



CAL POLY

Academic Senate
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE
805.756.1258

MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, April 29, 2008
00220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

- 3:10 I. Minutes:
Approval of minutes for Academic Senate meeting of April 15, 2008 (pp. 2-3).
- n. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- m. Reports:
Regular reports [*Please limit to 3 minutes or less*]:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President's Office:
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA Campus President:
G. ASI Representative:
- Special reports [*Please limit to 5 minutes or less!*]:
Schaffner, chair of Instruction Committee: report on issues concerning student evaluations of teaching [course design/faculty performance] (pp. 4-18).
- IV. Consent Agenda:
Curriculum proposal for CHEM 101: (p. 19).
[URL for all courses being reviewed during continuous review]:
<http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/curric-andbook/Continuous%20Course%20Summaries/Continuous-Course-Sum-F08.doc>
- 3:45 V. Business Item(s):
A. **Resolution on New Masters of Science Degree in Polymers and Coatings Science:** Hannings, chair of Curriculum Committee/Fernando, Director for Polymers and Coatings Program, second reading (pp. 20-24).
B. **Resolution on WU Grade:** Schaffner, chair of Instruction Committee, first reading continued (pp. 25-27).
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
Resolution on Changes to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate: Executive Committee (pp. 28-53).
- 5:00 VII. Adjournment:

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE
805.756.1258

MINUTES OF
The Academic Senate
Tuesday, April 15, 2008
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00 p.m.

- I. Minutes: The minutes of March 4 and March 11 were approved as presented.
- II. Communications and Announcements: Giberti announced that President Baker has approved the Resolution Abolishing the Academic Senate Library Committee, the Resolution on new Masters of Science Degree in Biomedical Engineering, and the Resolution on Diversity Learning Objectives.
- III. Regular Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair: Giberti announced that Chair-Elect John Soares will undertake some Academic Senate Chair responsibilities this quarter.
 - B. President's Office: Howard-Greene announced the fourth Baker Forum, which will take place May 4, in the Spanos Theater at 4:30 pm. This event is open to the public and everyone is encouraged to attend. The keynote speaker, John Morgridge, Chairman Emeritus of the Board, Cisco Systems, Inc., will address the changing technology landscape and its implications for a polytechnic education. Also, President Baker has published the first in a series of communications regarding diversity at Cal Poly in the Mustang Daily. The series will continue into next year.
 - C. Provost: none.
 - D. Vice President for Student Affairs: Morton announced that a survey on the needs, experiences, and aspirations of off-campus students will take place within the next few weeks. The survey is an attempt to maintain and improve contact with students who live off campus and their needs as part of our University community.
 - E. Statewide Senate: none.
 - F. CFA Campus President: Saenz announced that CFA and CSU continue to work together on the alliance campaign, which asks the legislature to reconsider planned budget cuts.
 - G. ASI Representative: Guntermann reported that ASI passed resolution #08-08 *ASI Supports the Establishment of Office of Sustainability* at its last ASI Board meeting. He also reported that Dean Noori and the Engineering Student Council held an open forum for engineering students on the Jubail project.

Special Reports:

- A. Dave Hannings: Continuous Curriculum Review Process. The current 2-year cycle for program review is being changed to a continuous program review process. At this point in time, only new course proposals that do not affect other departments will be addressed. The curriculum committee will review new course proposal once a quarter.
- B. Kate Lancaster: Sustainability Charrette. PowerPoint presentation available at http://www.calpoly.edu/acad_en/Minutes/2007-2008/Sustainability_Charette.ppt

IV. Consent Agenda: none.


V. Business Hem(s):

- A. Resolution on *Report to the Provost: Task Group on the Future of the Library* (Library Committee): Michael Miller, Library Dean, presented the resolution, which requests the Academic Senate's endorsement of the recommendations presented in the report. The following amendment failed:
Resolved: That the Academic Senate ~~endorse~~ acknowledges the recommendations presented in the attached *Report to the Provost: Task Group on the Future of the Library* (summary of recommendations provided on page 2 of the report).
M/SIP to adopt the resolution as presented.
- B. Resolution on Evaluation of Teaching Associates (Faculty Mfairs Committee): Foroohar presented the resolution, which requests the formation of an ad-hoc committee to develop a University-wide policy regarding the employment and evaluation of Teaching Associates. *M/SIP* to adopt the resolution.
- C. Resolution on New Masters of Sciences Degree in Polymers and Coatings Science (Curriculum Committee): Hannings presented the resolution, which will return as a second reading item at the next Academic Senate meeting.
- D. Resolution on WU Grade (Instruction Committee): Schaffner presented the resolution, which proposes that AS-449-95/IC Resolution on "U" Grades be repealed, that grading policies be disseminated quarterly to all faculty prior to grade entry, and that grade definitions be made easily available for reference during grade entry. This resolution will continue as a first reading item at the next Academic Senate meeting.

VI. Discussion Hem(s): none.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by



Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate

Joint Committee:
The California State University
California Faculty Association
Academic Senate CSU

Report on Student Evaluations of Teaching

March 12, 2008

Table of Contents

Committee Membership	page 1
Introduction	Page 2
Research Findings	
• Current practices in the'CSU	Pages 3-4
• Research on student evaluations and teaching effectiveness	
o What factors influence the results of student evaluations?	Pages 4-5
o On-line student evaluations of teaching	Pages 5-6
Recommendations for best practice	
• Administering evaluations	Page 6
• Reporting results	Pages 6-7
• Which courses to evaluate	Page 7
• Content and design of evaluation	Pages 7-8
• On-line student evaluations	Page 8
How can student evaluations be used most effectively?	Pages 9-10
Recommendations to specific groups	Page 10
• Chancellor's Office	
• Academic Senate CSU	
• CFA	
• Provosts	
• Academic Senates and campus faculty	
Bibliography	Page 11
Appendix One	

Committee Membership

California State University:

Margaret Merryfield, Senior Director, Academic Human Resources, Office of the Chancellor
Lorie Roth, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Office of the Chancellor
Michael Suess, Associate Vice President, Academic Personnel, California Polytechnic State
University, San Luis Obispo

California Faculty Association:

Cecil Canton (Chair), California State University, Sacramento
Jacki Booth, San Diego State University
Leslie Grier, California State University, Fullerton

Academic Senate, CSU:

Glen Brodowsky, California State University, San Marcos
Mark Van Selst, San Jose State University
Tuuli Messer-Bookman, California Maritime Academy

INTRODUCTION

This committee was formed in response to provision 15.19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) of May 15, 2007 between the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the California State University (CSU). In recognition of unresolved concerns regarding student evaluation practices, the parties agreed to form a joint committee to study "the best and most effective practices for the student evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness." The article further stipulated that the committee's work should include a review of instruments used for student evaluation as well as on-line evaluation, and that possible bias factors would also be considered. Given the central role of shared governance in establishing policies regarding student evaluations of teaching on the campuses, the parties further agreed that the committee would include representation from the Academic Senate of the CSU. The recommendations included in this report reflect the work of the joint committee and are not intended to alter the established roles of the Academic Senate, the CSU, or the CFA in any way.

The CBA establishes a small number of ground rules for student evaluations of teaching. First, such evaluations are required. According to Article 15.15, "Written student questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. A minimum of two (2) classes annually for each faculty unit employee shall have such written student evaluations. Student evaluations shall be conducted in classes representative of the faculty unit employee's teaching assignment. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File."

The CBA further stipulates that these evaluations shall be anonymous, and must be either quantitative (meaning survey data that can be expressed numerically) or a combination of quantitative and qualitative (normally implemented either through the use of open-ended questions, or through the provision of opportunity for students to write comments.) The mechanism for non-anonymous input by students into the evaluation process for faculty members is described in detail in Article 15.2 of the CBA; this form of input is outside the scope of the committee's work.

The CBA permits the appropriate "academic unit" to develop the evaluation instrument and determine the extent of its use. While the CBA only requires that two classes per year be evaluated, some departments and colleges have developed policies requiring more evaluations, either of specific groups (*e.g.* requiring all sections taught by probationary faculty members to be evaluated until tenure is awarded) or of all faculty members in the academic unit.

Student evaluations of teaching are frequently given substantial weight in performance reviews for retention, tenure, and promotion of tenure-track faculty members as well as for reappointment of lecturers. In its discussions, the committee focused on several questions:

What do student evaluations measure?

What factors influence the results of student evaluations?

What are the characteristics of well-designed teaching evaluations?

How can student evaluations be used most effectively?

The following section presents research findings based on the literature that address these questions, as well as practices within the CSU.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Current practices in the CSU

The 23 CSU campuses were surveyed as to current practices. Twenty-two campuses provided responses. These responses are compiled in Appendix One. Each campus was asked to report whether it used a common survey instrument or allowed individual units to develop their own forms. Campuses also reported whether the forms had been developed on the campus ("home grown") or were provided by an outside vendor, and if so, which vendor. Campuses were also asked to report whether on-line evaluations were in use. Finally, campuses were asked whether students were given the opportunity to provide narrative comments (characterized as "qualitative"). In addition, each campus was asked to provide a copy of its evaluation instrument (or representative instruments, if multiple instruments were in use).

The most common type of student evaluation instrument used across the CSU is "home-grown." These forms have often been developed by faculty committees. Only three campuses are currently using a form developed by an outside vendor (and one of those is currently working on a new internally-developed form). These professionally-developed forms have usually been subjected to reliability and validity studies, but may also be relatively costly for the campus to administer. In contrast, campus-developed questionnaires may or may not have undergone analysis for validity or reliability. The most common model is for the campus to have agreed upon a common set of questions that can be supplemented at the department or college level. In six cases, the campus does not have a common form; each unit (department or college) is free to develop its own.

Nearly all campuses allow students to attach comments to the survey; some provide specific prompts to elicit feedback. The majority of campuses have begun to experiment with on-line evaluations, most commonly for on-line courses. One campus has moved entirely to on-line evaluations, and some others indicate they are poised to follow.

The results of student evaluations are used by the campuses for both formative and summative purposes. In order to use student evaluations for summative purposes in retention, tenure, and promotion cases, the results must be placed into the faculty member's official personnel action file prior to the beginning of the performance review. When students are allowed to add narrative comments to the evaluation, these comments may or may not be placed in the Personnel Action File, depending on campus practice; in some cases, only the faculty member receives the comments. One campus prohibits the use of comments in performance reviews. If they are to be used for evaluations, all the narrative comments must be placed into the personnel action file, or procedures need to be developed for consolidating the themes of the written comments. As a result, narrative comments are not always used in performance evaluations.

CSU evaluation instruments: What do student evaluations attempt to measure?

Members of the committee reviewed the sample instruments provided by the campuses and provided the following observations.

