

June 21, 2011

**From:** Dr. Graham C. Archer P.Eng., Chair Faculty Affairs Committee

**To:** Cal Poly Academic Senate

**Re:** Committee Report, 2010-2011

---

The Faculty Affairs committee was tasked in the fall quarter 2010 with revising the committee procedures and continuing the work on a resolution on the RPT report. The revised committee procedures are attached to this report. The committee also submitted a revised and expanded recommendation and resolution on the RPT report.

During the winter quarter 2011 the Faculty Affairs committee finalized its resolution on its review of the Retention Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Focus Group Report. The resolution was passed by the Academic Senate and signed by the President. The recommendations and the resolution are attached to this report.

In the spring quarter, the committee continued its deliberations on a resolution on shared governance. The current working document is attached to this report. The committee has had many fruitful discussions on the role of faculty in shared governance. The focus has been on defining the areas in which the faculty has the primary responsibility such as: curriculum; appointments; retention; tenure; and promotion. This important work will continue in the fall quarter 2011.

Committee members:

Archer, Graham (CH) Arce CAED

Brar, Navjit Library PCS

Brown, D. Ken Philos CLA

Li, Christopher Student ASI

Liddicoat, Al AcadPersl Admin

Lund, Ulric Stats CSM

Olsen, Eric IndTech OCOB

Spiller, Bob AniSci CAFES

Wu, Xi MechEngr CENG

# Faculty Affairs Committee

## **Membership:**

Shall include voting General Faculty representative from each college and Professional Consultative Services. The Academic Senate Chair is an ex officio, nonvoting member. Voting Ex officio members of the Faculty Affairs Committee shall be the Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel or designee and an ASI representative.

The Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee will be appointed annually by the Chair of the Senate, with the approval of the Executive Committee.

## **Meetings:**

- 1- A simple majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for a meeting. A quorum is required to conduct business.
- 2- Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the chairperson or upon the request of three members of the committee. Committee is required to meet at least once per quarter during the academic year. Regular meetings shall be scheduled during normal work hours.
- 3- Notification of meetings shall be sent by the chairperson at least three (3) working days before the meeting date. Committee may establish regular meeting times. Upon committee agreement, a regular meeting time shall constitute notice.
- 4- A vote by the majority of the voting members attending a meeting would reflect the recommendations of the committee. Members may not vote by proxy. Voting shall take place by a show of hands unless one attending member requests a secret ballot. The record shall show the resulting vote.
- 5- A committee report addressing actions and recommendations of the committee shall be filed at the Academic Senate office at least once each quarter. Minority reports also may be filed with that office.

## **Procedures for selecting issues to be addressed by the committee:**

The committee will select issues to be addressed from two primary sources: The committee members and the Senate Executive Committee. The final selection of issues to be addressed will be made in consultation and with the approval of the Senate Executive Committee.

## **Reporting Procedures:**

Faculty Affairs Committee shall report to the Senate. Committee's recommendations shall not be considered policy statements until formally approved by the Senate.

**Focus Group's Recommendation #4. "The implementation of an online student evaluation pilot program in the College of Liberal Arts and the Orfalea College of Business to study and evaluate the effectiveness, benefits, and disadvantages of online student evaluation."**

FAC observations:

The Faculty Affairs Committee agrees with the Focus Group's Recommendation #4. However the FAC members have the following concerns:

1. As in the current system, only students that are actually attending class should be permitted to evaluate the faculty.
2. The Provost designated committee should contain significant faculty involvement.
3. The Provost designated committee should include ASI representation.
4. Faculty must volunteer to participate in the pilot study.
5. A faculty member's student evaluation results are confidential. The confidentiality of the data must be ensured.
6. To aid in data mining, a student's eventual grade in the class should be linked to their evaluation.
7. Automatically normalizing or scaling the results should be controlled by college or department faculty committee. The method of norming or scaling used should be provided along with a data summary.
8. The pilot study should consider whether it is necessary for the students to enter the data online or if similar results and efficiencies can be gained through an improved scanned form.
9. The evaluation of the effectiveness of the pilot study must be accomplished with significant faculty involvement.

