

June 20, 2014

From: D. Kenneth Brown (CLA, Philosophy), Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

To: Cal Poly Academic Senate

Re: Faculty Affairs Committee Annual Report, Spring 2014

The charges for the Faculty Affairs Committee for Fall 2013 from the Academic Senate were the following:

1. Discuss the number of required class evaluations and develop alternatives.
2. Discuss new RPT policies.
3. Consideration of Teacher-Scholar Model aspects in the RPT guidelines.
4. Discuss intellectual property policy for online education.
5. Discuss statement on Academic Freedom.
6. Discuss shared governance.
7. Review the process for removal of comments for deceased and retired faculty in Polyratings.

We held two meetings to commence with addressing these charges and to set our agenda for the rest of the academic year. At both meetings we had quorum. Details about how we addressed these charges are in the Fall 2013 report. Charges 2 and 3 would dominate our concerns for the whole academic year.

The charges for Winter 2014 were the following:

1. Assist RSCA by providing feedback concerning upcoming resolution and documents about the establishment and review of new centers and institutes.
2. Continuing charge: Review RPT policies, especially in light of recent adoption of Teacher-Scholar model.

We scheduled and held four meetings in Winter to address these charges. We had quorum at all meetings, and all our decisions coming out of these meetings were unanimously approved. Details about how we addressed these charges are in the Winter 2014 report. Our activity for the first charge is worth noting in summary for this annual report: we heard a report from Bradford Anderson (Interim Vice President for Research and Economic Development and Associate Dean, Orfalea College of Business), and Christopher Dicus (Faculty Fellow, Office of the Provost) concerning the establishment and review of new centers and institutes. We found the new policies to be sensible and appropriate. We forwarded our comments to that effect to the chair of RSCA, Frank Kurfess. These policies were approved by the Academic Senate in resolution AS-780-14. Members of FAC attended the Academic Senate meetings in which that resolution was discussed and passed.

The charges for Spring 2014 were the following:

1. Discuss new RPT policies at college and university level.

2. Consideration of Teacher-Scholar Model aspects in the RPT guidelines. Consider whether and how to revise the document in light of recent Senate actions concerning the Teacher-Scholar Model.

We scheduled and held four meetings in Spring to address these charges. We had quorum at all meetings, and though our decisions coming out of these meetings were merely procedural matters.

We continued to discuss the task of reviewing RPT policy documents for the University and Colleges. In Winter we set our goals for the review of University policies as the following:

- a) Adding clarity of expectations for probationary faculty,
- b) Compliance with the contract and other university practices (student evals in all classes with campus exceptions, online evals, possible electronic RPT portfolio, etc),
- c) Consistency with the spirit of the Teacher Scholar emphasis,
- d) Consideration for the recent College and Department document changes,
- e) Alignment with University mission, goals and aspirations.

Since we were reviewing college level RPT policies, an issue concerning CSM landed on our table: the Physics dept. voted to suggest to Dean Phil Bailey that CSM add to its RPT policies language that allows service “to the wider community” especially about sustainability initiatives to count towards service expectations. In email correspondence with FAC member Pat Fidopiastis Dean Bailey said he was “hesitant to add a lot of examples of service to the document [...] since RPT committees could evaluate such service without it being in the document.” FAC unanimously concurred with Dean Bailey, and thought that in relation to RPT service to the wider community beyond Cal Poly merits some case for linkage of that service to one’s role as faculty at Cal Poly. This issue may be taken up by CSM at their next cycle of RPT policy review.

Through Winter and Spring we discussed how teaching and scholarship are addressed in the University Faculty Personnel Actions document (UFPA) and the college level RPT policies in light of documents pertaining to the teacher/scholar model. We determined that the UFPA needs to be restructured so as to offer a more useful guide to faculty seeking guidance on university level policies, and to offer a clearer statement of the policies that limit the college level policy statements. Clarity on what sort of evidence categories are relevant to teaching and scholarship would, we thought, be especially helpful.

The Academic Senate has new leadership this coming academic year. The FAC needs to work with the new chair to determine how best to proceed next year to complete this task. As of now the FAC assumes the outcome of this project would be a report and a resolution assenting to a new or revised UFPA. Brown and Liddicoat are willing to work this summer to draft a revision of the UFPA for the whole FAC to review this coming Fall, if the new Senate leadership thinks that is the right way to go. We await instruction.

FAC Members:

D. Kenneth Brown, CLA (chair)

John Dobson, OCOB

Pat M. Fidopiastis, CSM  
Jim Guthrie, CAED  
Albert Liddicoat, Admin  
Jaymee Ellen McInerney, ASI  
Aydin Nazmi, CAFES  
Shikha Rahman, CENG

Library and Counseling, vacant.