Common themes present themselves in campus evaluation documents. Forms generally include one or more "global satisfaction" questions. Questions tend to cluster into four areas of "faculty quality":

Communication/clarity of expression

Teacher skills such as time management, content management, structure of exams

Instructor motivation, energy, enthusiasm

Content knowledge

Some questions are poorly designed. One common pitfall is double- or triple-loading, in which the student is asked to rate the instructor on multiple areas in a single question. Other questions ask students to make subjective judgments about the internal state of the instructor (*e.g.*, the instructor has a "serious desire to help students learn"). There are also examples of better-designed questions that ask the student about specific relevant instructor behaviors, that students would be better able to answer objectively (*e.g.* "the instructor returned graded material promptly").

Research on Student Evaluations and Teaching Effectiveness

Evaluations are not a simple measure of teaching effectiveness and have multiple uses. Edward B. Nuhfer, Director of Faculty Development at CSUCI, recently reviewed the research literature on student evaluations; the full article is available at <http://www.isu.edu/ctl/facultydev/extras/student-evals.html>. Nuhfer highlights the challenge of using student evaluations in faculty evaluation processes when he states that student evaluations are "ratings derived from students' *overall feelings* that arise from an *inseparable* mix of learning, pedagogical approaches, communication skills, and affective factors that may or may not be important to student learning." He makes a distinction between summative evaluations (whose purpose is purely to evaluate the faculty member for some personnel action) and formative evaluations (whose primary intent is to assist the instructor in becoming a more effective teacher). Often summative evaluations ask "global" questions such as, "Overall how do you rate this instructor's teaching ability?" "Overall, how do you rate this course compared to other college courses?" These questions provide information on student satisfaction, not student learning.

Formative evaluation questions, by contrast, will often focus on specific effective teaching practices. Students might use a Likert scale to designate "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" to topics such as "is well prepared," "uses examples and illustrations," "encourages class discussion". One of Nuhfer's recommendations is that evaluators use formative questions to determine the efforts the instructor is making to incorporate effective teaching practices.

What factors influence the results of student evaluations?

The evaluation literature identifies student variables that can influence the outcome of evaluations, including student motivation, anticipated grades, and the perceived difficulty of the course. Weaker correlations exist with class level and size (larger classes are more negatively rated). The strongest correlation to instructor behavior is for expressiveness and content delivery. Interestingly, what students see as the most important instructor behaviors may differ according to discipline.

Nuhfer references two cautionary examples regarding how evaluation results can either be misleading or manipulated. The first, the "Dr. Fox experiment" described by Naftulin in 1973, used an actor to lecture to groups of faculty and educational administrators, who rated the content of the lectures as satisfactory even though they were deliberately low in content. His second example is of Peter Sacks, the author of "Generation X Goes to College" (1996). Sacks describes how he deliberately set out to manipulate his own ratings by pandering to the students, an effort which was successful and led to his tenure.

A further cautionary note by Nuhfer is that most of the published research comes from heavily Caucasian classrooms, typically representing selective universities. Not much research has come from highly diverse, relatively non-selective institutions such as the CSU. While the influence of instructor's gender on evaluations has been studied to some extent, much less research exists on the influence of race and ethnicity.

The committee also surveyed the Faculty Development Council of the CSU, composed of the campus directors of centers for teaching and learning. While many of the directors stated that there was no single definition of teaching effectiveness, the directors identified common characteristics and practices associated with effective teachers (operationally defined as those that promote student learning). The directors generally see student satisfaction, as measured by student evaluations, as just one component that should be included in attempting to measure teaching effectiveness. As Dr. Mark Stoner of CSU Sacramento notes, "Taken together, the more variety of measures and the more perspectives we have on the process of teaching, the more confident we may be in saying that any particular instructor or group of instructors are "effective teachers."

On-line student evaluations of **teaching**

The committee looked at a sampling of recent literature on the use of on-line student evaluations of teaching. It is clear that this is an area where the available research is limited, given the relatively recent emergence of on-line evaluation as an alternative to paper-and-pencil evaluation. Many of the available reports represent pilot studies or small and/or specialized applications. Some of the interesting findings to date include some evidence that on-line evaluations yield longer and more substantive open-ended responses (when that option is available) (Laubsch, 2006) and that question-to-question differences may increase; the authors speculate that there simply may be a greater tendency to bubble in the same response to a series of questions when they are lined up on a piece of paper than when they appear one at a time on a screen (Gamliel and Davidovitz, 2005). While some studies have reported lower student ratings with on-line administration, other studies have found no significant differences in student rating means or have observed a slightly positive effect (for example, see Loveland, 2007; Gamliel and Davidovitz, 2005; Carini *et al*, 2003). A common concern is response rate. McGourty *et al* (2002) analyzed the experience at two large universities and observed dramatic differences in response rate that they attributed to campus culture and climate, but also significant improvement in response rates as both campuses gained experience.

One concern of the committee's in the use of on-line evaluations is that the greater apparent anonymity (because the students are not in a controlled environment) may lead to less inhibition

against students using offensive or defamatory speech that attacks the instructor for who he or she is, not what he or she does. This has already manifested itself as a problem in the uncontrolled and unregulated environment of the various independent rating sites that have proliferated recently. One member of the committee found a particularly ugly example (from someone purporting to rate "AAbumtheniggers") accessible through a CSU campus's web site. Beyond their tendency to attract such extremes, these sites have such blatant methodological flaws that they obviously and unequivocally have no place in any legitimate personnel procedure. However, campuses must also take responsibility for monitoring their own in-house processes, whether on-line or paper-and-pencil, and to take steps to prevent such attacks, if they occur, from polluting evaluations.

RECOMMENDATIONS: WHAT ARE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF WELL-DESIGNED TEACHING EVALVATIONS?

This section includes a consensus of recommendations from the committee for campuses to consider as they develop their own procedures for student evaluation of teaching.

Administering evaluations

- The respondents should identify their level (freshman, sophomore, etc.)
- Respondents should identify whether the course is required or elective.
For in-person evaluations, a proctor (a student from the class or an individual not involved with the class) should administer the evaluation; the faculty member should not be present.
- Completed evaluations should be returned by the proctor directly to the department designee to protect the integrity of the process; provisions should be made for the evaluations to be returned after hours if necessary (*e.g.*, through use of a locked drop box).
- The proctor should read a script that explains the purpose of the evaluation and instructs students to complete their evaluations independently without discussion among themselves. (A script should also be provided to accompany on-line evaluations.)
Students should be given sufficient time to complete the evaluation; ideally, it should be administered at the beginning of the class period rather than the end.
The campus should establish a window of time prior to [mal exams when all official evaluations must be administered.
- Evaluations should be anonymous. Students should be reassured that results of the evaluation will not be provided to the instructor of record until after final grades have been submitted. If campuses wish to collect additional student characteristics that could potentially influence student ratings, students' anonymity should be protected.

Reporting results

- Results pertaining to the instructor should be differentiated from results pertaining to the course and student demographics.
- In reporting results, campuses should take care not to make inappropriate comparisons. For example, there is some evidence that students in different disciplines may value different aspects of teaching (and even that some disciplines may inherently generate

lower ratings). Thus, comparison to a global campus average is not likely to be informative.

Campuses are encouraged to periodically engage in norming of the campus evaluation instrument(s), and to communicate the results to faculty members and administrators who will be involved in reviewing the teaching effectiveness of other faculty members. (For an excellent example of how this process can be implemented, see San Jose State's *Interpretation Guide for Student Opinions of Teaching Effectiveness*. In fall 2003, SJSU administered its new form across all class sections (achieving a 93% response rate) to establish means, medians, and standard deviations by departments and colleges, to be used in making comparisons. In this process, the campus also collected extensive student demographic information and looked for factors that might influence student ratings. The results of this study were made available to faculty and administrators as a guide to interpreting the numbers.)

- Campuses should also provide guidance to users in how to interpret any statistics provided with the evaluation report. Extreme caution should be used in interpreting means and standard deviations based on fewer than 10 student responses. The campus may wish to report the median response in classes with low enrollment, and set a threshold below which no statistics will be reported.

Which courses to evaluate

The choice of courses evaluated should be representative of the courses taught by the faculty member.

- Academic units may develop policies in which more than two classes per year per faculty member are evaluated, up to and including requiring that all classes be evaluated. Regardless of the number of courses to be evaluated, faculty members should have advance notice regarding when and how courses will be selected for evaluation. Any department policy should be applied consistently. Campuses should consider whether some types of classes should not undergo the standard evaluation (for example, extremely small sections; supervision classes). We note that some campuses have developed several variant evaluation forms designed to be used in classes with specific modes of instruction (laboratories, fieldwork, *etc.*).

Content and design of evaluation

The faculty on each individual campus have the right, through their governance processes, to develop the campus-based program of student evaluations of teaching.

- Items on student evaluations should, as much as possible, attempt to measure aspects of instructor performance that students can objectively evaluate.
- Items on student evaluations should directly relate to faculty instructional responsibilities
- Items on student evaluations should ask about effective teaching practices.
- Avoid compound questions or references.
- Consider adding questions about the students' own effort and engagement in the course.
- Consider including questions regarding whether course learning objectives have been met.
- Do include opportunities for students to provide written comments. Encourage students to provide written comments to explain ratings that are either very positive or very negative.

- Consider building in one or more validity-checking questions. Ensure form is laid out to prevent confusion as to questions on the course itself, vs. questions on the faculty member.
- Evaluation instruments can legitimately have both summative and formative purposes. In constructing student evaluation instruments, campuses should consider how the instrument will be used. (For example, a task force at CSU San Marcos recommended that evaluations contain summative questions that would be used in personnel decisions as well as formative questions that would be reported only to the faculty member. However, a campus may also wish to include questions in personnel decisions that have a formative component, such as those that ask about whether the faculty member uses specific teaching practices that also offer evidence of the faculty member's effectiveness.)
- The inclusion of written comments may or may not be a required component of personnel evaluation processes. Some campuses have developed effective and efficient ways to consolidate these comments in reporting results.

On-line student evaluations

The committee discussed the merits of on-line student evaluations at length. While the group remains somewhat divided on this issue, we are in consensus that any campus that adopts on-line evaluations must be attentive to the issues identified below. Given a relatively thin research base in this area, those CSU campuses that are converting their systems to on-line evaluations have an opportunity to expand the academic community's knowledge in this area through well-constructed research projects.

- On-line evaluation systems must be designed to provide maximum security, to ensure that only the enrolled students participate and that each student can respond only once. The same principles of confidentiality and anonymity that apply to paper-and-pencil evaluations must be applied to on-line evaluations. Students should be assured that the faculty member will not have access to the results prior to the assignment of final grades. Campuses that move to on-line evaluations should do so with eyes open. This includes norming the instrument in the on-line format, taking steps to ensure good response rates, and educating students as to the importance of the process. Further, campuses should monitor demographic differences in response rates to ensure that no groups of students are underrepresented in the process.
- Campuses should not assume that on-line evaluations and in-person evaluations are directly comparable, even if the questions are the same.
 - Campuses should establish windows of time for completing on-line evaluations that are comparable to those used for in-person evaluations (*e.g.*, completion before the final examination period).
Campuses should continue to monitor the on-line evaluation process following implementation and be ready to correct problems that may arise.
 - Students should always have the option of opting out of the evaluation process. Faculty members should be able to use existing procedures for challenging the inclusion of materials in the PAF to exclude defamatory responses.

