cal Poly Statement on Diversity, whose contributions to contemporary American society have been impeded by ~~cultural~~ conflict or restricted opportunities
2. Contemporary social issues resulting from ~~cultural~~ conflict or restricted opportunities, including, but not limited to, problems associated with discrimination based on age, ethnicity, gender, nationality, abilities, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, or race
3. Critical thinking skills used by students to approach these contemporary social issues, examine their own attitudes, and consider the diverse perspectives of others
4. The contributions of people from diverse groups to contemporary American society

**In addition to satisfying these criteria, USCP courses must also address the Diversity Learning Objectives.**

## Diversity Learning Objectives

All Cal Poly graduates should be able to:

1. Demonstrate understanding of relationships between diversity, inequality, and social, economic, and political power both in the United States and globally
2. Demonstrate **understanding** ~~knowledge~~ of contributions made by individuals from diverse and/or underrepresented groups to our local, national, and global communities
3. **Critically examine their own attitudes about diverse and/or underrepresented groups**
4. Consider perspectives of diverse groups to inform **reasonable** decisions
5. Function as members of society and as professionals with people who have ideas, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors that are different from their own

Adopted:

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

**AS-\_\_\_-17**

**RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICY CONSENT  
AGENDA PROCEDURES**

- 1 WHEREAS, The University Faculty Personnel Actions document (UFPA) needs revision; and  
2  
3 WHEREAS, Revisions to the UFPA into a new university level faculty personnel policies and  
4 procedures document include mere formalities of restating already established  
5 policies and procedures from various sources beyond the Senate (e.g. changes to  
6 the Collective Bargaining Agreement, administrative memos); and  
7  
8 WHEREAS, Many revisions amount to reformatting, consolidating, reorganizing, and restating  
9 existing policies and procedures; and  
10  
11 WHEREAS, Some revisions involve the Senate enacting changes to university policies by  
12 means of resolutions; and  
13  
14 WHEREAS, Presenting to the Senate a single new university level faculty personnel policies  
15 and procedures document with all the sorts of changes noted above may prevent  
16 the Senate from giving each significant change in policy and procedure its due  
17 consideration; and  
18  
19 WHEREAS, Presenting to the Senate the change to university level faculty personnel policies  
20 and procedures in many pieces would clog the Senate agenda with a barrage of  
21 resolutions; and  
22  
23 WHEREAS, The attached Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedures would allow the  
24 Senate to formulate its own informed decisions about which revisions to  
25 university level faculty personnel policies and procedures should be passed as  
26 mere formalities and which merit presentation and debate on the Senate floor; and  
27  
28 WHEREAS, Cal Poly would benefit in perpetuity by adopting a more flexible procedure for  
29 securing Senate approval of changes to university level faculty personnel policies  
30 and procedures; therefore be it  
31  
32 **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate approve the attached Personnel Policy Consent Agenda  
33 Procedures, and be it further

34 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee use this procedure to  
35 present to the Senate revisions to university level faculty personnel policies and  
36 procedures in topically discrete pieces suited to focused discussion and debate.

Proposed by: Faculty Affairs Committee  
Date: January 5, 2017  
Revised: April 12, 2017

Background on proposed  
**Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedure**  
Faculty Affairs Committee  
Winter 2017  
Revised April 11, 2017

In Fall 2013 the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate charged the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to update the University Faculty Personnel Actions document (UFPA). In commencing with the work on this charge, members of FAC reviewed the following:

- Current university level personnel policies contained in UFPA,
- Proposed revisions to UFPA,
- All current college personnel policies and procedures documents,
- Proposed changes to some college personnel policies and procedures documents.

The goals for this project included consideration of practices in the colleges to determine which offered models of best practices to include in statements of university level policies and procedures. In formulating university level policies FAC sought to provide direction for the colleges to specify in more detail their criteria and procedures. Such changes would improve the utility of university and college level personnel policy and procedure statements as guide for faculty as they undergo review or participate in the review of their colleagues.

Initially, completion of this project was set to consist of a completed revision of the UFPA which would then be presented to the Senate for feedback and approval. Of course, such a change to university level policies and procedures needs much more than Senate approval. Prior to sending this package of changes to the Senate the proposed changes would be presented to college councils and the deans council so the Provost, Deans, and Program Chairs/Heads could provide their feedback as well. Suffice it to say that this would be a large project to tackle in one shot.