**Focus Group's Recommendation #5. "The University should explore the use of electronic faculty evaluation processes and set up a pilot process in one college."**

FAC observations:

Faculty Affairs Committee agrees with the Focus Group's Recommendation #5. However the FAC members have the following concerns:

1. Faculty must volunteer to participate in the pilot study.

2. The Administration must provide appropriate support to the faculty to ensure that faculty workload does not increase due to participation in the pilot study.
3. The Provost designated committee should contain significant faculty involvement.
4. As in the current system, WPAF files must be returned to the faculty member. The system must ensure that no copies are maintained elsewhere.
5. The pilot study must allow for, and support, a reviewer who wants to use paper copy instead of the electronic format.
6. The evaluation of the effectiveness of the pilot study must be accomplished with significant faculty involvement.

**Focus Group's Recommendation #10. "The University or Colleges should articulate a policy indicating how learning assessment can be linked to teaching, service, professional development, or some combination of them all."**

FAC observations:

1-Faculty Affairs Committee agrees with the Focus Group's Recommendation #10, provided that the recommendation refers to faculty participation in learning assessment rather than learning assessment itself. The policy should be articulated at the department level, rather than college or University.

2-FAC agrees that "clarity of faculty expectations with respect to learning assessment will lead to a better understanding and implementation of learning assessment".

FAC Recommendations on Focus Group recommendation #10:

1- It is the departments, rather than the colleges, that should articulate policies indicating as to whether or how faculty participation in assessment can constitute a form of service, improve teaching, count as a faculty member's professional development, or some combination of them all.

**Focus Group's Recommendation #11. "The University or colleges should provide direction for faculty members to better evaluate teaching effectiveness."**

FAC observations:

1-Faculty Affairs Committee agrees with the Focus Group's Recommendation #11, as formulated in the above sentence. FAC members, however, do not agree with linking “instructor’s process of defining learning outcomes for their courses” to the RPT process.

2-FAC opposes the Focus Group’s assertion that “All faculty members should include the course learning outcomes in their syllabi so that teaching effectiveness can be evaluated against course learning outcome.”

3-FAC opposes the standardization of “student evaluations, grade distributions, and other relative evaluative parameters,” as recommended by the Focus Group.

4-FAC opposes the Focus Group contention that “Peer Review Committee evaluators need guidance in how to best determine if instructors are effective teachers”. It is the departmental faculty themselves, possibly with the aid of university resources, which could provide guidance in how to best determine if instructors are effective teachers – not the University or colleges.

FAC recommendation:

1-Departments and colleges should continue their work to update and further clarify their RPT criteria and processes and provide direction for faculty members to evaluate teaching effectiveness in the peer review framework.

Adopted:

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

**AS-\_\_\_-10**

**RESOLUTION ON FACULTY AFFAIRS  
REVIEW OF RETENTION PROMOTION  
AND TENURE FOCUS GROUP REPORT**

- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee during 2009 reviewed the *Retention Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Focus Group Report*; and
- WHEREAS, On May 1 2009 the Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee endorsed recommendations 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the *RPT Focus Group Report*; and
- WHEREAS, On June 2 2009 the Academic Senate endorsed recommendations 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the *RPT Focus Group Report*; and
- WHEREAS, On March 16 2010 the Academic Senate Instruction Committee submitted its comments to recommendations 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the *RPT Focus Group Report*; and
- WHEREAS, On April 6 2010, recommendations 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the *RPT Focus Group Report* were forwarded to the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee for its review; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee concluded its review and submitted its comments to recommendations 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the *RPT Focus Group Report*; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the Faculty Affairs Committee comments on items 4, 5, 10, and 11 of the *RPT Focus Group Report* as attached; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Faculty Affairs Committee's comments be forwarded to the Provost and the members of the Retention Promotion and Tenure Focus Group for attachment in the *RPT Focus Group Report*.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee  
Date: October 25 2010

**RESOLUTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE**

Shared Governance: One of the key tenets of quality higher education, this term refers to governance of higher education institutions in which responsibility is shared by faculty, administrators, and trustees. The AAUP emphasizes the importance of faculty involvement in personnel decisions, selection of administrators, preparation of the budget, and determination of educational policies. Faculty should have primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process, according to the Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities.

Possible clauses:

The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

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.

Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor. Distinction should be observed between the institutional system of communication and the system of responsibility for the making of decisions.

The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.

The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the



governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.