How can student evaluations be used most effectively?

Our final set of recommendations address the uses of student evaluations of teaching as part of the larger task of evaluating faculty teaching effectiveness.

- Campuses have a responsibility to educate those who will be using evaluation results as part of the personnel process as to their strengths and limitations. This includes:
 - a) Acknowledging that most such instruments *primarily* measure student satisfaction;
 - b) Noting the statistical limitations, including cautions against reading too much into small differences in means;
 - c) Understanding the differences between questions that are directed toward global satisfaction (*e. g.* "rate the overall effectiveness of the instructor in this course"), and questions that are directed to specific behaviors or practices associated with effective teaching;
 - d) Awareness of factors such as the level of the class, whether it is required or elective, and even the level and background of the students enrolled, that can influence student satisfaction;
 - e) Recognizing that evaluation results cannot be used in a linear manner to rank faculty or to place them in categories ("excellent", "below average").

Student evaluations should never be the sole basis for evaluation of teaching effectiveness

- Student evaluations must be recognized as only one component of an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Evaluation policies for all faculty (lecturers as well as tenure-track) should require that reviewers use multiple measures of teaching effectiveness. High student ratings in isolation do not necessarily mean that an individual is an effective teacher, nor do lower ratings necessarily mean that an individual is an ineffective teacher.
- Faculty members should be encouraged (if not already required by policy) to provide a narrative document that comments on and analyzes student evaluations in the context of the faculty member's growth as a teacher and efforts to improve his/her instruction. This narrative would also provide the faculty member with an opportunity to interpret anomalous evaluations. For example, when a faculty member tries out a new teaching practice, the first attempt in particular may produce lower evaluations - but ultimately may prove to improve student learning.
- Campuses should monitor the student evaluation process and be particularly sensitive to the potential for bias in evaluations. The available research on whether the race, gender, and ethnicity of the instructor influences the results of student evaluations is limited; however, campuses should be aware of the possibility of such impacts, especially in those classes where students may be asked to confront ideas and topics that take them out of their comfort zones.

Campuses should use a well-designed student evaluation instrument (with demonstrable validity and reliability) in providing diagnostic information and feedback to faculty, and those involved in evaluations should have an understanding of their formative as well as summative uses.

Faculty members should be encouraged to seek student feedback outside of the formal evaluation process for the purpose of improving their instruction. For example, during the course, faculty could invite small groups of students to provide feedback on how the course is going, or could administer informal mid-term surveys. Since such activities are

not formal evaluations, the results could only be included in materials submitted for personnel evaluations at the request of the faculty member. Campuses should periodically review, reevaluate, and re-norm their instruments for student evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO SPECIFIC GROUPS

Recommendation to Chancellor's Office

The committee discovered gaps in the research literature in one of the areas that drove the formation of this group - the question of whether race, gender, and/or ethnicity of the instructor can significantly bias student evaluation results. The CSU has a unique opportunity to seek answers to this question, given both the (relative) diversity of its faculty and the large and diverse student population served. We recommend that the CSU sponsor system-wide research on the significance of "differentness" in student evaluations of faculty. This might be implemented as a Request for Proposals from CSU faculty.

Recommendation to Academic Senate CSU

We recommend that the Academic Senate generate and adopt a set of "best practices" for evaluation of teaching effectiveness and disseminate these to the campuses. The Senate should review its recommendations in light of changes in the CBA with each new agreement.

Recommendations to CFA

We recommend that the California Faculty Association take this report, as well as any subsequent resolutions or reports from the Academic Senate, into account as it develops its sunshine proposals for the next contract negotiation, to determine whether modifications to Article 15 are appropriate.

Recommendations to Provosts

We recommend that Provosts/Presidents for Academic Affairs review current practices on their campuses in light of these recommendations and any subsequent resolutions or reports from the Academic Senate CSU, and work with campus faculty and administrators to implement changes, as appropriate.

Recommendations to campus Academic Senates and campus faculty

We recommend that appropriate campus groups (such as Faculty Affairs Committees) review the literature on student evaluations and critically evaluate the instruments and evaluation practices used on their respective campuses. We further recommend, based on this review and our report, as well as any subsequent resolutions or reports from the Academic Senate CSU, that the campuses adopt policies and practices that incorporate the findings from these sources, as appropriate. The senates should review their policies and practices in light of changes in the CBA with each new agreement.

Given that most campuses are now experimenting with on-line evaluations, we strongly recommend that campuses carry out research to assess the validity and reliability of this newer mode of evaluation as well as factors that contribute to successful implementation, and that campuses share their findings with the CSU community.

Bibliography

Carini, Robert M, Hayek, John C, Kuh, George D, Kennedy, John M, Ouimet, Judith A. (2003) "College student responses to web and paper surveys: does mode matter?" *Research in Higher Education* 44, 1-19.

Gamliel, Eyal, and Davidovitz, Liema (2005) "Online versus traditional teaching evaluation: mode can matter." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 30, 581-592.

Laubsch, Paulette (2006) "Online and in-person evaluations: a literature review and exploratory comparison." *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching* 2, 62-73.

Loveland, Karen A. (2007) "Student evaluation of teaching (SET) in web-based classes: preliminary findings and a call for further research." *Journal of Educators Online* 4, no. 2, 1-18.

McGourty, Jack, Scoles, Kevin, and Thorpe, Stephen (2002) "Web-based course evaluation: comparing the experience at two universities." 32nd ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference.

Nuhfer, Edward B. (2003) "Of What Value Are Student Evaluations?"
<http://www.isu.edu/ctl/facultydev/extras/student-evals.html>

San Jose State University Student Evaluation review Board, "Interpretation Guide for Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness Results."
http://www.apb.sjsu.edu/Survey_Research_&_Evaluation/SOTE_&_SOLATE/

Appendix One. Campus Practices Regarding Student Evaluations of Teaching.

Campus	Common form!many	Instrument type	Vendor	Online Evaluations?	Free Response! Qualitative part?
Bakersfield	Common	Home-grown		Some (for online courses, not much experience)	Yes. Use "agree/disagree" with six questions plus comments
Channel Islands	Common	Vendor	U of Washington SETE	No (not even for online courses)	Yes.
Chico	Common available, depts can develop own	Home grown influenced by vendor	Based on SIRII from ETS	ForWebCT courses	Common instrument is both, dept instruments can be qual, quant, or both
Dominguez Hills	Common (depts. can add questions)	Home-grown		Some now, possibly all by fall 2008	Yes
East Bay	Common (depts. can add questions)	Home-grown		Only for MA in Online Teaching	Yes (room for comments)
Fresno	Many (by dept or college)	Homegrown, considering vendor		For online courses or by dept preference	Yes (but may move away from comments)
Fullerton	By dept	Home-grown		For online courses or by dept preference	Yes (open-ended questions)
Humboldt	Common (depts. can add questions)	Home-grown		Only for online courses	Yes
Long Beach	Common (depts. can add questions)	Home-grown		Only for some online courses	Yes
Los Angeles	Common	Home-grown		No (surveys mailed in distance classes)	Yes (qualitative data goes directly to the faculty)
Maritime	Mostly common, some specialized instruments	Vendor plus some home-grown	SUMMA Information Systems	Beginning to	Yes (less so on SUMMA forms)
Monterey Bay	Common (narrative questions may be added by dept.)	Home-grown		For online courses and by opt-in for others	Yes

Northridge	By dept	Home-grown		For online courses or by dept preference	Yes (faculty may opt to put comments in PAF)
Pomona	Common (depts. can add questions)	Home-grown		No (considering it)	Yes, but comments not allowed in RTP
Sacramento	Many -- one for Business, others by dept	Home-grown		Possibly in Nursing	Yes
San Bernardino	Common (a couple of exceptions)	Home-grown		Only on pilot basis	Yes
San Diego	Many (by dept or college)	Home-grown		Entirely online	Yes
San Francisco	Common (depts. can add questions)	Home-grown		Testing in College of Business	Yes
San Jose	Common	Home-grown		Piloted spring 07	Yes
San Luis Obispo	Many (by college or dept)	Home-grown		No	Varies (some are qual only)
San Marcos	Common (variants by class type)	Home-grown		Being tested	Yes
Stanislaus	Common	Vendor	IDEA Center	Piloting	Yes

Fall Quarter 2008

Continuous Course Review

Note: The following courses have been summarized by staff in the Academic Programs Office for review by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC). *Unless otherwise noted, the ASCC recommends approval of the following courses to the Academic Senate.*

Date Prepared: March 13,2008

NEW COURSES

Course Number, Title	(Total Units) Mode	CST	Other
CHEM 101 Introduction to the Chemical Sciences	(1) 1 lecture	02	CRiNC grading

Adopted:

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

AS- -08

RESOLUTION ON
NEW MASTERS OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN
POLYMERS AND COATINGS SCIENCE

- 1 WHEREAS, The Chemistry and Biochemistry Department is proposing the implementation of a
2 Masters of Science in Polymers and Coatings Science; and
3
4 WHEREAS, The Masters of Science in Polymers and Coatings Science has been a successful
5 pilot program for the past six years; and
6
7 WHEREAS, The Chemistry and Biochemistry Department now proposes to convert this
8 program to pennanent status; and
9
10 WHEREAS, The existing specialization and BS degree in Polymers and Coatings Chemistry is a
11 nationally recognized program strongly supported by industry; and
12
13 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Curriculum committee has carefully considered this proposal
14 and recommends its approval; and
15
16 WHEREAS, A summary of the proposal is attached to this resolution with the full proposal
17 available in the Academic Senate office; therefore be it
18
19 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the proposal for a Masters of
20 Science in Polymers and Coatings Science and that the proposal be sent to the
21 Chancellor's Office for final approval.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Date: March 11, 2008
Revised: April 1, 2008

Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

Summary Statement of Proposed New Degree Program for
Academic Senate

March 11, 2008

1. **Title of proposed program:** MS in Polymers and Coatings Science
2. **Reason for proposing the program:** Nearly twenty years ago the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department embarked on an effort to develop a unique, high quality undergraduate concentration in Polymers and Coatings Chemistry. Through a cooperative effort with industry, this program has become recognized as one of the truly outstanding undergraduate programs in polymer chemistry in the nation, and one of only a handful of undergraduate programs that offers specialized training in the applications of polymers to modern coatings.