There are other significant downsides to proposing revisions to the entire UFPA for a single act of approval. Proposing potentially very many changes in one document may obscure particular changes of policy and procedure which merit direct and focused consideration by the Senate and college leadership. Also, policy documents at the university level are subject to a variety of occasions for revision, some of which are entirely beyond the scope of local faculty approval (e.g. changes to the collective bargaining agreement, directives from the Chancellor). Breaking the changes to the UFPA into bite-sized chunks allows each to receive its due consideration, but then clogs the pipeline of the Senate agenda with a swarm of resolutions, some of which would be mere formalities.

FAC wishes to be responsive to these issues while ensuring that the Academic Senate remains properly informed and able to offer due consideration in its approval of changes to faculty personnel policies. We therefore propose a consent agenda procedure as effective, appropriate, and efficient for bringing to the Senate changes to personnel policies.



The proposed consent agenda procedure appropriates existing procedures already familiar to senators. The timeline for informing the Senate of a consent agenda item, for senators to consider and pose questions to the FAC chair, and for pulling items from the consent agenda are essentially the same as for items on the curriculum consent agenda. When a senator pulls an item from the consent agenda, it becomes a standard discussion or business item, and in the latter case as a resolution endorsing a report at the stage of first reading. From there normal Senate procedures apply concerning deliberation and voting the change up or down.

This consent agenda procedure would allow senators to decide for themselves what counts as significant enough of a change to merit subjection to normal Senate deliberative processes while allowing the high threshold of unanimous informed consent to pass items thereby considered to be minor enough not to merit occupying time at a Senate meeting. The proposed consent agenda procedure includes the requirement that FAC provide the senators with significant detail about proposed changes so their consent would be properly informed and their retraction of consent may focus subsequent discussion on the key provisions of the change. The proposed requirements for engendering informed consent also provide a clear and logical assemblage of the documents that established the policy or which are being subject to the proposed revision. Such references to policy documents would aid any subsequent enterprise of revising or invoking policy documents.

A consent agenda procedure for bringing personnel policy matters to the Senate reduces the steps otherwise necessary for placing Senate resolutions on the Senate agenda while preserving the deliberative process of the Senate according to the discretion of individual senators. This proposed procedure assumes that the Academic Senate Executive Committee considers faculty personnel policies to be a *per se* function of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and therefore personnel policy revisions approved by FAC and accompanied by the variety of information required in this procedure would thereby be appropriate to be brought to the Senate. The Academic Senate Executive Committee's normal oversight concerning the agenda for Academic Senate meetings would continue by means of ~~the process of posing questions about an item or removing it from the~~ being the body which ultimately decides whether and how personnel policy revisions submitted by FAC are placed on the Academic Senate consent agenda.

To clarify how this consent agenda procedure would work, here are two examples of changes to personnel policies and procedures as they would have been presented to the Senate on the proposed consent agenda. Both are on related topics (student evaluation of instruction) one of a business item and the other of a discussion item:

- Discussion: Student Evaluation Requirements
- Business: Procedures for Online Student Evaluation of Instruction

Each example is offered below as it would be presented to senators on the proposed consent agenda. Note that the key distinction here concerns the nature of the process for implementing

the change. In the example of the business item the proposed change to faculty personnel policies would require the Senate to adopt new official procedures. The Senate already ruled on this matter by voting to implement the policy in AS-821-16. Were this item to have been presented to the Senate by means of the proposed consent agenda, the resolution and report would have been formulated differently, but the action of the Senate to implement the policy would have been functionally the same as before: by passing a resolution. Were no senator to pull it from the consent agenda, then the item would be passed by unanimous consent. But were at least one senator to wish to subject the change to normal Senate deliberative process, all that senator need do is pull it from the consent agenda. It then becomes a normal Senate business item. The members of FAC would have expected that this change be pulled from the consent agenda. Had the proposed consent agenda procedure been in place this matter would have reached the Senate earlier in Fall quarter.

The other example of the discussion item differs in that the change in policy came from the administration and so implementing it is not a matter of Senate resolution. Instead, the Senate would be informed of the nature of the change. The function of having it on the Senate consent agenda concerns informing the Senate of the mere formality of placing the change into the official faculty personnel policy document. Were at least one senator to wish to have the matter presented in more detail on the Senate floor, all that senator need do is pull it from the consent agenda. It would then become a normal discussion item. The function of having the item on the consent agenda is to report to the Senate the exact language of the policy change including an account of its background and impact. Consent in this case amounts to mere approval of the placement of the existing policy into the official faculty personnel policy document.

Each of these examples of proposed policy changes would be packaged in a resolution with a resolved clause stating that the Senate approve the changes to the official faculty personnel policies document as stated in the resolution's attached report. The attached report would provide the relevant information about the change in policy as specified in the proposed consent agenda procedure. In the case of business items, the Senate would be approving the policy itself and the placement of the policy into official documents. In the case of discussion items, Senate consent amounts to approval only of the placement of the policy into official policy documents.