Through continued cooperative efforts with industry, a pilot MS in Polymers and Coatings Science was launched in 2002 and it will complete its sixth year at the end of current academic year. The program offers students a unique, focused educational opportunity closely tied to industry. Students gain academic preparation in polymers and coatings science through lecture and laboratory courses and then are expected to undertake a rigorous industrial internship or industry sponsored research. Students are prepared for challenging careers in the polymers and coatings industry, and upon graduation they are highly sought after by companies operating in the field. The program also provides excellent background for doctoral studies in areas related to polymer and coatings science. This program is unique in California; there is no other similar academic program in the western US.

3. **Anticipated student demand:**

	Number of Students		
	<u>at initiation</u>	<u>3 years after initiation</u>	<u>5 years after initiation</u>
Number of Majors	9	12	30
Number of Graduates	5	6	15

Indicate briefly what these projections are based upon: So far, the program has produced thirteen graduates, and five more are scheduled to be graduated by the end of current academic year. Enrollment will be limited for the next three-year period while the new Science Center building and the privately funded Kenneth N. Edwards Western Coatings Technology Center will be built.

4. Indicate the kind of resource assessment used in developing the program proposal. If additional resources will be required, the summary should indicate the extent of department and/or college commitment(s) to allocate them: Resources in terms of faculty, equipment, library facilities, internships and research funding, and building facilities all have been addressed. No additional resources beyond what is already available and what has already been planned are needed.
5. If the program is occupational or professional, briefly summarize evidence of need for graduates with this specific educational background: The global polymer and coating industry represents hundreds of billions of dollars worth products and services spanning house paints, plastic products, electronics, biomedical devices, personal care items, and so on. Within these industries, there is a high demand for graduates having an education background in the multi-disciplinary field of polymers and coatings along with a strong background in chemistry. Graduates with this combined education are rare in California and the rest of the US. Our program faculty alone receives many inquiries about graduating students by potential employers having staffing difficulties. Those who have graduated so far and decided to enter the workforce have secured significantly better compensation packages than did their counterparts having generalized degrees.
6. If the new program is currently a concentration or specialization, include a brief rationale for conversion: This proposal is to convert the existing MS in Polymers and Coatings Science from pilot to permanent status. An undergraduate concentration in Polymers and Coatings is available for Chemistry and Biochemistry majors, and it will be continued.
7. If the new program is not commonly offered as a bachelor's or master's degree, provide a compelling rationale explaining how the proposed subject area constitutes a coherent, integrated degree major which has potential value for students. If the new program does not appear to conform to the CSU Board of Trustee policy calling for "broadly based program," provide rationale: not applicable.
8. Briefly describe how the new program fits with the department/college/university strategic plans: The key elements of the program (Le. course work and *culminating* experience) are well aligned with the strategic plans of the department, college, and university. The program maintains a "learn by doing" atmosphere and promotes application of theory. The program's cross-disciplinary curriculum produces graduates who are better prepared to adapt to multi-disciplinary working environments that are becoming more commonplace.

Curriculum for Polymers and Coatings Science MS Degree

CHEM 544 Polymer Physical Chemistry and Analysis
 CHEM 547 Polymer Characterization and Analysis
 Laboratory
 CHEM 545 Polymer Synthesis and Mechanisms
 CHEM 548 Polymer Synthesis Laboratory
 CHEM 550 Coatings Formulation Principles
 CHEM 551 Coatings Formulation Laboratory
 CHEM 590 Graduate Seminar (1)(1)(1)
 CHEM 598 Graduate Project (3)(3)(3)
 CHEM 599 Graduate Thesis (3)(3)(3)
 Electives from 400- and 500- level courses*
 *At least 3 units must be 500-level

Elective courses (18 units)

Examples of Elective Courses	Units	Prerequisite
CHEM 405 Advanced Physical Chemistry	3	CHEM 353
CHEM 420 Advanced Organic Chemistry	2	CHEM 212/312 or CHEM 216/316
CHEM 439 Instrumental Analysis	5	CHEM 231/331 , CHEM 354
CHEM 441 Bioinformatics Applications	4	One course in college biology (BID 111 or BID 161 recommended)
CHEM 446 Surface Chemistry of Materials	2	CHEM 305 or CHEM 351 or course in engineering thermodynamics
CHEM 458 Instrumental Organic Qualitative Analysis	3	CHEM 319
CHEM 470 Selected Advanced Topics	1-4	CHEM 305 or CHEM 351 or CHEM 217/317
CHEM 471 Selected Advanced Laboratory	1-4	Consent of instructor
CHEM 500 Special Problems for Graduate Students	1-3	Graduate standing and consent of Department Chair
STAT 512 Statistical Methods or STAT 513 Applied Experimental Design and Regression Models	4	For STAT 512, graduate standing and intermediate algebra or equivalent; for STAT 513, one of the following: STAT 512, STAT 217, STAT 218, STAT 221, STAT 252, Stat 312, or equivalent
MATE/BMED 530 Biomaterials	4	BID 213, ENGR 213, MATE 210 and graduate standing or consent of instructor

MATE 560 Thin Film Processing	3	Graduate standing or consent of instructor
BMED 450 Contemporary Issues in Biomedical Engineering or BMED 455 Bioengineering Design or IME 556 Technological Project Management	4	For BMED 450, senior standing in BMED major or instructor consent; for BMED 455, ME 341 , BMED 410 or consent of instructor; for IME 556, graduate standing or consent of instructor

Adopted:

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

AS- -08

RESOLUTION ON WU GRADE

- 1 WHEREAS, AS-449-95/IC *Resolution on 'U' Grades* established a policy to allow students to
2 change a '[W]U' grade to a 'W' one time in their academic career; and
3
4 WHEREAS, AS-449-95IC recognized that registration is a student responsibility, and that
5 students enrolling but failing to attend class are potentially preventing other
6 students from enrolling; and
7
8 WHEREAS, Prior to 1995, registration **information** was not readily accessible to students
9 online, thus **making** procedural errors more likely; and
10
11 WHEREAS, Students currently can easily view their schedules at any time using the My Cal
12 Poly portal; and
13
14 WHEREAS, Many faculty members are unaware or unclear of policies regarding the WU grade;
15 and
16
17 WHEREAS, Inconsistent use of the WU grade leads to differing treatment of students across
18 campus; and
19
20 WHEREAS, Historically faculty members were reminded of grading policies each quarter in the
21 form of an attachment to paper grade sheets; be it therefore
22
23 RESOLVED: That AS-449-95/IC be repealed; and
24
25 RESOLVED: That the grading policies, including detailed definitions of all grading symbols
26 used, be disseminated quarterly to all faculty members prior to grade entry and that
27 the grade definitions be made easily available for reference during grade entry; and
28 be it further
29
30 RESOLVED: That these changes be implemented beginning Fall 2008.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee

Date: January 17, 2008

Revised: March 27, 2008

Background Material

Executive Order 792

EO 792 defines the WU Grade as follows:

*WU (Withdrawal Unauthorized). The symbol 'WU' shall be used where a student, who is enrolled on the census date, does not officially withdraw from a course but fails to complete it. Its most common use is in those instances where a student has not completed sufficient course assignments or participated in sufficient course activity to make it possible, in the opinion of the instructor, to report satisfactory or unsatisfactory completion of the class by use of the letter grade (A - F). The instructor shall report the last known **date** of attendance by the student. The symbol "WU" shall be identified as a failing grade in the transcript legend and shall be counted as units attempted but not passed in computing the grade point average. In courses which are graded Credit/No Credit or in cases where the student has elected Credit/No Credit evaluation, use of the symbol "WU" is inappropriate and "NC" shall be used instead. The following statement shall appear in the campus catalog:*

The symbol "WU" indicates that an enrolled student did not withdraw from the course and also failed to complete course requirements. It is used when, in the opinion of the instructor, completed assignments or course activities or both were insufficient to make normal evaluation of academic performance possible. For purposes of grade point average and progress point computation this symbol is equivalent to an "F."

If local campus policy prescribes other instances where this symbol may be used, the foregoing statement shall be extended to cover such instances.

The full text of EO 792 is available online at: <http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-792.pdf> Note that the above does not mandate the use of the WU grade, but rather prescribes its intended use.

Some comments related to WU use at Cal Poly

- Some students who have attended a portion of a course, submitted assignments, and are earning a failing grade are being advised by campus personnel to request that faculty members issue or change failing grades to WU so that the grade can be later changed to a W. This results in giving some students an extra course of "grade forgiveness" above and beyond the 16-unit, one-time-per-course policy allowed by AS-645-06.
- Since 2002 there have been over 4000 WU grades assigned. The vast majority of these grades are coming from seven departments suggesting that students are not being treated equitably across the campus.
- Cal Poly has both regular and emergency withdrawal processes for students who need to withdraw from a class for serious and compelling reasons.

AS449-95/IC

Adopted: November 28, 1995

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

AS-449-95/IC .
RESOLUTION ON
"U" GRADES

- WHEREAS, Executive Order 268 specifies that "The symbol 'W' indicates that the student was permitted to drop the course after the (day/week) of instruction with the approval of the instructor and appropriate campus officials. It carries no connotation of quality of student performance and is not used in calculating grade point average or progress points"; and
- WHEREAS, Executive Order 268 specifies that the grade of "U" is used "when, in the opinion of the instructor, completed assignments or course activities or both were insufficient to make nonnal evaluation of academic performance possible. For purposes of grade point average and progress point computation this symbol is equivalent to an "F"; and
- WHEREAS, It is recognized that registration is a student responsibility, and that students enrolling but failing to attend class are potentially preventing other students from utilizing campus resources; and
- WHEREAS, In some cases, the "U" grade may represent an unduly harsh performance grade consequence for a procedural error; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That students may request a grade change from "U" to "W"; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That students may receive only one such grade change from "U" to "W" during their academic career at Cal Poly; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That such student-initiated grade changes will be governed by the policy set out in AS-384-92 (Resolution on Change of Grade) adopted April 14, 1992.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
May 11, 1995

Adopted:

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

AS- -08

**RESOLUTION ON CHANGES TO THE
*BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE***

1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached changes to the *Bylaws*
2 *of the Academic Senate.*

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: February 12, 2008
Revised: April 14, 2008
Revised: April 23, 2008

April 23, 2008

CHANGES TO THE *BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE*

[items highlighted in blue were agendized at the 2.19.08, 4.8.08, and 4.22.08 ExecCom meetings]

	page	section	change recommended
1)	4	I.B.2	grade point average for ASI representatives changed from 2.0 to 2.3 to conform to ASI committee eligibility requirements.
2)	5	II.A.1	"Elected members shall be voting members" removed because of redundancy. Voting status is stated in the <i>Constitution</i> .
3)	5	II.A.2	"shall be nonvoting" removed because of redundancy. Ex officio nonvoting status is stated in the <i>Constitution</i> .
4)	7,8	III.B	Changes to the election procedures are in keeping with current practices.
			Duties of Chair have been itemized.
6)	9	IV.A.1.c	Added duty of Chair to "meet with the President, Provost and Deans Council on a regular basis."
7)	9	IV.A.1.d	Added duty of Chair to "prepare an annual list of charges for Academic Senate committees [and] meet with each committee or committee chair at the beginning of the academic year."
8)	10	IV.A.1.e	Appointment of parliamentarian is eliminated. See IV.A.4: Past Academic Chair becomes the parliamentarian.
9)	10	IV.A.1.f	"and there is not time to elect a replacement" removed because of redundancy. Procedures for replacing a CSU academic senator are stated in VII.B.5.
10)	10	IV.A.1.g	"The Chair shall also transmit all official actions of the Academic Senate to the President of the University" removed because this is a function of the Senate office, not a duty of the Chair.
11)	10	IV.A.4	Past Chair, if available, becomes the parliamentarian for Executive Committee and Senate meetings.
12)	12	VII.A.	Slight wording change to specify "caucus chair" membership to the Executive Committee.
13)	12	VII.A.	The two student representatives to the Academic Senate are added to the Executive Committee as nonvoting members.