Example of a Faculty Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Discussion Item

**SAMPLE OF REPORT:**

**SUMMARY OF CHANGE IN POLICY ON STUDENT EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS**

This change in policy implements the discretion granted to the President in section 15.15 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement to specify exceptions to the general requirement that all courses be subjected to student evaluation of instruction. This change in policy was set by the attached administrative memo of February 22, 2013. The placement of this policy in official policy documents at Cal Poly is thus a mere formality. The memo states and briefly explains the nature of the change, its basis in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the nature of the consultation with faculty on the change, and the timeline for implementation (Winter 2013).

**STATEMENT OF NEW POLICY:**

Student evaluations are required for all classes taught by each faculty unit employee except for the following:

- a. Courses with low enrollment (fewer than five students) such as individual senior projects and independent study.
- b. Capstone senior project classes will be evaluated if there are more than 5 students enrolled.
- c. Student evaluations will not be administered for individually supervised senior projects.
- d. Cooperative Education courses that do not include direct instruction shall not be evaluated using the student evaluation process. Academic departments or the Career Services Office may use a survey to evaluate the students' co-op experience, but this is not part of the student evaluation process.
- e. Team-taught classes: In situations when classes are team-taught, the instructor of record shall conduct student evaluations. If there is more than one instructor of record, then copies of the evaluation results shall be placed in each of the instructor's personnel files with a memo indicating that the course was team-taught. Any faculty member team teaching the course will have the opportunity to write a narrative description to accompany the student evaluation results for the team-taught course if he/she desires to add context to the results. A faculty member who team-teaches a course and believes that the results are not representative of his/her contributions to the course, may request that the dean not include the results associated with this team-taught course in his/her PAF. After reviewing this request, the dean has the discretion to determine if the student evaluation results of the team-taught course shall be placed in the instructor's file.

**SUPERSEDES BOLDFACE TEXT IN THE FOLLOWING:**

University Faculty Personnel Actions (section I.A.7.a.4)  
Student Evaluations

- a. A summary of results from student evaluations **for all courses taught** during the period under review shall be included. **The only exceptions to this requirement are classes with fewer than 5 students enrolled (such as individual senior project and**

independent study courses), and Cooperative Education courses that do not include direct instruction.

State of California  
M e m o r a n d u m



To: Philip Bailey, Dave Christy, Douglas Epperson, Debra Larson, Christine Theodoropoulos, David Wehner

Date: February 22, 2013

From: Kathleen Enz Finken  
Provost

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

Subject: New Student Evaluation Requirement Effective Winter Quarter 2013

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

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

1. Courses with low enrollment (less than five students) shall not be evaluated. Typical of these courses would be:  
  - Individual senior projects
  - Independent study
2. Cooperative Education courses that do not include direct instruction shall not be evaluated using the student evaluation process. Academic Departments or the Career Services Office may use a survey to evaluate the students' co-op experience, but this is not part of the student evaluation process.
3. Capstone senior project courses, which usually have larger enrollment, shall be evaluated if there are more than 5 students enrolled.
4. Team-taught classes: In situations when classes are team-taught, the instructor of record shall conduct student evaluations. If there is more than one instructor of record, then copies of the evaluation results shall be placed in each of the instructor's personnel files with a memo indicating that the course was team-taught. Any faculty member team teaching the course will have the opportunity to write a narrative description to accompany the student evaluation results for the team-taught course if they desire to add context to the results. A faculty member who team-teaches a course and believes that the results are not representative of their contributions to the course, may request that the dean not include the results associated with this team-taught course in his/her PAF. After reviewing this request, the dean has the discretion to determine if the student evaluation results of the team-taught course should be placed in the instructor's file.

As a reminder, all student evaluations are to be conducted utilizing the questions and format that have been vetted and approved by your college. All other requirements and processes outlined in the Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty (available at <http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/content/policies/rpt>) remain applicable.

Example of a Faculty Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Business Item

**Procedures for Online Student Evaluation of Instruction**

**SAMPLE OF RESOLUTION:**

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

**AS-XXX-16**

**RESOLUTION ON PROCEDURES FOR  
ONLINE STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION**

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt the attached “Procedures for Conducting Student Evaluation of Instruction” as the official procedure for online student evaluation of instruction starting Fall 2016; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That this procedure shall be included in university personnel policy documents that cover student evaluation of instruction; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate require FAC to report to Academic Senate no later than Fall 2017 on response rate data for student evaluation participation in academic year 2016-2017 for advisement on further changes to these procedures.

Proposed by: Faculty Affairs Committee

Date: XXX

## **SAMPLE OF REPORT:**

### **SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGE IN POLICY:**

This proposed change of the faculty policy establishes a university level procedure for conducting the student evaluations of instruction as mandated by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (articles 15.15-18). Currently colleges had established their own procedures for running their various paper or online student evaluations of instruction. The attached background report explains the need for the Senate to establish university level procedures along with the campus-wide rollout of the online system for student evaluation of instruction. The background report also explains the nature of consultation with faculty over the formulation of the proposed procedure and the rationale for implementing the change effective Fall 2016. The background report concludes by explaining the requirements for assessing these procedures included in the resolution.

### **STATEMENT OF NEW POLICY:**

#### Procedures for Conducting Student Evaluation of Instruction

- 1) Evaluations for courses occur during the last week of instruction.
  - a) The last week of instruction and final exam week are defined by the official academic calendar.
  - b) For courses whose official final assessment is during the last week of instruction according to the academic calendar (e.g. labs or activities with their own final exam or assessment), their evaluation period may be the penultimate week of instruction according to the academic calendar.
    - i) Requesting the earlier timeline for the evaluation of courses with early final assessments should occur by means of standard procedures of scheduling evaluations as determined by the office of Academic Personnel and communicated to the relevant college and/or program department staff.
- 2) The evaluation period opens the Sunday immediately prior to the last week of instruction and closes at the end of the last day of the last week of instruction.
  - a) Students will be allowed to complete their evaluations during this period.
  - b) This period may be adjusted on an ad hoc basis to accommodate for academic holidays.
- 3) Students shall receive notifications by email on the day the evaluation period opens, and at appropriate intervals until the evaluation period closes.
  - a) The initial email explains the evaluation procedure, includes links to all the classes which the student may evaluate, and indicates that the evaluation period has opened.
  - b) Subsequent emails follow at appropriate intervals until the student has formally submitted evaluations for all classes with scheduled evaluations.
    - i) What would count as appropriate intervals should balance any positive effect reminders have on response counts and the potential negative effect of badgering students with emails they may come to ignore.
  - c) For students who still have remaining evaluations to complete, a final email notification would occur on the day the evaluation period closes.
  - d) Other modes of notification (e.g. notifications within the portal) may be implemented as they become feasible.
- 4) Faculty shall receive by email a response rate report for their evaluated courses partway through the evaluation period.
  - a) Faculty are encouraged to announce to their classes that the evaluation period is underway.
  - b) Faculty are encouraged to address questions from students about the nature of the evaluation



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

#### SUPERSEDES THE FOLLOWING POLICIES:

All college or program level procedures for conducting student evaluation of instruction.

#### **Background About the Pilot of Online Student Evaluation of Instruction**

The 2015-2016 pilot of the online student evaluation of instruction included programs from each college at Cal Poly. The faculty in the programs that volunteered to participate in the pilot agreed to uniform evaluation procedures that would comprise an approximation of existing practices across colleges. The acknowledged compromises in this uniform procedure included the following:

- Insensitivity to the practice of conducting lab/activity evaluations prior to their final assessment occurring during the last official week of instruction.
- Commencing with the evaluation period earlier in the quarter than many faculty would prefer the evaluation to occur.

The participating faculty judged the efficiencies of uniformity to be worth these compromises. Now that the pilot is over and full university implementation is on hand we have an occasion to revisit these procedures.

During and after the pilot the software for the online system has been updated and our ability to configure the software used to implement the evaluations has increased. We now have the ability to implement different timelines for opening and closing the evaluation periods for broad categories of courses (viz. allowing programs to select lab/activity courses as meriting an earlier evaluation timeline than courses whose evaluation occurs in final exam week). We can now resolve the compromises of the procedure used during the pilot. To implement such a change right at the start of the university wide rollout of the online system requires prompt action by the Academic Senate. That is the function of this resolution. The procedure proposed by this resolution adequately resolves the compromises of the procedure used in the pilot. In the absence of immediate Senate action to adopt a new procedure, the procedure used during that pilot would continue to be implemented in the Fall 2016 university wide rollout of the online system.

The provisions of the proposed procedure were shaped by broad consultation with faculty, deans, associate deans, and program and college staff. In late Spring and throughout Summer 2016 Ken Brown (Faculty Affairs Committee chair) met with the college councils of CLA, CSM,

CENG, CAED, and CAFES, with an associate dean of OCOB, and with chairs and staff from every program in CLA and several in CSM and CENG (with a few more meetings forthcoming). The key staff from the Office of Academic Personnel (most notably, Jen Myers) attended nearly all of these meetings to clarify the procedural matters and keep staff apprised of details about their crucial role in this project. These meetings offered chairs and heads from each program to provide their feedback on the implementation of the online system, both its apparent benefits and shortcomings as it was implemented in the pilot. Ken Brown also led a session at the Academic Senate Fall Conference Retreat presenting information about the pilot of the online program, describing the procedures used during the pilot, and offering alternative procedures, and soliciting feedback on ideas for alternative procedures. The procedure proposed in this resolution was shaped by all this feedback. The proposed procedure was then supported unanimously by the attending members of the Faculty Affairs Committee at their meeting on 9/30/2016.