- 14) 12 VII.B.1 "Setting the agenda" replaced with "agendizing resolutions" for clarification.
- 15) 12 VIII.A "Executive Committee" added for clarification.
- 16) 12,13 VIII.B Changes made in general membership of Academic Senate committees: Chair becomes ex officio, nonvoting member of all committees; faculty emeriti member eliminated.
- 17) 13 VIII.B "Terms shall be staggered to ensure continuity" added to conform to current practices.
- 18) 13 VIII.C Duties of committee chairs have been itemized.
- 19) 13 VIII.C.5 These responsibilities of the committee chair have been modified to conform to current practices.
- 20) 13 VIII.C.7 Wording change re annual meeting between committee chairs and Academic Senate Chair made to conform to current practices.
- 21) 14 VIII.D.7&8 Two operating procedures added for Academic Senate committees.
- 22) 14 VIII.I.1.a Budget Officer or designee removed from membership of Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee.
- 23) 15 VIII.I.2.a Wording change re membership of the Curriculum Committee made for clarity.
- 24) 15 VIII.I.2.b Changes made in responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee.
- 25) 15,16 VIII.I.2.b Changes made in the membership and procedures of the U.S. Cultural Pluralism Subcommittee.
- 26) 16 VIII.I.3.a&b Changes made in the membership and responsibilities of the Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee.
- 27) 16,17 VIII.I.4.a&b Changes made in the membership and responsibilities of the Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee.
- 28) 17,18 VIII.I.7.a Changes made in the membership of the Grants Review Committee.
- 29) 19 VIII.I.8.b Change made in responsibilities of the Instruction Committee eliminating "The chair of the Instruction Committee shall meet regularly with the chair of the Curriculum Committee and the Chair of the Academic Senate."
- 30) 19 VIII.I.10.a&b Changes made in the membership and responsibilities of the Research and Professional Development Committee.

April 23,2008

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY
and the
BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Table of Contents

<i>CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY</i>	<i>1</i>
Preamble	1
ARTICLE I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE GENERAL FACULTY	1
ARTICLE II. RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND POWERS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY ..	1
Section 1. Rights of the General Faculty	1
Section 2. Responsibilities of the General Faculty	1
Section 3. Powers of the General Faculty: Meetings, Initiatives, Referenda, and Recall	2
ARTICLE III. THE ACADEMIC SENATE	2
Section 1. Membership	2
Section 2. Powers and Responsibilities of the Academic Senate	3
Section 3. Officers	3
Section 4. Organization	3
ARTICLE IV. AMENDMENTS	3
 <i>BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE</i>	 <i>4</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	4
A. CONSULTATIVE PROCEDURES	4
B. DEFINITIONS	4
II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE	5
A. ELIGIBILITY	5
B. TERMS OF OFFICE	6
C. REPRESENTATION	6
D. SUBSTITUTES	6
E. PROXIES	6
F. AUTOMATIC RESIGNATIONS	7
III. ELECTION PROCEDURES	7
A. GENERAL PROCEDURES	7

B.	ELECTION CALENDAR	7
IV.	OFFICERS	9
A.	OFFICERS	9
B.	ELIGIBILITY	10
C.	TERMS OF OFFICE	10
D.	REPLACEMENT	10
V.	MEETINGS	10
A.	REGULAR MEETINGS	11
B.	SPECIAL MEETINGS	11
C.	PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY	11
VI.	SUMMER OPERATION	11
A.	MEETINGS	11
B.	RESPONSIBILITIES	11
VII.	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	12
A.	MEMBERSHIP	12
B.	FUNCTIONS	12
VIII.	COMMITTEES	12
A.	GENERAL	12
B.	MEMBERSHIP	12
C.	COMMITTEE CHAIRS	13
D.	OPERATING PROCEDURES	13
E.	MEETINGS	14
F.	REPORTING	14
G.	MINORITY REPORTS	14
H.	COMMITTEES	14
I.	COMMITTEE DESCRIPTIONS	14
IX.	RECALL OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES	19
A.	APPLICATION	19
B.	PROCEDURES	20
X.	AMENDMENTS TO THE BYLAWS	21

CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY

Preamble

We, the faculty of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, in order to meet our academic responsibilities hereby establish this *Constitution of the Faculty* for our governance. The responsibilities of the faculty, the powers necessary to fulfill those responsibilities, and the collegial form of governance are based on historic academic traditions that have been recognized by the people of the State of California through their legislature.

ARTICLE I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

Voting members of the General Faculty of Cal Poly shall consist of those persons who are employed at Cal Poly and belong to at least one of the following entities: (1) full-time academic employees holding faculty rank whose principal duty is within an academic department, unit, or program; (2) faculty members in the Pre-Retirement Reduction in Time Base Program; (3) full-time probationary and/or permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services as defined in Article III.1.b of this constitution; (4) full-time coaches holding a current faculty appointment of at least one year; (5) lecturers holding full-time appointments of at least one year in ~~one~~ or more academic departments, units, or programs; or (6) lecturers with a current assignment of 15 WTUs for at least three consecutive quarters.

Members of the General Faculty, including department chairs/heads, shall not cease to be members because of any assigned time allotted to them for the carrying out of duties consistent with their employment at Cal Poly. "Visiting Personnel" shall not be members of the General Faculty. Members of the General Faculty who are on leave for at least one year shall not be voting members during their leave.

Nonvoting membership in the General Faculty shall consist of all academic personnel not included in the voting membership.

ARTICLE II. RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND POWERS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

Section 1. Rights of the General Faculty

The right of academic freedom is necessary for the pursuit and dissemination of truth and the maintenance of a free society. It is the obligation of the General Faculty to insure the preservation of an academic community with full freedom of inquiry and expression and insulation from political influence.

Voting members of the General Faculty have the right to nominate, elect, and recall members of the Academic Senate and the right to call for, participate in, and vote at meetings of the General Faculty.

Section 2. Responsibilities of the General Faculty

The primary responsibility of members of the General Faculty is to seek truth and to encourage the free pursuit of learning in their peers and students. To this end, they devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluation of students and peers reflects true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation of students for their private advantage, acknowledge significant assistance from them, and protect their freedom of inquiry.

Section 3. Powers of the General Faculty: Meetings, Initiatives, Referenda, and Recall

No regularly scheduled meetings of the General Faculty are provided for but meetings of the General Faculty may be called by the University President or the Academic Senate Chair. Meetings of the General Faculty will be scheduled by the Academic Senate Chair upon receipt of a meeting request petition bearing the signatures of 10% of the voting membership of the General Faculty. The Academic Senate Chair presides at meetings of the General Faculty and parliamentary procedure is in effect. Positions developed at meetings of the General Faculty must be ratified by initiative.

A majority of the voting members of the General Faculty in attendance at duly called General Faculty meetings is needed to propose an initiative to be put before the entire voting membership of the General Faculty. A majority of those voting in a mail ballot is needed to pass an initiative. Initiatives to amend this constitution shall be governed by Article IV.

Actions of the Academic Senate are subject to nullification by the voting membership of the General Faculty. Upon receipt of a referendum petition bearing the signatures of 15% of the voting faculty constituency, the Academic Senate Chair will conduct a mail ballot of the voting members of the General Faculty. A majority of those voting on a referendum is required to **nullify** the Academic Senate action in question. Recall of academic senators shall be provided for in the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate*.

ARTICLE III. THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Section 1. Membership

- (a) Colleges with fewer than 30 faculty members shall elect two senators. All other colleges shall elect three senators, plus one senator for each 30 faculty members or major fraction thereof
- (b) Designated personnel in Professional Consultative Services (excepting directors) shall be represented in the Academic Senate by the formula of one senator per each fifteen members, or major fraction thereof:
 - (1) Full-time probationary or permanent Librarians; and
 - (2) Full-time probationary or permanent (a) counselors; (b) student services professionals [SSPs] I, ~~II~~, and III-academically related; (c) SSPs III and IV; (d) Cooperative Education lecturers; and (e) physicians.
 - (3) Full-time coaches holding a current faculty appointment of at least one year.
- (c) Part-time lecturers in an academic department/teaching area and part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services, other than those who are members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I, will be represented by one voting member in the Senate.
- (d) Senators acting in an at-large capacity are the immediate Past Academic Senate Chair and the CSU academic senators.
- (e) Ex officio, nonvoting members are (1) the President of the University or designee, (2) the Provost or Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee, (3) one representative from among the academic deans, (4) the ASI

President and ~~Executive Vice President of ASI or designees~~ Chair of ASI Board of Directors, and (5) the Vice President for Student Affairs.

Section 2. Powers and Responsibilities of the Academic Senate

Joint decision making and consultation between the administration and the General Faculty have been recognized by the legislature of the State of California as the long accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and are essential to the educational missions of such institutions. In order to participate fully in the process of joint decision making and consultation with the administration, the Academic Senate is empowered to exercise all legislative and advisory powers on behalf of the General Faculty. These legislative powers shall include all educational matters that affect the General Faculty (e.g., curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards). Advisory powers shall include, but not be limited to consultation on budget policy, administrative appointments, determination of campus administrative policy, University organization, and facilities use and planning.

It is the responsibility of the Academic Senate to respond to requests for legislative action or advice from the President within sixty days of the receipt of such requests. On those occasions when the President disapproves Senate legislation, she shall inform the Senate in writing within sixty days from the date of transmittal of the compelling reasons for disapproval. The President shall inform the Senate of the disposition of such matters upon which the Academic Senate has performed in its advisory capacity.

The Academic Senate has the right to present to the Chancellor or the Board of Trustees of the CSU any matter pertaining to the conduct and welfare of the University. The Academic Senate, through its chairperson, is empowered to express the sentiments of the General Faculty.

The Academic Senate is empowered to adopt bylaws for its governance.

Section 3. Officers

The officers of the Academic Senate are a Chair, a Vice Chair, and a Secretary as provided for in the bylaws.