As we move forward with this online system, we should take note that the percentage of students completing the evaluations is markedly lower with the online system than with the paper system. A drop in response rates has been reported by other CSU campuses that have moved to online systems, and so this drop is not unexpected. Many faculty have responded to these lower response rates with significant concern. This resolution requires FAC to report back to the Senate by Fall 2017 with an assessment of data about the implementation of the online system in 2016-2017. Adopting a procedure for implementing the online system for Fall and continuing using it through the academic year would allow for a better basis of assessing response rates given that the paper system experienced significant quarterly fluctuations in response rates.

#### **Prior Procedure for Conducting Student Evaluation of Instruction Used During the 2015-2016 Pilot of the Online Student Evaluation System**

The following is an account of the procedure used during the 2015-2016 pilot of the online system. It is here formatted to correlate with the proposed policy attached to **RESOLUTION ON PROCEDURES FOR ONLINE STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION** for purposes of easy comparison. Were that resolution not passed, this procedure from the pilot would continue as an interim procedure indefinitely until some official statement of procedure supersedes it.

- 1) Evaluations for courses occur during the last two weeks of instruction, as determined by the academic calendar.
- 2) The evaluation period opens the Sunday immediately prior to the penultimate week of instruction and closes at the end of the last day of the last week of instruction.
  - a) Students will be allowed to complete their evaluations during this period.
  - b) This period would be adjusted on an ad hoc basis to accommodate for academic holidays.
- 3) Students shall receive notifications by email on the day the evaluation period opens, and at appropriate intervals until the evaluation period closes.
  - a) The initial email explains the evaluation procedure, includes links to all the classes which the student may evaluate, and indicates that the evaluation period has opened.

- b) Subsequent emails follow at appropriate intervals until the student has formally submitted evaluations for all classes with scheduled evaluations.
    - i) What would count as appropriate intervals should balance any positive effect reminders have on response counts and the potential negative effect of badgering students with emails they may come to ignore.
  - c) For students who still have remaining evaluations to complete, a final email notification would occur on the day the evaluation period closes.
  - d) Other modes of notification (e.g. notifications within the portal) may be implemented as they become feasible.
- 4) Faculty shall receive by email a response rate report for their evaluated courses partway through the evaluation period.
- a) Faculty are encouraged to announce to their classes that the evaluation period is underway.
  - b) Faculty are encouraged to address questions from students about the nature of the evaluation process clarifying the role of student evaluations in processes of faculty review.
  - c) Faculty may at their discretion reserve time in class for students to complete the evaluation on the student's own computer, phone or tablet.
    - i) Faculty shall comply with any college level procedures about how to implement student evaluations in their classrooms.
    - ii) Whenever practical realities require faculty to remain in the classroom (e.g. lab safety requirements), completion of the evaluation outside of class time is preferable.

### Personnel Policy Consent Agenda Procedure

To be appended to the Faculty Affairs Committee Procedures, and included in any future revisions to university faculty personnel policies documents.

1. All university-wide faculty personnel policy proposals from the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee appear on the Academic Senate meeting agenda as consent items.
  - a. The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee chair submits the personnel policy proposals to the Academic Senate Executive Committee.
  - b. The Academic Senate Executive Committee determines whether and how the personnel policy proposals shall be placed on the Academic Senate consent agenda.
2. The Academic Senate Executive Committee gives Senators ~~are given~~ two weeks' notice that the consent items will appear on the Academic Senate meeting agenda, and are expected to review the documents related to the policy proposal.
3. When the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee proposes revisions to university-wide faculty personnel policies, the documents presented to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for Academic Senate ~~for~~ consent should include as many of the following as are relevant to the proposal:
  - a. The text of the proposed policy.
  - b. The text of superseded policy (if available).
  - c. Summary of the proposed changes noting especially any of the following:
    - i. Revisions to reflect existing policy stated elsewhere,
    - ii. Proposed changes in policy.
  - d. Citation of relevant documents, which may include:
    - i. Senate resolutions,
    - ii. Provisions in the collective bargaining agreement,
    - iii. Administrative memos,
    - iv. Existing policy documents in need of revision,
    - v. Superseded policy statements.
  - e. Expected effects of the policy change on faculty units, including:
    - i. The nature of consultation with affected faculty units,
    - ii. Timeline and nature of implementation.
4. Queries from senators regarding policy proposals are directed to the chair of the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee.
5. Any senator may request an item be removed from the consent agenda no later than one week prior to the meeting.
  - a. Items removed from the Academic Senate consent agenda will be placed on the Senate agenda as discussion or business items.
    - i. Discussion items: Revisions to include existing policy or procedure.
    - ii. Business items: Revisions formulating new policy or procedure.
      1. Business items shall be presented as reports attached to resolutions.
      2. The report contains the new university policy and all background or explanatory information about the change in policy.
  - b. The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee chair (or designee) is responsible for presenting the policy proposal to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and to the Academic Senate.

- c. The Academic Senate Chair (or designee) may invite interested parties concerning the policy proposals to be present at the meetings where pulled proposals will be discussed.
  - d. Following discussion in the Academic Senate Executive Committee or in the Academic Senate, the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee chair (or designee) will make the decision to return the items to committee for further development or propose to the Senate Chair that the items be treated as normal Senate business items at the stage of a first reading.
6. Items not removed from the consent agenda are considered approved on the meeting date of the consent agenda.

Adopted:

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

AS-\_\_-17

RESOLUTION ON ELECTRONIC WPAF AND WORKFLOW  
IN FACULTY EVALUATION

1 WHEREAS, ~~Cal Poly will be implementing~~ Electronic Working Personnel Action Files  
2 (WPAF) and workflow in faculty evaluation<sup>i</sup> processes, as are allowed by  
3 the collective bargaining agreement (CBA 15.8<sup>ii</sup>); and  
4

5 WHEREAS, Electronic WPAF and workflow can conform with current official policies  
6 and procedures in place across the university (concerning, for instance, the  
7 structure and contents of Working Personnel Action Files, committee  
8 access to documents, levels of review, timeline of stages of review, etc.);  
9 and  
10

11 WHEREAS, Electronic WPAF and workflow processes can ease the labor involved in  
12 producing and reviewing personnel documents for faculty evaluation; and  
13

14 WHEREAS, Electronic WPAF and workflow processes can adapt to foreseeable  
15 adjustments of any such faculty personnel policies and procedures; and  
16

17 WHEREAS, Electronic WPAF and workflow processes may warrant improvements to  
18 faculty personnel policies and procedures; and  
19

20 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate has determined in AS-752-12 that “the Academic  
21 Senate Faculty Affairs Committee serve as a resource for best RPT  
22 practices;” therefore be it  
23

24 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate affirm that Cal Poly should implement  
25 Electronic (WPAF) and workflow in faculty evaluation processes, and be  
26 it further  
27

28 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) shall  
29 incorporate Electronic WPAF and workflow into university faculty  
30 personnel policies and procedures, and be it further  
31

32 RESOLVED: That FAC assist the Office of Academic Personnel concerning the policy  
33 and procedural aspects of adapting to Electronic WPAF and workflow,  
34 including the timeline for implementation, and be it further  
35  
36

37 RESOLVED: That any changes to faculty evaluation procedures arising from the  
38 transition to Electronic WPAF and workflow in faculty evaluation shall be  
39 communicated to faculty in a timely fashion consistent with the CBA<sup>iii</sup> and  
40 existing university policies for communicating such changes to faculty.<sup>iv</sup>

Proposed by Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee  
Date: March 8, 2017  
Revised: April 4, 2017

---

<sup>i</sup> CBA 15.1 defines “faculty evaluation” as “either a Periodic Evaluation or a Performance Review, and thus this term covers all personnel reviews of faculty, including RPT for tenure-stream faculty, all lecturer reviews, post-tenure reviews, reviews of librarians, coaches, counselors, etc.

<sup>ii</sup> CBA 15.8 states “The contents of the Working Personnel Action File may be compiled and reviewed in electronic format, pursuant to campus policy.”

<sup>iii</sup> CBA 15.3 states “Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty unit employee during the evaluation process.”

<sup>iv</sup> AS-752-12 Resolution on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure focuses on *criteria* for RPT, and not on the *medium* for review documents from candidates (i.e. WPAF) or reviewing bodies (e.g. AP-109 forms). Nevertheless, the change to electronic document workflow is significant for all involved and warrants timely communication to faculty and the relevant staff so they may prepare for the transition and understand the workings of the new system.