Section 4. Organization

The Academic Senate shall function through its standing and ad hoc committees as well as through floor discussion and debate. Enumeration of the committees and their responsibilities is specified in the bylaws. **Meetings** of the Academic Senate and its committees shall be called and conducted as specified in the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate*. 50% plus one member of the Academic Senate membership constitutes a quorum.

ARTICLE IV. AMENDMENTS

Amendments to this constitution may be proposed by initiative in a meeting of the General Faculty (Article II, Section 3) or by resolution of the Academic Senate by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting.

Amendments to this constitution shall be adopted by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast by the voting members of the General Faculty. A referendum to amend this constitution shall be administered by the Academic Senate Chair within 45 days of the receipt of a duly submitted proposal.

BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

1. INTRODUCTION

A. CONSULTATIVE PROCEDURES

1. Consultative **procedures** to be used by the Academic Senate must guarantee full participation by the faculty in the formulation of policies and procedures affecting academic governance.
2. The **consultative process** must provide adequate time for collection and dissemination of information, discussion, and formulation of recommendations.
3. Recommendations from the **Senate** shall normally be submitted to the President. Actions taken by the President in response shall be reported to the Senate.
4. In accordance with procedures specified for particular committees in these bylaws, committee recommendations shall be reported to the Academic Senate.
5. Any appointee of the Executive Committee, or of the Academic Senate Chair, to any committee not specified in these bylaws, shall report from such **committee** to the Academic Senate or to one of its committees.
6. Any senator who believes that consultative procedures on any recommendation of the Senate or of any department or of a college have not been adequate, may submit evidence in writing to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in support of this belief and request an investigation. The Executive Committee will make a determination as to the merit of the written evidence and then assign this matter to an appropriate committee for investigation. The committee may then make recommendations for improvement of these consultative procedures to the Academic Senate.

B. DEFINITIONS

1. Title Change

When there is a change in the title of an individual listed as an ex officio member of an Academic Senate committee, without any substantial changes in the duties of this individual, this title shall be changed in the bylaws as an editorial change and need not go through the normal procedures for amending bylaws.

2. ASI Representatives

Unless otherwise specifically stated in these bylaws, ASI representatives on committees shall be students carrying at least seven quarter units, who have completed two quarters within the previous academic year, at least 24 quarter units at Cal Poly, and who have a Cal Poly grade point average of at least ~~2.0~~ 2.3.

3. Full-time Academic Employees

Full-time faculty members holding rank and occupying positions in academic departments/teaching areas in the University, full-time personnel in Professional Consultative Services (as defined in Article III.1.b of the *Constitution of the Faculty*), and full-time lecturers holding one-year appointments in academic departments/teaching areas shall be considered full-time academic employees. This

status shall not lapse because of a temporary part-time appointment to duties outside the department/teaching area.

4. Part-time Academic Employees

Part-time lecturers in academic departments/teaching areas in the University and part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services (professional Consultative Services classifications: librarians, counselors, student service professionals I-, II-, ill-academically related, student service professionals III and IV, Cooperative Education lecturers, physicians, and coaches) who are not members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I of the *Constitution of the Faculty*.

5. College Caucus

All of the senators from each college and Professional Consultative Services shall constitute the caucus for that college or Professional Consultative Services. Part-time academic employees shall not be part of any college caucus.

6. Temporary Vacancy

A vacancy caused by illness, death, resignation, retirement, sabbatical leave, jury duty, temporary administrative appointment, or other compelling reason which will last generally less than one academic year.

7. Vacant Position

A vacancy resulting from the criteria for membership specified in Article III, Section 1 of the *Constitution of the Faculty*. Vacancies shall be filled in accordance with Article III.B.7 of the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate*.

8. Voter Eligibility

Voting members of the General Faculty as specified in Article I of the constitution are eligible to vote for:

- a. Senators from colleges or Professional Consultative Services;
- b. CSU academic senators;
- c. Members to the Grants Review Committee;
- d. Consultative committees as needed.

II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

A. ELIGIBILITY

1. Elected Members

Elected members shall be full-time members of the General Faculty who have been nominated and elected in accordance with Article III of these bylaws. ~~Elected members shall be voting members.~~

2. Ex Officio Members

Ex officio members ~~shall be nonvoting as~~ are specified in Article III.1.e of the constitution.

3. Representative of Part-time Academic Employees

A voting member of the Academic Senate representing part-time academic employees shall be elected by vote of all University part-time academic employees during fall quarter of each academic year. Such representative must have an academic year appointment in order to serve in this position.

B. TERMS OF OFFICE

The elected term of office shall be two years. A senator can serve a maximum of two consecutive, elected terms and shall not again be eligible for election until one year has elapsed. A senator appointed to fill 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, it shall not be counted as part of the two-term 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.

C. REPRESENTATION

1. Colleges and Professional Consultative Services with an even number of senators shall elect one-half of their senators each year. Those with an odd number of senators shall not deviate from electing one-half of their senators each year by more than one senator. All of the senators from each college and Professional Consultative Services shall constitute the appropriate caucus.
2. When a college or Professional Consultative Services with an uneven number of senators gains a new senator due to an increase in faculty in a year when more than one-half of their senators is to be elected, the new Senate position shall be for one year for the first year, then two years thereafter.
3. There shall be no more than one senator per department/teaching area elected by any college where applicable until all departments/teaching areas within that college are represented. A department/teaching area shall waive its right to representation by failure to nominate. This bylaw shall have precedence over Article m.B.7 of the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate*.
4. Nothing in this section (Section C) shall be interpreted to affect the filling of temporary vacancies. These vacancies shall be filled as specified in Article m .B.7 of these bylaws.

D. SUBSTITUTES

When a senator must miss Senate meetings over an extended period of time (two or three consecutive meetings), the senator must **notify** the appropriate caucus chair of the planned absences. The caucus chair will solicit nominations for a substitute, who is eligible for election to the Senate, from the senator's college/Professional Consultative Services. The caucus will then hold an election to decide who will act as a substitute. Substitutes shall be counted in the determination of a quorum and shall have voting rights. The caucus chair will transmit, in writing, the name of the substitute and the dates that substitute will be in attendance at Academic Senate meetings to the Academic Senate office.

E. PROXIES

When a senator must miss a Senate meeting or a portion of a meeting, the senator may select a member in the same college/Professional Consultative Services who is eligible for

election to the Senate or another senator who is a member of the college Professional Consultative Services to serve as proxy. The senator shall transmit in writing the name of the person to serve as proxy to the Academic Senate office. Proxies shall be counted in the determination of a quorum and will have the same right to vote as the senator who is absent.

F. AUTOMATIC RESIGNATIONS

Any senator missing more than two consecutive Senate meetings without a substitute or proxy shall be automatically resigned from the Senate at its regular meeting and shall be reinstated if an appeal for reinstatement is upheld by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

III. ELECTION PROCEDURES

Elections shall be held for membership to the Academic Senate, Senate offices, Academic Senate CSU, Grants Review Committee, appropriate recall elections for the preceding as per Section IX of these bylaws, and ad hoc committees created to search for such University positions as president, provost, vice presidents, college deans, and similar type administrative positions.

A. GENERAL PROCEDURES

Balloting shall be by the "double envelope system" (outside envelope signed, inside envelope sealed and containing the voted ballot) which ensures that only eligible persons will vote and ballots will remain secret.

1. Time and manner of nominations and elections will be announced in a timely fashion to facilitate maximum faculty participation.
2. Voter and candidate eligibility shall be verified.
3. The Executive Committee will rule on questions as they arise and serve as an appeals body to rule on any allegations of irregularities in the nomination and election process.
4. Votes will be publicly tallied at an announced time and place and results of the election will be published.
5. Ballots will be counted only if they are properly signed and received by the announced closing date. Ballots will be retained for ten working days.
6. Those candidates who receive the highest number of votes shall be declared elected.
7. Department/teaching area representation shall have precedence in elections according to Article n.C.3 of the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate*.

B. ELECTION CALENDAR

1. During the first week of winter quarter, the Academic Senate office shall solicit nominations to fill vacancies for the next academic year. At the same time, each caucus chair shall be notified, in writing, of such vacancies. ~~By Friday of the following week, each caucus chair shall notify the Senate office, in writing, of any discrepancies in the number of vacancies in its constituency.~~ Accepted nominations shall include a signed statement of intent to serve from the candidate.

Eligibility to serve shall be determined for each college and Professional Consultative Services.

2. Election of senators shall be conducted during the last week of January in February. ~~Any~~ Runoff elections, if needed, shall be conducted the week following the conclusion of the election.
3. At the first Senate meeting after the ~~coalesiOB of the election,~~ the names of all nominees, the dates of the elections (including a runoff, if necessary), and the time and place at which ballots will be counted shall be reported.
4. Election results shall be announced by direct or electronic mail to all departments and again at the first Senate meeting following the electioas. Election results shall be announced to the campus and the Senate.
5. Whenever the normal election process fails to provide full membership or when a vacancy occurs:
 - (a) the caucus for the underrepresented collegeProfessional Consultative Services shall solicit nominations through direct or electronic mail contact to each faculty member in the collegeProfessional Consultative Services. (See department/teaching area representation requirement in Article II.C.3 of these bylaws.) Accepted nominations shall include signed statements of intent to serve from the candidates.
 - (b) from the list of accepted nominations, the caucus shall select ~~by secret ballot~~ the nominees of its choice and recommend the names of the selected nominees to the Executive Committee for its appointment.
 - (c) the appointed member shall serve until the end of the term of the position being filled.'
6. The procedures and timetable for election of CSU academic senators shall be the same as that for the campus Academic Senate and Grants Review Committee, except that nomination shall be by petition of not less than ten members of the faculty and shall include a consent to serve statement signed by the nominee. [Reference VII.B.5 of these bylaws for filling of temporary vacancy for a CSU academic senator.]
7. Election of Academic Senate officers:
 - (a) prior to the last regularly scheduled Senate meeting of winter quarter, eligible nominees of the Senate shall be solicited for the offices of Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.
 - (b) a petition of nomination signed by three senators which includes a consent to serve statement signed by the nominee shall be received by the Senate office. Such petitions shall be due at the Senate office prior to the last regularly scheduled Senate meeting of winter quarter. The names of the eligible nominees shall be announced at the last regularly scheduled meeting of winter quarter.
 - (c) nominations for other eligible candidates will be received from the floor of the Senate provided that (1) at least two senators second the nominations, and (2) the nominee is present and agrees to serve if elected.

- (d) the Academic Senate Vice Chair shall conduct the election of Senate officers at the last regularly scheduled meeting of winter quarter. Officers shall be elected one at a time: first the Chair, then the Vice Chair, and finally the Secretary.
 - (e) in the event of a vacancy in the offices of the Senate, an election will be conducted at the next meeting of the Senate to fill the unexpired term. Nominations shall be made from the floor of the Senate in compliance with subsection (c) above.
8. Election of representative for part-time academic employees:
- (a) during the first weeks of fall quarter, the Academic Senate office shall solicit nominations for the position of Academic Senate representative for part-time academic employees.
 - (b) after nominations have been received, election to this position shall be conducted. A runoff election, if needed, shall be conducted the week following the conclusion of the election. Said position shall be elected by vote of all University part-time academic employees unless only one nomination to this position is received, in which case the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall have the authority to appoint said nominee to the position.
 - (c) the elected member shall serve until the end of the academic year.

IV. OFFICERS

A. OFFICERS

The officers shall consist of the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary, as specified in Article III, Section 3 of the constitution. The duties shall be as follows:

1. Chair
 - a. The Chair shall set agendas and conduct all meetings of the Academic Senate and Executive Committee.
 - b. The Chair shall serve as a representative of the Academic Senate upon call by the President of the University.
 - c. The Chair shall meet with the President and Provost on a regular basis and brief them on Academic Senate business. The Chair shall perform a similar function at the Deans Council.
 - d. The Chair shall prepare an annual list of charges for Academic Senate committees in consultation with the President, Provost, Executive Committee, and the committee chairs. The Chair shall meet with each committee or committee chair before the end of fall quarter to review these charges as well as applicable bylaws and procedures [Xref: VIII.C.5&7J.

- e. The chair shall appoint a parliamentarian for Academic Senate meetings.
- f. The Chair shall serve as an alternate for the Academic Senate California State University and shall attend when an elected statewide senator must miss a given meeting and there is not time to elect a replacement.
- g. The Chair shall also transmit all official actions of the Academic Senate to the President of the University.

2. Vice Chair

In the event of a permanent vacancy in the office of Chair, the Vice Chair shall succeed to the office and a replacement Vice Chair shall be elected to complete the term of office. The Vice Chair shall serve in the capacity of the Chair during her/his absence or upon the request of the Chair.

3. Secretary

The Secretary or designee shall record the minutes of all Senate and Executive Committee meetings and shall provide copies of these minutes to all senators in the case of Senate meetings and to all Executive Committee members in the case of Executive Committee meetings. The Secretary or designee shall provide written notice of meetings to the appropriate faculty and shall handle correspondence of the Academic Senate. The Secretary or designee shall create three copies of the minutes of all meetings--one for the Chair, one to be passed to the library, and one to be filed in the Academic Senate office. The Secretary shall have available at each Senate meeting a current file of the actions of the Senate and a copy of the constitution and bylaws.

4. The immediate Past Chair, if available, shall serve as parliamentarian for Executive Committee and Senate meetings.

B. ELIGIBILITY

Each officer shall be an elected member of the Academic Senate. Every candidate for Academic Senate office shall have at least one more year to serve as an elected senator. A college is permitted to provide only one officer at a time.

C. TERMS OF OFFICE

Each officer shall be elected by the voting members of the Academic Senate for a one-year term. These elections shall be held at the last regularly scheduled Senate meeting of winter quarter and term of office shall begin with the start of summer quarter. The only limitation to the number of terms that a senator may hold office are the eligibility requirements in Article 11.A of these bylaws and the terms of office restrictions in Article 11.B of these bylaws.

D. REPLACEMENT

The filling of temporary vacancies shall be accomplished as specified in Article III.B.7.e of these bylaws.

V. MEETINGS

A. REGULAR MEETINGS

1. Regular meetings of the Academic Senate shall be held at 3:00pm on Tuesdays, as needed, except in the months of July, August, and September.
2. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall not schedule Academic Senate meetings:
 - (a) on an academic holiday;
 - (b) after the last regular day of classes during the quarter; or
 - (c) during final examinations.

B. SPECIAL MEETINGS

Special meetings may be held on call by the Academic Senate Chair or by petition of 25% of the membership of the Academic Senate.

C. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

Except as otherwise specified in these constitution and bylaws, the latest edition of *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* shall serve as the parliamentary authority for Academic Senate and Senate committee meetings.

VI. SUMMER OPERATION

A. MEETINGS

During summer quarter the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall meet as needed and shall act in place of the full Senate.

1. **If** any member of the Executive Committee other than the officers of the Senate will not be available during summer quarter, then the appropriate caucus shall elect an alternate to fill the vacancy during the absence. Such alternates shall be elected from the other senators of the same college or Professional Consultative Services as the person being replaced. **If** no such candidates are available, the caucus shall designate another person from the same college or Professional Consultative Services that qualifies for Senate membership to serve as an alternate.
2. **If** the Chair, Vice Chair, or Secretary will not be available during the summer quarter, the Senate shall, at the regular June meeting, elect an alternate officer from the Senate membership to fill the vacancy during her/his absence.

B. RESPONSIBILITIES

1. The Executive Committee shall act on behalf of the full Academic Senate during the summer quarter.
2. The usual Academic Senate representation on the President's Council and other administrative bodies shall be maintained throughout the summer quarter by the regular representative or an alternate named by the Academic Senate Chair.
3. At the first regular meeting of the Academic Senate in the fall quarter, the Executive Committee shall give a full report of its action during the summer quarter.

VII. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A. MEMBERSHIP

The Executive Committee shall consist of the officers of the Senate who serve the Executive Committee in like capacity, plus one senator a caucus chair from each college and one from Professional Consultative Services elected by the appropriate caucus. The CSU academic senators, the immediate Past Academic Senate Chair, the ASI President, the Chair of ASI Board of Directors, and the ProvostNice President for Academic Mfairs or designee are ex officio members. The ProvostNice President for Academic Affairs, the ASI President, and the Chair of ASI Board of Directors are ~~is a~~ nonvoting members. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members.

B. FUNCTIONS

The Executive Committee shall be responsible for the following functions:

1. ~~Setting the agenda~~ Agendizing resolutions for Academic Senate meetings;
2. The appointment of committee members and committee chairs (pursuant to section *VIII.C* of these bylaws);
3. The directing of studies to committees and receipt of reports there from for inclusion on the agenda;
4. The filling of temporary vacancies in the membership of the Academic Senate in accordance with Article *ill.B.7* of these bylaws;
5. The making of nominations for a temporary vacancy for CSU academic senator. The Academic Senate shall elect a replacement to the position to be effective only until the next regular election date for members of the Senate or until the individual that vacated the position returns;
6. The filling of temporary vacancies in Senate office or membership of the Executive Committee except in the case of vacancies created by recall (see section *IX* of these bylaws);
7. The approving of nominations and/or appointments by the Academic Senate Chair to other official committees.

VIII. COMMITTEES

A. GENERAL

The functional integrity of the Academic Senate shall be maintained by the committee process. The committee structure shall include standing committees staffed by appointment or ex officio status, elected committees staffed by election, and ad hoc committees staffed either by appointment or election as directed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

B. MEMBERSHIP

Except as noted in the individual committee description, committees shall include at least one voting General Faculty representative from each college and Professional Consultative Services. The Academic Senate Chair is an ex officio, nonvoting member of all committees. Additional ex officio representation may include members of Administration,

ASI representatives appointed by the ASI president, the Chair of the Academic Senate, faculty emeriti, and other representation when deemed necessary by the Senate. Ex officio members shall be voting unless otherwise specified in the committee's description,

During spring quarter, each caucus shall convene to nominate candidates from that college or Professional Consultative Services to fill committee vacancies occurring for the next academic year.

These nominations shall be taken to a meeting of the Executive Committee before the June regular meeting of the Senate. The Executive Committee shall appoint members to standing committee vacancies from these lists. Each appointed member shall serve a two-year term with a maximum appointment of four consecutive terms on one committee. Terms shall be staggered to ensure continuity.

No person shall be assigned concurrent membership on more than one standing committee except for Executive Committee members who may serve on the Executive Committee and one other Senate committee.

C. COMMITTEE CHAIRS

1. Chairs shall be members of the General Faculty.
2. Committee chairs shall be voting members and may be chosen from inside or outside the committees. The chair need not be an academic senator.
3. The Executive Committee may choose to appoint the committee chairs, If the Executive Committee chooses not to appoint a committee chair, then the chair of that committee shall be elected by a majority vote of the eligible voting members on the committee.
4. Committee chairs serve for one-year terms.
5. Each committee chair shall be responsible for reporting committee activities to the Academic Senate implementing the charges established by the Academic Senate Chair [Xref: IV.A.I.d], for keeping minutes, and for making quarterly reports to the Academic Senate Chair.
6. The committee chair shall notify the chair of the college caucus whenever a member has not attended two consecutive meetings.
7. Committee chairs shall meet with Academic Senate Chair at least annually before the end of fall quarter or fall J.d.

D. OPERATING PROCEDURES

Operating procedures for Academic Senate committees are as follows:

1. A simple majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for a meeting. A quorum is required to conduct business.
2. Chairpersons serve until the end of the academic year. In the event that a chair must miss a meeting, s/he shall appoint a substitute chair for that meeting.
3. Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the chair or upon the request of three members of the committee. Committees are required to meet at least once per quarter during the school year. Regular meetings shall be scheduled during normal work hours.

4. Notification of meetings shall be sent by the committee chair at least three **working** days before the meeting date. Committees may establish regular meeting times. Upon committee agreement, a regular meeting time shall constitute notice.
5. Members may not vote by proxy.
6. A vote by the majority of the voting members attending a meeting shall be the decision of the committee.
7. Minutes shall be kept for each meeting and a copy transmitted to the Academic Senate office.
8. Special *rules* and procedures must be approved by the Executive **Committee**, included in the **committee's** description, and on file with the Academic Senate office.

E. MEETINGS

Meetings of all committees except those dealing with personnel matters of individuals shall be open. The time and place of each meeting shall be announced in advance.

F. REPORTING

Each committee shall maintain a written record of its deliberations. A summary report shall be submitted to the Academic Senate office at the end of the academic year.

G. MINORITY REPORTS

Minority reports may be submitted with the reports of the committees.

H. COMMITTEES

1. Budget and Long-Range Planning
2. Curriculum (and its subcommittee: U.S. Cultural Pluralism Subcommittee)
3. Distinguished Scholarship Awards
4. Distinguished Teaching Awards
5. Faculty Affairs
6. Fairness Board
7. Grants Review
8. Instruction
9. Research and Professional Development
10. Sustainability

1. COMMITTEE DESCRIPTIONS

1. Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee

a. Membership

Ex officio members shall be the ProvostNice President for Academic Affairs or designee, ~~the Budget Officer or designee~~, the Vice President for Administration and Finance or designee, and an ASI representative.

b. Responsibilities

- (1) The Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee shall provide oversight and make recommendations concerning policy for the allocation of budgeted resources. This includes the review of matters related to the allocation of budgeted resources and representation on bodies formed to review the mechanisms by which campuswide resource allocations are made.
- (2) In addition, the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee shall also develop recommendations concerning future actions, policies, and goals of the University. Areas assigned to specific standing committees of the Academic Senate fall within its purview when future predictions and extreme long-range planning are necessary or possible.