Adopted:

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

**AS-\_\_-17**

**RESOLUTION ON RESCINDING RESOLUTION AS-603-03/IC,CC,GEC  
[RESOLUTION ON CREDIT/NO CREDIT GRADING (CR/NC)]**

- 1 WHEREAS, Resolution AS-603-03/IC,CC,GEC [RESOLUTION ON CREDIT/NO  
2 CREDIT GRADING (CR/NC)] modifying the rules for CR/NC grading  
3 established by resolution AS-479-97/CC Resolution on Credit/No  
4 Credit Grading was adopted by the Cal Poly Academic Senate on June  
5 3, 2003; and  
6
- 7 WHEREAS, No response concerning AS-603-03/IC,CC,GEC was received from the  
8 President's Office; and  
9
- 10 WHEREAS, Resolution AS-603-03/IC,CC,GEC has not been implemented for  
11 reasons unknown; and  
12
- 13 WHEREAS, The above situation was not discovered until Winter Quarter 2016, by  
14 which time some of its provisions had become anachronistic; and  
15
- 16 WHEREAS, After a delay of thirteen years it is appropriate to consult the current  
17 Academic Senate to know its will on the matter; therefore be it  
18
- 19 RESOLVED: That AS-603-03/IC,CC,GEC [RESOLUTION ON CREDIT/NO CREDIT  
20 GRADING (CR/NC)] be hereby rescinded; and be it further  
21
- 22 RESOLVED: That the matter of Credit/No Credit be referred to the Academic  
23 Senate Instruction Committee for review.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Date: October 27, 2016  
Revised: January 31, 2017

Adopted: June 3, 2003

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

**AS-603-03/IC,CC,GEC**

**RESOLUTION ON  
CREDIT/NO CREDIT GRADING (CR/NC)**

- 1 WHEREAS, This resolution pertains to courses that are normally graded, not to CR/NC-only courses;  
2 and  
3
- 4 WHEREAS, This resolution refers to undergraduate students only, not to graduate students; and  
5
- 6 WHEREAS, Students in good standing (not on academic probation) should have the option of taking a  
7 limited number of courses CR/NC; and  
8
- 9 WHEREAS, The ability to take courses CR/NC can broaden a student's academic experience, which  
10 should be encouraged; and  
11
- 12 WHEREAS, POWER and CAPTURE currently prompt students to select normal grading or the  
13 CR/NC option for each course they enroll in during registration; and  
14
- 15 WHEREAS, The current policy, as approved by the Academic Senate in 1997, cannot be fully  
16 implemented; therefore, be it  
17
- 18 RESOLVED: That undergraduate students be permitted to take up to 12 units of courses CR/NC in  
19 accord with the following specifications:  
20
- 21 ■ CR requires the student earn a C or higher; and
  - 22
  - 23 ■ The catalog and class schedule provide advice to students to consult with their  
24 advisor when considering taking a major course CR/NC; and  
25
  - 26 ■ The method by which students elect the CR/NC option be removed from students'  
27 course selection via POWER and CAPTURE and a designated link be added to  
28 POWER to serve as the sole vehicle for electing the CR/NC option after initial  
29 registration.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction,  
Curriculum, and General Education Committees  
Date: April 29, 2003  
Revised: May 14, 2003  
Revised: May 28, 2003  
Revised: June 3, 2003

Adopted: April 29, 1997

ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-479-97/CC  
RESOLUTION ON  
CREDIT/NO CREDIT GRADING

- WHEREAS, This resolution pertains to courses that are normally graded, not to CR/NC-only courses; and
- WHEREAS, This resolution refers to undergraduate students only, not to graduate students; and
- WHEREAS, The number of courses a student may elect to take CR/NC should be kept to a minimum; and
- WHEREAS, Students should have the option of taking a limited number of courses CR/NC; and
- WHEREAS, Some balance must be found between limiting the number of courses that may be taken CR/NC and allowing students to enroll in a small number of such courses for the reasons outlined above; and
- WHEREAS, Some departments (or equivalent unit) may approve of their majors taking a major or support course CR/NC, or a GEB course CR/NC, while some departments would not approve, and individual departments should properly have the right, and be allowed to retain the flexibility, to make this decision; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That students be permitted to take a maximum of 16 units of courses CR/NC in accord with the following specifications:
- \* no more than 4 units CR/NC in major or support courses, subject to approval by the student's major department or equivalent unit; and
  - \* no more than 4 units CR/NC in GEB courses.