2. Curriculum Committee

a. Membership

~~General Faculty~~ from ~~colleges~~ College representatives shall be either ~~(1)~~ the current chair of ~~their~~ college ~~curriculum committee~~ or ~~(2)~~ a current member of their college curriculum committee. The Professional Consultative Services representative shall be an academic advisor from one of the colleges. Ex officio members shall be the Provost/Nice President for Academic Affairs or designee, the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs or designee, the Dean of Library Services or designee, a representative from Academic Records, and an ASI representative.

b. Responsibilities

The Curriculum Committee evaluates curriculum proposals from departments and colleges before making recommendations to the Academic Senate. In addition, the committee makes ~~shall develop~~ recommendations ~~regarding academic master planning and curriculum; academic programs;~~ to the Senate on University requirements for graduation, general education, learning objectives, and cultural pluralism; provides library oversight as it relates to instruction curriculum; and addresses any other curriculum-related matter referred to it by the Senate, Senate chair, or Executive Committee. Members will meet at least quarterly and as needed. The chair of the Curriculum Committee shall be responsible for ~~the~~ coordination of the curriculum review with ~~the~~ Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs office Academic Programs. The chair of the Curriculum Committee shall meet regularly with the chair of the Instruction Committee and the Chair of the Academic Senate.

U.S. Cultural Pluralism Subcommittee

There will be a standing subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee that is responsible for the initial review of courses proposed to fulfill the Cultural Pluralism baccalaureate requirement. This subcommittee shall consist of ~~one~~ General Faculty representative from each college and Professional Consultative Services. Terms shall be for two years, staggered to ensure continuity.

Academic Senate caucuses will solicit and receive applications for membership. The slate of applicants will be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee who will appoint members.

A chair of this subcommittee will be elected from the subcommittee members each academic year.

Ex officio Members shall be the department chair of Ethnic Studies, the department chair of Women's Studies, a representative from both the Director of the General Education Program, and the chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, or their designees, and an ASI representative.

Selection of courses to fulfill the requirement shall follow the criteria listed in Academic Senate resolution number AS-395-92.

Recommendations from this subcommittee will be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee which will, in turn, submit them to the Academic Senate for a vote.

3. Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee

a. Membership

General Faculty representatives should include former recipients of the Distinguished Scholarship Award. Ex officio members shall be the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs who shall also serve as the designee of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and two ASI representatives----one undergraduate and one graduate student.

b. Responsibilities

The Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee shall conduct the selection process and determine the policies and procedures to be used in accordance with the special rules and procedures approved by the Executive Committee for judging potential candidates for the Distinguished Scholarship Award.

4. Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee

a. Membership

The Distinguished Teaching Award Committee shall be composed of five General Faculty members from different colleges, when possible, and two students. The faculty members will be appointed by the Chair of the Academic Senate with the approval of the Executive Committee. These faculty members will be representatives should include former recipients of the Distinguished Teaching Award and will serve two year staggered terms. Colleges not represented during a term of membership will be rotated onto the committee when a member needs to be replaced. The students will be appointed by ASI. Ex officio members shall be two ASI representatives. These will have at least junior standing and will have completed at least three consecutive quarters and 36 quarter units at Cal Poly with at least a 3.0 grade point average.

b. Responsibilities

~~The Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee shall conduct the selection process and determine the policies and procedures to be used for judging potential candidates for the Distinguished Teaching Award. Nominations for the award will be received by the committee during fall quarter and final selection will be made no later than the sixth week of spring quarter. The Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee shall conduct the selection process in accordance with the special rules and procedures approved by the Executive Committee for judging potential candidates for the Distinguished Teaching Award.~~

5. Faculty Mfairs Committee

a. Membership

Ex officio members of the Faculty Mfairs Committee shall be the Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel or designee and an ASI representative.

b. Responsibilities

The Faculty Mfairs Committee shall be the advisory body of the Academic Senate on faculty policy and its administration and procedures. The scope of faculty procedures and policies coming within its purview includes standards and criteria concerning appointment, promotion, tenure, academic freedom, leaves of absence, retention, professional relations and ethics, research, grievance, layoff procedures, and lecturers' rights and responsibilities.

6. Fairness Board

a. Membership

Ex officio members are the Vice President for Student Mfairs or designee and two ASI representatives with no less than junior standing and three consecutive quarters of attendance at Cal Poly preceding appointment.

b. Responsibilities

The procedures to be followed and the problems to be considered shall be approved by the Academic Senate and published as a document entitled *Fairness Board Description and Procedures*. The Board shall report to the Provost and Academic Senate Chair.

7. Grants Review

a. Membership

(1) Pursuant to the Chancellor's Office guidelines for the State Faculty Support Grants (SFG) , [AA-2006-25], a majority of the membership shall consist of elected faculty members elected by the probationary and tenured faculty. They shall be elected as follows:

———Ca) OBe member shall be elected from each college and Professional Consultative Services by faculty unit employees from that college and Professional Consultative Services, respectively.

(b) ~~membership shall be for two year terms, with the terms of service staggered between the various colleges and Professional Consultative Services.~~

(2) Ex officio members shall be the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs or designee, ~~an instructional dean or designee, the Foundation Executive Director or designee,~~ and an ASI representative. ~~Pursuant to the Chancellor's Office guidelines for the State Faculty Support Grants (SFSG),~~ ~~the ASI representative must be a graduate student. The representative of the instructional eeaBS shall be appointed by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs for a two year repeatable term.~~ Ex officio members shall be nonvoting members of this committee.

(3) ~~The chair of the Grants Review Committee shall be elected from the elected faculty members of the committee.~~

~~(4)~~ (3) No member of the Grants Review Committee is eligible to apply for any grant, leave, or award program administered by the committee while serving on the committee.

b. Responsibilities

- (1) In coordination with the Research and Professional Development Committee, the Grants Review Committee shall develop and recommend policies and procedures for the review of grant proposals referred to it, including the State Faculty Support Grants (SFSG).
- (2) Solicit, receive, and evaluate requests for State Faculty Support Grants and make recommendations for funding, when appropriate, to the Dean for Research and Graduate Programs.
- (3) Make recommendations concerning the funding of other internal grants when appropriate.
- (4) Evaluate requests for special leaves for research or creative activity and, when appropriate, rank order them for consideration and transmit this ranking through the Academic Senate Chair to the President.

8. Instruction Committee

a. Membership

Ex officio members shall be the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee, the Vice Provost for Information Technology Services or designee, the Dean of Library Services or designee, a representative from Academic Records, and an ASI representative.

b. Responsibilities

The Instruction Committee shall be responsible for recommendations regarding subjects that impinge directly on the quality of teaching and for providing policy recommendations concerning grading as well as

admissions policies and requirements. It will also provide review and input concerning electronic teaching techniques.

In accordance with CAM 481 and AS-357-91/IC, the Instruction Committee shall review the Academic Calendar as proposed by the Provost/Nice President for Academic Affairs before its final submission to the President for approval.

~~The chair of the Instruction Committee shall meet regularly with the chair of the Curriculum Committee and the Chair of the Academic Senate.~~

9. Research and Professional Development Committee

a. Membership

Ex officio members shall be the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs or designee, ~~an instructional dean or designee, the Vice President for Administration and Finance or designee, the Foundation Executive Director or designee,~~ and an ASI representative. ~~The representative of the instructional deans shall be appointed by the Provost/President for Academic Affairs for a two year repeatable term. Ex officio members shall be nonvoting members of this committee.~~

b. Responsibilities

The Research and Professional Development Committee shall:

- (1) Make recommendations ~~concerning~~ on University policies and procedures ~~for research and professional development activities on campus~~ regarding scholarship.
- (2) Provide advice and guidance ~~related to research and professional development to the following~~ regarding scholarship to the following:
 - (a) Kennedy Library
 - (b) Information Technology Services
 - (c) Cal Poly Technology Park
 - (d) University committees
 - (e) campus research centers and institutes

10. Sustainability Committee

a. Membership

Ex officio members shall be the Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives and Planning or designee, the Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education or designee, the Director of Facilities Planning, the Manager of Engineering and Utilities, one academic dean, and two ASI representatives.

b. Responsibilities

The Sustainability Committee shall inform and support the activities of other committees whose scope encompasses environmental responsibility. The Sustainability Committee shall make recommendations to the

Academic Senate, as appropriate, regarding the provisions of the Talloires Declaration.

IX. RECALL OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES

A. APPLICATION

The procedures for recall shall apply to:

1. Elected members of the Academic Senate, California Polytechnic State University;
2. Officers of the Academic Senate, California Polytechnic State University;
3. Elected representatives to the Academic Senate, California State University; and
4. Members to the Grants Review Committee.

B. PROCEDURES

An election for recall of elected representatives as specified in Article II, Sections 1 and 3 of the constitution, may be instituted by a petition of those eligible to vote in the election for the representatives in the various categories provided the following provisions are met:

1. An individual eligible to vote in the election for the representative shall **notify** the Academic Senate Chair of her/his intention to circulate a recall petition. This written notification shall state further the reasons for the recall action in brief terms.
2. The Academic Senate Chair shall notify all of the eligible voters in the area affected of the intended recall petition and state the reasons given for the petition to recall.
3. The notification will be in effect five (5) days in which classes are in session prior to the circulation of the petition. Signatures on a petition may be obtained for the next ten (10) days in which regular classes are in session. A recall election, if required, shall be initiated within twenty (20) days, in which classes are regularly in session, after the recall notification is received by the Academic Senate Chair.
4. The recall petition will be circulated by those initiating the recall action. The top of each sheet heading a list of signatures for recall action shall contain a statement of the reasons for recall.
5. The dated signatures of at least 20% of those eligible to vote in the area represented by the incumbent as specified in the constitution and bylaws of the Academic Senate, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, or the *Constitution and Bylaws of the Academic Senate CSU*, shall be required to initiate a recall election.
6. If the petition is for the recall of a member or an officer of the Academic Senate, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, a member of the Grants Review Committee, or a CSU academic senator, the Academic Senate office shall conduct the balloting in these elections.
7. The recall ballot shall be worded so that it can be answered "yes" or "no."
(name) shall be recalled from the (category of elected representative). The reasons stated in the petition are as follows:

- | | Yes | No |
|-----|--|----|
| 8. | A majority vote of those eligible to vote and voting will be sufficient to recall the incumbent. | |
| 9. | If the incumbent is recalled, nominees will be solicited for ten (10) days in which regular classes are in session from the area where the vacancy now exists. | |
| 10. | After nominees have been received, the Academic Senate Chair shall notify all of the faculty members of the college or area affected of the nominees and of the time and place of the election to fill the vacancy created by the recall. | |
| 11. | The election procedures and ballot counting shall be as provided in these bylaws for regular elections. | |

X. AMENDMENTS TO THE BYLAWS

These bylaws may be amended by a two thirds majority vote of the senators present at a regular meeting of the Academic Senate, providing that a first reading of the proposed amendment has taken place at the previous regular meeting of the Academic Senate.