***Rationale:*** *The number of courses a student may elect to take CR/NC should be kept to a minimum, for reasons that include the following: It is generally recognized, as evidenced in testimony from recipients of Cal Poly's Distinguished Teaching Award (e.g., memo from Dr. Snetsinger dated 10 Nov. 1996), that students who enroll in a course CR/NC often do not take such courses as seriously as their graded courses, working toward a lower standard and consequently learning less in CR/NC courses; as Drs. Greenwald and Hampsey have stated, "Those involved in teaching GEB courses have complained that the students who take GEB classes CR/NC are often working for a C-. The data from Tom Zuur supports this contention. There were 40 percent more A's and B's among all students than among CR/NC*

**Resolution on CR/NC Grading**

AS-479-97/CC

Page Two

*students. There were 40 percent fewer D's and F's among all students than among [CR/NC] students. The result is a pronounced downward shift of grades among CR/NC classes" (memo dated 10 Oct. 1996);*

*Senate Resolution AS-464-96 abolishing the option of taking GEB classes CR/NC was passed in a near-unanimous vote by the Academic Senate in Spring 1996 and approved by President Baker in Fall 1996;*

*Students at Cal Poly cannot elect to take major or support courses CR/NC because these courses are considered vital to their education, and GEB courses cannot be taken CR/NC because they are considered equally vital to students' education; as President Baker has stated, this resolution "particularly underscores the status of GEB as a partner with the major programs at the University" (memo dated 9 Dec. 1996); as Dr. Zingg has stated, General Education should not be seen as a "second class citizen" in the curriculum (ASI Board of Directors minutes dated 6 Nov. 1996); as Drs. Greenwald and Hampsey have stated, "The implied message that GEB classes are somehow less important is one that teachers of GEB classes find objectionable. If we want to consider Cal Poly a premier institution, then GEB must be taken seriously" (memo dated 10 Oct. 1996);*

*Prospective employers have been known to disapprove of CR/NC courses on transcripts, which may adversely affect students' ability to obtain jobs;*

*Graduate school admissions boards have been known to disapprove of CR/NC courses on transcripts, with some graduate schools refusing to accept CR/NC courses for credit, and other schools automatically converting CR's to C's or F's.*

*Students should have the option of taking a limited number of courses CR/NC, for reasons that include the following: Students may explore unfamiliar areas of the curriculum or enroll in challenging courses without undue risk to their grade point average; President Baker has encouraged the Senate "to protect both the exploratory purpose of Cr/NCr grading and the principle of curricular choice through free electives" (memo dated 25 Sept. 1996);*

*Students may take a higher course load during certain quarters in order to move more quickly toward graduation;*

*Transfer students who have taken some courses CR/NC elsewhere may have an easier time making the transition to Cal Poly and thus move more quickly toward graduation.*

Proposed by the Academic Senate Curriculum  
Committee

February 27, 1997

Revised April 8, 1997

Revised April 22, 1997

Revised April 29, 1997

Adopted:

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

**AS-\_\_-17**

**RESOLUTION TO MODIFY THE BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

1 RESOLVED: That the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* be modified as shown on the  
2 attached copy.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Date: November 16, 2016

## ***BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE***

### II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

#### B. TERMS OF OFFICE

1. Terms of office for senators: the elected term of office for senators shall be a two-year term or one-year term when the caucus membership changes by more than two representatives. A senator can serve a maximum of two consecutive, elected terms An elected senator (according to Article III of the bylaws), can serve a maximum of four consecutive years and shall not again be eligible for election until one year has elapsed with the exception of ex officio members (e.g., past Senate Chair and Statewide Senators). A senator appointed to fill a vacant elected position after the winter elections or a temporary vacancy for an elected position shall serve until the completion of that term or until the senator being temporarily replaced returns, whichever occurs first. If this temporary appointment is for one year or less or if the senator is serving a one-year elected term, it shall not be counted as part of the ~~two-term~~ four years maximum for elected senators. The representative for part-time academic employees shall serve a one-year term with a maximum of four consecutive one-year terms.

Adopted:

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

AS-\_\_-17

**RESOLUTION ON RETIRING OBSOLETE ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTIONS**

- 1 WHEREAS, A resolution approved by Cal Poly’s Academic Senate reflects the concerns and
- 2 campus organization of the time in which it is adopted; and
- 3
- 4 WHEREAS, With the passage of sufficient time an adopted resolution may no longer hold
- 5 relevance; and
- 6
- 7 WHEREAS, Such obsolete resolutions should be identified and formally removed from the set of
- 8 active resolutions; and
- 9
- 10 WHEREAS, No process currently exists for determining the obsolescence of Academic Senate
- 11 resolutions or for their formal retirement; therefore be it
- 12
- 13 RESOLVED: That the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* be amended as shown on the attached copy to
- 14 guide the formal retirement of resolutions by the Academic Senate.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Date: August 25, 2016



V. MEETINGS

E. RETIRING RESOLUTIONS

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